

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**December 13 1984**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, in the most recent ceremony at Rideau Hall, four Saskatchewan residents were honoured with the Order of Canada medal, and they are Mr. Earnest Chan, Mr. Will Klein, Chief Hilliard McNabb, and Mr. Henry Langan, Sr. And I have extended and will be extending invitations to them to be coming into the legislature and introduced. And we are honoured today to have one of those members with us, and I would ask the Legislative Assembly to please acknowledge the presence of Mr. Will Klein, who has received the Order of Canada from the province of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. KLEIN:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to echo the Premier's sentiments on behalf of the small-business community of the province of Saskatchewan. We all know that Will is the president of the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, and I think it has been a most deserving award to a most deserving recipient.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

**Increasing Taxes**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, and the question deals with the disturbing news which he brought to his pre-budget meetings in Regina yesterday — that is, that the government to which he belongs, which came to power promising to cut taxes, is now looking at increasing taxes.

And I want to ask the minister whether, in the review of taxes that he is considering increases, are there any specific tax increases which you have considered taboo? Are there any specific tax increases which you have now considered and ruled out?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, I think it's important to bear in mind that the budget dialogue meetings is an exercise by which we try to involve the community, various sectors of the community: small business, agriculture, the labour movement, the hospital people, the health care sector, social services sector. And for the first time, not only in Saskatchewan, but across Canada, we share with them the real world that we live in — fiscal. And we suggest to them, what would you do? What things should we look at?

Now obviously that exercise involves: should you let the deficit go higher, or should it be lower, or should it stay the same? Should you raise revenues, and which revenues should you raise, or should you reduce revenues? Should you deal with expenditures, and how should you deal with expenditures? And that process is open, and, quite frankly, I'm very proud of that process.

With regards to tax increases, Mr. Speaker, with regard to tax increases, I can tell you of the two meetings we've had this year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who was I talking to? Well, I'll be happy to answer that. We had people like Andy Robinson. Andy Robinson is the Regina committee of International Association of Machinists. We had Gus Zaba. We had Ivy Scales. All these real hard, over-right-wing people that participated, Mr. Speaker, in that process.

The only one on tax that we really, I think, saw some unanimity, if you like, that should be increased is the tax on cigarettes and the tax on booze. I haven't determined, and we haven't determined, whether those will go up again, but I suspect they're in the top category of ones that we're going to be looking at.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My question is the same one I asked you before, and which you avoided at length. And considering tax increases, are there any tax increases which you have now considered and ruled out?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Well, I'll tell you. With regard to tax increases, with regard to tax increases, Mr. Speaker, it is this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You would suggest that I am somehow afraid to look at you. All right. I'll tell you what. I'll tell you what. I happen not to believe in the wisdom of tax increases if they can be avoided, and they should be avoided if at all possible.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I think if one thing, Mr. Speaker, separates this side of the House and that side of the House, is you like to raise taxes. We do not like to raise taxes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — If we must be responsible, Mr. Speaker, if we must be responsible — and we are — to deal with the fiscal problems of this province, as every other province must, then we're prepared to look at anything that is fair and that is reasonable. But we are not bent on raising taxes as you are, whether it's estate taxes, whether it's gas taxes, whether it's income taxes, whether it's sales taxes, or, like your friends in Manitoba, a tax on employment, so you discourage people being hired.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It appears that we're throwing some stones and getting some squeals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — My question to you is this: I understood you to say that you had not ruled out increasing any particular tax. That's what I understood you to say. Have you ruled out increasing the sales tax in view of the fact that you in Kindersley and your colleagues campaigned on a platform of removing the sales tax?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The thin, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order, please. When you ask a question, give the minister an opportunity to reply.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, the thing that never ceases to amaze me about my friends opposite is that everything has to be black and white — everything has to be black and white, Mr. Speaker. I recall last budget we made some reductions in sales tax, power bills, telephone bills, that type of things — well received. We are moving towards reducing the sales tax where we can. Now obviously, I would like to eliminate all the sales tax. The reality is, we can't.

When we came to power, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps sometimes we should remember when we came to power, the former premier and the former prime minister put together this brilliant oil deal wherein, Mr. Speaker, wherein they projected — Trudeau and the former premier got together and said, "What is oil prices going to be? Well, we think they're going to be \$70 a barrel by 1988." \$70 a barrel? They're about 26 now. Had they gone to \$70 a barrel, and who are we to

question the wisdom of the former premier . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order, please. I want to caution the ministers that when you answer questions, you should be brief and to the point.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, we believe that that type of tax we would like to see addressed, and we hope to address it. All I'm simply saying to the House is this, that we will do that when we have the capacity to do it, Mr. Speaker, we will do it in a responsible and reasoned way. I can only close by saying this, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House do not like to raise taxes. Our philosophy is to hold the line on, and we'll reduce them. The members over there want to raise taxes. That is their bent. That's the way they deal with it, Mr. Speaker. And that's the difference between the two sides of the House.

### **Staffing of Gas Inspection and Gas Servicing Branches**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question is the Minister of Labour and deals with your sorry record of mismanagement and the coroner's jury report which blamed your department, in part at least, for the death of a 65-year-old woman. Yesterday, the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union added their voice to the countless others which have decried your handling of the matter both before and since it was raised. And they have said that the dangerous staffing in the labour department's gas inspections branch is just a tip of the iceberg because the same kind of understaffing exists in the electrical, fire, boiler safety units of your department. My question to the minister is: will you give this Assembly a full accounting of how many vacant positions there are in each of these units; how much a reduction in staff there's been; and how many of these positions you've advertised to have refilled?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a little bit of difficulty in understanding exactly what the SGEU is saying in their press release.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What they're saying is you're negligent.

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Okay. But they, the SGEU . . . I would suggest to them that they get the facts before making statements such as they did in their news release.

I would like to tell the legislature that in 1980, under the previous administration, in the electrical division there was a backlog of 27,700 inspections — under your administration — 27,700 inspections . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. Order, please. With the amount of hollering in the Chamber it's impossible to hear, and I would ask for decorum.

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1984, under a PC administration and my department, we have reduced the backlog by 2,500, with less staff.

And I would like to tell the members opposite that the staff level under your administration in 1980 was 38 people. The previous administration was also operating short three people. So there were 35 electrical inspectors working under your administration. That seems to fit in with the SGEU complaint, but it was happening then.

In 1981-82, the same thing — 38 permanent positions, and 2.5 or 3 positions short of 35. In 1984 we dropped the backlog 2,700, with a permanent staff of 35. And as of today, we have on staff 32 people, with two retiring, including the two that retired on September 30th. We've already

got the certification for a new chief electrical inspector. And the field inspector that retired — that is being advertised — we'll be back to our full complement.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, let me say by way of background, it is the responsibility of all members to accept what other members say at face value. But you're making that a challenging responsibility.

You have said on previous occasions that you have been unable to fill these positions. You make that claim in spite of the large number of unemployed people. On unemployed electrician, we find, that was cleaning dog pens. I wonder if he was offered a position in your department.

Mr. Minister, my question is based on the fact that most of these vacancies in the critical public safety area took place after inspectors retired and you didn't fill the position. My question to you is: why didn't you begin the process of filling the positions even before the inspectors retired?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had, as I said, almost a full complement. We have 35, and we were down to 32, and we're getting two back. We're back to 34, which is almost a full complement. And we agree that we can look after that with that kind of complement.

We have efficient staff in our departments to look after the situation. We're not shedding the priority of safety for the people of Saskatchewan down on the totem pole. In fact, we are improving it.

And I'd like to just talk about the fire-safety program. Under your administration in 1979 you had a complement of 22, and there were two vacancies back in 1979. In 1980 you had two vacancies. In 1981 you had two vacancies. In 1982 you had two vacancies. In 1984 we have added two new positions bringing the complement to 24.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — And working, as of this date, there are 19. We have already hired one for North Battleford, and we have one more that we have advertised internally for a complement of 21, one more than you people were operating with.

For the safety of the public of Saskatchewan, our 1984-85 budget calls for an additional five people, and those people will protect the families of — by the way of the best fire-prevention program that the Department of Labour has ever delivered in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if the facts are as you say they are, can you offer any opinion as to why the coroner's jury, after hearing all the facts, including those from your assistant gas inspector, recommended that three additional people be hired?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying earlier, we have a staff that is very competent. And who is to say that 22 or 21, and so on, are the right numbers? I think it will be some time before I say that the opposition, or Larry Brown with the SGEU, or Nadine Hunt with the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, are going to determine what we should have in our departments. They can make recommendations, and we'll listen to recommendations, but ultimately our staff will decide what is necessary to cope with the services of safety for the people of Saskatchewan. And if it may mean that we can do it with one less, that's what we will do it with.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. the minister indicates that he will listen to recommendations, and I can understand why he would be a little sceptical of recommendations coming from the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union or perhaps ourselves. Will he listen to the recommendation of the coroner whose job it was to make a ruling on what he thought was best for public safety in Saskatchewan? Will you adopt that recommendation?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Minister, we've been addressing the ruling of the coroner of the inquest. And as I stated earlier, we'll have a document to table. As soon as I have it, it will be on that table. And I would say that the recommendations by the coroner may not be what we believe is the problem. And that report will tell this Assembly exactly what the problem is.

### **Employment Development Subsidy — Qu'Appelle Hunt Club**

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I took notice of a question which was very critical of this government for funding a particular recreation program under our Saskatchewan Employment Development Program. Unfortunately the questions where were asked left some very erroneous and incorrect impressions which need to be corrected, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I want to indicate that there are a number of recreational organizations, Mr. Speaker, which are funded under this particular program. For example, the Spruce Home Trail Riders Club, the Red River Riding and Roping Club, the Hillcrest Sport Centre Golf Association, and a number of others, so funding of recreational programs is part of the overall program.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite suggested that this particular organization wasn't . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please! The opposition continually calls, "What is this in reply to?" It's a reply to the member from Shaunavon's question yesterday, and I believe if you just listen he will give . . . Order, please! He took notice of the question yesterday. Proceed . . .

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — The suggestion was made, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Qu'Appelle Hunt Club is an elitist organization. I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, how elitist this organization is. It is to elitist, Mr. Speaker, that the annual membership dues for a single person are \$20 a year, and the annual membership dues for a couple are \$35 a years.

Mr. Speaker, for an elitist organization one would expect that the hierarchy of society would be part of that organization. Well, the members of this organization are comprised of farmers, there are salesmen in there. There are civil servants there. Mr. Speaker, we have . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please! Give the minister an opportunity to . . . Order! Order! Proceed. I'm going to caution the member for Shaunavon for the third time, and the last time. Proceed.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, the membership of this organization is comprised of average Canadians. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and finally, this organization is so elitist that the recently nominated NDP candidate for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden was, and I believe still is, a member of the Qu'Appelle Hunt Club.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the members opposite in their generous spirit would certainly want to apologize to the members of the Qu'Appelle Hunt Club for the erroneous impression that they have left.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Supplementary.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — . . . the minister could indicate whether or not one Peter Grady, the former deputy minister, is a director of this club.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I indicated that farmers, and business people, and civil servants, and salesmen . . . I believe Mr. Peter Grady is a member of this particular organization, although I understand two other individuals from this club were the people that actually signed the contract with the Department of Social Services employment program.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I asked the minister very clearly, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't get an answer whether or not Peter Grady is a director — is a director, not a member. He answered whether or not he was a member. I want to know whether he is, or was, a director of the Qu'Appelle Hunt Club?

