

EVENING SITTING

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Dutchak that Bill No. 46 — **An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I made a few brief comments the other day in respect to The Court of Appeal Amendment Act. I want to indicate that there are two essential substantive changes introduced in the amendment: one having to do that no appeal lies to a court from the interlocutory decision of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench; and the other is also requiring leave of the Court of Appeal.

I have had an opportunity to take a look at this and to contact some of the members of the bar, and I think that generally speaking that there is some agreement. I think it's very important, though, Mr. Speaker, that whenever leave is not automatic from one court to the next that we have to be very conscious of why we are eliminating that basic right, whether it's to convenience an inadequately staffed Court of Appeal, or whether we are in fact increasing and protecting the rights of the individual citizens. And I think that whenever we're taking a look at modifying the right of appeal automatically, we have to be very careful that we guard, protect the rights of the citizens.

I want to know from the minister . . . In his introductory remarks basically said nothing in so far as his contact with the judicial body in Saskatchewan. He did not in fact give any statistics as to whether there was an abuse of the process which necessitated that leave be granted by the Court of Appeal, nor did he in fact indicate what particular problem he was attempting to overcome. I would only say that his introduction in the second reading left a lot to be desired. And so I took it upon myself to contact the legal fraternity and I think that, Mr. Speaker, I will have some detailed questions dealing with a couple of the provisions here when we deal with it in committee of the whole.

I only say that it is incumbent upon us to make sure that if we are depriving a basic right of appeal that we know that we are making it better for the general rights and privileges of the citizens, rather than correcting a situation where we may have in fact a Court of Appeal which cannot handle the volume of work and accordingly we start eliminating rather than increase the number of justices on the Court of Appeal. It has been said that in certainly the northern half of the province, having a resident member of the Court of Appeal in the city of Saskatoon for the northern half certainly would facilitate dealing with any chamber application of the Court of Appeal. But I will deal with these matters in some detail with the minister in committee of the whole and I can only say that I hope that he will be able to indicate the

information that we request as to what input he has had in respect to it. So we'll be supporting it in second reading on principle.

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

SECOND READINGS

Bill NO. 53 — An Act to amend The Forest Act

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, the forest companies in this province, members of the Saskatchewan Council of Independent Forest Industries, and many small operators have expressed some discomfort with the present forest Act.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the concerns expressed by the forest companies and small operators. This government is currently renegotiating forest management licence agreements with the major forest companies in Saskatchewan.

Two of the key objectives of these negotiations are: (1) to provide forest companies with a secure fibre base and security of tenure within the limitation of the resource base; and (2) to conduct relations with the forest industry in general on a more business-like basis through contractual arrangements that specify the terms and conditions of operations.

Mr. Speaker, I am proposing an amendment to The Forest Act to assist in meeting these two objectives. This government is committed to developing a strong and healthy forest industry in this province, an industry that will trust the government and enjoy security of tenure.

I now move second reading of Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Forest Act.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I find it quite interesting that the Minister of Energy gets up here and talking about how strong and healthy the forest industry is going to be in the province of Saskatchewan, and especially because of the amendments that they're bringing in; especially when you take a look at the fact that they've sold pretty well everything that we have in Saskatchewan regarding the forest industry.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of concerns that we see in this Bill, and we have our officials looking it over. It looks like this Bill is going to remove the rights of municipalities to regulate timber companies in this province. They will be out there just operating and free-wheeling in our forest industry and we most certainly want to take a look into this further. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Labour**

Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 20

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I understood you to say yesterday that the gentleman to your right has been appointed deputy. Was the appointment made by order in council or by contract of service?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — It was an order in council — September 18th, 1985. And it was a very good order in council.

Mr. Shillington: — I hope this is not the resumption of the silly season that started last night.

Mr. Minister, with respect to the video display terminals. Mr. Minister said last night that the video display terminals . . . There was no evidence that radiation from the screen caused any health problems. I think that's perhaps accurate. There are some disturbing statistics which don't constitute evidence. That is, there seems to be a far larger volume of complaints from people who use them than from the general public. But the available evidence does seem to suggest it's ergonomics and not radiation.

Mr. Minister, most — indeed, I think all — of the recommendations in that report relate to ergonomics. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if it's the government's intention to act on those recommendations. None of them, I think, relate to any . . . None of them, I believe, bear any relation to radiation.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — If we're going to take up where we left off last night, and you suggest that things are rather silly, I agree with you. Because in all the time I've been the member for Melville no NDP has ever called me a jackass, and I have to come to the legislature to be called that by an NDP. And so I would say that my constituents, no matter what their political strife, expect some common sense in this Chamber.

With respect to the video display terminals, we are getting feedback from the employees, the union groups, from management and employers, and so far the response to the report has been quite positive. Once we have allowed a sufficient time for feedback as to the reaction, then we will develop a policy as to exactly how much action we should take on the report. Up to now the response is positive, and we haven't made a final decision on how far we should go or how far we have to go.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, over what period of time do you see this happening? I ask this question with a note of concern in my voice. Other matters which admittedly were commenced by your predecessor have dragged on for very long periods of time before any action is taken.

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, when do you see this process being brought to a conclusion?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well actually there have been a lot of changes made in Labour recently and a lot of progress has been made. I think you've forgotten that we brought in the occupational health and safety regulations, which

had been in preparation for quite some time.

And you will recall that shortly after my appointment as minister, I spoke in Saskatoon, and I'm sure you have all the information. Miss Hunt and many other people were there and heard me speak. And if your people aren't reporting back to you, I am sure that if you check with them they'll give you the information. But I promised them that I would have them ready within six weeks, and they were passed within four. So we've been making a lot of progress and cleaning up some backlog.

Building accessibility has moved along, and we are now writing the regulations, and we're also consulting with people and we're getting the reaction. The response on the building accessibility regulations has been so overwhelming that it's taken a few extra months to try to process this and put it all together into some sensible regulations.

(1915)

With respect to your question on the video display terminals, I would expect in about three months we should have it all together and be ready to move on it.

Mr. Shillington: — One of the things that would be useful, Mr. Minister, is a publication, is a pamphlet in fact, that the department, I think, might put out to be made available to employers, and employees. Part of the problem is that people simply don't . . . Neither employees nor employers understand the technology, understand the potential ergonomic problems, I guess the word is. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if it might not be an idea to put out a pamphlet which might be made available to potential users, which would explain to them many of the simple precautions that should be taken when using these machines, such as getting up and leaving the machine once an hour and so on. It doesn't require a rest break once an hour; it just requires some minimal degree of organization of the operator's work-load.

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, if this might not be one case; if you might not redirect some of the advertising dollars that you're using to pat yourself on the back; if you might not direct some of them to this area and put out some information which I think would be genuinely useful to the employers and the employees who use them.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I don't know where you get the idea that I'm using advertising to pay myself on the back. You'll notice, if you go into the elevators, we haven't changed the signs. The former minister's name is still on the signs. I'm not exactly a publicity-monger, except when the media comes to my office, marching with 70 or 80 people trying to take my picture and getting my comment on things. But other than that, I'm not exactly a publicity-monger, and sometimes you're surprised where you find your face.

Now we are printing reports on the occupational health and safety, and we're printing about 40,000 of them. I would hope that you wouldn't criticize that as too many, because we have more employers than that in the province. But we thought we'd take a conservative sum of

40,000 of the occupational health and safety brochures so that this information will be public.

On the video display terminals, it's a bit premature because we're still receiving input from the various groups as to the reaction of the report and what they think we should do with it. I could dash out and do something, but then of course nobody would be satisfied. This way we'll give everybody a chance to give us their opinion, and then I'll decide what should be done, because I don't think we'll have total agreement.

As for other advertising, I don't really know what you're talking about. Maybe you've seen advertising I haven't seen or you've been looking at old advertising from five years ago. But I'm working right now on some safety pamphlets on gas, propane. I don't know what kind of political advertising you suggest that might be. I would think that if people are not blown up, that would be good politics, but it certainly isn't party politics.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, could you tell me how many claims the Workers' Compensation board received from law offices in the province of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well this is not the Workers' Compensation Board estimates here. We'll try and get you the information and report. I don't think it's very many. Law offices are very safe places to work.

Mr. Shillington: — It's my assumption . . . Do you want to deal with Workers' Compensation Board under a separate estimate? All right, if you'd rather do that. No, I'm told . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Workers' Compensation board is part of the Department of Labour estimates for the purposes of this discussion.

Mr. Shillington: — Well I wonder, now that we've got the minister partially informed at least as to what his department includes, I wonder if the minister might try and answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I can't argue with the chairman, but the Department of Labour and the Workers' Compensation Board are entirely separate, and I don't have the Workers' Compensation Board people here. We will undertake to send you the information.

As you know, having run a law office, the rates are very low, so that means that the claim level is very low. I think it's something like . . . The last I recall when I was still actively in practice of law, I think it was 15 cents per hundred or something like that. It was rather insignificant.

Mr. Shillington: — I would be surprised to hear that there were any claims by law offices in the province of Saskatchewan. I suspect there isn't any.

Mr. Minister, I want to thank you for your courtesy in sending me a merit award. I received a merit award presented to myself and my colleagues on maintaining a safe workplace during the preceding three years. I deeply appreciate the honour. In fact, we had a small celebration when we got this. It just meant so much to us.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, what these things cost to send out and whether or not you might have been more selective. I suppose it might be one thing to send them to a mining company if they achieved a three-year safety record, but I really wonder about sending them to professional offices. My guess is you haven't had any claims in three years from professional offices. They just don't arise.

And I wonder, Mr. Minister, how much this gambit, clearly designed to enhance the reputation of the government before an election, I wonder what, Mr. Minister, this cost you.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well I think you've only told us half of the story. You've probably got a refund cheque with that document. And you're not sure. Well don't tell us just half of the story, but it seems to me that the postage was already paid on your refund cheque. Next time we'll just keep your refund cheque if you're not happy. And it seems to me that . . . I'm only guessing, but I expect it cost about maybe half a cent to print that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

And your colleague there suggests it cost more. I know that the NDP printing company charges more, but I'm sure that out in the free market that about half a cent is probably all it cost.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, it was accompanied by a letter which did include a merit rebate award. I just wondered what the purpose in sending that certificate was. The letter informed me how proud you were of my office and how much it meant that someone with my sense of responsibility and my ability to administer and manage an office is carrying on business in the province. And I recognize that's sincere and I appreciate those deeply-felt comments. But I really wonder, Mr. Minister, if you needed to send me a certificate as well. I really wonder what that contributed to these sentiments which I know were deeply felt by yourself.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I advise the hon. member that I sincerely meant that. You do run a very good law office. It's very safe; it's very efficient; and it's something you're good at. And I think you should really stick with it and stay there.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I may well do that — I may well do that.

Mr. Minister, I wonder how many of these certificates you sent out. Would you undertake to give me the cost of the certificates, the merit award 1986 program. You may not have it. If you do I'll take it; if not, would you undertake to give it to me.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I don't have the information, but I'll try to track it down for you.

It seems to me that when people do something good you should recognize it and encourage them to keep up the good work. And when people have a safe record in the workplace . . . And I know that you consider safety insignificant at your law office, but safety is a major problem. We have between 25 and 46 people in an

average year killed on the job. And I might say that law offices are not that safe; there's been a few lawyers shot at. So you should keep that in mind. But safety is an important factor, and it seems to me that it is not a waste of the taxpayers' money to recognize a good safety record. And you still have not admitted that you received a refund cheque . . .

An Hon. Member: — I did. I said that.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Oh, you now acknowledge that you received a refund cheque. It seems to me that that is an incentive. An incentive, I know, is something that's hard for your party to comprehend, but that is an incentive. You get a refund; you make a little extra profit, it's an incentive to run an even safer workplace next year and make a little extra profit. I know this is dirty language I'm talking — profit — to the NDP, but people do appreciate profit in this province.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, in mines and in the smoke-stack industries, safety is a serious problem. I tell you, it's a fairly minor problem in a law office.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you could just undertake to give me the cost of those things, and I will then go on to the next question. But I didn't hear you, Mr. Minister — in the midst of your strong compliments — I didn't catch your undertaking to give me the cost of that.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We'll track down the cost and we'll let you know.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, before getting into the estimates in detail, I want to draw to your attention what I think is a decline in this department that didn't begin with your ministry, to be sure, but which has gone on over the four years.

Mr. Minister, I have with me the 1983 Estimates which is the first set of estimates presented by your government, after the first year in office, I guess I should say. At that point in time, by my calculation, excluding the women's division which has now been transferred out of the department, there were 280 employees on a comparable basis. You had 280 employees. Now you have 225. I think the decline in the size of the department matches the decline in the prestige of the department and, as I want to get on to later on, matches the decline in the living standards of working people in this province. One follows the other because I think one has been a cause of the other.

Mr. Minister, I notice this year again there are seven subvotes. In five of them there's a decrease in staff. That's happened virtually every year that these estimates have come before the Legislative Assembly.

I know, Mr. Minister, that you will rise and give us the standard Conservative rhetoric that you're doing more with less. The fact is you're not, Mr. Minister. This department is no longer seen as being the spokesperson on behalf of working people, the department that protects the rights of working people. It has become, I think, at best a joke; at worst a real tragedy.

I'm going to deal with that comment in more detail, but I say, Mr. Minister, that the decline in the size of your department represents a decline in the stature of this department and certainly, Mr. Minister, a decline in its effectiveness in terms of its ability to look out for working people. And I would appreciate your comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well there are many, many ways of running a department and we believe, and particularly I believe, in running it efficiently.

First of all, with respect to the 65 people, I believe it is — or is it 55 people? — that you refer to, that we have fewer, I'm not apologizing for that at all. First of all, 12 of those went to the Advanced Education department; some of them with Women's Secretariat; 22 went on the apprenticeship program that went to Advanced Education; and three went to the Public Service Commission, for a total of 37, which leaves me — what is it? — about 18 fewer people.

(1930)

And quite honestly, the Labour department as I knew it in the old days and as we found it in 1982 was the front for your NDP hacks. They used to hide them and train them and groom them for politics. And when we cleaned those 18 out, we found that we didn't have to replace them with Conservatives. So that we were able to save the taxpayers an average of 24,000 times 18, which is quite a lot of money per year.

With respect to my department as it now is, you can see we've kept the professional people. We've thrown the politicians out. The only politician in my department is myself. And we've kept the professional people who get the job done, and they're not busy campaigning. So that has narrowed it down. And you've noticed that I only have two executive assistants and we've been able to operate very efficiently.

With respect to your comment that my department is a joke, you may have noticed that the militancy is down somewhat in the last few months. The labour scene has been a lot quieter over the last three and a half, four years, and therefore we haven't needed as many people in the department. The people I've got work very hard; done an excellent job. And as a matter of fact they have made my job as minister quite easy because they are so professional and so good at what they do.

Mr. Shillington: — I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, not to drag your officials into this discussion. We agree upon their competence. What I'm talking about is not the competence of the officials, but the leadership of the government. That, Mr. Minister, begins and ends in your office.

Mr. Minister, there may be an apparent calm. I think it is largely because most working people anticipate a change in government and they're biding their time until that happens. And I really think, Mr. Minister, if there is an apparent calm it is an expectation that the long night is about to end and that a new day is going to dawn, whenever the Premier has the courage to call an election.

But this department, I tell you, has regained none of its prestige and none of its credibility with working people. They don't exactly refer to individual subvotes that have gone down. They don't refer to fewer people in administration, or one less in policy and planning, or one less in labour relations, or one fewer person in labour standards. But they do, when I am talking to them, talk about the inability of the department to meet their needs and to provide the kind of services which working people have come to expect of this department, through governments of very different political views.

Mr. Minister, I want specifically to go to the question of pension benefits. There was a time when this department had the wherewithal to provide some leadership with respect to pensions. Admittedly there might have been more that could have been done, but the department was certainly seen as the department which was in charge of developing policy and administering police with respect to pensions.

Mr. Minister, let me ask you a question. Do you anticipate that the home-makers' pension legislation, if I can call it that . . . It not yet having been introduced, I don't have a name for it and if I am misdescribing its function and scope, I'd be happy to be corrected. I am as irritated as anyone that this legislation has not been introduced. But the pension legislation which has been referred to in the throne speech, do you see this, do you anticipate that this legislation will be administered by this department?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well first of all, you're still concerned about the operations of my department. And I can tell you that my department is getting along just fine without Larry Brown. He doesn't work there any more. And we're getting along just fine without Mr. Mitchell, your candidate in Saskatoon. He doesn't work for me any more. And we're getting along just fine with Mr. Ching. He doesn't work for us any more. And as for your provincial campaign manager, Mr. Garry Simons, we're getting along just fine without him. We haven't found any need to replace them. And there's a whole long list. Well Craig Dotson doesn't work for us any more either. And I understand he works for the Leader of the Opposition. And I'm getting along fine without him.

So without these political hacks in my department, we've been able to save the taxpayers some money. And while the contact that these political operatives used to have with your socialist friends is not there any more . . . I mean it's there but they're now doing it on their own payroll. There may be some complaints from your socialist friends who have their own hidden agenda, but the average working person, the little man and the little woman out there, and the young people who are out there working, making a living, paying taxes, are getting along just fine without these people in my department.

With respect to the home-makers' pension, it is a truly amazing piece of legislation. You will be totally against it when you see it, as is your habit. I mean, I don't yet know what you people are for over there. You won't tell us what you're for; you tell us what you're against. You're against everything that any government ever does. However, you will not tell us what you are for. So if you could ever come

up and give us your hidden agenda as to what you would really do if you were ever government again, or if you ever came up with constructive criticism, then the duties of the opposition and the way this legislature should function would be greatly enhanced and you would be doing a service to the people who elected you. But however to be against everything . . . And I see you're getting ready to be against this home-makers' pension plan.