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know if Mr. Peter Grady is a director of this organization, just as I don't know if the particular member of the New Democratic Party that I mentioned is a director of that organization either.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the minister, and it has to do with his refusal to answer the question yesterday. And I don't want to get into a debate on whether or not certain individuals and their party membership . . . The statement made in the press yesterday by the employee in question was this:

The only people getting any kind of benefit out of this are the people who are wealthy people.

and I might add:

. . . he said, from his home in McLean.

Now you, Mr. Minister, regardless of the individual's background — and I could care less whether they are New Democrats, whether they are Conservatives, or whether they are Liberals. The point is that your deputy minister, the former deputy minister of labour, is involved in a club, an elite club, and I say it very clearly, is involved in providing a riding club to people at taxpayers' expense.

And I want to know whether or not you agree with that?

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't agree with his suggestion at all. Farmers, salesmen, civil servants, retired females, 4-H people; these are not the elite of society, Mr. Speaker. These are common, average, everyday Canadians who are involved in a very worthwhile recreational activity for children, for middle-aged people, for senior citizens, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, out of their generous spirit, they have decided to provide employment for individuals in our society. A very worthwhile thing to do . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I will ask the minister one more time whether he agrees with welfare recipients, former journeyman electrician being forced onto welfare and having to clean dog pens and help people mount their horses, whether or not he accepts that as meaningful employment for the people of the province.

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand the particular individual in question did have some association with this club previously. He had done some work for this particular organization, and as it relates to an individual having certain skills, and being on welfare, and taking a certain kind of a position, I will reiterate what I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker. If someone is on welfare and there is an opportunity there for them to work, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all work has dignity, all work has value, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DIRKS:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the Lord God made man to work, and He made work as a valuable activity. That's what I read in my Bible. perhaps the socialist Bible says something different.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

#### **Bill No. 16 – An Act respecting Court Officials**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Court Officials.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 17 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of the Court Officials Act, 1984**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill respecting The Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of the Court Officials Act, 1984.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 19 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act**

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act**

**HON. MR. PICKERING:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm going to just pause for a moment and ask the members for a little silence while we're trying to deal with items on the order paper. It's very difficult to hear.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Snowmobile Act**

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Snowmobile Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983**

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1984.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Statute Law**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Statute Law.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**POINT OF ORDER**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and I rise with respect to the conduct of the question period, and particularly the position taken by the Minister of Social Services that he had taken notice of a question. And I think it's important that this be cleared up because there is a clear difference of opinion as to the nature of the proceeding.

The Minister of Social Services yesterday answered, over a period of a good length of time, questions about the Qu'Appelle Hunt Club. At one point he said early in his remarks, "I don't have any knowledge of that particular program. I can take notice if the member wishes." He then went on to answer questions for a considerable period of time, consuming two and a half pages. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor? Two and one-half pages . . .

Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order, and I am being interrupted by members opposite, but I propose to proceed with my point of order. My point is this: . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I think both sides of this House have been unreasonably noisy throughout question period and are continuing to be so. And I'm asking for order so that this point can be cleared up.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, my point is this, very clearly: if a minister can say at the outset of his remarks, "I will take notice if the member wishes," and proceed for two pages to attempt to field the questions, and then decide after examining the transcript that he didn't do very well and wants a rebuttal the next day, then our question periods are going to be chaotic.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to review this transcript, and if you tell me that this is in order, then we will know what the rules are. As I understand the rules, it is not in order. My request is that you review the transcript and advise whether or not the minister had any status to rise today under



the guise of having taken notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'll review the transcript and bring back a ruling tomorrow. Why is the member on his feet?

### **POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

**MR. SVEINSON:** — That's a good question, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — State your point.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — 6(2) in the rule book . . . It's a question, Mr. Speaker, that I find is very serious, and I have to ask you to waive notice on the question in order to raise it today.

It's a question that involves the Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, and his subsequent and continued reign of terror against people within the civil service.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this minister was instructed . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. Order, please. The member is asking to raise a question of personal privilege, and he's raising it under Rule 6(2), and in order to do that he will have to have leave. Is leave granted?

Leave is not granted.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

#### **SECOND READINGS**

#### **Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Legal Profession Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of The Legal Profession Act, 1984 (No. 2).

This Bill amends section 79 of The Legal Profession Act. The amendment is requested by the law Society of Saskatchewan and is necessary in order to protect the public and to allow the law society to discipline its member lawyers who violate the provisions of The Legal Profession Act.

Mr. Speaker, this House passed an amendment to section 79 earlier this year, and that amendment was effective June 1, 1984. That amendment was also requested by the Law Society of Saskatchewan.

The intention of the law society in requesting the earlier amendment was to make the one-year limitation period applicable to summary conviction offences respecting the unauthorized practice of law. It was not intended to apply to disciplinary proceedings. However, the affect of the amendment may well have gone so far as to preclude disciplinary proceedings against lawyers who have contravened the Act unless those proceedings are commenced within one year of the infraction.

Many cases do not come to light until much later and, therefore, the law society has requested this further amendment to section 79 in order that the situation is rectified and the intent made clear. The law society requires that this change be made in order to protect the public and to allow it to police the activities of its members.

The Bill specifies that it is to be retroactive to June 1, 1984, which is the date that the previous amendment became effective. This is necessary to ensure that no mischief arises out of the interim amendment and to fully enable the law society to carry out its functions.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Legal profession Amendment Act, 1984 (No. 2).

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a few comments. I am rather surprised that only last year the Minister of Justice brought in the amendments to The Legal Profession Act, and what he is saying now is that now he is wanting to amend it. But he puts it onto the backs of the legal society, the benchers.

I think that this has been consistent with this Minister of Justice, that he has been fumbling the ball and bringing in legislation that's not properly drafted. "The last time," he says. He puts the blame onto the legal profession. I'd like to know why the Minister of Justice wouldn't be aware of what the amendment was doing last year? Certainly, here in the Act, what it did is to extend the time in which action could be taken, from six months to a year. Were you not aware as to what the provision of section 79 was doing? That it, in fact, covered all the procedures under the Act? Is that the basis? That you did not understand what you had brought in last year?

And the other fact I want to point out to the Minister of Justice, it's rather ill-becoming of the legal profession and the justice department to be coming in here and — who are always so concerned with retroactive legislation — now coming forward and wanting retroactive legislation back to June 1, 1984. And clearly here is . . . I suspect what has happened, is that the legal profession have been wanting to take action, and possibly have not done it within the time frame and are now going back to retroactivity to include a claim. That is not a very good piece of legislation coming from the Minister of Justice and from the legal profession.

I want to take a careful look at the minister's comments, Mr. Speaker, and accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of An Act to amend The Land Titles Act. Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to bring The Land Titles Act in line with The Planning and Development Act, 1983 which came into force in April of this year. The changes will accommodate the procedures and the terminology specified in that Act.

The procedures relating to the filing of plans with the land titles office and with the granting of titles to public lands are adapted to accommodate those procedures set out in The Planning and Development Act, 1983.

In addition, the master of titles will be able to grant an order to change the boundaries of a park or dedicated lands by following the procedures set out in The Planning and Development Act, 1983.

The Bill updates the terminology so that the language used in The Land Titles Act is consistent with that used in The Planning and Development Act, 1983. These changes are to be effective April 17, 1984, which is the date on which The Planning and Development Act, 1983, came into force.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Land Titles Act.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe we will have any particular problems with this, but we haven't had an opportunity to fully review it, and I would beg leave to adjourn

debate on this particular bill.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act**

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move second reading of a Bill, An Act to amend The Environmental Management and Protection Act.

As members will recall, the establishment of a water corporation this year required substantial changes to the province's environmental protection legislation. A new Act entitled The Environmental Management and Protection Act was created.

The vital components of the new Act were drawn from The Water Resources Management Act and The Department of the Environment Act. The new Act provides for the protection of the environment and includes clauses governing the safe operation and discharges from industrial and municipal works. A system of permits has been used for this purpose, and for many, many years, and was to be continued.

(1445)

The large number of projects my department regulates promoted my department to request legal advice on how charges could be laid should this ever be considered necessary after all the facts are determined. This legal review pointed out that the legislation enacted earlier this year was ambiguous in certain respects.

As was indicated last spring when The Environmental Management and Protection Act received clause-by-clause study in the committee, the intent was to consolidate environmental protection legislation by repealing a number of obsolete Acts and to increase the efficiency and authority of the department.

As in any change, Mr. Speaker, there are certain problems, and this amendment will give the Act the authority and the efficiency which it was originally intended. The retroactive clause in the Bill will ensure that the original intention of the Act in regards to all permit holders is enforceable.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to consider and study the content of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and review as well the minister's remarks to it. Therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Northern Municipalities Act**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, just over one year ago, on October 1, 1983, The Northern Municipalities Act came into force, dramatically changing the structure of municipal government in northern Saskatchewan.

That legislation resulted in the establishment of autonomous local governments in 13 northern communities which, until then, had not experienced the responsibility and challenge of administering their own municipal affairs. Eleven other northern communities, while not becoming established as autonomous municipal governments, were accorded and have grasped the opportunity at becoming much more involved and influential in the provision of municipal services to the residents of those communities.

I am pleased to report to the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the first year under the

new legislation has been one of success and accomplishment. Many of the accomplishments of the last year cannot just be measured in terms of tangible items in northern communities, such as buildings and roads, but also in the changes in attitude, interest, and maturity of the northern people serving as elected or appointed officials of northern municipalities. These people have shown a keen interest and awareness in moving their communities ahead, and in expanding and improving the services and facilities the communities have to offer.

During my tour last summer I visited 18 northern communities. I was most impressed by the interest and enthusiasm which was shown by northern municipal officials in meeting the challenges and responsibilities that The Northern Municipalities Act has placed upon them. There is still a long way to go, but with the help and support of this government I am confident that the people of northern Saskatchewan will set an example that people in the northern parts of other Canadian provinces will both envy and wish to follow.

Mr. Speaker, as with any new legislation, and particularly major legislation such as The Northern Municipalities Act, subsequent revision and fine tuning is often necessary. The amendments being brought before the members of this Assembly in this Bill represent revisions which are necessary for the effective and accurate application and administration of The Northern Municipalities Act.

Two of the amendments pertain to clause 291(3)(a) and to subsection 291(6). The amendments are necessary simply to correct what appear to have been typographical errors in the original legislation, but which, if left unchanged, would impede the operation of the Northern Revenue Sharing Trust Account.

The amendment to subsection 291(2) is required to facilitate the financial administration of the Northern Revenue sharing Trust Account. Briefly, the trust account is responsible for levying and collecting school taxes in northern Saskatchewan on behalf of the Northern Lights School Division, for all areas of the school division outside of the boundaries of towns and northern villages.

While authority exists with The Northern Municipalities act to levy and collect those taxes, authority to remit the proceeds of their collection to the school division was inadvertently omitted. As well, the trust account is empowered and may be required from time to time to make collections on behalf of other bodies, an example of which would be the Saskatchewan Water Corporation. The present legislation, again, does not provide the authority to make remittances of the funds collected. The amendment to this subsection provides the authority necessary to make those payments.

The final amendment is to subsection 298(2). During the course of realignment of the department of northern Saskatchewan to the various southern departments and agencies, certain physical realignments sometimes occurred prior to all the necessary legislative changes being achieved. This situation was created when realigning was the responsibility for the provision of assessment field inspection services from the department of northern Saskatchewan to the Saskatchewan Assessment Authority. A gap existed for a short period of time during which the Saskatchewan Assessment Authority continued to provide inspection services to northern municipalities without the complete legislative authority required to do so.

The Saskatchewan Assessment Authority now has that jurisdiction and responsibility. However, the legislative amendment made to give them that jurisdiction neglected to cover the period and the gap to which I have just referred.

The amendment being proposed to subsection 298(2) simply validates the assessment services which were provided to northern municipalities during the period between realignment and the passage of the amendment to The Saskatchewan Assessment (Authority) Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the Assembly to support these amendments, and I move second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend The Northern Municipalities Act.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister may very well be introducing an amendment to The Northern Municipalities Act. obviously, Mr. Speaker, we have had a fair amount of concern expressed to us in my constituency and the Athabasca constituency represented by my colleague, the member for Athabasca. We have had a number of concerns expressed to us relating to boundaries and local government jurisdictions, elections, and other related local government functions.

At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take some time to consider and study the minister's comments as well as the content of his amendment to The Northern Municipalities Act. Therefore I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Bill No. 14 — An Act to amend The Planning and Development Act, 1983**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of Bill 14, A Bill to amend The Planning and Development Act, 1983. The major amendment being proposed relates to the planning districts along the Qu'Appelle Valley.

Land-use plans to guide the future development of the valley have been prepared and adopted by the commissions of these planning districts. These land-use plans aid in ensuring that the Qu'Appelle Valley area will continue to support a wide range of activities and interest for the people of Saskatchewan by addressing the environmental, inter-municipal, and land-use interests in the valley.

The plans are in place and we are now prepared to examine alternative means of administering them.

For example, if, in the spirit of local autonomy, an individual municipality wishes to withdraw from the planning district and administer the plan themselves, we are prepared to consider that. However The Planning and Development Act currently does not permit it. The purpose of this amendment is to allow the minister to exclude a municipality from the planning district and transfer to that municipality, responsibility for administering the plan and zoning by-law developed by the district planning commission. In this way, the integrity of the comprehensive plan for the valley will be maintained while the management of local affairs can be returned to the local level.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendments proposed are of a technical nature. our purpose is to continue to be responsive to the needs of the people, organizations, and municipalities in this province, and ensure that our legislation is clear and specific in its intent. The amendments proposed clarify and make more specific certain sections of the Act. We have been advised by a variety of sources that some sections of the Act could be improved.

For example, section 80 deals with the referral of development agreements in a direct control district to the Provincial Planning Appeals Board for arbitration, if the developer and the municipality have been unable to negotiate an agreement. We have been advised that some lawyers feel this section, as currently worded in the Act, could lend itself to misinterpretation.

In its current form, the specific section could lead one of the parties to believe they can refer a signed agreement to the Provincial Planning Appeals Board, seeking an alteration of the agreement between the municipality and the developer. This is not the intent of this section, nor is it a desirable interpretation of this section. That such an interpretation of this section is possible, we wish to eliminate it by amending the Act.

Similar clarification is being provided by the amendment to section 227. This amendment relates to municipal development plans adopted under the former planning and development Act. The new Act currently provides for the continuing in force of these plans until they are replaced by a development plan adopted under the new Act. The proposed amendment clarifies that these old plans are to be administered under the new Act until their replacement.

Mr. Speaker, there are no issues of a policy nature in these technical amendments. They are simply to improve the clarity of specific sections to ensure interpretation is consistent with the intent, and to assist municipalities in the implementation of this Act.

In the past year, The Urban Municipality Act and The Planning and Development Act have been debated in this House and proclaimed. Both pieces of legislation were major steps in the direction of increasing local autonomy for urban municipalities. This government wants to assist urban municipal governments in making sound decisions. It is not our desire to tell urban municipalities what decision to make. In short, if we can reduce the road-blacks for urban municipalities by increasing local autonomy, then we help them govern more effectively and with more strength.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are part of this government's aim of putting the power for making local government decisions back into the hands of local government, and I urge the members of this House to support the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to review the bill in the light of the minister's remarks, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Bill No. 15 — An Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act**

**HON. MR. EMBURY:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to move second reading of Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Wakamow Valley Authority Act.

The amendments proposed in this Bill will add the rural municipality of Moose Jaw as a participating party in the Wakamow Valley Authority. The present participating parties include the city of Moose Jaw, the rural municipality of Baildon, and the province of Saskatchewan. This change has been requested jointly by the Wakamow Valley Authority and the rural municipality of Moose Jaw. The amendments before you are the product of a number of months of consultations with these two parties, as well as the rural municipality of Baildon and the city of Moose Jaw. They reflect the consensus which has resulted from this process.

Mr. Speaker, this consensus represents the agreement which the previous government was unable to achieve when it originally introduced The Wakamow Valley Authority Act. It permits participation of and co-operation among all the urban and rural municipalities who are willing to support Wakamow Valley.

As a participating party, the rural municipality of Moose Jaw, like the rural municipality of Baildon, will now have a member on the Authority's board and will contribute financially to the Authority's work. Section 5 will increase local decision-making autonomy by permitting either rural municipality to choose to withdraw as a participating party from the Authority at any time in the future. This particular provision is an expression of faith in the judgment of the rural municipalities which are involved. At the same time there is also an expression of faith in the work of the Authority since, Mr. Speaker, I believe, it is unlikely to ever be used.

(1500)

This amendment also recognizes the responsibilities each participating party has to the others and to the Authority, by making any withdrawal subject to notice being given to the Authority and other participating parties two years before it takes place.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note again that these provisions reflect the consensus developed among the participating parties. As such, it represents a very sound basis for the Authority's continuing efforts, and I would urge the members of this House to support the Bill.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — In review of the Bill and in light of the minister's remarks, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act**

**HON. MR. MCLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade, I'm pleased to rise to move second reading of an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the restraint our government has shown in spending during the past year, and further in keeping with the freeze on salary increases among senior managers in the public service, the government is proposing a freeze on all increases in indemnity and allowances to members of cabinet and members of this Assembly generally.

This legislation affects the following allowances: the indemnity for members; the sessional allowance for members; the Speaker's allowance; the allowance for deputy chairmen; for allowance for chairmen of standing committees; the allowance for the House Leaders; the allowance for whips; the allowance for the Leader of the Opposition; the allowance for the Leader of the third party, if that was the case as it isn't in this day; the salaries to members of cabinet and the Premier; the salary paid to legislative secretaries.

This freeze in increases is for one year, and the increase for 1986 will be based on the adjusted amount for 1985 as it has been affected by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorely tempted to discuss in a little more detail the prudent manner in which the government has managed expenses, particularly with respect to overseas trips for ministers and many other items of that nature, but I will refrain from doing so. I will say, on behalf of the opposition, that we agree with the action which the government is taking, and I will say that it is the position of the official opposition that we will be supporting the Bill.

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

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **SECOND READINGS**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Pickering

that Bill No. 7 — **An Act to amend The Forest Act** be now read a second time.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, we see nothing controversial in this legislation of this Bill, however, we will ask a few questions when we get it into committee, and we'll just let it go right now. And later on this day if you want to take it into committee, we will push it through.

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

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

### **Bill No. 3 – An Act to amend The Wascana Centre Act**

#### **Clause 1**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and, Mr. Minister, without prolong the debate, I want to say that I very much regret that this Bill does not reinstate the cuts made last year, the cuts of 20 per cent in the funding of Wascana Centre, which has remained uncut since 1962.

The basis of the Wascana Centre arrangement between the city and the university was that a fixed and statutory amount of money would be available. This was provided for in statute in 1962.

At times the university, as I think, felt that it would have wished that it could contribute less. At times the city has felt that it wished it could have contributed less. At times the Government of Saskatchewan has felt that it could have contributed less.

But each of them stuck to the bargain they made in 1962, until last year. Last year we had a statutory change reducing the contribution of the Government of Saskatchewan, and of all the parties necessarily, since they're formula contributions, by 20 per cent.

I have no hesitation in saying that the Wascana Centre Authority has made an outstanding contribution to the city of Regina and the province of Saskatchewan. Anybody who is familiar with the tourist attractions of Saskatchewan will rank the Legislative Building and the Wascana Centre park area as near the top of tourist attractions.

And while I am not sure of the figures, I believe it is the tourist attraction most frequently visited by out-of-province visitors. It is, of course, enjoyed by a great number of provincial visitors who come from outside Regina.

Accordingly, we should not view the Wascana Centre Authority only as park, only as grass around the Legislative Building, only as a recreational area for Regina citizens; we should regard it for what it is, a major tourist attraction and a major Mecca for people inside Saskatchewan who wish to have, as part of their holiday, a visit to the capital city and time spent in Wascana Centre.

Since the objective of much of our tourist policy is to ensure that Saskatchewan citizens spend more time in Saskatchewan and less time outside Saskatchewan, when they're on holidays, this is a point of some merit.

Mr. Chairman, the Bill last year reduced the total contribution of base funding to which the Centre Authority could look forward to by 20 per cent. The Bill we have before us, so far as I can ascertain, it simply retains the level of funding of last year, converting from the old mill rate prior to reassessment, to a mill rate following reassessment. This is the situation for the year ended March 31, 1986, and thereafter there are very modest increases of 3 or 4 per cent a year. And this terminates — this schedule of increase terminates in 1989; thereafter after April 1, 1989 it



continues on a flat basis of 1.7 mills calculated on the new mill.

It is my information that the conversion rate for the old mill to the new mill is 2.7 to 1. Accordingly, the figures look about right for a 4 to 1.5. And I, therefore, don't quarrel with the mathematics, but I would ask the minister whether or not it is his information that the Authority will get as much under 1.5 new mills as it would under 4 old mills?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would start out by answering the question which he just asked. And the answer is yes, that would be the equivalent — 1.5 in the reassessment is the equivalent of 4 mills under the old assessment.

Now in response to some of the remarks that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has made, I fully concur with the remarks that he did make concerning the significance of the Wascana Centre Authority. I, perhaps, have as much reason as anyone to be not just associated but very, very interested in the growth and the development of the Wascana Centre Authority, particularly, I suppose in a pragmatic way because of the fact that it is located right in the middle of the Wascana constituency which I am the MLA for.

At the time of the decision to make the assessment based on four mills as opposed to five mills, it was done in the context of establishing what the government priorities were. Considering that there was a policy of restraint, the Wascana Centre Authority, was asked to do its share, and I am very, very pleased to report that due to good management on the part of Mr. Joe Moran, who is the chief executive officer of the Wascana Centre Authority, and of all of his administrative staff and his works, they have done just an outstanding job of ensuring that services are rendered in the same way as previously. And although they are operating close to the vest, as most departments and agencies are expected to do in this day and age, they informed me that nothing has really suffered to date.

And so, in view of the fact that there was the reassessment taking place in the city, it was appropriate for a re-evaluation to take place, and so the three parties consulted — that is the provincial government, the city of Regina, and the University of Regina — and they developed a formula which was satisfactory to each of the participating parties.

(1515)

It was taken to the finance committee which consists of Dr. Lloyd Barber, major Larry Schneider, the chief executive officer, Joe Moran, and myself. We felt that it was a fair arrangement, that it was adequate to service the needs of the Wascana Centre Authority from the point of view of this year, and with the slight increase that was going to be forthcoming for the next four years, the finance committee felt that it was adequate in order to ensure that the same kind of development would take place as has taken place in the past.