I can tell you this: first of all, you will be very, very disappointed because it is going to be an innovative piece of legislation that will be copied all across Canada. It will receive national attention, and even your left-wing friends will find it hard to criticize.

But you will be against it. You will be against it because it will be popular among the people, the poorer people who have never had pensions. So you will be against it. But in the end the question of who will administer it has not been decided. I would be pleased to have my department operate it. However, it may be the Department of Finance. And it has not been decided which department will operate that, nor has it been decided where the office will be.

Mr. Shillington: — Do I take it then, Mr. Minister, that your department is not involved in the drawing up of the legislation, and is not responsible for the drawing up of the legislation, and you are not the minister who is responsible for taking to cabinet recommendations with respect to the form and shape of this legislation?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well I'm the chairman of the legislative review committee so nothing gets to this Assembly without me seeing it and having some input in it. And in particular, I have had an awful lot of input in that legislation with a view to protecting workers and non-workers because a lot of people covered by this plan are going to be non-workers — people who work but don't receive any pay, so maybe a "non-worker" is a discredit to them. But a lot of these people are people who don't watch the clock, who don't get overtime, who don't get fringe benefits, and now finally they're going to get a pension plan.

My department has followed it very close. I've officials in this room who have been at every meeting and I have been at 80 per cent of all the meetings with respect to that particular Act.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, I'm concerned about the legislation. I ask the question for two reasons. One, to express a note of concern. This legislation will now, I think, inevitably be brought into the legislature in the dying days of the session when there is no . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, there is not lots of time. If the member from Saskatoon Sutherland believes there's lots of time, then he's not much of an observer of legislative processes, because we are in the last weeks at least of the session, Mr. Minister.

We have not seen the legislation; the public have not seen it; no one has had a chance to react to it; and no one has had a chance to study it. And I suspect, Mr. Minister, that that is part of the game plan — is that legislation will

be brought in late in the session, after an opportunity for proper scrutiny escapes us.

I'm concerned, Mr. Minister, because I think something this important should have come in early in the session and the public ought to have had a full opportunity to look into it. We, as their representatives, ought to have had a full opportunity to get their views, and there ought to have been a good discussion. The discussion, Mr. Minister, is inevitably going to be truncated now, just by the sheer legislative process. It's either intentional, or it's incompetence in the sense that you can't make up your mind what you're going to do.

Mr. Minister, I ask the questions with respect to the pension legislation for a secondary reason, and that is that the . . . it is not clear to us which minister we should be asking questions about. If it is the Finance minister, if someone would tell us that, in unequivocal terms, then I will save the questions until the Finance minister's estimates comes before the House. But we have in the past left these questions only to find out that the minister who would have been responsible for answering them has already sneaked his estimates through. So that's why I ask you if you're the minister responsible for the legislation. If you are, I have some questions. If you don't, I have made such comments as I'm going to, and I'll leave the balance for the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well with respect to the pension legislation, it will be forthcoming very soon, and you won't have to study it very long to say you're opposed to it, so I wouldn't be concerned about the amount of time it takes you to say no, but you will be given enough time. And quite honestly the concept is so novel and it takes a great deal of thought and skill. I really doubt if the average socialist could ever understand it or would want to understand it. So just try your best, and say no like you always do.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, if the minister is going to snarl like a dog every time I ask a question, then these estimates serve no purpose at all. There is no way in the world, Mr. Minister, I can make you ask questions. If you want to respond to every question with sarcasm or some inane allegation about the New Democratic Party, then we might as well get on to the next department. I have no desire to waste my time with you, if this is the way you want to carry on your estimates. If you're prepared to answer questions honestly and reasonably put, we will carry on. If not, this is a pointless process. No one can make you answer questions. If you want to behave like a mad dog, then these estimates make no sense at all.

So I'd ask you, Mr. Minister, if you're prepared to answer the questions, then start doing that, but if you view this as a gladiatorial contest, then these estimates are absolutely pointless, and we go on to somebody who has some sense. I ask you again, Mr. Minister: are you the minister responsible for the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The Minister of Finance is responsible for the legislation. If you will ask a simple question, I'll give you a simple answer.

Mr. Shillington: — Well I don't know why you didn't tell

us that 10 minutes ago instead of making all those inane comments . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you didn't. No, you didn't. You said it may be the Minister of Finance, or it may be us. We don't know. That is what he said.

Mr. Minister, I note with respect to the technical safety services, I assume this includes furnace inspection. If I'm wrong, I wait to be corrected, but I assume that's the section. It's gone down by five people. I ask you, Mr. Minister, what positions were deleted in this section?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I would answer your question: three of those five positions were communications people who were going around school to schools doing the "Sparky the Dog" program, which has been replaced with a "Learn to Burn" program which is cheaper and we find will hit more students. We can cover them all in a year.

One curriculum development officer for the fire college was deleted because we didn't proceed with a fire college at this time. One building inspector was deleted because the building standards have not gone up and rolling yet, so we didn't need an inspector to inspect nothing. And we added one new boiler inspector. So that gives you the explanation of the reductions there.

(1945)

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I don't wish to rehash the tragedy of Polly Redhot. I do ask you, Mr. Minister, if your inspections are current. They certainly weren't at that time. They were running a very long period of time behind. The member from Yorkton was never candid enough to admit that, but they were running many months behind time. And inevitably the tragedy which we might have expected occurred — someone was killed.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, then, if your inspections are now current?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well we've been trying to take care of the backlog; it's been there for quite a long time. We've been giving it priorities, and we've had an extra person paying particular attention to gas defects. But I'm doing everything possible to try and cure this backlog, and it is something that concerns me and it has concerned me for a long time.

And I'm holding a tag here, which I'm sure you will question whether this is accurate or not, but I can tell you that I personally took this tag off my furnace in my house. And this tag is this gas safety unit inspection tag, dated January 1, 1977 — and I moved into my house on January 1, 1974. So three years after I moved into my house, my furnace was inspected.

And I don't recall who was the minister in 1977 or in 1974, but it seems to me it was probably Gordon Snyder for all of that period of time. And it seems to me that you had a blatant disregard for my safety and that of my family, and I've been trying to cure this backlog ever since I've been appointed the minister. So that three years after I moved into my new house my furnace was inspected. It

seems to me, three years later it's rather a waste of time coming around and inspecting it. And as somebody suggested, it says, "Not to be removed." But I think, for the sake of political truth, I will break that small law and bring it into the Assembly; I'll take it home, put it back on my furnace — so that I have history there to show how bad your gas inspections have been for 10 years. And we're trying to get the backlog cleared up.

I'm working on a new proposal, which I will try to introduce in the next few months, that will greatly increase the number of inspections and reduce the requirements for as many inspections as we do have now. And so we're making progress. It's not as fast as I'd like to see it, but we are making progress. And we have put safety as the number one criteria in inspections rather than just going through the mundane inspections of inspecting something three years after the fact. Now we are going out and doing the most important things first.

Mr. Shillington: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, if everything possible — you said you're doing everything possible — I wonder, Mr. Minister, if that includes hiring more staff. The controversy was so fierce last year, the minister will recall, because your department had a number of vacant positions, were running a very long period of time behind, and one of the officials of your department said rather candidly that they were unable to keep up with the matter due to the number of vacancies in the department.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if all those positions are filled, and if you have considered — when you say you're doing everything possible — if you've considered hiring enough people to get those things done, and get them done in a timely fashion.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We filled all the positions, and the people that are filling the positions are working better than ever. In the old days when you were the government, the efficiency of your inspectors left a lot to be desired. And we had instances, when you were the government, where we found inspectors going out of town and then spending an afternoon at the mall, and we had instances where inspectors were spending an afternoon at the golf course. And we've now weaned them from those kind of habits that you allowed them to develop, and the efficiency of their inspections is up considerably.

Mr. Shillington: — I suspect, Mr. Minister, that then, as now, most of the inspectors were conscientious people who attempted to do their job. I suspect that your comments about the people who were there in the '70s are inaccurate, and I suspect that they're unfair.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would give me the number of positions you have as inspectors now so that we might compare it with the number that was in existence, the number of positions that were there when this tragedy occurred.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — In this budget year we have on the job, to my knowledge: boiler and pressure vessel inspectors, 13; electrical and elevator inspectors, 25.5; gas safety unit, 20; fire commissioner's inspectors, 21.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, with respect to the

Workers' Compensation Board, I wonder if you would tell us when you expect the report of Judge Muir and company.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I'm hopeful that his report will come in in August. As you know, you can't hurry a judge. They work on their own time and decide when they've decided. So I would expect that he's going to try and have it ready in August.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, members of the commission were quoted by the media as saying they were appalled by some of the stories they heard. I've also been appalled by the operation of the Workers' Compensation Board. This is not a subject, this is not a matter about which there exists any fine legal proof or any mathematical proof. These are observations which I have made as an elected member, that the volume of complaints with respect to the Workers' Compensation Board has increased very dramatically. The complaints — many of them I simply have no answer for. The disposition of some of these claims defies any rational explanation, and the approach defies a rational explanation.

This is by and large not the government's money. In a very real sense it's not the employers' money. The money belongs to the workers. It's their money. It's what is paid into the fund by their employers in return for an age-old compromise by which they gave up their right to sue their employer. To then turn the thumbscrews on them when they come to make some legitimate complaints is really, I think, Mr. Minister, very harsh.

A number of things that seem to be happening, which I have not witnessed before . . . I had nowhere near the volume of complaints I've got recently. One of the things that seems to be happening is that people are deemed to be fit to go back to work even although there is patently no conceivable way in this economy they can ever find employment. Their workers' compensation is then reduced and they are left with a real shortage of money to live on.

I want to read for you an advertisement that was clipped out of *The Regina Shopper* on March 4th, 1986. It's a classified ad. It says:

Job Wanted. SASK INJURED WORK ASSOCIATION require employment for a male, age early 50s. Education: public school graduate. Previous experience: landscaping . . . Physical restrictions. Specialists' Reports. Cannot bend forward or sideways. Sitting and walking time limited . . . Requirement minimum: 8 hours per day at \$6.70 per hour, as established by the Workers Compensation Board.

It's a true case. I actually got the name of the individual and talked to him. That individual — and that accurately describes him — has actually been deemed to be fit to work for eight hours a day, five days a week, at 6.70 an hour; and his compensation was reduced accordingly, even though there is patently no way in the wide, wide world such a man would ever find a job in this economy.

And there are other difficulties with the Workers' Compensation Board, but the most recent and the most severe seems to be this system of deeming. I have put these questions previously to your predecessor, the member from Yorkton, and all I got was a song and dance that nothing had changed, that everything was as it was. I admit that the regulations, the law, hasn't changed, but the administration most certainly has.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if the time is not overdue to adopt a more compassionate approach towards injured workmen. These are not the sort of people that are constantly castigated by the member from Regina Rosemont as being lazy or unwilling to work. These are patiently not people who are attempting to avoid work. They're people who can't work. By reports of medical officers, they're people who can't work.

Equally patently, someone who's a male; age, early 50; education, public school graduate; previous experience, landscaping; who has the following physical restrictions — cannot bend forward or sideways; sitting and walking time limited — patently he's going to have the greatest difficulty finding a job.

So I wonder, Mr. Minister, if the time isn't long overdue for a more compassionate approach towards workers' compensation. Most of them aren't asking for charity. What they're asking for is what is theirs — fair access to the money in the workers' compensation, and fair and reasonable allowance when they can't find employment due to injuries at the workplace.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — In my short term as the minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board, I have found several problems. First of all, as a minister responsible, I don't have the complete power to correct any mistakes that they might make over there even if I thought they ever did do that. And so therefore I can only suggest to them that they review some of these matters and they give them a serious look.

As you know, the Workers' Compensation Board as established is very autonomous. It's not a Crown corporation and it's not really part of my department. And so they don't, strictly speaking, come under these estimates; and they don't come under Crown corporations.

So first of all you have to keep in mind that the Workers' Compensation Board is not a charity; it's a compensation board. And just because an individual declares that the individual is ill, sick, injured, not capable of working, that does not mean that that individual is necessarily perceiving the facts as they are. And you'd also know that the Workers' Compensation Board hires competent doctors to assess people, and they are doctors who do nothing but assess people and report to the board.

The board members by and large are business orientated, labour orientated, and compassionate people. You have a religious doctor; you have an ex-union man — or maybe he still is, but he serves on the board — and you have group of very competent people. And they have to make judgement calls. And as you know as a lawyer that you were never . . . or at least I was not always satisfied

with the decision of a judge. And they have appeal procedures, but the legislation does not allow for an appeal beyond the full board.

So with respect to the question of deemed earnings, I agree with you; it has been a problem area. You have to have some degree of deemed earnings. I understand that this area will be reconsidered. There are isolated cases where an individual is, in your opinion, which I would think is not quite as professional as that of the board, not treated fairly. But you will have to admit that you have written me on several occasions and we've always looked into the matter and given you an answer.

(2000)

And on some occasions — and I won't mention the names of the people you've written for — but on some occasions I've indicated to you that I would ask the board to reconsider this. And they have. So that's the most I can do. It's a judgement call.

There are some strange situations and I don't really want to stand up here and be sexist against men, but all of the problem cases I've had on workers' compensation have been men. In my term, I have not yet had a female complain that she's not being fairly treated by workers' compensation. And it seems to be a class of men that seem to have more problems than others. They seem to be recurring. I get them back from 20 years where these cases, the same people keep recurring. I had an example of a man the other day who they've assessed at 2 per cent, and he considers himself totally unfit to work. And they've assessed him at 2 per cent disability. So it's not a charity; we can't give people what they want. They can't necessarily retire on workers' compensation. It's for compensation if you're injured and can't work.

The deemed earnings is a bit of a problem. I agree with you. And on occasion I've said to the board, would you please reconsider this because you have to be realistic on what a person can actually earn. But with workers' compensation it's quite lucrative if you get injured on a high-paying job that you may have held down for a very short period of time.

And so if you were making . . . And there's instances of people making \$17 an hour for a month or two on a job. They get injured and then they'd kind of like to get paid \$17 an hour for the rest of their life; whereas they are healthy and the board says to them, listen, if you can't make \$17 an hour, you've got to go out and work for 8 or 9 or whatever is realistic. Just because you got injured on a high-paying job, that doesn't mean you've got a life retirement.

So I agree that there are some problems because when ever you have individuals you will have some disagreements. Now the human beings at the board make human decisions, and on occasion they may be wrong, but they have to make the decisions, not you and I.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, I thank you for your admission that there are problems with the process of deemed employment. There certainly are problems. This, I think, eloquently illustrates the kind of problem

that exists.

Mr. Minister, I don't think it's all that strange, Mr. Minister, that there are more men than women who are injured. The vast majority of people who are injured come from people who do manual labour. It's inherently more dangerous and you're much, much more likely to drop something on your foot or put your back out, or something of that sort. But they're not all men.

Mr. Minister, you and I have been corresponding for some time with respect to a nurse, who is patently a female, who got injured trying to lift a heavy patient. So the majority of them are men, but that's simply the kind of work that men do. Women are less likely to be doing heavy manual work, which is inherently more dangerous, both because of the nature of the workplace and because of the possibility of injuring muscles.

Mr. Minister, if as I suspect, this government is roasted by Judge Muir for the whole program of deemed employment, Mr. Minister, are you prepared to reassess those people who have been denied their workers' compensation because of the deemed employment system?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We have a problem in that the Act doesn't allow you to go back five, 10 years, or whatever, and pay people retroactively. We will try to do equity within the Act and look at those particular cases.

There is a problem with workers' compensation and that, if anything, the employers are saying to us we are too generous; and the board, from what I can see, if they do err, err on the side of the worker, and take the employer's money and pay it out to the worker and give that worker the benefit of the doubt. Now I don't know what you want to do. Do you want to give the workers the benefit of the doubt or do you just want to give them all outright charity at the expense of the employers and the other employees that are out there?

So you have to have some reasonable limits. We have, from what I can ascertain, one of the best workers' compensation boards in Canada. It's very efficient; it's very well funded; our rates are very low, and they pay reasonable amounts. The Workers' Compensation Board is contributing about 12 — it's either 12 or \$14 million to the new Wascana Hospital for rehabilitation.

But you have to admit that there are some workers who do not wish to be rehabilitated. They wish to be rehabilitated just enough so that they can play golf and fish, but not quite enough so that they have to go back to their job. And there are a minority of those people; there are a few. And as a politician, you will get those kind of calls, and I will get those kind of calls, and the board gets those kind of problems. And their duty is to sort the truly injured people from the fakes. And you cannot tell me that every person that puts in a claim is entitled to be paid.

And I know of instances in my own city where there were a few people who were faking. And of course we're not going to use names today, but . . . And you know of a few instances; you hear of them. Everyone in this Assembly, the public out there, knows of people who have faked on

workers' compensation. It's a very difficult job to pick out the fakes from the real people who have an injury that is hard to ascertain what it is or to what extent it's bothering them.

So because there are one or two bad apples, a few innocent people sometimes suffer.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, in this case I think the one or two bad apples are sitting around the cabinet table and the innocent are suffering. That's quite right.

Mr. Minister, I don't intend to pursue this subject. Suffice it to say it's an old movie. When the government of Ross Thatcher was in office, members of the opposition were just besieged with calls from injured workmen. It somehow or another seems to be in the handbook of right-wing governments that you should show no compassion to injured workmen. They are somehow or other thought to be an undeserving lot and you deal with them as harshly as you possibly can.

I remember, Mr. Minister, that being the case when the Thatcher government was in office. Within months of the time that the government changed, those cases were all dealt with in a summary fashion and we went on. This is just an old movie. This is just an old movie, Mr. Minister.

I sense, although I cannot provide, analytically or otherwise, that you're also dealing in a harsher and less compassionate way with claims in general; that there are just more people having more difficulty getting their injuries recognized. I can't provide that but I believe that to be the case, simply from the observations I've made as an elected member.