This was then taken to the Wascana Centre Authority and was given approval by the Wascana Centre Authority. So I would at this point commend Mr. Joe Moran, and his staff, for a job well done in ensuring that this very, very important Wascana Centre Authority is not only adequately looked after, but superbly looked after.

And it looks as though in looking at the financial picture, it looks as though this particular year we should end up with a slight surplus, judging from what has been spent to date.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

**Bill No. 2 — An Act to establish the Employment Development Agency**

**Clause 1**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his officials?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Chairman, I introduce Dr. John Siu, the associate deputy minister of Justice, who's been seconded and will be the chief executive officer of the Employment Development Agency; and behind, Mr. Ron Hewitt, who's familiar to members.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question, Mr. Minister, is: why this trip? What's the necessity for the employment agency? This is the third of these little roundabouts we've had. We had the present Minister of Education who was set up to be the jobs minister. She lasted until spring — till last spring. We then had the Department of Advanced Manpower and Education, and he seems to have failed, too.

I wonder why we now need yet a third agency. Why can't we just make some effort to make the agencies we have, work, instead of continually moving a problem?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, I think the agency may be a sign of success rather than anything else, in that we have . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . An agency was announced before any figures came out, I might remind the hon. members. But there is a great deal of activity in the Department of Education, Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, and throughout the public service, and throughout the government.

And having said that, it was our view that there should be a co-ordination of the activities to ensure that we do, in fact have a focus on job creation. We indicated in our second reading that we would monitor existing programs. We would attempt to be a catalyst to develop new programs without necessarily to go through the traditional structures. And it may give us a more ready response to different initiatives.

Having said that, I've given several reasons. Some of the goals and functions I gave in the second reading: to collect and maintain and update an inventory of employment development programs and policies; to promote and co-ordinate the development of employment development policies and programs by individual departments; to create an interdepartmental process to monitor, promote, and co-ordinate employment development initiatives; to ensure consistency of those initiatives. And I go on.

We also indicated that we want to pay special attention to the employment needs of specific employment groups such as the youth, women, natives, the handicapped, to act as a catalyst for ideas both from within government and from the general public. So we see it as a co-ordinating role. we do not, at this time, as I've indicated, see it as a program delivery role, but certainly an effort to focus the government activities in this very important area.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, you have had two years to perform those functions under the existing agencies, and I say, Mr. Minister, that you've neglected them all. You came into office with a rate of unemployment which was satisfactory to all concerned. Under this administration, the rate of unemployment has degenerated. We have gone from having the third or fourth best rate of job development, down to the ninth. The short question is, Mr. Minister, all of those worthy objectives which you enumerate, but which your government has taken no concrete steps to reach, why couldn't all of those have been handled under the Advanced Education and Manpower mandate?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the difficulty, of course, with any line department is that they are focused on the activities within their department. I mean we take a look at within the province generally. You have two basic streams. one, the general creation of demand which would be on

the side of small business, tourism, industry, trade and commerce, or trade and economic development. Then we have the other stream of the unemployed and what to do to make sure that they both have training opportunity. When we take Social Services, it's got a specific target area. Advanced Education and Manpower has been concentrating on training. So pulling them together and make sure that all are in co-ordination, I just think is good management.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Why couldn't that have been done by the . . . why couldn't that pulling together co-ordination have been done by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower? The accusation I make in clear and simple terms is that you will not, have not, and cannot deal with unemployment, so you're moving the problem around every year to create the illusion of some progress. Reorganization does not mean any progress. In fact, it usually is a sign of disorganization, inefficiency, and demoralization.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I don't know why the hon. member would make that rather extreme assumption. From time to time we have activities in any government where we have interdepartmental cabinet committees. We have co-ordinating activities by cabinet ministers in all sorts of areas. That's common practice of any government. And to flesh that up I think exemplifies the effort that we're prepared to put into the matter. I don't see the co-ordinating activity as something that's strange. In fact, again I just simply say it's good management.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I guess the proof of the pudding, Mr. Minister, will be in the eating. During the '70s we created about 10,000 jobs a year. Under the tutelage of this administration we lost about six, I believe, the first year, and gained four of them back, so we're still down 2,000 jobs over 1982.

The question, Mr. Minister, is: what is your goal for the next year? Let's take it easy on you. How many jobs do you expect to create over the next year? What is your target?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — As we've indicated, that the agency we hope to have up and operating in January, certainly it will be one of our objectives to set target goals . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I mean, we're just setting up the agency. I hope the hon. member understands that. But we want to begin to, as well, target goals perhaps by community, and that's an area under active review because we do have different unemployment levels in different areas.

Secondly, we want to determine the feasibility of target goals by sectors within the economy, certainly an area that had not been embarked upon, I believe, by any government, and one that we are taking a very serious look at.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well it was a year ago that you announced to the breathless, waiting world that job creation was your number one priority. Why did this planning have to wait until January 1, 1985 to begin? Why couldn't one of your predecessors have started the process in motion a year ago when the thoughts finally struck you that unemployment was a problem in Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I don't think that that's a fair statement. I think the hon. member, the minister responsible for Advanced Education and Manpower, has indicated virtually a doubling in the first term of office of training spaces — that last year we announced significant initiatives in the community colleges. Initiatives have been announced from time to time.

I would not, as I say, think it a fair allegation to say that the priority has not been recognized. In fact, we have made many structural changes in opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan. And when we take a look at the figures again . . . We went through the debate during the throne speech. November over November was an increase of 4,000. I think when we throw into that that our figures indicate an approximate loss from the drought of 6,000, I think we've done extremely well.

And then, of course, we looked at the highly volatile construction industry. And I have agreed with the hon. members during throne speech debate as to the question of residential starts. And that may be an area where you may feel criticism is warranted.

I'm just not satisfied in my own mind that as interest rates are falling — and today's reports indicate that they are predicting a further decline in interest rates — that it's an appropriate time to take any initiatives with regard to residential construction. We're not committed to it, but we don't rule it out. We have taken initiatives in the past, and, if necessary, we'll do it again.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, I think you're being very kind to your predecessors to suggest that the only criticism which might be levied is in the area of residential construction. I'd suggest that you could levy criticism in virtually every area of this government's activities.

Mr. Minister, your government has gone, has degenerated to the point where you now have the ninth worst job creation record in Canada. Only tiny Prince Edward Island has a worse record. Prince Edward Island has none of the resources or advantages of this province.

Mr. Minister, how can you stand with a straight face in this House and suggest that the ninth worst job creation record in Canada is a satisfactory record?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Again, the hon. member is again, I don't think, being fair, and comparison to Prince Edward Island is not appropriate either. If one was to compare Prince Edward Island to the city of Regina, approximately, Prince Edward Island even being smaller in size, I think the employment rate in Regina is rather healthy, and I think the activity that is, in fact, going on is being well received.

But when you talk about again the figures, year to year, November '83, November '84, the labour force has increased by 10,000 people. Certainly there's been a structural shift in where people are working, and it's a rather dramatic growth, year to year, in the service sector, from 123,000 to 134,000, and I think that augurs well for the province.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I did not hear you saying much in the month of November, of course, when the volatility swung in favour of the government. I mean, I suppose I will not rest satisfied till the only unemployed in the province are the eight sitting across the way from me. But I say that somewhat facetiously, but in fact it's . . . some are in very serious trouble, as we all know.

(1530)

Having said that, we recognize, I think the hon. members opposite recognize, that the dealing with the question of the unemployed students, those 16 to 24, there has to be perhaps some changes in our thinking, and a smaller agency can provoke that.

We have to begin to look at: why would a 16-year-old drop out of school? I've raised this question beforehand, and there has to be a fair amount of thought given to that, and whether there are programs that we can encourage the younger people to stay in school. If one begins to take out of the unemployment statistics in Saskatchewan those 16 to 24-year-olds that are unskilled, by and large, in the vast majority of cases — and those 16 to 19, by and large, are high school drop-outs and unskilled — then the unemployment rate is one, I believe, that any government and the people of Saskatchewan would be proud of.

If your question, quite simply, is: am I satisfied? No. Will I ever be satisfied? Probably not.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Will you do anything about it besides announce the anaemic job

creation program you announced yesterday?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I have indicated that there will be other initiatives coming, and we've already begun the public consultation process. And I believe we are the first government in Canada to embark on a public consultation process in terms of job creation.

Many people would have heard an open-line program that I was on in Saskatoon approximately 10 days ago with the public phoning in with suggestions and asking whether the government has considered areas of fishing, tourism, and things of this nature. So I think there is a public interest, and I believe that there is a legitimate public desire to participate in the process. And we will be the catalysts for that participation.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There's lots of public interest in unemployment, and that was evident during the federal election when your party didn't do near as well as you thought you would.

Mr. Minister, I want to go back to a comment you made, and the Premier repeatedly makes, about upgrading the skills of young people and how that is somehow or other the key to solving the unemployment problem. In the long run, that's valid. In the short run, it has no validity. In the long run, increasing the productivity of Canadian workers has a great deal of validity, but if you're serious about that, you will stop starving universities and stop starving education institutes.

The member from Quill Lakes and I had an opportunity spend some time on the universities this fall, and I think it's fair to say we were both shocked by what we saw at the universities. They are critically short of resources. Books in the libraries, subscriptions to trade periodicals that chemistry students, law students need — the subscriptions have not been renewed and the information they're dealing with is last year or the year before's information. The buildings are in terrible shape. The roofs are leaking. Classes are impossibly full.

I talked to a professor who taught a highly esoteric class, Arabian history, I believe it was, if my memory serves me correctly, normally would have three to four students in it. It's got 34 students in it. Why? Because they can't get into something that's relevant. So in order to get a degree, they wind up taking something which is of very narrow interest and of little interest to most of the students in it.

Mr. Minister, if you were serious in your comment that upgrading productivity and skills is the key, I think your colleagues would do something about the sad state of degeneration of the education institutes in the province.

In the short run, Mr. Minister — I'll let you know when I want a comment — in the short run, Mr. Minister, it has no validity. You can upgrade the skills of everybody in the province, and there would be no more people employed because there are no skilled jobs going begging.

One of the most ludicrous comments by the members of the treasury benches opposite is the claim by the Minister of Labour that he can't get a skilled gas inspector, somebody with a gas ticket to . . . Heavens! There are unemployed people in all skills.

And I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, if you won't agree that in the short run upgrading skills won't do anything. In the long run it will do everything. But in the long run you and the other Conservative administration in this country are doing very serious damage to the education structure of this country.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — It's unfortunate, but it's that attitude that perhaps caused a lot of the problems in Canada today. And I tell you what the attitude is, that because of that attitude that improving the skills of our young people was a very low priority, it made it in many cases impossible, or extremely difficult, to attract industries to the province. Without a skilled labour

force or a trained labour force your opportunities for bringing in new industry are very limited.

So to disparage the need for upgrading and training and a skilled work-force, I think is a very short-sighted approach. I will agree that the training, of itself, does not automatically cause people to flock to it. That will depend on world and national economic factors. Having said that, if the opportunities are there and we don't have trained people, those opportunities pass the province by. So we have to be ready.

Secondly, when we are on the other stream, as I indicated in response to your first question, of trying to create demand through new businesses — and I believe the hon. member has indicated that certainly over the next year we'll be announcing at least 81 and probably more new businesses, new industries, that stream has to go on. But they are not mutually exclusive. And to look upon training in isolation, and separate from the ability to attract business or the ability to encourage business development, I think is a very, very short-sighted policy.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, Mr. Minister, you're either not listening or intentionally avoiding the thrust of my comments. The thrust of my comments is that in the long run, upgrading skills is very important. In the short run, over the next year, it wouldn't mean a thing. You can upgrade the skills of every person in the province, and if that's all you accomplished over the next year, not one more person would be working because there aren't any skilled jobs out there going begging.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, if . . . And this takes me back to your job creation program. Mr. Minister, there was virtually nothing in there for the private sector, a pittance, nothing more than a pittance.

Mr. Minister, I say to you what I think is obvious to many people who looked at that job creation program, and that is that it is anaemic, there's nothing there. It's got the vitality of a sick jellyfish, that program of yours. We have had better job creation, summer job creation programs for students, than what you announce. We have had better programs during the summer to get students working than what you announced.

In the middle of the worst job crisis since the Depression (and I think that's probably an accurate statement), in the midst of the worst job creation crisis since the Depression, you come forth with a second-rate student employment program. And that's all that was. Moreover, a good part of the \$15 million doesn't get new people working at all. It's assisting people on welfare, and so on.

But even . . . That's assuming the whole \$15 million — I don't want to get into that argument — that 's assuming the whole \$15 million is targeted at getting people working. It just simply is not enough to do this through recreational organizations and municipalities. A program which is going to work must involve the private sector. and if you don't, your efforts are simply too half-hearted.

You know, all this government is capable of doing is taking programs which we drafted in the '70s and reworking them. And I can go over any program that you people take credit for, and what it is a paled version of something we got going during the '70s.

Mr. Minister, the problems have changed since the '70s. unemployment in 1984 is a larger problem than just getting students working during the summer, which is what you have really done. You have really taken a student employment program and tried to make that do in 1984, and it simply won't do. The problem is much, much larger than that.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that what you announced yesterday is so pitifully inadequate that it would embarrass any government which had any sensitivity to what's going on out there.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the hon. member can make the suggestion. I'm a little disappointed that he at least did not, if he did not listen to news clips, at least read the news release where some \$4 million of the funds will be targeted to the private sector. And we have begun the consultative process of dealing with them.

Perhaps to reinforce the argument — and I'm sorry the efforts, and much of it is catch-up in terms of creation of job training and the opportunities for job training that we are embarking upon — I take a look at *Sask-Trends Monitor* which dealt with the particular matter under the headline, "Education pays off in jobs." If we begin to look at figures, the higher the level of education, the lower the unemployment rate. And there is, in fact, a direct correlation.

I'm sorry that you would disparage the training efforts, because I believe that they're substantive.

Certainly in terms of training specific to industries is long overdue, and new initiatives have been started on that. For some strange reason it was not thought of a few years ago to ask the industry, or private sector: look, what do you need in terms of the skills, as opposed to government trying to impose, in many cases, some obsolete training programs.

There has to be a greater tie between the training and employers. And those initiatives have begun. They've begun going on for two years now. I believe they have been successful. I believe they will pay long-term dividends as well as short-term dividends. But I believe that there is a great deal of statistical support for the argument that better educated, or better trained people, have a higher chance of getting a job.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, let me describe precisely what happened, and why this government is coming unraveled. Mr. Minister, you had no intention of coming forth with a winter works program. What this government intended was a fall election, and when September 4th came, and you got shellacked in Regina, and in Moose Jaw, and in Yorkton, and The Battlefords, and in P.A., and so on and so forth, you then decided, maybe, maybe there was something else on people's minds out there but an adoration of this government.

And in September, I suggest to you, you began to worry about unemployment seriously for the first time. Because, while you might ignore our comments over the last two years in this House, you listened to the sounds of the ballots dropping on September 4th; because, Mr. Minister, there's no other sensible explanation for a winter works program coming in as late as December 7th. Since you decided you couldn't take the risk of a fall election, Mr. Minister, you've been playing catch-up ball ever since. And a winter works program announced on December 7th is ludicrous, and it represents this government playing catch-up ball. Instead of planning for winter works program you were planning an election, and you tripped and fell over that one.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the hon. member has been wrong so often. you've been predicting an election since 1982; you've been predicting the time. I don't know whether you're just trying to get your own troops motivated or not, but only the New Democratic Party can believe that they won an election victory in 1984. I recall the NDP saying that there was no way they were going to lose the seat held by Rev. Bob Ogle. As a matter of fact, they went so far as to tell the people of Saskatoon that's a safe riding for the NDP. They were making lots of bets, making lots of bets as to how well they were going to do in Saskatoon, and frankly got their can cleaned.

Mr. Speaker, now I had the good fortune of putting in an appearance up in The Battlefords; Meadow Lake, during the federal election, and lo and behold I ran into NDP who swore on a stack of Bibles they were going to win. The Battlefords, Meadow Lake. They promised me sincerely and faithfully that was a safe seat. They were going to win it. They were going to hang on.

(1545)

And so you know, I mean we can debate this for quite some time as to who did what to whom in the federal election. All I know is that we picked up two ridings, and the only thing I say is that as long as you want to keep living in the fantasy land, it got you to where you are. You didn't listen to us in 1982. You're not listening to us again today. We genuinely offered you some good political advice over the last few months, in the last couple of years, and unfortunately, or fortunately for us, you've neglected to take it.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have a question to the minister for this new Employment Development Agency. In your recent announcement you referred to specific area, namely the northern administration district. you've earmarked a \$1 million fund there to help alleviate some of the disparities confronting Northerners.

Mr. Minister, you know very well and your government knows full well as members on this side of the House, that northern Saskatchewan, the northern administration district, is confronted with tremendous social and economic problems, and many of our communities are confronted with unemployment as high as 95 per cent. There's just simply no hope.

You'll notice as well, Mr. Minister, that last spring in the debate over your last fiscal year's budget, a good number of our native people are incarcerated in jails in provincial correctional centres due to the fact that your government hasn't been able to tackle the problems that confront native people in this province.

The problems we have in the North are compounded further, Mr. Minister, by your remarks to me seat-mate just a moment ago. in questioning your program, you keep referring to the political means and political propaganda that you're wanting to alleviate, I guess, in front of the . . . promote in front of the TV cameras.

You know, the problems are serious, Mr. Minister. I would invite you, and I have invited the Premier and members of his cabinet to come into northern Saskatchewan and meet with the people in the northern administration district and confront with the — listen to the people themselves, not confront — but listen to the people's problems, and see for yourselves at first hand the disparities that are confronted by them.

The top half of this province was supposed to be the mainstream of Saskatchewan. This is something that I heard numerous times mentioned by the ministers responsible for the Northern Affairs Secretariat, the native affairs secretariat, and various other ministers.

Well, we are not into the mainstream of Saskatchewan as yet. We have never been. I state to you, Mr. Minister, that we have never been part of the social and economic mainstream of society. And to this point, my question to you, Mr. Minister, is that you have earmarked \$1 million for a population of 30,000, approximately 30,000 people.

Do you find that this is sufficient to help alleviate the hardships that are confronted by people living in the northern administration district? Do you find this figure realistic? Do you think that will help resolve the high social and economic conditions of the North?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, of course, the total amount of \$15 million, plus the Department of Highways \$26 million, is not going to solve the unemployment problem, and we freely stated that.

I do have some difficulty with your argument as to 90 to 95 per cent unemployment when statistics have not been kept, and historically have not been kept. Having said that, that is in no way an argument that the problem is not serious because, of course, it is.

I do tend to resent arguments coming from, as you've just articulated and others have, that unemployment causes crime. Because the corollary of that is that it's the poor that commit



crime. I do not happen to buy that, and I don't take the sociological argument that that is the case. And I have never accepted that.

I suppose the better question to be asked by the hon. member — or answered by the hon. member — is: where do you stand on the uranium industry? Do you want to shut it down in northern Saskatchewan, or are you participating with the government in terms of creating unemployment?

In other words, to the hon. member, don't stand up and say that this is inadequate, and that nothing is being done, because I really believe that your efforts and the other member from northern Saskatchewan, the active participation in the shut-down of some industries in northern Saskatchewan will cause problems in northern Saskatchewan. They will put people out of work in northern Saskatchewan. It will put people in secondary industries out of work in northern Saskatchewan.

Now are the problems in northern Saskatchewan serious? Of course. And you and I have debated that before, and we're not disagreeing. But remember as well, to the hon. member, the hon. member, that we're not satisfied, and we have a difference. The previous administration took the view that imposing a major bureaucracy in northern Saskatchewan and moving a whole bunch of people in from the South to work for the government would solve the problem. It didn't solve the problem. It did not solve the problem.

So in the effort that we're trying to create with the new Employment Development Agency, we will certainly be open to practical and realistic suggestions from people in the North as to employment that will give good long-term employment to Northerners. I don't believe that Northerners like tokenism more than anyone else, and that a greater participation in trying to solve the long-term structural problems by Northerners is more than welcome.

And I would appreciate . . . You know, as I say, I'll be looking for opportunities to meet with those in the North as to practical and realistic solutions. We've tried. There is resource development going on in northern Saskatchewan, going on today, that is not going on in other province, because of the active encouragement of this government.

We've talked and debated about the question of the wild rice initiatives not going on before and will have to be expanded. And we all see market opportunities and some opportunity for Northerners. So I suggest to the hon. member that to say that nothing is being done is not accurate. But I will agree with the hon. member that the problem is serious, and much more will have to be done.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that this session is brought about so that we can question the appropriate ministers, and in particular the minister responsible for this new agency — the policies and specifics about the program that this government has launched. It's not a time for the minister to be questioning the motives of the members on this side of the House. Therefore, I will continue with my questions regarding the program brought about in the course of the last couple of days.

I want to ask the minister: with respect to your allotment of \$1 million for the North, you indicated that it will bring about 140 jobs. A hundred and forty jobs barely dents the need for employment in northern Saskatchewan, barely touches the need for employment in northern Saskatchewan. There are numerous, numerous people out there that want work, that want to be a part of the solution, and not a part of the problem.

Now I ask you, Mr. Minister, what are you doing in terms of some creative efforts and creative programs and legislation to try to see that the minister who is responsible for the northern administration district bring about a self-sufficient economic strategy, such as the one that was promised to us by the minister of northern affairs, the hon. member for the Meadow Lake

constituency was back on, if I remember correctly, July 16, 1982? In a departmental memo he assured Northerners that this government would introduced a self-sufficient economic strategy.

To this point in time we have been getting absolutely nothing but neglect and abandonment by your government. And all of a sudden you come up with this scheme of alleviating some problems and you earmark \$1 million to create 140 jobs, short-term jobs — nothing long term. Your people back there, your government today, as I can see it, is nothing but short term.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: what is your government doing about the self-sufficient economic strategy that was promised the people of the northern administration district?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, I sincerely hope that the hon. member is not carrying the message that there's only \$1 million dollars because, in fact, the northern municipalities will be able to participate in the municipal aspect the same as any other and on the same basis. They will be able to participate, when the criteria are established, on the community development. As well, any private sector will be able to participate as well as any other in the province under those aspects of the funding program.

So there is more. You'll have the opportunity to take advantage. We will make sure that northern municipalities do, in fact, take advantage of the program. but you have argued for many times that this should be decided at the local level. We're giving that opportunity now and I would hope you'd support it.