The minister will no doubt benefit from the wise and learned comments of the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

Mr. Minister, I want to go on. I may say that I don't intend this evening to deal with unemployment. Following your estimates, we'll be having the department of economic development and employment. I may not have the name quite right; I don't think I do. But we'll have the department of employment and economic development, I guess, coming next. So we intend to deal with the unemployment issue in that department. I don't intend to raise them in your department.

I do, however, want to raise the question of the average wage. I said that the decline in the size of your department mirrored not only a decline in its credibility and prestige; it also mirrors a decline in the economic stature and status of working people.

Mr. Minister, I clipped two articles out of the *Leader-Post*. One followed so closely behind the other one that I'm surprised it didn't occur to the provincial editor to note the incongruity in the two articles. They were a scant few weeks apart.

The first one said — this is on the front page of "Market Place," section C — "Executive pay likely to rise." The first paragraph says:

Salary increases for executive are expected to be in the range of five to six per cent next year, with continuing emphasis on bonuses for good performance . . .

That was followed a scant few weeks later by the following article, also on the front page of the "Market Place" section of the *Leader-Post*, which says: "Average wage drops in province." "Wage patterns in Saskatchewan . . ." I'm reading the first paragraph:

Wage patterns in Saskatchewan are not moving in line with the rest of the country. Farm wages are moving ahead, while industrial wages are falling.

Mr. Minister, this is a direct result of (a) a vastly higher number of unemployed, so that those who have jobs have a very poor bargaining position; and the changes to The Trade Union Act. Both of those, Mr. Minister, are reflected in large measure in this peculiarity: that while the wages across Canada have moved ahead, the average wage in Saskatchewan has dropped. It's most unusual for the average industrial wage to drop. It's happened here because of intentional policies of your government with respect to The Trade Union Act, and it has happened because of the neglect of your province to deal with the unemployment issue.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if this doesn't give you some smattering of an idea as to why it is that your predecessor was booed at two labour conventions and given a stony, silent treatment at the last one he attended. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if these articles don't give you some idea of why trade unionists are so unhappy with your government.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well I'm afraid that I've discerned and learned something very truly disgusting — that the people who shout the loudest about a social conscience have none at all. And that's your party and some of the union leaders that I've had to deal with.

And I can tell you, I had some of them in my office one day. And they said, we can't get by on our increase; we can't survive on a 3 per cent increase this year. And I said to those people — the people that you suggest have a social conscience, and you and your party suggest you have a social conscience — I said to them: have you no social conscience? Where do you expect the government and the people in general to give you more than a 3 per cent raise? Do you expect me to go to the 2,000 farmers in my constituency who have had a 10 per cent cut in income this year, and a 10 per cent cut last year? Do you expect me to go into their pockets and give more money to you out of their pockets when their pockets are already empty?

And if you at all believe in a social conscience, then you have to believe that everyone in our society has to share proportionately. And when our farmers and certain elements of our society are losing income due to the problems in international trade, you have the audacity to come here and say that you have a social conscience and I should go and take from the poor and give to the reasonably affluent in comparison.

Now I know there are people in this city and in Saskatoon

and every other city who are having to struggle, but I can tell you they are not struggling as much as the people in rural Saskatchewan. And that problem is, you only see to the city limits of Regina and you think that somebody with a two-income family and a motor home in their back yard is poor.

You come into my constituency and look what the real people live like, and they don't think they're poor. They're wealthy in spirit; that's where it counts. But don't tell me . . . and your party every come to me and say that, we have a social conscience, when you want me to go to the people who have no money, take more from them and give it to the powerful, some of the people that you're talking about.

I realize you can't get rich in Regina or Saskatoon on \$401 a week. But that is more than virtually every farmer in my constituency makes. And that is a lot more than their wives make because they don't have any jobs at all. And it's a lot more than most of the women in Melville make, and in every other little town in my constituency and in half of this province. I don't know where you say it's gone down because the average increase in this province was 3 per cent, except for farmers and except for people in small business.

So if you have a social conscience at all, you will share the wealth of this province. For example, I don't know how you think that this province is suffering so much when the statistics show that the people of Saskatchewan buy more big cars per capita than anywhere in Canada and more expensive trucks per capita than anywhere in Canada. What makes you think that this province is so badly off?

You know, some of you people have a strange idea of what poverty is. I knocked on doors in Regina North East, and I remember knocking on doors and the people say, oh no, I'm poor. And I looked in the man's backyard and there was a motor home. I knocked on the next door and they said, oh no, I'm poor. I looked in his backyard — a \$10,000 boat. You know what I got at the third house? The same answer, and there was a \$12,000 trailer in the backyard. You are going around telling people who are affluent they are poor; and as a result, they have a poor attitude. You should be telling people that they have to learn to get by on what there is in this society and they have to be prepared to share. And I think your constituents should be prepared to share with mine.

(2015)

Mr. Shillington: — Now that, I may say, is an altogether too typical example of Tory logic and ethics. Logic, because there isn't any; there is no way in the world that the impoverishment of working people in Saskatchewan will in any way benefit the farmers. It's also an example of Tory ethics, because it's in part intentional. You play the farmer against the worker, and you attempt to do the opposite. It's the old Tory trick of divide and conquer. You think if you can get the farmers angry enough at working people, and you can portray the NDP as being in the hip pocket of the trade unionists, then you'll get the votes of the farmers. Well, you may be right, Mr. Minister, but that's not the way I see it when I'm out in rural

Saskatchewan, and I'm out in rural Saskatchewan quite a bit.

Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Minister, the member from Quill Lakes makes a good point; I am shouting to try to make myself heard over the braying of members opposite. Mr. Minister, I want you to note, if you'd been listening, that farm income, farm wages are moving ahead while industrial wages are falling. It's not farmers who are unfairly paying their workers less. It's people who are taking advantage of the unfair trade union legislation which your government brought in.

And I want to say something about all the socialists you talk about in the trade union movement. I recall being interviewed by a journalist, a student from the university. She had just come from the Premier's office and she had asked the Premier . . . This was a month or so after your predecessor refused to speak to the federation of labour. She asked him why. His response, so the journalism student told me, was because, ah, those trade unionists, they're all a bunch of socialists anyway. Well, all I could say is that you made them that way, because there wasn't a whole lot of those people packing union cards who voted NDP in 1982.

One of the reasons the member from Elphinstone and I are here is because we represent low-income ridings. By and large, if they're socialists, and that's my impression, it's because you made them into socialists with the vicious anti-union and anti-working legislation which were brought in. In some ways, I suppose, if we were as crass and as cynical as you people are, we'd thank you. But we're not. I am angry about what you have done to working people. Every time I meet with trade unionists and workers in this province, I get angrier.

Mr. Minister, let me read you a couple of more paragraphs. Ah well, you're now in good hands. You're now getting the sterling advice from the member from Saskatoon Fairview who almost has enough nerve to let his name stand for nomination again. Mr. Minister, let me read you a couple of more paragraphs. Mr. Minister, it goes on:

The drop is not an aberration. If one uses an average of the last three months available for 1985 compared with the same three months in '84, the same decline occurs. Hourly, evenings were down in Saskatchewan, but up in each of the other provinces.

Another wage trend charted by Statistics Canada — when you say you wonder where I'm getting it from, that's easy. It's taken straight from Statistics Canada. Another wage trend charted by Statistics Canada points in a similar direction:

In December, union wage index for the construction trades was up in all provinces with the exception of Saskatchewan.

That, Mr. Minister, is a direct result of the amendments to The Trade Union Act, and the ability of the construction industry to break the trades as they've done. They'd be the first to admit that if you set out with Bill 104 to break the

trade union movement you've come very close to succeeding in many, and you have succeeded in some.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, if you don't think you can see in here some evidence of why you and your predecessor in office are treated so rudely by trade unionists. They're angry; they are very angry at you and your government for what you've done to them — for the cruel, unethical approach you have taken; for your despicable trading off. And you're playing farmers against workers. They're angry about that, Mr. Minister. And I wonder if you don't think that that anger has something to do with the stark facts set out in these two articles which appeared a few weeks apart in the *Leader-Post*.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well the first thing I had to learn when I came to this Assembly was to never accept any figures or statistics that your party ever gave to us. And you haven't had the courtesy to send me a copy of that article so I can't even read it for myself. So I'm not sure what's in it.

But your figures don't seem to match with the figures I have. And in particular, I really don't know why you seem to be hung up on some sort of a class struggle, other than possibly Marx told you that's how it had to be. That's what you seem to have on your mind — some sort of a class struggle.

What I was talking about was sharing the wealth of this province, and that the powerful groups whether they be union or whether they be management, or whether they be churches, or whatever they might be, that the powerful groups have to have their power restricted for those people who have no power at all. And you seem to only be prepared to act on behalf of your favourite and special powerful groups.

And that was the problem I had when I was a member of your party. I felt that a political party should try to represent all of the people and try to balance the interests and the power struggles of the people. But you seem to represent one group or two groups or three groups in society and the rest of society should work and share with your three or four powerful groups that you would like to have fed.

And it is quite clear where your allegiances lie. Name me one other political party that receives union dues into their political party — one other than yours. None. And that makes it quite clear where your allegiances stand with respect to your party. The more union dues that are paid the more comes into your party. And so it makes it quite clear where you stand.

But I can tell you that the union leaders in this province are of two kinds. About half of them are very professional union leaders; I have great respect for them and they do an excellent job for their members. The other half in Saskatchewan is the most politicized union situation in all of Canada. The other half are NDP politicians on the union payroll. So not only do you take the union dues but you park your hacks, and the ones that we fire you park them on the union payroll and support them on the backs of the workers. And that . . .

An Hon. Member: — Name one.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — You say name one. You give me the salary of Nadine Hunt; you give me the salary of Larry Brown; and tell me if they're working for the industrial wage. Did anyone ever publish the salary of the union leaders?

An Hon. Member: — Yes, indeed, that's public information.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well then you send it over to me.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I must say that I think this is all a concocted effort to make the former minister of Labour look as if he knew what he was doing. That's the only conceivable explanation for this display that we have seen over the last few minutes.

The suggestion that Larry Brown is somehow or other an NDP operative really is . . . I have every respect for Larry Brown. I think he's often not given credit by his critics for doing the job he is, which is looking out for the interests of people who are working for the public service. But to say that he has been an NDP operative — if he's listening, I am sure he will not know whether to laugh or cry at that sort of an allegation.

You have to remember with respect to both of those individuals that they were elected at a duly-called convention and a hard-fought convention of delegates from the entire trade union movement in Saskatchewan — now with very, very few exceptions.

Mr. Minister, you forget that these tyrannical labour bosses — you can never figure out whether they're tyrants with respect to their workers or our lackeys. I don't understand them being both, but that you paint them as both. You seem to forget that in all cases they are either democratically elected, as is the case with Nadine Hunt, or they are hired by people who are democratically elected.

The minister keeps asking me what their wages are. I don't know, but I'll tell you it's public information. If you want to pick up the phone, they'll tell you with respect to Nadine Hunt. Larry Brown, I'm not sure — he's a staff member; he's not elected. But Nadine Hunt's salary I'm quite sure is public information.

Mr. Minister, they're neither tyrants with respect to their workers nor are they lackeys of ours. If we share some common goals, it is because we speak for the same people with the same compassion. And we have, Mr. Minister, the same goals; that is, to assist working people in a better life.

Mr. Minister, you say that . . . you talk about the class struggle. Well you ought to recognize it when you stand here as you did 10 minutes ago and suggest that somehow or other the high wages of workers in the urban areas is responsible or the plight of the farmers. If that's not promoting a class struggle in classical terms in Saskatchewan, then I don't know what is.

As I say, I was annoyed when this started, but I can only

assume, Mr. Minister, that this is a very, very clever attempt to redeem the former minister and make him look good, because I think that's all you've accomplished in the last hour and a half.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well I think we've accomplished a lot. At least this evening you haven't called me a jackass, so you're learning some manners this evening.

Let me tell you about the boiler makers. As a Minister of Labour, I don't just look after the leaders; I have to look after the workers. The rank and file of the boiler makers have come to me, and keep coming to me. And the leaders don't know who they are because I won't tell them. And I've had to phone the president of the boiler makers in Kansas City, and I may even have to fly down there; and when I do, I will tell you how much it cost.

And the reason I'm going to go is for the boiler makers of Saskatchewan, because they are one construction union that does not have their own local, and their local is run out of Winnipeg. And so they come to me and complain that the local out of Winnipeg is sending Manitoba workers into Saskatchewan and our Saskatchewan boiler makers are sitting idle.

And, for example, at the P.A. pulp-mill right now where there's a refitting going on; on some shifts there are seven Manitoba boiler makers and four Saskatchewan boiler makers. And the unemployed boiler makers come to me, but their union leaders in Kansas City and at Edmonton will not give them a Saskatchewan local.

So now I as Minister of Labour have got to try and help them. And they're rather leery because they have a closed shop. And if they petition for a local again as they did last time and sign their names with a closed shop, they may never work in Saskatchewan again. So they've had to come for the protection of the Minister of Labour.

So you tell me about the fairness and the democracy that is practised. Unions are very essential and in many cases they protect the workers, but they also build their own empires. And what I'm telling you about the boiler makers is that if you think the workers think this minister is a joke, then you've got another thought coming because the workers, the rank and file, are coming to me for help. So I have to protect the workers, and not only the unionized ones, but the non-unionized workers.

So don't you ever say that the Department of Labour is not protecting workers and has no compassion, because I will fly to Kansas City if necessary to help those Saskatchewan boiler makers get their own union in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask the minister whether you are aware of the fact that a group of workers — some 290 members of the energy chemical union, local 922 — of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan Lanigan mine, that they have in fact been on strike since March 10, 1986. I wonder whether you're aware of it, whether you're aware of the particular issues of concern to the workers at the Lanigan potash mine.

I know that as minister you used your office to intervene in the MacDonalds lock-out, as I understand it, and I was

wondering whether you intend to, in fact, take any steps as Minister of Labour to investigate, or have you appraised yourself of the major concerns that have been raised by the workers at the potash mine in Lanigan?

(2030)

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I am aware of the situation and there's a meeting scheduled with my conciliator for this Thursday to try to see what my department can do to help settle this strike. And with respect to personal intervention, that has not been asked for and I would not personally intervene until I thought the parties were ready to get serious and get down to business, and then I would do what I could as I did in the MacDonalds Consolidated strike. I'm pleased that you are congratulating me for the effort we did on the MacDonalds Consolidated strike and the amount of success we had in resolving the situation.

As you recall, there the collective bargaining process did not work very well and they asked this minister to intervene. And contrary to what your colleagues say, I had enough compassion to try to help resolve that, and it is resolved and those people are back on their jobs.

And with respect to the people in your constituency, I will do everything possible to help them get back to work, and on Thursday the process will continue. And I will be the minister for quite a long time, and however long it takes I will help them get their jobs sorted out.

Mr. Koskie: — Well there's a fair amount of presumptions about you being around for a long time, because you can only make that presumption if you don't call an election. Because if you call an election, you're gone my friend, and we're rid of you, and the workers of Saskatchewan then will have a Labour minister that has some compassion and understanding, not an outcast that has lost all his principles and has run and joined another party and tried to inherit a philosophy which is obviously alien to you.

But let's get a little bit more specific. Let's take the situation in Lanigan where it's over 15 months going on — it will probably be 16 months by now — that they haven't been able to come to any settlement. And I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, you may not be concerned, but I'll tell you that the workers are concerned and the families are concerned. And there are issues which you should have been concerned with as a Minister of Labour.

I want to go through some of the grievances that are raised by the workers in Lanigan. Some of the problems at Lanigan mine which led to the basic strike, Mr. Chairman, are first of all management's disregard for health and safety of workers and a disregard for occupational health and safety loss. This is a contention by the members of the union, and I'm telling you, Mr. Minister, that it can in fact be documented.

There are cases where contractors were grinding and filing fibreglass pipe openly; glass fibres were being inhaled and ingested by workers. Company representatives did not respond to union complaints and workers continued to be exposed to this hazard.

I want to say further that another safety — very much a

concern to the workers — is that the underground cage which transports the workers to and from the work site was operated by an untrained, unqualified hoist operator and that management insisted that the workers jeopardize their safety by using the elevator anyway.

These are some of the health and safety concerns of 290 workers in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, Lanigan division. And this minister sits by idly and says, oh yes, I'll help. But these are the concerns here and they haven't been addressed.

I'll tell you the workers of Saskatchewan are sick and tired of this anti-worker attitude of this party opposite. I want to say further that from the membership of 290 people there are hundreds of grievances that have been submitted. There are 150 grievances still unsettled, some up to four years old, and they haven't in fact been addressed by management.

Arbitrated grievances resolved in favour of the union have not been implemented by the company. Grievances dealing with the seniority and lay-off had been lodged due to employees with five years seniority being laid off and employees with only two years seniority being retained. These are some of the concerns that have precipitated the strike. And for almost 15, 16 months now these people have not been able to get a contract.

But I'll tell you, if you go over to . . . the workers at International Minerals at Esterhazy . . . The employees at Lanigan, what they have been asking for, the employees have not had a wage increase for two years. Workers at International Minerals at Esterhazy received a 5 per cent wage increase effective from February 1, '85 to January 31, '87. And what the workers in Lanigan are asking for is fairness. And they're asking for some fairness, and there is no fairness with this government.

We have seen that there has been also wage roll-backs. PCS wants to change the mutually agreed to interpretation of an article in the contract dealing with the pay for statutory holidays. Management reinterpretation would cost approximately 150 workers a loss of pay, from 60 to \$1,000. And these are some of the areas of major concern that the workers who are mining in Lanigan are concerned with.