**MR. YEW:** — You mentioned that . . . Okay, Mr. Minister, I gather that the total program is for 50 million. I question the allotment of 1 million, specifically, because it was designated there for the northern administration district.

I might take it from your suggestions then, Mr. Minister, that the North is also applicable to the other 14. Fine, that's positive news. But how do we take advantage of this additional 14 million, Mr. Minister, if your government has not designated specific policy and specific funding? I can't see how, say for an example, the community of Southend on Reindeer Lake — of which I was in conversation with last night, the members of the council and the chairman of this local advisory council — how can that isolated community take advantage of this program? Can you specify in detail?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — One of the objectives of the program is to leave that decision making in the hands of the municipal governments wherever they may be within the province. If they do not have the information . . . The information is going out to all municipalities — maybe today, I'm not sure. The announcement specifically was made today. but certainly, in the very near future, if your northern municipalities do not have that, say, by the middle of next week, you let me know and I'll make sure they get it immediately.

**MR. YEW:** — In other areas, Mr. Minister, you've quoted another figure here in terms of creating an additional 500, I believe it's 500 jobs — 500 to possibly 900 jobs in terms of the road construction and maintenance of such.

Mr. Minister, can you identify to me whether or not there is any specific program there for the top half of this province?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I will ask the Minister of Highways to supply the information generally, whenever that distribution goes. Whether there is any or not, I don't have that information.

(1600)

**MR. YEW:** — I gather then, Mr. Minister, that this portion of the program need not have to be mentioned in conjunction with this new initiative that you have just announced. This won't

come until due time — in due course?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — The Highways' road construction is announced separately. And if there hasn't been details, I gather there's some under consideration now in the northern part of the province.

**MR. YEW:** — It's pretty hard for me to have anything to refer to here, Mr. Minister. You talk with your colleague, the Minister for Highways, and I'm not just certain what his comments were.

Is this the appropriate time to raise that question with the Minister of Highways, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — The member has to address his questions to the Attorney General.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Just so the hon. member will be advised, I know something is being developed, and we will supply it to you.

**MR. YEW:** — I ask the Minister of Justice, then: when can we expect concise, specific information on this program?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, probably within the week.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, seeing as how you and your government — the Conservative government of this province — cannot come up with a clear, self-sufficient economic strategy for Northerners, for the people living in the top half of this province, I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: apart from your program, what are you doing to assist Northerners in jobs associated with, for example, the Nipawin hydro project, the forestry resource areas?

Can the minister specify any action that his government has taken to ensure that Northerners are part of that development and are not being left on the wayside in terms of major initiatives being undertaken throughout our province?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well that will be one of the many objectives of the agency. We will monitor programs to ensure that there is that fair participation. Obviously that is going on as well, and I'm sure the hon. member agrees with me that we cannot divorce, in many cases, either the lack of education or the lack of skills from the lack of ability to obtain employment. That problem is far more acute in northern Saskatchewan than elsewhere. We've already identified the need for that training in southern Saskatchewan. So it will be a long-term problem.

I, for one, disagreed most strongly with DNS. I did not question the motives of the government of the day as to what it was trying to do in northern Saskatchewan. I do have difficulty with the idea that strictly spending government money in expanding bureaucracy would solve the problem. It obviously didn't. And you know, we will be looking at all sorts of options and I would appreciate from time to time the positive comments of the two northern members for their suggestions. The suggestion that we made was that they should be realistic, they should be effective, and we would certainly be prepared to entertain it.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Minister, I want to dispute with you in terms of your policy. To this point in time, we have been the victims of, the last two and a half years, victims of your big business and this private sector emphasis that you have imposed on us.

I go back for an example. Over the course of the last two and a half years, the big oil companies have seen their taxes cut by more than \$300 million, and your government has given Husky Oil of Alberta a \$390 million loan guarantee. Another area we lost in was the selling out of the Coronach mine. And on top of that you give Manalta Coal of Calgary, Alberta, another \$89 million loan guarantee. Just a few days ago, Mr. Minister, your banks, your corporate friends and

your banks and bond dealer friends have reported huge profits, big profits — \$450 million reported by the Royal Bank of Canada. Toronto Bank reported 355 million.

In spite of all these profits, Mr. Minister, in spite of all these profits, we end up with a hug deficit of 829 million, of which we are again paying, the people of Saskatchewan are paying \$92.6 million in interest payments to your corporate friends, your banks and bond dealers, or \$11,000 an hour.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: are we in the mercy of the big corporate companies, the banks, to come to our rescue and tell us specifically, "Well, here's a program. Here's a self-sufficient economic strategy program for you guys. We've finally made it big enough to give you a few dollars."

Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that . . . Are we to wait for these big corporate business firms to come to our rescue and tell us they can provide to us a self-sufficient economic program, or can we expect some government intervention? What we need is some government intervention — support and encouragement, Mr. Minister.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well if I thought the hon. member believed what he said, I would probably get upset. But I take it in the humorous spirit in which it was delivered. And I know that the hon. member, when he opposed Husky Oil and huge multinational from Alberta, two years ago your government was talking about being opposed to non-Canadian companies, so you supported the national energy program.

So then a Canadian company decides to expand in the province of Saskatchewan, and it was already here in the first place. It manages to swipe right out of the private sector and the corporate boardrooms of central Canada, that famous entrepreneur, nefarious businessman, Tommy Douglas, and put him on the board. That's how bad Husky Oil is.

Having said that, here there are Alberta companies, Canadian companies, that are able to expand in the province, and you're critical. And yet, as I say, two years ago, two, three years ago this April, you were madly in love with Uranerz and Amok. You thought there were great. Now something's gone wrong and you want to kick them out of the province and shut them down.

So please, all I ask you is be consistent — be consistent — because I would strongly suspect if that industry shuts down it will be on the heads of the two hon. members opposite. And you know that. And every single person put out of work in northern Saskatchewan because of your policy will be on your heads. You know that.

And if you decide to cancel because you don't want to deal with Husky, a Husky Oil upgrader, or if you decide that the Consumer Co-op Refinery in Regina is a multinational, that it's a hug corporation, that nothing should be done . . . And that's the position that you're talking. As I say, if I thought the hon. member believed what he said I would be concerned, but I know he doesn't.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to respond briefly to the minister's comments, and I don't want to get into any debate regarding the positions I took prior to the last provincial election. I think the forum here today is to scrutinize in detail the program announced by this government.

I want to ask the minister with respect to the 140 positions that were outlined in his presentation a couple of days ago — pardon me, in the course of the last two days. you indicated to me a moment ago that the other 14 million would also be eligible to the communities in the top half of this province. Can you specify in numbers — in terms of jobs, in terms of positions — how many people could receive employment through this program?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — No, because the program is designed to let the local governments decide on the type of projects they want done or the type of work they want done. If they're using

highly skilled labour that's unemployed, obviously, they will have to top up the wages above the 4.25. It will cost more. They would use fewer people. that's a decision local governments will have to have. And again I can simply assure the hon. member that the northern governments will have the same access to the programs as other municipal governments. That's been set out on a per capita basis. That will be forwarded. And my officials advise me that the specific criteria for the forestry program should be coming out in the next few days.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, I am going to direct a few questions and make a few comments. I won't be too long as my colleague from Cumberland has eloquently brought out all the concerns that we have up in northern Saskatchewan, but I do want to make a few comments, Mr. Minister, and then ask you a few questions.

First of all, I think when we are dealing with a region such as we have in northern Saskatchewan one would have to treat it, and I believe should treat it, as a special area, and I would ask you to comment on that fact.

When you take a look at the type of unemployment and the amount of unemployment that we have, most certainly they type is a lot of unskilled labourers up in the North. But the program that you have announced yesterday that will create 140 jobs in the North as a cost of \$1 million, I want to say, Mr. Minister, if you're dealing strictly with the \$1 million and that's all that's going to be up there — I'll comment further on that — then really it's not even scratching the surface. In a town like La Loche we could probably use 4 to 500 jobs to get that town back on the same percentage level as southern Saskatchewan.

(1615)

You also indicate that the 140 jobs that you are going to create through this program will be through local governments, and I just wonder if it's going to be on a first come first served basis as the applications come in for approval.

You also indicate that the jobs that were going to be created will be minimum wage jobs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. you say they're not going to be minimum wage jobs, but you say the jobs will be directed at getting individuals off of the welfare rolls and back onto the jobs. I want to say that you do have that program in the North right now that's operating. And I find it very discouraging when I see young people who have just graduated out of school and are out looking for a job, Mr. Chairman, and when they go to ask for a job the first question they're asked is if they're on welfare, and if they're not on welfare then they are turned down.

I just think . . . And another question I would like you to answer, Mr. Minister: are you going to — your new agency — are you going to co-ordinate any of the other departments? For instance, are you going to talk to Sask Power and see if there is any chance of clearing the power lines and get them to do that in the winter when it can be done in the winter? Are you going to be talking to Sask Housing and asking them if there's any winter jobs that they could provide through Sask Housing and these types of departments?

Mr. Minister, I'll sit down and just let you comment on that.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the point you make about some of the . . . The specific program about taking people off welfare with jobs, as you say, that does apply in the North. That will be expanded by \$2 million. The North will get some opportunity there as well.

But do not equate it with the municipal program. The municipal program will not be limited to those on welfare or anything else. It's whoever the municipality wants to hire, as long as they're not employed. For example, then can, if they have given seasonal lay-off notices, can bring those people back. That was at the request of the respective unions that they not be excluded. I gather programs of his nature in the past have tended to try and exclude those who were on lay-off

notice, and we did not want to get into that particular problem. We are allowing them to call them back.

So the North will have access to that program. The criteria was set out today, and we'll send that over to the hon. member if he doesn't have it. It was distributed. It's on a per capita basis so it's not a first come first served basis.

The other program, the extended youth access program, will also be available to northern Saskatchewan, and they've certainly taken advantage of the program to date.

The forestry program, as I say, the criteria will be announced in the next few days.

I appreciate very much the hon. member's comment about Sask Power. We will take it up with the corporations. One of the aspects of the new agency will be to co-ordinate or encourage the Crown corporations in term of specific projects. That's one that I've asked my officials to make a note of. We will take it up with SPC.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, and, Mr. Chairman. I'm very pleased to see that you are going to co-ordinate and make that effort to get some of the Crown corporations or other departments within government to try and get jobs in the winter, and also the fact that it's going to be on a per capita basis. And I think that's very important because communities are not going to just rush in with any program. They will be able to do some planning and they know that the funds will be there.

Without getting into any arguments with the minister regarding the way I think or the way he thinks, I see that you have said that you're going to co-ordinate training. And I just ask you, Mr. Minister: will you be making an effort to co-ordinate the training of individuals that the Key Lake Mine needs to bring up that level under the surface lease to 50 per cent?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, we will certainly take a very serious look at it. It's not one of the areas we've considered, but again we'll make note of it and respond to you on it. But we'll certainly take a very serious look at it.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Okay. Another thin, Mr. Minister: I wonder if you would just take a look at maybe expanding that lease — I don't know if you would even look at it — but into Rabbit Lake and to the underground operation at Cluff Lake.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Certainly we'll take a look at that.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Minister, in respect to the 44,000 unemployed people in Saskatchewan, I wonder if you have done a breakdown, first of all, in numbers in the various classifications? That is, how many young people from 15 to 24 and the various age groups can you break down the 44,000 people in this province — unemployed — can you break it down into the various categories?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — The detailed figures that we have from the bureau of statistics on the Justice serious, November, is 40,000. Of the 15 to 19, that's 8,000. Of the 20 to 24, 11,000. As we indicate, approximately 50 per cent.