The unions jobs, some of them have been taken over by management. Four employees in the control room were laid off, then recalled to different jobs. I can only say that the PCS wants to cut wages for 15 per cent of the workers of up to \$5,000 a year. They've laid off some employees, called them back to work at a lower rate of pay, but doing the same job in an attempt to achieve a wage cut. The union has had to file additional grievances to stop this practice.

These are the areas of concern, Mr. Minister, that you have stood by and watched and given no assistance. Mr. Minister, I ask you: are you concerned with the families here, 290 employees who haven't had a contract for over two years, who have sought a reasonable basis, some safety?

And I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, you sit by idly and

congratulate yourself in respect to the MacDonald lock-out. I'll tell you that labour has received the worse possible deal under this government. There's no doubt about it. And I'll tell you, the workers of Saskatchewan will show you people. I'll tell you, the workers of Saskatchewan deserve some of your support because many of them supported you last time. But there won't be a one of you that will be re-elected with the support of labour.

I'll tell you, these are Saskatchewan men and women that are working in these mines — that's who they are — wanting to make a decent living for themselves and their families. And what we have here is a government standing by, idly by, precipitating, destroying families and destroying towns. That's what you're doing. And with hypocrisy say, oh yes, we're going to look into it Thursday. I'd like to ask you what you have been doing? I mean you're responsible as a member of the government. What have you been doing for the last two years, you and your predecessor? Why now on Thursday? Why can't you address those health and safety issues which are of major concerns?

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that there was a wildcat strike, and because of the safety issues, many of the workers wouldn't go down the mine. And they were reprimanded for it; they lost some wages. And it was over safety issues.

And so I ask you, Mr. Minister, these are Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan men and women, men and women and children of people who built this province. And one of the things that is necessary is fairness. That's what Saskatchewan people want — a government who are fair. Not a government who can give millions of dollars to oil companies and take the very livelihood from people because they want to precipitate a strike in the hope of getting elected. That's the policy of the members opposite — attempting to precipitate a strike.

You know what? They made a mockery out of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan; they turned it over to Canpotex to sell and dispose of all of the potash. And the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan hasn't been doing very well. Something like a \$67 million deficit during the past year.

And what I'm saying to you, Mr. Minister, you are the Minister of Labour. These are people, Saskatchewan people. They're workers and they're entitled to fairness. And I wonder, when in fact are you going to take action to be fair to 290 people out in Lanigan. I want to tell you that, you know, the public announcement to the board of trade in Lanigan, as the Premier of this province said that, oh yes, I'll look into it. The minister in charge of the potash corporation said, don't worry, we'll look after it; we'll get back and we'll get a settlement here. Yes, he sure did. They've continued to precipitate it.

And I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, give some fairness. Rise above, rise above what is happening here. There's a community in Lanigan that wants to survive. There are families that want to feed their children and give them the education and opportunities just like the rest of us. And I say that there should be no reason why this matter hasn't

been resolved. There's a precedent, a precedent of a settlement over in the International Minerals and Chemical Corporation. And they're prepared to accept that. And I'll tell you they are prepared, and they haven't, because you want to readjust and turn back and deprive and reclassify some of the workers.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, what the people in Lanigan are saying, we want a government that's fair. We hope that this Minister of Labour, unlike the other one, which throughout his career demonstrated a pro-employer attitude — the former minister who couldn't even walk into a labour convention in the end; he didn't go — they're saying, we'll give you a chance, Mr. Minister. You're raised and born here. And what they're asking from you is some fairness.

And so I ask you, Mr. Minister, I'm pleased to hear that on Thursday that some action is being taken. But I'd like to ask you: are you aware of the nature of the problems which I have outlined to you, of major concern to the workers of this potash mine? And I'll ask you: how far are you prepared to go to get a settlement? Or do you want to continue to precipitate it because there's a surplus of potash and you want to give it over to the private sector and run down the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan as part of your conspiracy to destroy a once proud corporation?

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, in all sincerity, on behalf of 290 workers, 290 workers and a town, and a town and a board of trade that thought they could trust the minister in charge, and they could trust the Premier that they would in fact legitimately help resolve . . . But for two years now, and for two months, they have been on strike. And I'll tell you it's not an easy situation for workers with families.

(2045)

We have seen the strife that your government caused in the construction industry. We have seen you allow companies to bust unions. We have seen the anti-union approach as practised by your predecessor. You have an opportunity to give some credibility to your government.

So I ask you to take up that challenge, to use your good office and your basic fairness, Mr. Minister, to resolve this which will be of a benefit to the workers, the families, the business men who depend on them using their services or their buying and selling. The whole area is dependent upon it. The strike is really the last resort. It's the Peter Pocklington approach to management. We don't want to inherit, here in Saskatchewan, the Peter Pocklington approach to labour. What we want here is what we have built up in the past — a tradition of fairness. And so I ask you, Mr. Minister . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Weiman: Mr. Chairman, point of order. I've sat and listened now for the last 15 minutes, literally, on a diatribe that in my opinion had nothing to do at all with the expenditure of the Department of Labour and the budgetary process of the Minister of Labour. It's regrettable that there are strikes in a province, in any

province and Saskatchewan. It's regrettable that people suffer through strikes, but, however, I find no correlation at all in the member from Quill Lakes' diatribe on strikes and Peter Pocklington, or the attendance or the non-attendance to a union meeting, having nothing at all to do with the budgetary estimates before us. And I would refer the chairman to rule 494, under the topic . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would refer the chairman, before he decides on the ruling, Beauchesne's, rule 494, in terms of general administration, and I would ask for a ruling on that matter, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Minister, I would like . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I would like the member to wait until I rule on the point of order.

Upon careful consideration of the member's point of order, I must rule that the point of order is not well taken. The member is speaking on issues which are within the mandate of the Department of Labour, and as such, he may continue.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously the member didn't like what he was hearing, so wanted to interrupt the proceedings which were totally on point.

And what I was about to conclude, in any event, but maybe I should just summarize what I have said since it's in order. So what I want to ask the minister, the Minister of Labour, is that what I'm asking you for is a new approach, not an approach of your predecessor, which was anti-worker, I ask you, and the workers in Lanigan and the workers throughout this province ask, for fairness. That's all they ask, is for fairness.

And I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, the people of the workers of Saskatchewan deserve fairness, because in Saskatchewan since 1944, when the CCF first became elected, it was under Tommy Douglas that established the most progressive labour legislation in North America, and I'll tell you that is a tradition, that is the tradition that we established here in Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you, our party, together with farmers and workers, will re-establish fairness in Saskatchewan — be it fairness to the worker, be it fairness to the business man, be it fairness to the professional. But that, I'll say, Mr. Chairman, is what the people of Saskatchewan expect.

And I'll tell you, they got nothing of the course. This has been the most unfair government to labour that Saskatchewan has ever had — anti-working people. People who are building this economy, people who are mining, people who are earning with the sweat of their brow have been demeaned by this government.

And so what I am saying, Mr. Minister: you have a unique opportunity, a unique opportunity to not be pro-employer, not pro-employee, but fair. That's what we're asking. That's what the people of Saskatchewan expect. And I ask you to take a look at it, to come to an assistance in the resolve of a problem which is a lot of stress to the town, to the business community in that area, to the workers, and to the families.

A strike is not a very nice situation. You know what's happening in the bitter dispute in Alberta — the Pocklington dispute, if I may call it that. We don't want that. We don't want that type of labour management here in Saskatchewan. And all I ask you, Mr. Minister, is to give our commitment, to give the House and the people of Saskatchewan a commitment of fairness — fairness to the employer, fairness to the employee. Can we get that commitment?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I can tell the member that in 15 years as a lawyer and four years as a politician, nobody has ever questioned my fairness. I don't have to give you a commitment. I was born fair; I was educated fair . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. The member from Quill Lakes has had about 15 minutes to make his point, and the minister is attempting to reply. And immediately he starts to holler at the minister's reply. I ask him to please be quiet and allow the minister to answer.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I don't have to give the member a commitment to be fair. I am fair, and that's the end of it. There's no need for any commitment. That is my personality.

The next point is that the strike at Lanigan is unfortunate, and I will do what I can from the point of view of my office. And as I've indicated, my capable assistants will be there on Thursday of this week to see if they can assist in the settlement of this strike. And it's quite clear that we will do everything possible to assist, but I implore management and the workers to act in a Christian way and try to be reasonable and resolve their differences. And I will help them in every way possible.

Now I have to deal briefly with your 15-minute speech on labour and what we've done for labour. And I want to remind the member opposite that the most important and most essential working condition of any labourer or worker is to have a job. A job is the first essential working condition. And what we have given to the workers of this province is jobs — 35,000 more jobs in the last four years. And we believe in building the province for jobs for today and jobs for the future.

So when the working people of this province look at our government, first of all they have to look at the existence of jobs, and that is what we stand for. After we have created jobs as a government, then fair and reasonable working conditions are also to be considered. But above all, we have given the people of this province jobs, and jobs is what they need and jobs is what they want.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 20 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1986
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Labour
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 20**

Items 1 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 20 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — This concludes then the estimates for the Department of Labour. I will give the Minister of Labour the opportunity to make some concluding remarks.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my entire department for the co-operation they have given me in the six months that I have been the minister. And I in particular want to thank the branch and department heads who are here today, and my deputy and assistant deputy who have helped me very much with respect to providing the answers here today. And I want to thank the opposition for not using up too much time and being direct and to the point. I look forward to having this experience again next year.

Mr. Shillington: — Well there may be a possibility there won't be an election before next year, but that's the only way that this is going to be continued next year.

I want to thank the minister and his officials for the courtesy of making themselves available in estimates during this year.

Mr. Chairman: — Thank you. We will now move to the estimates of Tourism and Small Business and take a brief pause while the minister brings in his officials.

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Tourism and Small Business Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 45

Item 1 (continued)

(2100)

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few questions that I would like to ask the minister. It won't take a lot of time tonight.

But I wonder . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, and I want to get back to your houseboats, Mr. Member. I want to ask a few questions about the houseboat venture in northern Saskatchewan. I see that the houseboat venture that was in La Ronge is no longer in La Ronge, Mr. Minister, and I wonder if you could just comment whether it came on hard times, or what just happened in La Ronge, why the move out of the community of La Ronge. I know last year when we were going through the estimates the former minister indicated that it was a good project and had lots of potential. I see now they have moved out of La Ronge, and I wonder if you could just comment on that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, it's my information that the statement the member made is incorrect. The operation is still in La Ronge. There are approximately 20 boats. My understanding is that they are booked well into August; that the project is going very well and is, in fact, very successful.

An Hon. Member: — Apologize.

Mr. Thompson: — Well the member from Duck Lake thinks that I should apologize for asking a question such as that. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, that the houseboat operation, I'm led to understand, has moved out of La Ronge. I have read articles where they were moving to Lake Diefenbaker.

The latest article that I have read is that boats will be moved into Buffalo Narrows. And I wonder, Mr. Minister, if this is a different group of houseboats or is it the same ones that are at La Ronge — or do we have two separate groups of houseboats operating in this province?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the CWA or the Canadian Wilderness Adventures which ran the project in La Ronge last year is still there; are still running, as I indicated, some 20 boats; and are in fact booked well into August.

Some of the investors, people who had boats being operated by that group, have made the decision to move those particular boats, some of them to Diefenbaker Lake, and that is in fact taking place. So now we have two separate, I suppose, entities operating houseboats in the province.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could indicate if Tourism and Small Business has invested any money in the operation that is starting in Buffalo Narrows re the houseboats.

An Hon. Member: — This department?

Mr. Thompson: — Tourism and Small Business.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — No, Mr. Chairman, our department is not in the habit or the practice of investing money in ventures. We operate as an advisory department aiding business, but we don't directly invest.

Mr. Thompson: — I want to get this very clear, Mr. Minister. Tourism and Small Business has no money involved in the houseboat venture that is starting up in Buffalo Narrows and working from Buffalo Narrows out into the Churchill River system?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — No, Mr. Chairman. My understanding is that, to date, we have not even received any application or requests, nor has the northern revolving fund. So the answer to the question is definitely no.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to . . . a couple of questions here, Mr. Minister, and it has to do with the press release . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who was that? Oh that's the former minister.

I want to ask the minister in respect to a newest tourist attraction, the Gopherville Tourist Attraction Inc. And it indicates there, Mr. Minister, that it will be receiving \$100,500 under the Canada-Saskatchewan tourist agreement to complete this Saskatchewan tourist attraction.

What I ask you is: what is the basic criteria for getting such grants? I'll ask that question first and a few others.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, obviously what I'm going to give you is not a detailed, detailed outline of the criteria under which the program operates. But it is in a general sense I think explanatory of what is trying to be carried out. And I'll simply give you what I have.

The primary purpose of the agreement, and of course we're talking about the Canada-Saskatchewan subsidiary agreement on tourism, is to strengthen the competitiveness of Saskatchewan's tourist industry; designed to enhance the growth of Saskatchewan's tourism industry and maximize the economic impact of travel activity; will stimulate participation and investment by the private sector.

First-class shared tourism and development agreement between Canada and Saskatchewan. The emphasis will be on viable projects which expand the normal tourist season, and which contribute to the creation of tourism destination areas. In most cases you'll have to provide 20 per cent equity to demonstrate managerial capability. I think that in a general sense the general requirement is that it be something that creates a new attraction, or a new event that will in fact enhance the tourism or the tourist element in Saskatchewan. And I think that Gopherville is a very good example of the type of thing that we're supporting in the subagreement.

Mr. Koskie: — A couple of other questions. Can you indicate whether a feasibility study was carried out in respect to this project? Were the respective governments involved in the evaluation of the tourist attraction?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, there was in fact a feasibility study carried out, and the results of that was reviewed in large part by the province. Our main role is to provide input into the federal people. In this case the federal people did in fact review the feasibility study as well.

Mr. Koskie: — And can you indicate whether there are other . . . how many other such Canada-Saskatchewan tourist agreement, in effect . . . any other projects in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of the projects, or the applications that have come in and been approved under this program, to date they're in excess of 14 capital projects that have had money accessed through the program. There are a number of other areas; marketing enhancement, marketing programs, some industry support — a number of things that have fit.

And since this . . . These are the approved ones. We have several other . . . I suppose I could use the term many, although I don't have an exact number of other capital projects that are now being reviewed to see if they do in fact fit the criteria of the program. but in excess of 14 have been approved.

Mr. Koskie: — A couple other questions. This agreement, is that cost-shared by the two governments equally, 50-50? And secondly, can you give the approximate

amount of dollars that had been put in under the agreement by the two governments?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the program is cost-shared on a 50-50 basis. There is \$30 million available over five years in the program. I think it's important though to note that the projects are not all 50-50. In some projects the federal government will make the major part of the contribution, if not all, and some we will pick up. But the key thing is that the program over its life is equally shared and there are \$30 million spread over five years to be used in this program.

Mr. Koskie: — The \$30 million over a five-year period, you indicate . . . I ask you, where is the money provided in the subvotes for the potential amount that the province may have to put up for any developments during the course of the coming year? I'm just wondering where that would be recorded.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, in the estimates, the money that we will be earmarking for this, there's \$1 million in the Employment Development Agency, in their estimates. The rest of it is spread out throughout our budget in the tourist section, primarily in the marketing and development sectors. But it doesn't appear as a specific item, which I assume is the rationale for the question, but it is spread out throughout the tourist section of Tourism and Small Business's budget.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister: in 1983 the financial records tabled in the Assembly here indicated that \$212 million came out of tourist appeal in Saskatchewan, primarily coming out of the North. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can indicate to me what the revenues were for the ensuing years, like 1984-85. I don't believe you'd have any statistics for '86. But the most current statistics — if you have that information, I'd certainly like to know.

(2115)

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not exactly sure where the member's numbers are coming from or precisely what they mean. The revenues that flow to the province of Saskatchewan from tourism come in many ways, and it's estimated that we have a billion dollar industry in the province in tourism at this time. Now it's estimated that that is going to increase over the rest of this decade to something in the area of a \$3 billion industry by the end of the decade.

I think the significant factor: there's no question that in tourism at this time Saskatchewan is in a deficit position. In other words, our people travel outside the province, spend more than tourists who come to the province. But in the last year we have reduced that deficit by \$20 million. We see a substantial increase in the amount of tourist dollars that are flowing in relative to what's going out.

So we're still in a deficit position. However, it is improving; we're cutting into that deficit. And in terms of returns, we're talking about an annual billion dollar industry. And I'm not sure what other numbers I could give you that would clarify the situation.

Mr. Yew: — In terms of angling licences issued, Mr. Minister, for the province — and much of this angling is done in the top half of our province — would you have the figures for the number of angling licences issued for the last three years?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — No, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure that would be relevant information; however, we don't have it. My colleague, the Minister of Parks and recreation, would be the individual who administers the angling licences. We see our role as attracting people. We work very closely with the outfitters and in our advertising programs outside the province to bring people here. But the actual selling, administering of angling licence, rests with Parks and Renewable.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, I was in a meeting, a formal meeting with fishermen, when my colleague from Athabasca raised the issue of houseboats. I, myself, had some formal meetings with people right in La Ronge, various interest groups, and also Stanley Mission, Sucker River, Missinipe and surrounding communities. Generally the groups comprised of fishermen, trappers, the northern outfitters association, northern interest groups, the Metis society, and the Indian band. It was noted at that time that a lot of the tourist — your government has been promoting tourism — and that a lot of revenue is being generated out of the North because the North still has a lot of good appeal in terms of its natural environment.

Generally when people come into the province, they want to go into the remote northern areas where it's isolated and quiet; the wilderness is still intact. But the question that confronts the people in the North is just how many jobs are being generated locally, permanent or otherwise — perhaps more seasonal than permanent — but how many of the 1 or \$3 billion that you are estimating goes towards employment of local residents?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, maybe I could ask the member to just clarify his question slightly. On the question of houseboats, are you asking employment generated by the houseboats? I wasn't clear how the houseboats and the meeting fit into the question. Are you speaking of tourism in northern Saskatchewan in an overall sense? And if you could clarify that, I will try to come up with a response.