Coming at it, another piece of information, of the 40 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The figures I have from Bureau Stats here are 40. Now if someone can tell me why these don't quite add up to 40 . . . But of the male, 24,000; 15,000 female.

The hon. member from Regina Centre may be able to comment on the differential. I don't know. I can't, I'm sure. It's not to the nearest decimal point I gather.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — As a further breakdown I wonder if the minister has done an analysis of the number of people in the total number that are unemployed, the number of people which indeed do have training either in carpentry or electricians or school teachers without work. Have you got a breakdown of the number of well-qualified people and what part of the 40 or 44,000 they constitute?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — We do not have that statistical information. We're endeavouring to get it. We are also endeavouring to get the skills that may look at long-term unemployment because the opportunities, no matter how the economy goes, will not be there. At the federal level they have recently been able to begin to break down their information as to the likelihood of certain skills having opportunities in the future. We will be endeavouring to develop a bank of similar statistics in the province.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, just for the information, since you have the job agency set up, I wonder if you could outline some of the areas that you have now analysed that young people, in fact, should be pursuing either for short-term or long-term jobs? Because certainly out there there's many, many young people who are taking university courses and are unable to find meaningful employment commensurate with their training. I have in my constituency young people who have trained five years at phys ed education degree. I have young people in my constituency who have gone to take electrical training and who are unemployed. I have young people who have taken carpentry and now work part of the summer and are unemployed. Not only that, these young people have taken, not only say the carpentry training, they have gone when they were unemployed and taken more training, like a waiter in a hotel in the service industry.

And this is the frustration that the young people of this province is faced with. There is no direction by this government outlining where you're heading or where they should be going, because they are taking university training and they're getting no jobs. They're taking technical training and they're getting no jobs.

So I'd like you to outline as clearly as possible and outline to the young people here today what your government sees as a future for them and what direction of training they should be taking.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, unfortunately for the hon. member it was lack of activity by your administration that, in fact, left the situation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The hon. members can shout it down, the hon. members can whine, and the hon. members can complain, but let me tell the public of Saskatchewan what was not done.

Under the previous administration there was no comprehensive counselling system so that young people could, in fact, be given some direction as to what direction their skills should take them. That was not done. The minister of manpower and advanced education has now established and announced that in 1984. The technical schools have, and had, obsolete training programs in many areas that were not dealt with and not reviewed by the previous administration. They are now going under review.

It's interesting that statistically this should have been done years ago where the targets could be set for the young people. The disappointing thing is that it's only recently even the federal government began to put those projections forward. Many members will have noticed a week ago the release of projections by the federal government. Unfortunately those projections are not broken down by region, not broken down by province.

Today, in our meeting with the federal minister, we have asked for a breakdown of those statistics by region, by province, so that we can in fact give the areas of opportunity to the young people. certainly that should be done. And I don't think there's any disagreement between the hon. member and myself. What I do say to the hon. member is that that type of programming and technical training and technical training assistance and counselling should have been done years ago.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to . . . Obviously the minister of jobs — this new department, this new agency, this saviour of young people's plight — has and is saying to this House that he has gone into a program of creating more jobs, and he is saying to the people of Saskatchewan and young people that he has not, in fact, done any analysis of the labour market or the direction in which the young people are to pursue. He is saying that, oh, it should have been done before.

I'm asking you: are you, in fact, doing an analysis, and when will you produce an analysis of the job skills that young people should be pursuing? When can we expect you to come forward with the blueprint?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I'm not going to let the hon. member off that lightly. You had an opportunity in 10 years to expand our technical system and the opportunity was there to make our technical programs the best in Canada. you ignored it. you missed that opportunity. And we are having to pay a tremendous price to play catch up.

I have already indicated, if the hon. member had of been listening while I was addressing my comments to the member from Regina Centre, that those are areas that we will be setting targets, setting the areas of opportunities.

We will be setting targets sectorially in terms of employment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, we expect to have . . . we would expect to have those targets generally ready by February at the latest. That is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the hon. members expect us to pick up your 10-year problems and get it done overnight. I think doing it in a month is not bad.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, I certainly am prepared to get into the debate. And I think the people of Saskatchewan are prepared to make comparisons during the 10 years that we were in government and the rate of growth of the economy.

(1630)

If that's what the minister wants to turn this into, I'm fully prepared, because we had the lower unemployment in all of Canada, around 4.5 per cent, during that period — better than any other province. And the growth of the economy was faster than anywhere else.

We had programs for building houses, and hospitals, and nursing homes, and highways, and on and on it went. Look at the last budget that we had in place. There was a \$2 billion expansion in government public funding which would have kept this economy going. What you did is turn it over to the multinational corporations and, as a result, a downward trend of the economy has pursued.

And so what I'm asking you . . . This government is really neglecting the young people of this province, and let that be clear. Never before . . . And we get a document from the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower indicating that it's going to be socially acceptable to have from 18 to 20 per cent young people unemployed.

I want to ask you: are you in agreement with the document that the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower provided us last year, indicating that it will be soon socially acceptable to have 18 to 22 per cent unemployment of our young people? Is that the goal that you're working on in this here so-called job creation farce that you're putting up here before us today?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I don't take figures from the hon. members. They've been wrong so often and, in fact, to the hon. member, it was very interesting when you just said where you spent money. It's very interesting that where you spent money it was all government expenditures, all government expenditures, and the minister very carefully gave a short overview of his record of expenditures when he was government. It was all government expenditures. He ignored the



major investments in the resource industry.

Not once did the hon. member say that, in fact, during his 10 years in office, or his government's 10 years in office, that they made a sincere effort to use the resource funds that are built up to develop a private sector, to develop a private sector — very pointedly ignored that. And I suggest to the hon. member that it's going to take us more than two and a half years to create the problems in trying to develop a private sector. We freely admit this. Fortunately, the public recognizes it.

So I suggest to the hon. member: why did you not develop the technical schools up to 20th century standards when you had the heritage fund? Why did you decide to put \$600 million into uranium instead of \$600 million into technical schools? Why did you make that conscious decision? Why did you choose to put \$100-and-some million into land bank instead of modernizing our technical schools around the province of Saskatchewan?

And I suggest to the hon. member we have had to put a high degree of public expenditures into upgrading our technical schools, something quite frankly I don't believe that we should have had to have done if there had been a fair and proper allocation of public funds.

Having said that, having said that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Gee, we . . . (inaudible) . . . as the hon. member, I guess we're just talking to a brick wall over there. The doubling of the technical school spaces in four years is a record that I think is second to none in the Dominion of Canada.

But it should have been unnecessary. The tragedy of the previous administration is it should have been unnecessary. You freely admit that you put it into some government expenditures but not into technical training. The young people ask why that there was a shortage of technical school spaces, and why is the necessity for catch up.

In terms of the targets, I have already indicated to the hon. member that we will be establishing targets by communities, by sectors, and we will also be attempting to look at initiatives, or looking at initiatives to determine the areas of opportunity for you young people so that they are taking the skills that are in line with the areas of opportunity.

We will also, and the first initiatives have been done in 1984 of beginning to make our training very specific to the new industry, so that the industries can come in and say, all right, I need people with the following skills, and I need this very specific training. We embark upon that because we believe that there is a tremendous investment in Saskatchewan's young people's future.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I wonder if the minister . . . He has mentioned that he's going to be targeting and training people for the new industries of the future. I wonder if you could outline in a brief way some of the new industries that you are contemplating, and have you any projections as to the employment opportunities in these so-called new industries that you are referring to?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I've already indicated that we are developing those and we'll be announcing those. And, as I've indicated, I could say soon, but certainly I would suspect that before the beginning of February those should be announced.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Minister, the facts remain. What this government has done is to run up this province into the most massive deficit that has ever been seen in this province — \$1 billion in two and a half years. And I'll tell you why this government is incapable of moving, because they have given away the resource funds of this province to the oil companies, and there is no money for job creation.

That is the problem with this government. When it comes to helping the farmers, they have no money. When it comes to the young people of this province, they have no money.

That's the hard facts — that with a deficit of \$1 billion and every indication that it'll be another 2 or 3 or 400 million this year, the facts remain is that you have taken your priorities, you have given it to the multinational oil companies, and you have abandoned the people, the small-business men of this province. And, as a consequence, they are unable to employ as they did when we were here and had a very sound economy in which the small-business man was doing well.

That's the problem that you're up against. And what I would ask you to do — come clean with the people of Saskatchewan. Don't continue to give them this line that you're going to be providing jobs and creating opportunities. Your hands are tied. You made your commitment. You have put this province into a deficit to such an extent that you have nothing for the farmers, and nothing now for the young people.

Isn't that, indeed, the problem that you're facing? Why don't you acknowledge that to the people of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, if there was any validity to the argument, I would acknowledge it, but as typical of the hon. member, that's not the case.

You tell the young people that are working in the oil industry that they shouldn't be working. You take the message. I'm not going to take the message, and this government is not going to take the message. You tell the young people at Ipsco that are working because of the oil industry development in this province, and you tell them that they shouldn't be working. You tell the young people at Kalium, or other areas, that in fact they shouldn't be working because the initiatives of this government. You tell them that. You tell them that.

Mr. Chairman, I can debate . . . I can debate far better, obviously, than the hon. member. The money is going into farming, and the hon. member doesn't quite see it, but that's not surprising. It's not surprising, nor is his articulation of the facts any more accurate than it has been during the course of this session.

Having said that . . . Having said that, there are only eight people in this province . . . There are, I'm sorry, there are only nine people in this province who believe that it's the multinationals who are benefiting from the oil incentives. There are how many, maybe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, they're only nine people. How many small oil companies are there?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — About 250.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — There are over 250 small oil companies now at work in the province of Saskatchewan that weren't here before that are actively assisting the people of Saskatchewan in developing their resources, Mr. Speaker. And the only nine people in this country who would argue straight faced that Husky oil is a large multinational, unfortunately, are in this Chamber.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — I would like to ask the minister about one area of great deal of concern, and that is the city of Saskatoon. The minister will know that the unemployment problem in the province today is concentrated, and I suppose most seriously highlighted in the city of Saskatoon where the unemployment rate has now reached 13 per cent.

Mr. Minister, you will know that Saskatoon now has the envious position of having the third highest unemployment rate in Canada, and the highest rate on their prairie provinces. Out of any of the three provinces — Alberta, Saskatchewan, or Manitoba — the city of Saskatoon has the reputation of having the highest unemployment.

I would say to you, Mr. Minister, that Saskatoon, more than any other city in Saskatchewan, is the centre of small business. Regina has high number of civil servants who tend to keep the

unemployment rate lower than other cities, but Saskatoon, I believe, is sort of the trend-setter in how well your open-for-business philosophy is working.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can explain to us why, in Saskatoon, the unemployment rate is higher than any other city in western Canada.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — The hon. member is partially correct that it is very much the heart of the small-business sector in this province, and that was evidenced to a large extent in the last federal election.