Mr. Yew: — Well let me put it in more precise terms, Mr. Minister. Tourism in general, and also in terms of the houseboat development in La Ronge — in terms of the houseboats in La Ronge, Mr. Minister, there's been quite a number of controversial meetings held in that respect. I could go beyond, but the issues that generated related more to grey water that was being dumped in the lake — Lac La Ronge lake — and other environmental concerns. But those don't relate to your department.

But the issues that did somewhat relate to your department per se is the jobs generated by the tourist appeal that comes from northern Saskatchewan. You're talking now in the billions of dollars, and if that is the case, I would think that it would be only fair that your department should put some emphasis, some priority or

policy in place so that local northern people can take advantage of the billions of dollars that are being made from the North in terms of tourism.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I think just a general comment first of all on the houseboats. I know that the grey water question was one that arose last year. The grey water is now all being captured by the houseboats, and I don't think that will be an issue. I think the houseboats are an example of advancements that occur from time to time. I think that there is clearly room in northern Saskatchewan for a project, an attraction such as the houseboats. I don't think it interferes that greatly, and it does in fact provide some jobs and benefits to northern people and also some indirect things in terms of the supplies and so on.

In terms of the specific question on general employment, we indicate that there are 32,000 people in Saskatchewan currently employed, directly or indirectly, in the tourist industry — 32,000. Now we don't have that broken down on north-south. We may, however, be able to do some extrapolations and some estimates on how many of those 32,000 do in fact live in the two northern ridings. We can't do that tonight, but I will commit to take a best effort at that and see if we can get those numbers, and we'll provide them to you in the very near future. That's the best I can do at this time.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'll look forward to getting some precise information regarding revenues generated through tourism in northern Saskatchewan, and also the related jobs that accrue from tourism, and just how many jobs are being implemented and emphasized for the people in northern Saskatchewan.

I just want to make a comment, Mr. Minister. You may want to respond to it, and you may not. That's fine. In my years as a fisherman and a trapper — and my colleague from Athabasca and, I'm sure, maybe several other members of this Assembly will recall that prior to the development of the North we had commercial fishing and domestic fishing, hunting, trapping, and the like, food gathering, etc. You know, we were able to sustain a living through our natural environment through the North prior to major industrial development. but since the major industrial development started happening in northern Saskatchewan - the mines, the highways, the forestry, the major developments and the like — things have slowly diminished to the point where now we are confronted with a lack of fishing in the lakes. We have had to put emphasis on restocking lakes; we have had to put emphasis in silviculture; planting new trees, etc.

But as I can clearly recall, Mr. Minister, we were able to fish annually, every year, and the fish population was stabilized; people made their living; people were able to supplement whatever means of other income they had through commercial fishing. And what I'm saying I guess, Mr. Minister, I'm not against development in any sort of way, but what I'm saying is that there has been an over-abundance of development in some areas whereby the commercial fishing industry, for an example, has been diminished.

And I would hope that your department, along with the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources and the

government of the day, would put some emphasis in restocking the natural environment and the natural habitat with resources that generally put food on the tables of many northern families. Nowadays it is hard to go out into the lakes, into the trap lines, into the hunting grounds, and to try to supplement the measly social assistance that many of the families have to rely on, seeing as how the government of today has been unable to provide a self-sufficient, economic strategy. We need to retain our natural resource.

And I would hope, Mr. Minister, that you would be able to talk to your colleagues, try to put emphasis in replenishing and restocking our lakes, and replenishing the North with its natural wildlife and habitat, instead of just taking and taking and taking and never putting anything back. There are many fisherman throughout the northern areas that do not rely on any means of livelihood as they did when I was growing up.

And another point I'd like to raise as well at this point in time, five of your ministers came to the North on March 5th to meet with the public Pardon? That's right. The member for Regina Wascana was there. And they were there to listen to the issues of people in northern Saskatchewan. But unfortunately they had to catch their planes back to Regina. They didn't have time, or they didn't want to allow time to listen to the specific grievances of Northerners. So what happened? The meeting was a flop.

But getting back to the issue at hand. There are many people out there that rely on domestic fishing options but cannot get a domestic fishing licence. One case for an example was George Sanderson; he has a family of five; asked for a domestic fishing licence but could not get one.

And nowadays I learned now that you need a permit to fish for mullets — what we call sucker fish. Those are very good eating fish. But all of a sudden your government has imposed so many other regulations upon us that we can't — we simply can't derive any food from the North as we normally would have prior to your major industrial plans.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not exactly sure what the point the member was making. I think it's safe to admit that there have been some significant changes in northern Saskatchewan in terms of major economic developments; and I would suggest that tourism is one of them.

And I sense that in the first parts of his remarks he was advocating a maintenance to the status quo and speaking against economic activity in northern Saskatchewan and maintaining the old ways. And I think that this government certainly has a sense of the tradition of the North and wants to work closely with the people of the North to advance it. And I would suggest that our department has spent a lot of time in consultation with various northern groups in the development of many of the projects that are in place and the development of some of the programs. In fact, my deputy minister tomorrow will be meeting with the northern advisory committee discussing various tours and small-business projects.

So I accept that the member is indicating that there is a need for some maintenance of the traditional life-styles in northern Saskatchewan. I think at the same time he will admit that development and advancement have to take place within that context. And if we can work with northern people to make that happen, hopefully provide them additional opportunities for economic improvement, we certainly want to do that. And I think that this department has an opportunity there, both on the tourism side and on the small-business side, and we're trying to exercise that mandate.

The only other comment I would make: I think this government has had a significant presence in northern Saskatchewan in terms of ministers who have visited there, probably as much because of the fact that all ministers in government now have responsibilities in northern Saskatchewan. In the previous administrative structure there was a minister who was responsible for northern Saskatchewan. Now we have the ministers of all the various administrative areas going to northern Saskatchewan, meeting with the people.

(2130)

And I suppose we could discuss which is the better way to do things. I have sensed in my visits in northern Saskatchewan that the people of the North do, in fact, appreciate meeting various ministers and getting possibly more in-depth discussion on the types of programs that are available to all of Saskatchewan.

But I would simply commit that this department, I'm sure the government as a whole, will work as closely with northern people to maintain those traditional life-styles and yet develop that part of the province in the way that the residents would like to see it.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Item 10

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, if I might just ask the minister one question in respect to tourism marketing. I'm wondering . . . I'm under the understanding that the former minister was in the process of setting up a provincial association for the promotion of tourism. Some work had been done on it. Are my facts indeed correct, and can you indicate how far that has progressed?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Yes, I'd be very pleased to comment on that. The association, TISASK, which stands for the Tourism Industry Association of Saskatchewan, came into being earlier this year. They are headquartered in Saskatoon. Mr. Ray Carlson is the newly hired executive director. The first major thing that they have undertaken is to administer this year the Saskatchewan Host program, which is our host program with the front-line people in the tourism industry.

They have some very ambitious plans. They are still working to expand their membership, and we are dealing with them in terms of funding over the long period. But I think that the association which my good friend and

colleague from Regina South initiated and put in place, got started; is off to a very good start. I'm very impressed with the direction they've taken, and their energy and enthusiasm. I think they'll be a tremendous addition to the tourism picture here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Item 10 agreed to.

Items 11 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 45 agreed to.

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Employment Development Agency — Tourism and Small
Business
Employment Development Fund — Vote 65**

Items 17 and 18 agreed to.

**Consolidated Fund Loans, Advances and Investments
Tourism and Small Business
Vote 167**

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 167 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1986
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Tourism and Small Business
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 45**

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Chairman, in the Supplementary Estimates here you have \$1.754 million for tourism or northern business development. In the main Estimates you had only something like . . . it was less than the amount that you have in the supplementary, in your main Estimates — 1.295 last year. How come you went over by this amount in your Supplementary Estimates?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Okay, Mr. Chairman, first of all I should indicate that the two items you raise are not related. The subvote, northern business development, previously was the administration of the branch. If you look back to item — I believe it's item 3, subvote 3, you will see an increase there because that has been absorbed into that particular subvote. So they're not related.

The specific one that we are talking about of the supplementary estimates — the situation there is that this money provides for accumulated deficit on forestry division, from the period of January 1, '84 to March 31, '85, of \$1,073,533.

We write off the loss on assets from winding down the operation, which were sold at market value; this is respecting sale of northern forest operations. And the payment is made from the Consolidated Fund to the revolving fund, and it's then credited back to the Consolidated Fund as revenue, and therefore there is no net impact on the Consolidated Fund. So it's a

bookkeeping exercise in the one case. It's administrative money in the other case, which has been taken out of that subvote and put in subvote 3, where you'll see the increase.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 45 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members opposite for their concise questions. I definitely want to thank the whole Department of Tourism and Small Business, particularly the people who have been in the House with me, and those were very actively involved in preparing these estimates.

I think that this department, in the short time that it has been in existence, has become a very dedicated, hard-working department — some excellent people in it. I think the advancements that are being made on both the tourism and the small business side indicate that.

While we're very pleased to have completed the exercise, we are disappointed that the member from Shaunavon has not been able to be in attendance as we completed these estimates. There was the outstanding issue of some of his comments about some of the practices of our people when they travel promoting the industry, which we did take some exception to, and I wish he'd had the opportunity to comment on that and possibly extend his apologies. But since that was not the case, we are pleased to be through and I would thank my officials very much.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join also with the minister to congratulate and thank the officials for providing the information, and to thank the minister for the answers which he has provided for us.

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Science And Technology
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 15**

Item 1

Mr. Chairman: — I would request that the minister please introduce his officials.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my pleasure to introduce to the Assembly the officials from the Department of Science and Technology. Here on my immediate right is Dr. Alex Guy, the deputy minister of the department. Immediately behind me is Richard Letilley, the executive director of the government research division. Behind Dr. Guy is Bob Mills, the acting executive director, industrial development division. To Dr. Guy's right is Frank May, the executive director of administration. And at the back is Wendy MacDonald, the manager of the advanced technology agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I did have a rather extensive commentary that I intended to lead into this discussion with. We are very proud of the accomplishments of this department. But rather than get into that in an extended way, in the spirit of co-operation and execution that has been here this evening I will condense this and simply indicate that

when this department was established on January 1, 1984 — which I'm sure all members will realize is just over two years ago — it was a signal from the Government of Saskatchewan that it was solidly committed to stimulating the industrial development of advanced technology here in Saskatchewan.

Under the previous minister, the member from Regina Wascana, a strategy was put in place that recognized the foundation of economic, industrial, and social development in Saskatchewan; recognized that that depended on how well the province develops, transfers, utilizes, and exploits new or advanced technology. And I think we've made a strong start.

To indicate the start, I will simply provide a few statistics for the members opposite. In 1982 the Saskatchewan advanced technology sector was made up of 39 companies. Today there are over 140 companies and, Mr. Chairman, just recently the department has completed a catalogue that we refer to as the technology transfer catalogue. It goes through the companies in the province and gives some details of each of them. And I will send a copy over to the opposition critic. We in fact have copies for each of the opposition members, and maybe we could ask the page to distribute those to the opposition.

As well as the increase in companies from 39 to 140, when we look at employment in 1982, there were 1,750 people working in the advanced technology sector; today that number has grown to 2,950 people who have skilled, permanent, well-paid jobs with high spin-off benefits for their communities.

In 1982, the sales of advanced technology products totalled \$81 billion; today sales have quintupled to \$400 million this year. I think, Mr. Chairman, the statistics, those very general ones, indicate very clearly that we have accessed an opportunity in the province for growth, for job creation, and have a very exciting high-tech industry now in the province. It's one that has a tremendous future. We have a number of very exciting companies and we're very excited about the potential for further growth in the future.

(2145)

And with those few comments, I would be prepared to respond to any of the questions the opposition may have.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to make just a brief comment at the outset to indicate that there has been some progress made in the area of high-tech and to indicate that the base, in fact, was laid during our administration and has been built on since that time.

I recall some of the areas that we had initiated — the support for basic and applied research at the University of Saskatchewan; the fibre optics arrangement between SaskTel and Northern Telecom. We built Innovation Place through Sedco, adjacent to the University of Saskatchewan, to facilitate the advanced technology industry. We had the science policy secretariat, led by Dr. Leon Katz, and we assigned a special adviser on science

policy, Dr. Alex Guy, presently deputy minister. So that base, I must admit, has been built on and has grown.

But I want to say that I don't think that we should be here slapping ourselves on the back in respect to what is committed to research and development. I want to refer the minister to a couple of articles in respect to the commitment of research and development that we have here in Canada vis-à-vis other industrialized countries of the world. And I would recommend the study to the department, and in fact the minister and his staff may indeed have reviewed it.

But I refer, first of all, to an article as a result of a task force, word done by Mr. Al Johnson, entitled "Stop Neglecting Research." And it sets out basically an analysis of our funding capacity in research as it applies to the universities primarily. I want only to touch on a couple of items in respect to it, to draw to the attention of the minister and the department the need for further emphasis for greater funding for research and development.

In respect to the article, I say here that he indicates that from 1977-78 to 1984-85, government grants to universities and colleges, the principal source of their funding, rose by only 2.5 per cent in real terms, while enrolment increased by 27 per cent in universities and 36 per cent in community colleges. So he indicates that the principal source of funding rose only by 2.5 per cent, compared to a very significant increase in the enrolment both in community colleges and universities.

It's an interesting article, but what I wanted to point out to the minister and the department, a couple of facts here in respect to the total commitment in Canada. We find that the amount of 1.22 per cent of the nations' GDP (gross domestic product) in 1981, compared with — Mr. Minister, these are the comparisons that he makes. The amount that we spend here in Canada, and that's in 1981, is:

1.22 per cent of the nation's GDP . . . compared (to) 2.52 per cent (in) the USA, 2.49 per cent (in) West Germany, 2.38 per cent (in) Japan . . . 1.97 per cent (in) France. (And he goes on to say) I repeat: 1.22 per cent (in) Canada.

So what I'm saying is that there's a lot that has to be done here in Canada, and I know governments are taking a look at that. The other article that I would refer to is "Start Applying Research" by a Scott Tiffin. I want only a couple of excerpts from this, which also indicates what is happening. He says:

While in 1985 . . . Canadian increase in Research and Development funding was 0.1 per cent (one-tenth of 1 per cent, at the same time) Korea's will increase (by) 18 per cent this coming year. (And) over the next decade, Japan plans to increase its R&D funding by 40 per cent.

And here, as I say, in Canada, 0.1 per cent. He goes on again to contrast what is the commitment, and they're similar to the comparisons of other countries.

I want only one other comment in respect to this article. It says:

With the creation of a Standing Committee on Research, (and) Science and Technology, Canada will cease to be one of the few advanced western countries without such a parliamentary forum. The investigations carried out by (the) parliamentarians will be of vital importance because there is little capacity elsewhere in Canada to study technology . . .

All I want to point out here is, there has been some experts taking a look at the comparison of what we're doing in research and development and our commitment. And I appreciate, Mr. Minister, that your department started only very recently, as you indicated.

I noticed that in 1984-85 that you budgeted for \$1.038 million and you spent 0.979 million, less than the budgeted amount. You indicated in the Heritage Fund or in the estimates that there was \$5 million set aside or budgeted for research and development; and in 1984-85 1.46 million, or 1.5 million rounded off, was spent.

In 1985-86 I notice that in Consolidated Fund you have 1.53 million budgeted and Heritage Fund, 4.5. So what we have here is an increase in the Consolidated Fund estimates, but a decrease in the Heritage Fund amount of expenditure from 5 million down to 4.5 million. What I'd like is: could you indicate what is actually spent in '85-86 vis-a-vis the Consolidated Fund and also the amount of the Heritage Fund? The amount budgeted was 4.5 — I'd like to know what was spent.

I make one other observation, Mr. Minister, and that is: in '86-87, if you look at the Consolidated Fund, the amount of expenditure budgeted has decreased from the previous year, and again we find that the Heritage Fund has decreased from 4.5 to 4 million. So I'd like to ask you to comment on those aspects. Could you give me the '85-86 actual amount that was spent, both Consolidated Fund and Heritage Fund, as opposed to what was budgeted? And why the decrease?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, we'll gather those numbers and try to get them in a form that makes sense. But first of all, in terms of your comments in your preamble, we have to get this into context or we're not going to get these estimates to advance very quickly.

Your comments on R&D funding are well taken. The money that you indicate, I have no reason to argue with. Canada, I think, as a country is aware that we have trailed in R&D research, and in fact members of our government have recently been in Winnipeg at a federal conference.

The point, however, is that that is not what this department is about. General, basic R&D research would be the priority of my colleague, the Minister of Advanced Education. This is a very specialized department dealing with science and technology, high-tech advancement. The R&D money we spend is primarily in the industrial area. We spend very little on university R&D. It's a very specific type of program.

And I think, when you check the catalogue that I sent over, the general fold-out, which indicates the tremendous growth in research and development activities in the high-tech sector, would indicate that what has become known as the Saskatchewan model in the last couple of years has been adopted across the country and is in fact having very positive results.

But it's important to be clear, as we discuss this, that we are not here defending basic research and development expenditures, particularly on the university level, which is in Advanced Education. We are discussing defending the estimates that are primarily industrial and deal specifically with science and technology — or high-tech, as it's generally called. And if you'll just give me 10 seconds, I will get that information that you requested.

Mr. Chairman, I think the numbers that the member requested: in the Consolidated Fund expenditures, the budget — and I believe we're talking about last year — we had budgeted \$1.538 million and spent 1.2. In the Heritage Fund, we budgeted 4.5 million and spent 3.75. Those are primarily start-up activities for most of these young companies, and we would anticipate that as we go along our expenditures will be equal to our budgeted numbers in future years.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I want to take a look and see whether or not you can indicate what is proposed to be spent on the various areas of initiatives by the department for this year in respect to the funds from the Heritage — the \$4 million. There are a series of programs, initiatives. And I was wondering whether you can indicate to me or provide me with the proposed funding relative to these individual programs.

If we take a look at your annual report on page 10, it sets out the various initiatives. And it deals there with the industrial research program and it describes the nature of that program. The program augments existing federal funding up to 25 per cent of the cost of eligible research. I was wondering whether the minister has the particular information: of the number of firms that applied for assistance under that particular program in 1985-86; the number of firms that were granted assistance; the total amount that was granted in that particular area.

And I'm basically interested in the basic criteria for applying when qualifying under that particular initiative, and the budget for '86-87, to get a grip as to the disposition of the funds within the department.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I'm not sure. The question is too detailed to answer, maybe. First of all, in terms of the various programs within that harried sector, there are about 14. I can go through them and give them to you while my department are gathering up the numbers of companies that have applied, as you requested. I'll start this. If it gets to be too much, you can let me know, and I can possibly send it over.

(2200)

The entrepreneur program furnishes a liaison, advisory, and facilitation role leading to establish new businesses; we have 300,000 there. The inventors services program,

which is an assist to inventors and property researching and documenting, has 50,000.

Offices of university research: to optimize resources available to conduct research; stimulate research activities between the university, the private sector, and government; and to increase new technology transfer and development — 300,000.

Special studies: this is to review and make recommendations in the area of provincial research institutions — 160,000. Industrial research: \$1,014 million to encourage research and development of new products. There we cost-share 25 per cent of a new product. Joint high-tech research to encourage R&D in areas of mutual government industry interests — 604,500.

I can read them all into the record, or maybe it would be easier if I simply sent them across to you and let you take the time to peruse them and possibly ask questions on the ones that are of specific interest.

Mr. Koskie: — That would be fine if you would send across a copy of the individual initiatives and the basic amounts that you're proposing to . . .

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — For the second part of the question, Mr. Chairman, I have the seven general categories and the seven programs. In industrial research we had \$1.5 million, roughly, budgeted; 53 companies made applications under that category and in fact were funded. Those are successful applications.

Joint high-tech: roughly \$1 million, not quite, 5 companies there; requests for proposals, 13 companies; feasibility studies, 1; capital equipment, 1; information transfer, 3 companies. Total number of companies involved in the programs in those categories were 80. So we had 80 companies in that general R&D Heritage Fund group who made contracts with this department and did, in fact, receive some assistance in the past year.

Mr. Koskie: — Well in respect to the \$4 million that is budgeted this year, I guess what I'm asking you initially is why has there been a decrease in the amount in the Heritage Fund. The first year that you were set up it was 5 million and then you went down to 4.5 and then you went down to 4 million. I appreciate that you didn't spend it all the first year and you didn't spend it all the second year. Presumably the only thin is how accurate is the budget, is really what I'm asking. I mean, you were putting in 5 million two years ago and you only spent 1.4 million. And last year you put in 4.5 million and you spent a little over 3 million. This year, looking at the projections on here, it's 4 million. What I'm asking is: how accurate are your projections this year if they were so far off in the previous year?

And the other question I ask is: why has there been a general decrease in the amount of funding?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the member opposite that we are discussing estimates, and that is exactly what we're dealing with. As you indicated, in the past two years we did not expend the

total amount of dollars that were budgeted in those areas. It's not our practice to spend the money simply because it's budgeted. It depends on companies applying and meeting the criteria that are set up in the various programs in that sector.

So this year we have made another educated guess. We believe that the 4 million is close to what we anticipate for demand. If there is more, we will consider it, and if there is less, we won't spend what is there. But we believe that the 4 million is very reasonable and representative of the demand we anticipate, and we think that is what the companies will be requesting in this fiscal year.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to personnel that you have with the department, I want to ask the minister: are all the positions filled as set out in the number of person-years? You have 19.3. I'm wondering whether all those positions are indeed filled.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, those positions are filled either by permanent or temporary people. The activities that are taking place at the present time surrounding the move of a significant portion of this department to Saskatoon probably necessitates a few more temporaries than we would like, but the positions are filled at this time.

Mr. Koskie: — Let me ask you this: the position establishments as of April 1, 1986, do you have in fact any positions that are vacant?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, as of April 1, all the positions were filled with either permanent, temporary, or contractual people.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to the director of communications, this, I take it, was covered by a contract. I ask you: can you indicate what amount was paid, and to what person under contract?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, under the contract, the young lady's name is Edith Wieler, and she's paid \$3,000 a month.

Mr. Koskie: — And in respect to your science co-ordinator for communications, is that position also filled by — covered by a contract — or is it filled by regular appointment?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — That was filled by contract. At the time that we're discussing, the young lady's name here was Miss Gerard. She's making \$2,000 a month. Those positions are both, I believe, advertised, and we hope to fill them with permanent people in the very near future.

Mr. Koskie: — In terms of the contract with Gerard, what was the amount that was being paid?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — 2,000 a month, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to other members of the staff, you have a number of science co-ordinators, and I want to ask you: are all the science co-ordinator positions at the present time filled?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, as I indicated those positions are filled. In some cases though they are filled by acting or temporary people. And I would emphasize again that the move of a significant portion of this department to Saskatoon is facilitating, shall we say, some indecision at this time, and some of them are not filled by total — having the term "acting" in front of them. but all the positions are in fact filled.

Mr. Koskie: — Can you give me the names of the individuals that are filling the Science Co-ordinator IV positions as of April 1, 1986?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, there are four people in those positions. The names of the people are: Miss Reenstra-Bryant in one of them; Dimitrijevic in the other; and Mr. Jones is the third; the fourth one is currently covered by — because Mr. Mills who I introduced to you has moved into Executive Director position — that position is covered by Mr. Butler at this time. And as of April 1st — I'm not sure whether we're on present or April 1st — I have a gentleman in that role is Harris. But the four present names are Reenstra-Bryant, Dimitrijevic, Butler and Jones.

Mr. Koskie: — And that is as of April 1, 1986? And I guess the question I ask is: are all still presently filling those particular positions?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — The answer is yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to a Mr. Jones, I want to ask you whether or not he has been assigned to conduct any particular tasks beyond what he was doing previously. Let me put it in this form. Is he in fact assigned to conduct sort of external assignment reporting to the particular deputy?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, at the present time Mr. Jones is on a home assignment, a specific task, which he is reporting to the deputy under. That will carry through until September 30, as of which time Mr. Jones has resigned.

Mr. Koskie: — And the special assignment, or the home assignment as you indicated, to conduct an external assignment that ends on September 1st, I take it, or September 30th — is this in effect a termination of duties by mutual arrangement? And can you indicate whether a resignation was requested in this instance in respect to Mr. Jones? Did he submit the resignation to the department subject to a special assignment, and can you indicate whether there was any need for investigation in respect to any conduct?

(2215)

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, it's my indication that Mr. Jones indicated that he was interested in pursuing employment in other parts of the country. In order to assist with his relocation, we arrived at this arrangement. Mr. Jones has tendered a resignation as of September 30th and, as I indicated, is on this assignment reporting to the deputy in the interim.

Mr. Koskie: — Well it seems like rather odd arrangement if he is planning on taking on other jobs or a different job. What I ask is . . . I ask specifically: in respect to the arrangement and obtaining the arrangement, was there, in fact, a submission of a resignation requested by the department in order to give him the special assignment or the home assignment until September the 30th?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the term "request" is a little strong. The deputy and Mr. Jones sat down and arrived at a time frame that was satisfactory to both parties, and consequently, as I have indicated, the assignment was set out and the time frame established and the resignation submitted.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to refer to and obtain some information about some contracts that were entered into with the department in '84-85. And is the particular agreement that is covered by the order in council for '84-85 . . . the Department of Science and Technology . . . And it is authorizing the Minister of Science and Technology, on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, to enter into an agreement with PGE Technology Canada Inc. of Saskatoon, and to make a payment of 41,000, and it goes on.

What I ask you in respect to this: has the payment in respect to that OC been made to PGE Technology Canada, Inc., and was any subsequent contract approved in respect to it?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — No, Mr. Chairman. That specific OC, we entered into a contract, as was indicated on the OC, with PGE Technology of Canada. To date — and I'm not sure if this is . . . (inaudible) . . . to date, but the work has not been carried out, hence no claim has been submitted, hence no money has been paid under that contract.

Mr. Koskie: — Can you indicate whether any steps were taken by the department to extend the term of the agreement with this particular company for another year? It is my understanding that some steps, in fact, were taken to extend that contract. And I'm wondering whether, in fact, it was indeed extended — and if so, why?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that contract ran out as of March 31, 1986. We have had what I would classify as informal discussions with the company, but I don't think it's correct to say that there have been attempts made to extend the contract.

Mr. Koskie: — Okay. I want to refer to another conference in 1986. The International Conference on Plasma Science was held in Saskatoon, and it's my understanding that it was held — I don't know if I have the exact date here for it or not — I believe Monday, May 19th, 1986. Can the minister indicate the nature of that conference and the subject matter which it discussed?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that specific conference, the only involvement we had was a personal invitation to myself to bring greetings on behalf of the government. I was unable to attend and I believe one of my colleagues, I'm not sure

whether it was the member from North Battleford or the member from Saskatoon Mayfair, spoke on my behalf to ask me for a definition of plasma science. I may be going to the wrong source, but my information is that it is a learned society that sponsored it; it involves the chemical activities that take place in space. Now I may have learned people chastise me for that definition, but for these purposes maybe that'll do. That's the best I can do, at any rate.

Mr. Koskie: — I wonder if the minister is aware whether there was any government funding for the sponsorship of the conference?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of the government overall. There was no funding from this department for that conference or any department I'm responsible for.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I'd like to advise the minister, in case he doesn't know — and he was invited to attend — that the Saskatchewan Energy and Mines has budgeted some \$4,000 to cover the contribution of the costs and the keynote speakers and travel costs.

I'm interested in the areas of discussion in respect to this conference, and I would like to . . . since the government did in fact help sponsor in a significant way, some \$4,000 it obviously was of concern to the high-tech industry in Saskatoon, I suppose, and I'm concerned with . . . from what I learn is that the basic discussion covered nuclear fusion, high power technology, the microwave technology, as well as plasma physics, and microwave generation over very high power and very short wave lengths.

I understand that two areas of discussion were, in fact, areas of focus as related to the SDI Star Wars research as is implemented by the United States government. And I'm just wondering whether there was any interest, and whether there is any promotion being made by the Government of Saskatchewan, in so far as becoming involved in a more direct way in the technology related to Star Wars. I know the official position taken by the federal government is that they did not, in fact, agree, or would not endorse the Star Wars development as initiated by the President of the United States, but they also indicated that they would not oppose private companies and their involvement.

And what we have here is the Government of Saskatchewan certainly sponsoring; and it must be of interest to someone to have brought it to Saskatchewan, and since that area of discussion was indeed a part of the conference, I'm wondering whether there's any position being taken by the minister or, to his knowledge, the government in advancing or having any association of the high-tech industry for the development and participation in the Star Wars development as proposed by the President of the United States.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, just to clarify, as I indicated earlier, this department was not involved in any funding of that particular conference. yes, I was invited to speak. As I indicated earlier, I was not able to attend and one of my colleagues substituted for me. The

Department of Energy and Mines may in fact have had an interest in some of the discussions and may in fact have been involved in the funding. I think more appropriately that could be asked to my colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines.

The Canadian position is no participation in Star Wars. As a government we are honouring that position. That is certainly the position that we take. However we do have, and the Canadian position does have, involvement in the space laboratory. And since Saskatchewan is the third largest player of the provinces in the space activities, we see some significant possibilities, some significant potential. And some of our companies, I'm sure, will be involved in the peaceful conquest of space in the space laboratory program. We think there is a tremendous amount of potential for some of our companies. so in that respect we certainly have an interest, MSAT (Mobile communication satellite) and RADARSAT, which are other programs that we could see potential in.

So there may have been some components of this conference that Saskatchewan companies may have had an interest in. But as a government we are certainly not involved in any way in the Star Wars program that is under way.

Mr. Koskie: — Okay, Mr. Minister, I take a look at the first item in respect to administration, and I note that the amount there remains the same. However, in other items you have governmental research; there's a cut in staff, and also a decrease in the amount of funding. And similarly with industrial development. And I'm a little concerned here with the amount of the total budget of the department that represents administration. It's about 30 per cent of the total budget that represents administration.

But leave that aside; I want just to close here by first of all asking you whether you have any personal staff attached with this portfolio, and if so, if you would provide me with the names and any salary related to it.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Just a very quick comment on the administrative costs. Our department is a relatively small one, and the administrative costs include the secretaries which are in the deputy and the other offices, and they provide the services to the entire department, so it may not be totally represented, but I don't think it's that far out of line.

The answer to your second question; no, I have no personal staff assigned to this department.

Mr. Koskie: — Can you provide me with the total cost of travel as associated with this department during the past year?

(2230)

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Out-of-province?

Mr. Koskie: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, since I have become minister of this department, I have not travelled outside the province in the capacity of Minister of Science

and Technology. As far as the department is concerned, we don't have a global number; we can put that together very quickly and we'll send it to you, certainly this week at the very latest.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to the advertising budget, I note that in 1984-85 there was a significant amount — some \$56,000. I believe, in public accounts for advertising. Could you indicate what was the total amount for advertising last year, and what is the budget for this year for advertising?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, in 1985-86 the total for advertising expenditures, the entire area is \$95,774.07.

Mr. Koskie: — And will you provide me with the details of any consulting work or contracts that you had during the course of the year? You don't have to provide that now. Last year you gave me a list of the contracts that you had, and if you could provide that, that would be satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — We have no problem. We have that prepared, and we'll send it right over.

Mr. Koskie: — One further question. you were indicating in the budget that the department would be moving to Saskatoon. I notice your comment tonight that a portion would be moving. could you indicate what progress has been made in respect to that, and the extent of the move? Are you leaving apart of an office here in Regina?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, as of September . . . First of all, in answer to the question, we're making very good progress. I think that the people in the department understand that Saskatoon possibly had a head start, that there are now in excess of half of the activity takes places in Saskatoon. It seems like the logical place for the major part of the department to be located. There are, however, 30 high-tech companies now in Regina, the rest spread around the province. And so we are maintaining a presence here in Regina.

As of September 2nd, in Regina we will maintain two industrial development officers, one consultant, and one secretary. The rest of the department will be housed in Saskatoon.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 15 agreed to.

Saskatchewan Heritage Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Research and Development Division
Science and Technology
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 56

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 56 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, just before we conclude this section, I would like to thank the member from Quill Lakes for his very concise and to-the-point

questions. I hope he found the answers the same.

I would also like to thank my department for the work they put in to preparing these estimates and the work that they have done over the last couple of years with the science and high-tech sector of the province. I think that their work is being rewarded with some very positive results.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to thank the members of the staff of the department for their efforts. As I say that some steps have been made and some progress has been made on building on the base that we had established in Saskatchewan, and certainly to that extent I congratulate the minister in carrying on the direction, and thank him for providing us the information.

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Employment Development Agency Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 49

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I would like to introduce to you the officials who are with us from the Employment development Agency. Immediately to my right is Dr. John Siu, the chief executive officer; directly behind me is Mr. Art Battiste, the chief operating officer; to my left is Kevin Costante, the managing director; behind Dr. Siu is Larry Spanner, the manager of economic analysis; and to Mr. Battiste's left is Rick Pawliw, the acting director of youth services.

I think at this late hour, Mr. Chairman, we'll forego an introductory address and invite the opposition to carry on with the questioning.

Item 1

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to start off by asking the minister responsible for the Employment and Development Agency, seeing as how there's such high unemployment in the North, it has been mentioned time and time again that there's a high welfare dependency rate in northern Saskatchewan. As well, there is high unemployment rates that exceed those in the southern part of our province and elsewhere in Canada — figures that are simply outrageous, Mr. Minister.

I want to ask you, with regards to the employment and development agency program, just how much emphasis and success that program has been to the more remote isolated areas in the top half of our province.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to give the member some detail in terms of job creation and moneys expended. I can review with him 1985-86 in some detail, and I can give him up-to-date numbers as of this point in this fiscal year, which of course is only nicely under way.

First of all, in terms of the native career development program, I'll split it by constituencies, which may make it easier for the two northern members to keep track of what has happened. In Athabasca, under the native career development program there were 24 jobs; the funds amounted to \$44,283. In Cumberland constituency, there were 214 jobs and \$109,831.

From the Special ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act) program, in Athabasca there were 200 jobs, and expenditure of \$40,000. In Cumberland, there was an expenditure of \$68,119.

In the Access youth employment program, in Athabasca there was only one job created, an expenditure of \$2,780. In Cumberland constituency under the Access youth, there were 12 jobs; the total expenditure there was \$16,055.

In the winter works program, which probably has more impact in the North: in Athabasca, 286 jobs; an expenditure of \$712,759 that was committed in that fiscal year. The commitment in Cumberland was \$1,056,915 and there were 433 jobs in that program — the winter works.

In the Canada-Saskatchewan Opportunities '85 which, of course, was last year's summer employment program: in Athabasca, 111 jobs, \$120,540; and in Cumberland, 322 jobs, \$339,533. That's the total programming in '85-86 of the responsibilities of the department.

So far in this fiscal year, the Access youth employment program in Athabasca has 17 jobs and \$30,500; in Cumberland House, six jobs, \$10,800. and the Opportunities '86, our summer student program this year: 72 jobs in Athabasca, a commitment of \$55,724; and in Cumberland, 216 jobs, a commitment of \$201,933. So I trust those figures provide the response the member was looking for.

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Before I pursue my next question to you, could I have the figures that you just outlined for my preference and for future reference when I get back to my constituency.