Having said that to the hon. member, one of the major problems in the city of Saskatoon is the growth that has taken place. We believe that at some time this spring Saskatoon will become the largest city in the province. Saskatoon is growing at an extremely rapid rate, and it will be difficult to keep up with the growth in job creation over the next few years. Saskatoon will become an even more popular place to live once it become the largest city in the province of Saskatchewan. Growth is a major component, the rapid growth to the city in the unemployment figures.

Having said that, we will be announcing some time early in the new year some initiatives with regard to the city of Saskatoon, which I'm sure they'll find quite acceptable.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate to the minister that the growth rate in Saskatchewan has been spectacular over the last 10 years, and this is not a new phenomenon, as he would have people believe.

Mr. Minister, what I would like to know is whether or not you have analyzed the city of Saskatoon and are coming forward with some new and exciting ideas that will deal with the problem of having the highest unemployment rate of the prairie provinces.

That's the question that I'm putting to you. Have you got, at this point in time, any new incentives or any new ideas that you can put forward here today that would explain to us what you are going to do to decrease the unemployment rate in Saskatoon to a level similar to what it was when you took office after a large number of years in increased growth in the city of Saskatoon?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, the growth has been far more rapid over the last two and one-half years. The hon. member knows that. Having said that, I've already indicated that we will be making announcements in due course, announcements that will be well received by the people of Saskatchewan.

It's interesting that in Saskatoon the number of initiatives by Saskatonians to develop their economy. Venture capital corporations have been established in Saskatoon. They are taking advantage of initiatives of this government and taking advantage far more aggressively than most areas in the province, and the venture capital corporation is a prime example. We would look to that small-business leadership that is so evident in Saskatoon for the initiatives; we will continue to do so.

The small-business sector in Saskatoon is becoming more and more confident. There are approximately 120 high tech companies centred in the city of Saskatoon. The new advanced training centre recognizes the initiatives in Saskatoon by the business sector and how we can continue to upgrade, the first in Canada, a rather imaginative program.

Having said that, as I have advised the hon. member on two occasions now, we will be discussing initiatives and making announcements in due course.

(1645)

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Well, Mr. Minister, there will be those in Saskatoon who believe that due course should have been yesterday in terms of creating jobs in Saskatoon. You will have had letters, I would imagine, because others are getting them, myself included, from social workers and people who are directly involved with the results of high unemployment. You will know that the recorded level or world class operation that you're running in Saskatoon in terms of unemployment is now showing up in terms of record levels of cases for social workers, record levels of family breakdown as a result of the pressures that unemployment cause. I believe you, Mr. Minister, will know better than anyone that this is a statement of fact and that as unemployment rises the social problems increase.

You need only go to the correctional centre in Saskatoon, and you being the minister, that you will know that you are now double-bunking in the correctional centres, that they are overflowing — that, too, a result of the very high unemployment in that city. And for you to stand here and say that in due course you will announce a program in Saskatoon, where the unemployment rate is the highest on the prairies, simply isn't good enough.

And I would challenge you that your opinions here today that people are flocking to Saskatoon simply aren't to be believed. People who are looking for work don't flock to the city with the highest unemployment rate. They know very well that coming to Saskatoon is impossible, that if you're an unskilled worker or a skilled worker who might be an electrician or a plumber you don't go to Saskatoon. So the idea that you put forward that people are flocking into Saskatoon and finding or looking for work simply isn't accurate. And I would like to ask the minister what he is doing specifically to create employment in Saskatoon.

You will know that the regeneration of the St. Paul's Hospital, of the University Hospital, and the City Hospital in Saskatoon have been put on hold by your colleague, the Minister of Health. The . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it is so. The recommendation of the joint hospital board that was delivered to the minister in June of 1982 indicated that \$250 million were needed to regenerate those hospitals. What has been announced is a \$50 million expansion or regeneration of those hospitals, and the administrators will tell you that it's a Band-Aid solution, and that very clearly is not going to create employment in Saskatoon.

Now it seems to me that when you have record numbers of people on welfare in the city of Saskatoon, that if you were doing some of these projects that have to be done, that that would create employment and you could much better use that money by putting it into employment training projects like regeneration of hospitals rather than paying it out in welfare. And when I'm finished, Mr. Chairman, the minister will be able to respond. But I would like to know the theory of shutting down those projects and paying out large amounts, in fact, record amounts of welfare in that city.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, let me take through several of the points. First of all, people are not flocking to Saskatoon because it's got the highest unemployment rate. They are flocking because it's an area of opportunity. And you indicate some trades. Let me tell you what people that are interested in the high tech industry are doing. They are going to Saskatoon because it is an area of opportunity, probably the most opportunity anywhere in Canada.

You talk about the incarceration level and the double bunking. I'll tell you why there's double bunking in Saskatoon. It's because you built a racket-ball court in the correctional centre instead of some dorms. That's the problem. You want a handball court and a racket-ball court instead of dorms. And I believe you were the hon. member at the time. Well, if he wasn't, fine. Blame the one who was. It also leads to the criticism that you said there was overcrowding. Yes, there was overcrowding in the racket-ball court. There shouldn't have been a racket-ball court. You built the racket-ball court in the correctional centre.

So, secondly, I indicated earlier to the hon. member that the argument that the poor commit

crimes is not one that I subscribe to, and it's not one that I believe that most people involved in either criminology or sociology are subscribing to today. Having said that, there are tremendous areas of opportunity. Certainly the business community in Saskatoon believes that they are the land of opportunity, in the areas of opportunity — are talking appropriately and are talking far more optimistically than the hon. member opposite. Saskatoon has tremendous strengths, and the high tech development is an obvious one that everyone in Saskatoon takes pride in. I don't know why the hon. member would want to put that down.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Minister, you referred to the fact that — and I believe I have this right; it was rather noisy when you were making your statement — but you didn't believe that the increase in crime is associated with unemployment or with poverty. And very clearly I would challenge you and many sociologists would challenge that statement by the justice minister.

I would also challenge the statement that the native people in Saskatoon are better off. I would very much like to tell you that here again that is the group of people who are most hard hit by the unemployment situation. And I've been to the rehab centre where people like Clarence Trotter have told me of the sad cases on 20th Street in Saskatoon, of young people, many of them native, who because they can't find work and there's no affirmative action by your government . . . The difficulties that are in terms of 13 per cent in the general population in Saskatoon are much higher with the native people.

But, Mr. Minister, I would like to tell you that you are not being totally honest in saying that you haven't got a plan ready for Saskatoon in terms of job creation. It's obvious that the announcement by the Minister of Health last year that \$250 million would not be made available for the regeneration of hospitals has had an impact. But the solution, I say to you, you can tell . . . yesterday when a committee of the pentagon came to Saskatoon to talk about ways that private entrepreneurs could become involved in the arms race of the United States.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'll tell you that there were meetings in Saskatoon yesterday. And the minister can get up and deny it, that he knows anything about it, that this is the solution to the unemployment problem, that you want to get involved with the Reagan government in giving incentives to small-business people to become part of the arms race.

Well, this may be a solution. But I tell you, building hospitals in Saskatoon that have waiting lists of 1,000 where elective surgery people are waiting up to a year, that the money would be much better put into hospitals as opposed to giving incentives to the arms race and to having meetings with committees of the Pentagon who would have the Canadian business become involved in that way.

I think that it's an unrealistic approach to the problem of unemployment, but one that you are directly involved in.

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Well, I cannot believe what I'm hearing. For the NDP to stand up and say that the high tech industries should be shut down, because that is precisely what you said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You have just stood up and reiterated some spokesman who said that SED Systems should be shut down because it's supplying technology to NASA.

That is precisely what you're saying, and that may be the most stupid statement that has ever been tabled in this Assembly. I can't believe it. And I can't wait till I deliver the copy of *Hansard* to the people in SED Systems and Develcon that are supplying their technology to the United States and the NASA. I cannot believe that the NDP are saying the SED Systems and Develcon and the high tech companies in Saskatoon are contributing to the arms race.

Now they just nod their head and yes that is precisely what they're saying. And I hope that the hon. members from Saskatoon, I hope that the hon. members from Saskatoon take that message

back because, Mr. Speaker, they now want to shut down the uranium industry and its employment in Saskatoon. And you're on record. That's your party statement. That's your party position.

You want to now go to the people of Saskatoon. You tell Develcon, you tell SED Systems, you tell the over 100 high tech companies in Saskatoon that they are participating in the arms race and that they should not carry on the activity. You tell the University of Saskatchewan, that has participated with Develcon and with SED Systems, that they are participating in the arms race and they should be shut down.

I have never heard, never heard a stupider statement . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. I'm going to give you every opportunity to try and extricate . . . You know, it's going to be a major job creation activity right now watching you trying to extricate yourself from the hole that you just dug for yourself.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Now I've seen make work projects, but again nothing as foolish as the one that the NDP has just articulated for this Assembly.

So the Minister of Health tells us that those involved in the hospital system are quite satisfied with their program — another argument gone. But to believe and to argue straight faced that Develcon, SED Systems, and the over 100 different companies in Saskatoon that are supplying their technical expertise throughout the world is a very strange position for the New Democratic Party to take. For the NDP to begin to say that their recent contract, and I believe it was some 10 to \$12 million by Develcon, their first contract with NASA, should be stopped and those people put out of work, I am going to take that position of the New Democratic Party to Develcon.

I hope you've got the courage to stand up before Develcon, SED Systems, the University of Saskatchewan and tell those industries to shut down because they're participating in the arms race. I think what you have just indicated today is one more crazy initiative from the New Democratic Party to be added back to land bank limiting farm size, shutting down the uranium industry, \$1.5 billion, eliminate the sales tax, and the establishment of community clinics as abortion clinics. I think no wonder the people have lost faith in the New Democratic Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Chairman, never have I seen a justice minister make a statement more ridiculous, stupider, than the minister who would get up in this House and defend the cut-back in spending on hospitals in Saskatoon. I tell you that I have never seen a Minister of Justice or an Attorney General — and I've been in this House for seven years — a Minister of Justice who would defend the cut-back in hospital spending and say that that money should be put into another area to give incentives to business to be involved in the arms race.

I'll tell you that a Minister of Justice who would take that approach to solving the jobs problem has already failed before he's started. And I say to you very clearly, Mr. Minister, that SED Systems and Develcon didn't have a problem when we were in government. They were going, and going full out, and it was only when the agricultural economy turned down and the spray systems and the monitoring systems for Avadex applicators began to not sell, because of the inaction of the Minister of Agriculture and the premier in their agricultural area, that you have to find a solution to try to keep the doors of the high tech industry in Saskatoon open.

I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, there was a day when Saskatoon was known as the silicon valley of Canada. But what you people have done to that industry is changed it around to the record unemployment capital of western Canada.

And for you, Mr. Minister of Justice, to say to this Assembly that you favour shutting down hospital constructions in Saskatoon, and trying to get some deal going with Ronald Reagan as the solution, I think does a discredit to the position of justice minister in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Never in my life have I seen a man of your level in the government stand in the Assembly and take a responsible position — or irresponsible position — of saying that hospitals should not be reconstructed in Saskatoon, that there should be a cut-back from 250 million to 50 million, and with the resulting loss of thousands of jobs.

And I say to you, Mr. Justice Minister, who are pretending not to listen now, that you will be judged on the fact that you would support that position, and, to try to cover it off by saying that the New Democratic Party is opposed to SED Systems, people will know the record of the New Democratic Party in terms of . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order. Being 5 o'clock, I now leave the chair till 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.