I want to ask you, Mr. Minister: in terms of the funding allotments and the numbers of jobs created — how many of those jobs, Mr. Minister, are temporary and how temporary are they? and how many — more specifically and more importantly — how many of those are long-term jobs or permanent jobs?

(2245)

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, in terms of accessing the information that I've given you, I took a fair amount of the committee's time just in the last answer because I wanted it in *Hansard*, and you'll be able to access that certainly early tomorrow morning. So hopefully that will do.

In terms of the types of jobs that are created — the native career development program, those jobs are permanent. All right, the Special ARDA, our training spaces, the Access youth employment program has a minimum of 24 weeks that is required in order to access the government portion. We have found in our studies, though, that 70 per cent of those youth employment program jobs in fact end up being permanent.

And of course the last 2 programs — the winter works program and the Canada-Saskatchewan Opportunities

'85, the summer student program — those are both obviously temporary and obviously targeted at other specific problems or specific opportunities for young people.

Mr. Yew: — Can I ask you, Mr. Minister, in terms of the estimates in question here, what we have under subvote number 10 — or is it number 9? — item number 12 anyway, you have an allotment there for \$3 million, Mr. Minister.

Is that funding allotment under your department to be administered by your department, or is that going to be transferred to third party organizations such as local bands throughout the province, or is that specifically aimed at one particular group. I'm not quite certain about that allotment.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the program that we're discussing is the Indian economic development program. It's administered by the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. The levels of funding go to a number of groups: band and band development corporations, district provincial economic development institutions, and to various individuals.

So it's administered by the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat. It goes to various groups.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, in terms of any one ethnic group in this province that live below the poverty line, in terms of one ethnic group — and I'm referring to people of native ancestry — that is one group of people that have a very difficult time making ends meet. And I'm referring to the people in the North.

We have a tremendous abundance of resources in the North when it comes down to renewable and non-renewable resources. The biggest complaint, and the biggest issue with regards to elected officials at the local level, whether it be LACs (local advisory councils), whether it be various other interest groups, or even members of the northern development advisory council or a committee, you go to any one particular group or any ordinary person in the North, their biggest beef or issue is the fact that there are no jobs — permanent jobs — in the North. We have heard figures ranging from 70 per cent, as high up as 95 per cent unemployment in the northern administration district.

And we have had elected officials come to me, or come to government or various bureaucrats in the government, explaining or trying to impress upon governments and upon the powers that be that something has to be done to build an economic base for many of those remote northern areas.

As I said earlier in one debate or another, tremendous amount of resources come from the North. Just how much of those resources are going back, not only to replenish the existing resources that we have, but to provide for meaningful job involvement. The people that are actually making . . . a hard time making ends meet under this administration as people in the northern administration district. Your philosophy of open-for-government simply has not worked.

There is talk about selling shares regarding SMDC. A while back there was talk — a policy by your government to sell Saskoil shares. Now there is talk about selling shares re SMDC. But how many people in the northern administration district who are having a hard time making ends meet will be able to afford those shares? I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, very, very, very few.

My question to you, Mr. Minister. There was talk in 1983 and '84 by the minister of northern affairs of the day that you and your government would implement a self-sufficient economic strategy for those people in northern Saskatchewan. But you are now on your fifth year in government — going into your fifth year in government. We have yet to see a self-sufficient economic strategy adopted and promoted in conjunction with local officials in the top half of our province. Many, many people are frustrated, Mr. Minister, with regards to the performance of your government.

And I want to ask you, what is the alternative? You have here, in discussion under estimates, the Employment Development Agency; and, Mr. Minister, I fail to see a plan that would help alleviate the high welfare dependency rates in the North and the high unemployment rates in the North.

We have many projects going in the North. We've got the Nipawin hydro project. We've got major plans and announcements regarding SPC. We've got Key Lake and Cluff Lake and major forestry programs, forestry resources that have been sold to a firm from Washington. But, Mr. Minister, where is that consultation process that ought to be there; that involvement, that participation, that local decision-making by Northerners in conjunction with your various departments that relate to employment?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Well, Mr. Chairman, let me make a couple of comments. We just completed Science and Technology estimates, and the member from Quill Lakes, I think for the most part in jest, suggested that the successes of that department were based on the foundation that had been laid by the NDP administration. I will resist the opportunity to go into depth on how the basis of the problems in northern Saskatchewan were in fact laid by the NDP administration. But I will point out some of the things that have been taking place — and the member named a couple of them — to try to improve the situation and in fact develop some realistic economic activity in northern Saskatchewan.

Now we had this exact same discussion when we discussed Small Business and Tourism. And we discussed the wild rice industry; we discussed the things happening in the gold industry, where there's a tremendous amount of activity and I think a tremendous amount of opportunity.

The member opposite mentioned the power line that is being built across northern Saskatchewan and the fact that a good deal of the work, certainly in the early stages of that, would be in fact designated as opportunities for northern people.

He mentioned, what is the alternative? Possibly we

should talk about what the alternative is not. The NDP have clearly stated that they do not agree with the Weyerhaeuser project. I think that one has tremendous opportunities in the forest industry for benefits for northern Saskatchewan.

He mentioned the selling of shares in SMDC. I'm not sure where he got that information. If there is talk of it, I don't think it is official talk, certainly at this time. I would suggest to him that selling shares in SMDC is a whole lot better for northern Saskatchewan than is closing the uranium mines, which is the policy that has been clearly enunciated by the NDP. And so, I suppose, when you look at the alternatives, you could do any number of things.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that none of those topics have anything to do with the Employment Development Agency. And I'll just take a moment and go through for the member the programs that we do have in place that are in some ways specific to native or northern job creation.

The objective here, of course, is long-term employability. And the native career development program, a \$610,000 program to train 500 native people toward permanent jobs — and I discussed that a moment ago. Obviously, the training component becomes very important when we discuss the potential for productive jobs, not only for young people across the province but most importantly, I think, in northern Saskatchewan. I think the member will agree that one of the great lacks in northern Saskatchewan is formal training.

The second program, the native and non-status Indian and Metis program, is a program administered by Advanced Education, my colleague from Meadow Lake, to provide financial assistance to native people going on to higher education — and again, an attempt to improve people so they can in fact look forward to productive employability.

And then the Special ARDA agreement, which is a joint federal/provincial program that is designed to provide financial assistance towards training, employment projects, and native business development. And I think all those are obviously, without saying very much, things that are very important in northern Saskatchewan. And finally, the Indian economic development program, which is a \$3 million program to assist status Indians in the development of new businesses.

And having said all that about programs in northern Saskatchewan, I would hasten to add that, in addition to these — these are programs specifically for northern and native people — native people are eligible for all the other employment programs that are offered by this government, including winter works, opportunities programs, our summer employment, and the Access . . . youth employment program.

So we can certainly discuss the root cause of unemployment in the North. Whether it is a result of our administration or yours, I'm not sure that that would accomplish much. I think we have to put our minds to the solutions. I think I presented some of the things that we

see as steps in the right direction. Hopefully they will have positive results. We're certainly working toward that end and I hope that in the future those statistics, which you indicate are anything but acceptable, can be vastly improved on and we can improve the way of life in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Yew: — Just a moment ago, Mr. Minister, for your information, I was making reference to the headline here dated March 20, 1986, whereby the Deputy Premier went into the North regarding special announcements, special projects re northern power lines, and I refer specifically to my area around Jan Lake, Pelican Narrows, Deschambault, and that corner of the province.

It's my understanding, Mr. Minister, and I've been approached a good number of times by local, ordinary residents of La Ronge or Sandy Bay or Beaver Lake, Sturgeon Landing, or Cumberland House — ordinary young people that want to get to work and that can't get basic information as to how to go about getting employment opportunities or make an application for a specific project in the northern administration district.

What I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Minister, is that your department, and various other related departments, ought to coincide an umbrella strategy. The big point of contention I have, and those I express on behalf of my constituents, is that there are so many ministers and so many civil servants, or senior civil servants with various roles and responsibilities, that it becomes very confusing for those remote areas to know whom to go to.

We have here your department, Employment Development Agency, then we have Indian and Native Affairs, and then we have Northern Affairs, and we have various other . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . We have a Northern Affairs under estimates, haven't we?

(2300)

And then we have various other departments: Highways, for example; SMDC; various other departments responsible for various types of development and construction. But on the overall, Mr. Minister, the point I'm trying to make here is that you have to come with a strategy whereby people know where they ought to make an application with regards to various projects.

I know that the minister for P.A.-Duck Lake has announced major initiatives at Cigar Lake and Star Lake and various other places. And then Berntson comes in with his SPC plans for new power-line projects, and various other people or officials in government have different ideas and strategies. But the people at the local level don't know, you know, where . . . where do you go to get the specific information, Mr. Minister? That's what I'm trying to say.

There ought to be a coalition of your government's efforts re job training and employment, rather than confusing matters. You've got 19 cabinet minister with various responsibilities and duties at the present time as it is. It's very confusing. As isolated as the North is, you know, how can you expect the people in the top half of this province to know what the policies and the

responsibilities are of each individual minister and various officials under your portfolios?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not going to stand here and tell you that the programs and the administrative structures that are offered by government are simple; they're not. There is any number of them. There are those that would argue that government may be in a whole lot of things that government doesn't belong in.

However, I think that the structure that you are advocating was one that was tried previously. I think we could debate at long lengths the successes or failures of that structure. I don't believe it worked. I think we have tried to get some co-ordination. You mention the Northern Affairs Secretariat, or the Native Affairs Secretariat. I think those concepts are to try to provide co-ordination and initial inquiry positions, places where those particular constituents can come and bring their concerns to government.

I'm sure that there would be people in the south-west corner of the province, for instance, that would like to have a program co-ordinated for them. There are probably people in the city of Regina who would like to have a Regina minister responsible for their things. I don't think that that is realistic. I think we live in a province that what we have tried to do is make all the programs that are available in any part of the province available in others.

In my previous answer I went through the specific programs that are related to this department — the employment side of things that apply specifically to northern and native people — and then I indicated that, as well as these, all of the programs that we provide anywhere else in the province are also available. It could be argued that, in terms of government involvement, northern Saskatchewan possibly has advantages.

But I think that's simply a response to an obvious need that is there and we have to continue to do that. If in fact having a minister of Sask Power come and make an announcement one day, and the minister for the SMDC another day creates problems, we certainly don't intend to do that. I think that there are so many things that are going on that we are attempting to keep happening in northern Saskatchewan, that it may in fact be a little confusing at times. But hopefully by dealing with my colleague from P.A.-Duck Lake through the Northern and Native Affairs Secretariat, some of that co-ordination that you seek can in fact take place. I don't think there's a better administrative structure than the one that's in place now.

Mr. Yew: — I wonder about that, Mr. Minister. I've stated before, in some debates and estimates and what have you, that your government has some misplaced priorities. And I look at your estimates, Mr. Minister, and I find that there is quite a reduction.

If jobs and employment are of high priority, then those ought to be reflected under Employment Development Agency estimates. Last year you had \$121.59 million allotted, earmarked under your department, and that is down drastically, Mr. Minister, down to \$98,883,450.

And I don't know, Mr. Minister, I feel that people in this province . . . the number one issue is employment. And I think through public pressures you reacted accordingly and enacted an employment development agency. But now I see in front of us that that agency has been cut back quite drastically. And I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, why is that? Isn't that supposed to be one of our mandates — is to create jobs, help alleviate the high unemployment rates in this province, try to alleviate the high welfare dependency rates throughout the province, help get rid of the food banks and the soup kitchens, and what have you?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member, the short answer is that this year . . . Well as he indicated, there was \$121 million allocated last year. This year there are \$98 million directly in the fund, which he has indicated. There is also 27 million capital dollars that show up in the blue book in the property development corporation, and those apply from last year for a total of 125. So when you compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges, you get an increase, in fact, of \$4 million this year — from 121 last year to 125 this year.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Minister, with the statements made by elected officials at the local level — officials I've mentioned, you know, elected at the civic level, at the municipal level, at the native organizational level — the statistics coming out from the communities themselves, statistics that tell us, tell this province and this government and members on this side of the House, that there are high unemployment rates in the North, as high as 95 per cent, and high welfare dependency rates, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you: do you dispute those figures?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the statistics that we deal with in this department are province-wide statistics. We don't have the capacity to regionalize the department, maintain our own statistics, so we depend on StatsCanada numbers. And I would indicate that, as of May 1986, Saskatchewan had the second lowest unemployment rate in Canada; that the unadjusted unemployment rate of 7.6 per cent was down from 8.2 in April and from 7.9 a year ago; that the seasonally adjusted rate of 7.9 was below the April rate; that employment has increased by 12,000 in the last month.

I can go through those stats; however, I accept that there are significant problems in northern Saskatchewan. I think we've had this discussion in other departments. There's no question about that. We don't have specific numbers, specific statistics. We simply don't have that capacity. I'm certainly not in a position to challenge the numbers that the native elected leaders in northern Saskatchewan bring forward.

I think it's safe to say that there is a problem; I think it's safe to say that we are attempting to deal with that problem. We have discussed some of the ways. If there are other ways, other specific directions that we could or should be taking, we're certainly prepared to sit down with native leaders, with northern leaders, at any time and discuss those, and I think that is going on on a continual basis.

I think as well that some of the policies — both in terms of

major projects, in terms of small business, things that we've discussed already — some of the specific programs in this department are moving in that direction, to try to add some additional input, some additional impetus, to improvements in northern Saskatchewan. And I suppose all I can do at this time is commit to continue that — to work, hopefully, with those elected people, with the two northern members, in any way we can to try to improve that situation. But the simple answer to the question: we don't have the capacity to do statistical analysis in the North. I can't either confirm or deny the numbers that people from the North may present.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if we could have the names, salaries, and the job descriptions of your personal staff.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm at a disadvantage. I believe in earlier estimates I sent my total staff complement to the opposition. Have you got what I sent in Tourism and Small Business? Because I obviously, with the three departments and the two agencies, I sent a package that indicated all of it. Now if that's not . . . I don't have it with me, I guess, is the point. I think you have it. You may have to co-ordinate with your colleagues to get that information. If you don't, I'll commit to provide it tomorrow morning.

Mr. Shillington: — No, I think we do have it, now that I am reminded of the events of about three weeks ago. Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would give me — you can give me it in writing, if you like — the salary of your senior executive officers; the pay increase, if any, of him or her.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — yes, Mr. Chairman, we have that information. We'll send it across in written form.

Mr. Shillington: — Have there been many increases in salary in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I'm not sure the definition of "many." I'll let you look at it and make the decision. I don't believe that there's been anybody in excess of 3 per cent. You can check those figures.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could tell us the amount spent by your department on advertising in the last fiscal year ending March 31, 1986.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, for the members opposite, last year we spent a total of \$212,300. I could break that down: advertising the winter works program, which includes folders, application kits, radio and TV ads, \$113,800; consultation materials, 57,800; and special projects such as newsletter, human resource development agreement, materials, program booklets, etc., 40,007.

Now that was what the department spent last year. But in order to give you a full picture, I should indicate that this year two other areas, native services and youth services, are now under our jurisdiction. Last year they were under Advanced Education and Manpower. There were expenditures there of 110,680. So in order to get the full picture of what was spent on advertising by the areas that we are now responsible for, the global number is

322,980. I don't want to mislead you by saying what we spent last year is X, when that other could slip through the crack. We want to give you a complete picture of our expenditures.

(2315)

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to make a general comment with respect to employment development. The vast majority of the two and a half pages, three full pages, are pure cosmetics. The vast majority of these are simply items that I would venture to say you will be hard put to give me much information on. I wonder, for instance, what kind of information you might give me with respect to the trade opportunities program, for instance.

The vast majority of these things are simply lifted out of other departments and put in this department purely for cosmetics. And that, Mr. Minister, is symbolic of your approach to the creation of jobs. You are far more concerned about cosmetics than you are about the actual creation of jobs. That's true both with respect to the way you approach it . . . You take old programs that have been in existence for a very long period of time, many of them, and you call them job creation programs. There have always been such things as grants for the upgrading of heavy-haul roads. That's not a new program, Mr. Minister.

An Hon. Member: — You know that it was smart to do that, though, right? You've got to admit it.

Mr. Shillington: — Well the member from Meadow Lake believes it's smart to produce results. I happen to believe in politics you're judged not by what you say, but by what you do.

I believe this government is going to be judged by its record on unemployment, and the bald truth is that your performance with respect to jobs has been unsatisfactory — to be very, very kind. You may say, Mr. Minister, that . . . you can cite all the statistics you want. The fact is, from one end of this province to the other, unemployment is the overarching issue.

I recall, Mr. Minister, in the federal election of 1984 doing a small, very unscientific poll in which we asked people to mail back some cards saying, what do you think the major issue was? Half of the ones that came back said unemployment. A year later we did a rather sophisticated poll and got almost the same results. Over half the people in Saskatchewan, if asked to name the major issue, name unemployment.

So, Mr. Minister, you are judged not by what you say, because the endless volley of statistics that you ream off are simply meaningless to people; they judge you by the performance. Your performance has been inadequate, to put it mildly. That really is pulling my punch when I call it inadequate; it's a great deal worse than that.

The reason why it has been inadequate, Mr. Minister, is because you haven't approached it as a serious responsibility. You have approached unemployment as something that needs to be cosmeticized — I think, because the Conservative members opposite do not

believe that unemployment is a great social evil. I think they believe it is a part and parcel of a capitalist economy. It comes and it goes, and you put up with it when it comes and you're thankful when it's not around, and you hope when you're in office you're lucky. And I honestly believe that is the approach of members opposite.

They believe, Mr. Minister, that . . . members opposite believe there's not much you can do about it except to try and avoid responsibility. Well that isn't satisfactory to the public of Saskatchewan and any polling of public opinion, no matter how rudimentary or how sophisticated — as I've said I've had access to both — it produced the same results. Your performance isn't satisfactory. A good deal of the reason can be seen in this nonsensical three-page listing of your estimates, and they all come from other departments. So I suggest, Mr. Minister, that the way you have set up the estimates symbolizes the problem which you have.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'll try to be brief in response to that. I think to suggest that attempts to deal with something as important as unemployment, and to call it cosmetic, is simply not becoming of even the member from Regina Centre. This department was put in place to bring some focus to our attempts at job creation, and dealing with the problem to co-ordinate the programs.

He asked what the details of the trade opportunities program are. I could go through those, but I don't think he was too serious or was too interested. I would point out that to suggest that it is somehow trivial to put in place an economic or an employment development fund of \$600 million over the next five years — I don't think that's trivial. I think that's a significant attempt to deal with a problem.

When that was identified last year as one of the four pillars on which we're going to operate, I think that was clearly a step in the right direction. To suggest that something was inadequate when we have budgeted \$12,186,512 and approved 11,706 jobs in this year's summer student program — I think that that's exceptional.

But probably more importantly, some very, very brief statistics — and I don't want to suggest for one minute that unemployment is not a problem. It is. This department is looking at some additional programming measures, some program development as well as some program delivery that will clearly indicate in the ensuing months what our approach will be. But I will give you some simple statistics.

We have had in this province the lowest unemployment rate in 1982, '83, and '84. We were tied for the second lowest in '85, and have been second lowest as of May 1986. In 1978, '79, '80, and '81 — I believe you know who was in government in those days — Saskatchewan was only the second lowest in unemployment in the province.

The labour force has grown from 446,000 in '81, to 491,000 in '85, to 503,000 in '86. And probably most important to summarize that, when we took office in April

of 1982, there were 420,000 people working in the province. And as of May 1986 there are 464,000 people who are working in Saskatchewan. That is 42,000 more people working today than in April of 1982 — so 42,000 more jobs in Saskatchewan.

To suggest that somehow the efforts of this particular department or the efforts of the government as a whole are somehow cosmetic or trivial is not borne out by that 42,000 additional jobs, Mr. Chairman — not to suggest that the problem has been solved. There's a lot of work to do by a lot of people in this province to solve it, and we would suggest that this department can play a significant role in continuing to do that.

Mr. Shillington: — The minister said that this department represented a real and significant attempt to do something about unemployment. This, Mr. Minister, which I saw Conservative members walking around with, this represents a real and significant effort to do something about unemployment.

I notice members opposite carrying it around, reading it, passing it around. All I can say is, you're in good company. The vast majority of people in Saskatchewan are reading and passing around this little booklet. So don't feel ashamed of yourself. It's a good booklet. It is a good . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The hon. member knows why I'm calling him to order, and therefore I'll just ask him to carry on, and . . . (inaudible) . . . the booklet which he well knows has nothing to do with the estimates under discussion.

Mr. Shillington: — Let me tie it in quickly. It says, "Let's get Saskatchewan working again."

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I rule that the hon. member's quoting is out of order.

Mr. Shillington: — A real program, Mr. Minister, to create jobs would look something like the following: providing direct assistance of \$7,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . providing direct assistance to people for purchase of a home of \$7,000.

Mr. Minister, I'm not going to go through the details of the housing program. They too well know it. They are too well-known in Saskatchewan. Suffice it to say that I don't think there's been an election promise in recent years that has created as much interest as that one. That, Mr. Minister, is a real program to create jobs.

A real program to create jobs does not consist of lifting out of Rural Development a program such as upgrading heavy-haul roads and putting it in your department. I'm fairly certain there's been a program to upgrade heavy-haul roads for some years. Probably the program existed during the years of high employment and low unemployment. That's before you people took office, if you're interested in the date.

Mr. Minister, the programs which you have in your department have been by and large lifted out of other departments. They add nothing, Mr. Minister, to the

efforts that you ought to be making to create jobs. What you have done is cosmeticized the problem, and Mr. Minister, that's why you're in the sort of trouble you are.

I often think that the public who follow our debates in question periods on the third Friday of every month, when there's minor gyrations up or down — and if the unemployment rate goes up by one-half of 1 per cent, one side claims total victory; and if the unemployment rate goes down by one-half of 1 per cent, the other side is ecstatic and claims total victory — I often think people must think that's foolish, because it is foolish.

These monthly gladiatorial contests over minute changes in the unemployment rate is silly. What is meaningful is what people feel and think. And what people feel and think, Mr. Minister, is that your efforts to solve the unemployment program have been really quite inadequate.

Mr. Minister, I said earlier that I honestly think that Conservatives do not believe that there's any meaningful thing they can do about unemployment. They believe, Mr. Minister, that unemployment is a part of a capitalist economy and it's going to be here whatever you do, and the best you can do is hope they don't blame it on you.

I would like, Mr. Minister, to read a couple of paragraphs from what is probably the most significant statement made on social and economic policy in decades. That's the bishops' statement on unemployment. I want to just read a bit for your edification. And I would hope, Mr. Minister, that you'll take it as a real responsibility to do something about unemployment:

Human work is not only a duty, it is also a fundamental human right.

And then it goes on:

The core of the agenda is a renewed vision of a market society where human beings and social relations are defined in terms of demand and supply forces of the market. The dominant tendency is to subordinate human dignity and human needs to the abstract rhetoric of the market.

Mr. Minister, that is a significant statement on unemployment — significant because it called to the attention of thoughtful people everywhere, whether they be Catholics or non-Catholic, the real social harm and the immorality of unemployment.

Mr. Minister, I think we ought to contrast that significant and thoughtful statement with this sham which appears in your estimates, of including in your estimates a whole lot of programs which have been in existence for a very long period of time and calling that a job-creation effort. It is obvious, Mr. Minister, you don't take it to be a serious responsibility because, Mr. Minister, you haven't done anything meaningful about it. Your view of unemployment is: you cosmeticize it, you hope to avoid responsibility, and sooner and later the market will take care of it.

Well it will, perhaps. But in the meantime there's an enormous amount of suffering, that should be viewed by governments as immoral if you honestly viewed unemployment in the manner in which the Catholic bishops have viewed unemployment. While I say this is the most significant social statement, I think, in decades, I say that as someone who is not a Catholic. But I can readily see the timeless wisdom which shines through that statement. If you believe that, Mr. Minister, you wouldn't include three pages in your estimates of programs lifted by the departments.

These estimates, Mr. Minister, have got to be a real mess. It is difficult for experienced legislators to figure out where a certain subvote is. The major reason for that is because of your gyrations with this department, your attempt to appear that a program called heavy-haul road upgrading some something about unemployment. It's supposed to do something about roads in northern Saskatchewan to haul logs on. It does nothing with respect to unemployment in a direct sense that hasn't been done.

(2330)

So I say, Mr. Minister, that the bishops' thoughtful statement on employment and the sham which we see in these estimates stand as stark contrasts in terms of compassion and in terms of an understanding of the responsibility of western societies to tackle unemployment in a meaningful fashion.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I think that the member and I will have to agree to disagree. I think the most significant thing about that whole session was that, in discussing the 7 per cent solution, he couldn't even do it with a straight face. I would suggest that everybody in Saskatchewan is laughing at that as an employment program.

Very quickly, to call a program that has put \$600 million into a five-year program to deal with employment development a sham, as I indicated earlier, does some discredit to the member who just spoke.

To very quickly summarize what we are doing in the department and where all those programs that you see in front of you fit in, there are a number of things that are short-term and seasonal that are directed at specific groups. Obviously the summer and winter seasonal programs fit into that area.

We have a significant component that is directed at training and opportunity development, because if we are going to somehow meet the expectations of the bishops and provide meaningful opportunities for people to find real work, the group that have the biggest problem are going to have to upgrade themselves, get some training improvements, and we are working to put that in place.

And the last component, of course, is economic development, long-term projects. We have seen many of those talked about in the last four years. We are seeing many of them take place. We have clear indications that the members opposite are against those, that that is not the direction they would choose to take. So I suppose the

bottom line is that, when we look at the 42,000 new jobs that have been created in the last four years, we are obviously doing some things right.

Again, despite the fact we have the second lowest unemployment, we accept that there are problems. We will continue to work with them. Obviously you have the methods that you would advocate; we have the ones we would advocate; and I think we will have to agree that there are some deep philosophical differences.

Mr. Shillington: — The hour is somewhat late to get into a philosophical discussion about the wisdom of the Gainers bacon plant, Weyerhaeuser mill, and so on. Suffice it to say — without getting into a specific discussion of those — suffice it to say that it's not the approach of this party to give away our resources and hope that by giving them away to outsiders we will make ourselves rich. We entirely miss the logic of that approach. The former premier of B.C., Dave Barrett, used to call it the trickle-down theory — pour enormous wealth on those at top and some of it might trickle down.

Well, Mr. Minister, we think there's a better approach, and I think the public have come to the conclusion there's a better approach, and that's why we haven't had an election. Because you know they're looking for a better approach and they're going to take that better approach whenever you people have the nerve to call an election.

Mr. Minister, I want to know if you have in your department two employees, Brenda Barootes and Trevor Roadhouse?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure how the member opposite can call the construction of a bacon plant the giving away of our resources, but somehow in that twisted mentality of his he has. I would suggest that when the member from Cumberland stood and talked about the problems in the North and your party determines that you're going to close the uranium mines, then you have some problems with employment in northern Saskatchewan.

The answer to your question about the two people is, yes, they are in our employ.

Mr. Shillington: — What are their duties?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, they are assigned to my office staff and are seconded to Executive Council.

Mr. Shillington: — Well would you explain that arrangement for me? If they are seconded to Executive Council, why aren't they in Executive Council? Why are they in your staff and seconded to Executive Council?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, the two individuals that the member mentions are assigned in my office from the department, and they have been seconded to Executive Council. The specific duties that they are involved in there, I don't have that type of detail. There are several people in government who are assigned in one department and seconded to others working in different jobs. The Department of Justice would be a good

example. I don't think that the arrangement is uncommon.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, is it accurate that Brenda Barootes is, in fact, a temporary employee?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Yes, Miss Barootes is, in fact, in temporary employment, or a temporary employee. I suppose I should add that she is the daughter of Senator Barootes, and that is probably for people's information more the reason for the questioning.

Mr. Shillington: — And Trevor Roadhouse, is he also a temporary?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — No, he is a permanent employee.

Mr. Shillington: — Will the minister explain to me the logic of seconding a temporary employee? Well if she's temporary, why doesn't she just move?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, Miss Barootes was an inquiries officer with EDA. She is on a temporary position, but she has been with us since March of 1985. I'm not sure what the rationale of a question on the secondment of a temporary versus a permanent is. It was deemed that the young lady could benefit the government working in Executive Council, that there would be benefits for her as well, and the secondment was put in place. Whether she's temporary or permanent I don't think has a whole lot of bearing.

Mr. Shillington: — How long has she been seconded to Executive Council?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Miss Barootes has been in that position since late March. My learned colleague from Rosthern informs me that there have been any number of people under your administration; the previous minister of Agriculture had a secondment from Education, a Miss Benson, I believe, who worked in his office. I mean, the arrangement is not something new or dramatic or Draconian in any way. It's been going on for some time.

Mr. Shillington: — What are her duties with Executive Council? She's being paid for by your department, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, the arrangement is in place. I have too much to do to be worrying about what people are specifically doing in other departments. They are seconded to that department, their duties are assigned in that department, and we are busy here in this department trying to deal with the unemployment problem.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, when will you undertake to give me the travel expenses of these two employees for the period since March '85, just to pick a date? Would you give us their travel expenses from March '85 to present?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, we'll provide the information on the travel of the department as we have with all our other departments. We will attempt to break it

down for those two specific individuals. I don't think that will be difficult. I think they've been on one trip in the time. But we'll get that information. If it's not adequate, I will commit to update it in a form that you find suitable.

Mr. Shillington: — Will you, Mr. Minister, give us the number of out-of-province trips; the destination of each, the amount spent on air travel, lodging, food, and miscellaneous, with respect to both of these employees?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, we will commit to give the number of people on the trip; the destination; and the amount spent.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I take it you are going to give us the . . . I'm sorry, I actually didn't hear you. Mr. Minister, do I take it you're going to give us the number of trips, the destination of each, and the number who accompanied him or her, as the case may be, the air travel, the meals, and the miscellaneous?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — If you can keep your colleagues quiet, I'll say it once more. We will give you the number of people who travel, the destination, and the total cost in a global sense, which is in keeping with the long, storied tradition of this establishment.

Mr. Shillington: — Well the reason, Mr. Minister, why I think a bit more might be . . . I really wish, Mr. Minister, that you would tell me what their duties are. I think you know. I don't think they have any duties that pertain to the administration of government. I think these two are organizing, attempting to organize your . . . They obviously have a difficult task. They are, I think, attempting to organize your party, Mr. Minister, for an election.

Mr. Minister, would you give me their wages, their salary that these people are paid?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I did not give the responsibilities because I don't know all the responsibilities. One of their responsibilities that Mr. Roadhouse is involved in — and, I believe, Miss Barootes — is in arranging cabinet tours, trips, within the province.

We have heard a great deal of talk in this Assembly about consultation and lack thereof. I think in Tourism and Small Business estimates we went into some detail though the simple fact that in the first six weeks that I was Minister of Small Business, I met with more business groups than the previous administration did in their 11-year history. And we are doing that with all interest groups. There are many of those types of things, and they work closely in Executive Council arranging ministers' travel around the province. I'm sure that's not all, but that's the only part I'm aware of.

In terms of the salaries of the two people under discussion. Mr. Roadhouse's salary is 5529, and Miss Barootes is 2553.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, just one further question before I leave this. Is there any family relationship between Brenda Barootes and Senator Barootes?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I indicated in my earlier response, when the member from Quill Lakes was obviously drowning me out, that Miss Barootes is Senator Barootes' daughter. And I also indicated that that probably created as much of a reason for the question as anything else that we could discuss here.

(2345)

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, there's a couple of other questions. I would appreciate the response to these questions as soon as possible, incidentally. A couple of years from now is not quite what I had in mind when I asked for your undertaking.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would tell me if you have any statistics on the number of people who are employed part-time. Do you have the figures for the number of people who have part-time employment in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, we don't have that with us. We will provide it. We don't do any statistical . . . or conduct statistical research ourselves. We depend on StatsCanada numbers. We don't have that capacity. We can search up StatsCanada numbers and respond to that. I'm sure your research department could do the same thing, but we will commit to get the best numbers we have on part-time employment in Saskatchewan and send it to you.

Mr. Shillington: — Well I will take the minister's undertaking and leave it with the following comment. The information we have is that there's 112,000 people have part-time employment. The vast majority of them are young people who want full-time employment.

Mr. Minister, the youth unemployment — I'm going to raise this subject and then I want to leave it — the youth unemployment should be regarded by this government as a very serious problem. The number of youth who are employed is actually lower than it was in 1982, and the number of unemployed is up by about 60 per cent. That may be a bit high — maybe about 40 per cent.

Mr. Minister, of the various classes of unemployed people, surely the young people are the ones who should concern us most. Young people who go for several years without a job — and some of these people have been unable to find jobs for several years — I think develop, or may well develop, a rather unhealthy approach to life.

Of all the statistics which we trade back and forth, the ones that should concern us the most is youth unemployment. They are the ones, I think, Mr. Minister, that this government has done the least for. The various heavy-haul road upgrading programs and the trade opportunities programs, by and large, I think, do not provide jobs for these young people who must compete with older and more experienced workers. So I suggest, Mr. Minister, that among your failings, perhaps the most tragic is youth unemployment.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that we recognize youth unemployment as a significant problem. We would be . . . (inaudible)

interjection) . . . That's obvious, true. I think it's important, as well, that we recognize that there have been some improvements.

In the number of unemployed young people in the 15 to 25 bracket in 1985, we had 18,000; in 1986 — this is May numbers — we have 15,000, a decrease of 3,000 people. I think that's moving in the right direction. Obviously the problem's not solved. The unemployment rate last year, May of '85, was 14.3 per cent; this year it's 12.6 — granted, too high, but still a further movement in the right direction.

I think that youth unemployment in that group can be categorized as poorly trained, as lacking skills. I think the role that we have to take is basically two things — encourage those young people, first of all, to stay in school. Members of the opposition took great exception to the advertising campaign that we undertook, using a well-known Saskatchewan high school athlete, and now a college and possibly an NFL athlete, to encourage young people to stay in school. I think that that is an important approach.

I think we have to provide training opportunities for those people. And I think, lastly, we have to provide them with that . . . help them get that first job because statistics will show that once people are in the labour force, they tend to have a much better chance of maintaining a position in the labour force.

So we accept that it's a serious problem, that there's a great deal more to be done. We have done some things; we are moving in the right direction; and I think we'll have some very exciting announcements to make in the short-term to attack this very serious problem.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 2 agreed to.

Vote 49 agreed to.

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Employment Development Agency
Employment Development Fund — Vote 65**

Items 1 to 16 inclusive agreed to.

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Employment Development Agency — Supply and Services
Employment Development Fund — Vote 65
Northern Institute of Technology
Young Offenders Facilities
Government Facilities
Capital Expenditure — Nil Vote**

Vote 65 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1986
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Employment Development Agency
Employment Development Fund — Vote 65**

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 65 agreed to.

**Supplementary Estimates 1986
Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Employment Development Agency
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 49**

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 49 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take this opportunity at this late hour to thank the members of the department for all their time and effort in preparing these estimates, and for providing me with the information that we presented tonight — an outstanding group who have waited a long time to get at this.

Mr. Shillington: — Yes, the officials do deserve a special note of thanks for having sat here until — having begun about 10:30 and finishing about 12; that is a special ordeal, and I join in thanking them.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:57 p.m.