

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Deputy Clerk: I beg to advise the Assembly that Mr. Speaker will not be present to open this sitting.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Deputy Clerk: Pursuant to rule 11(7), I've examined the following petition and it is hereby read and received:

Of certain citizens of the province of Saskatchewan praying that the Legislative Assembly may be pleased to urge the Government of Saskatchewan to retain the school-based dental plan.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Devine: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's my distinct pleasure to introduce two groups of individuals. Both, I believe, are in the Speaker's gallery.

First of all, I would like to welcome delegates that are in Regina attending the 27th Canadian Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We had a delightful dinner last night, and we had three hours of interesting debate today between a political scientist and a national news man and the Premier of the province, discussing the role of the media and the parliamentary system.

They are here with our pleasure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, enjoying Saskatchewan. They will be going across the province to visit people from one end of the province to the other, and I would like all members of the legislature to welcome them to the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: And I have a unique pleasure today to introduce a cabinet minister from the Soviet Union. Mr. Yuri Melentev, Minister of Culture for the U.S.S.R. is here. And he celebrated with us the National Doukhobor Heritage celebration, the unveiling of the Leo Tolstoy statue in Veregin, Saskatchewan, and it was attended by 3,000 to 3,500 people. And we appreciate very much the possibility that the Soviet minister would take the time and the effort and the expense to come into the province of Saskatchewan, and to honour Mr. Tolstoy and the heritage of the Doukhobors.

With the minister is Mr. Edvard Solovyov, member of the presidium, and, as well, accompanying them is Mitch Ozeroff from Saskatoon. I would like all members of the legislature to extend our special welcome to the minister and his delegation. Welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I add my words of welcome to those of the Premier. Words of

welcome to delegates and others attending the 27th regional conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I was with a good number of them last evening at the dinner to which the Premier referred. And we have delegates from many places: the distinguished President of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is from Malaysia, and we have guests from the United Kingdom, and from the Caribbean and, of course, from all of the provinces and territories.

We hope that they enjoy their stay with us, and that the discussions are fruitful. And the contacts made with other parliamentarians across Canada, and beyond, prove to be useful in the work we all do in attempting to strengthen this institution with which we work.

I would like, too, to join with the Premier in welcoming the Minister of Culture from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Mr. Yuri Melentev, and with him Mr. Edvard Solovyov, who are here, as the Premier has indicated, to join in commemorating the erection of the statue of Leo Tolstoy in Veregin, which is to honour the contribution made by that distinguished Soviet man of letters to the ... enabling Doukhobors to leave Tsarist Russia and come to be citizens of Saskatchewan and Canada.

We have always welcomed people from ... usually always welcomed people from other lands. And we are pleased to have this opportunity to honour those of our citizens who are of Doukhobor origin, and I welcome Mr. Melentev, Mr. Solovyov, and with them, Mitch Ozeroff.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Legislative Assembly, His Excellency Joseph Tumusange, the High Commissioner for Uganda, who is seated in the Speaker's gallery.

I had the opportunity just some several moments ago to have lunch with His Excellency. It gave us a chance to discuss the challenges facing resource economies, in our case ours fuelled by wheat, and in theirs fuelled by coffee. His Excellency has a number of meetings, a busy schedule with agriculture officials and others.

I would ask His Excellency to be recognized, and ask all members to join with me in extending a warm welcome to His Excellency.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, 30 members of the Miracle Centre Choir from Regina - their ages 10 to 20 - here with their pastor, Van Johnson, and their assistant pastor, Warren Cardinal, and Rev. P.M. Bourne. Also their bus drivers, Michael Born, Irene Dubois, and Shelly Desjarlais.

I hope they have an interesting experience in the legislature and have an opportunity here to learn how democracy works. And I ask the members to welcome

them here.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to, on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Shillington from Regina Centre, introduce to you, and to all members of this Assembly, 31 students from the Masonic Youth Conference, in the east gallery. They are age 13 to 18 years, and they are touring the Legislative Building this afternoon.

They are accompanied by their chaperons, Kara Bye, Dean Block, Jannette Wilson, Lorilee Snider, and their bus drivers, Paul Miller, Fred Stevens, and Dean Hoffman.

I'd like to wish them an enjoyable stay this afternoon and hope they enjoy the question period. And I'd like to ask all members to join with me in welcoming them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I too would like to join with my colleague from Regina North West in welcoming the students from the Masonic delegation here this afternoon. We trust you'll have an enjoyable stay and take a good look around the legislature.

If possible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should be very happy to meet with the students. There are a few members of the craft on this side of the House, and we'd like to have a chat with you. Welcome. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Justice Minister's Trip to Calgary

Mr. Brockelbank: I'd like to direct my question to the member from Kindersley, the Minister of Justice. It deals with the false information he provided in this Assembly yesterday during the question period. At page 1269 of *Hansard*, when I asked you if you had used a government aircraft to attend a wedding in Calgary with your family, you said: "that is absolutely not true." Yet outside this Assembly you told reporters, and this is a direct quote: "the purpose of the trip was the wedding."

Can the minister tell us why he misled the House yesterday?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question, and perhaps is so trying to respond to his question I can clarify the statements made by myself in the House yesterday.

Permit me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to set out the facts of the particular incident. First of all, some time ago, perhaps two or three months prior to the 20th of June, I received an invitation to my brother's son's wedding in Calgary, which I accepted very proudly, fully intending to go to

that wedding with my family, fully intending to drive from Regina to Calgary on that weekend. Point number one.

Point number two. About a week prior to that - 10 days, a week prior to that - it became apparent that there was a very senior Soviet delegation coming to Regina, a Mr. Murakhovsky and Mr. Rodionov. I'm sorry to the members if I haven't have those names properly.

Being the Minister of Agriculture of the Soviet Union, requiring the attendance of the Trade minister, I attended to that particular delegation. I picked them up at the airport on Friday evening at 6 o'clock. I had dinner with them that night, along with Charlie Mayer. The following morning I had a breakfast meeting with that particular delegation, starting at 9:45.

Now what happened, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is I found myself in somewhat of a quandary. I couldn't be at two places at one time. I couldn't be at two places at one time. Now I saw the solution to that particular problem. Prior to that time I had met with a Mr. Peter von Sass from Nortek Energy of Calgary. He had come here looking to make some investments in the province of Saskatchewan. I indicated to him, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I would have a follow-up meeting with that particular individual in Calgary at some future date.

Now here was my dilemma. Number one, I was required, I was required, and I think, importantly, Mr. Speaker, I was required to attend to, I was required to attend to the Soviet delegation. Very important. So what I proceeded to do was I set the meeting with Mr. von Sass in Calgary on June 20 to meet with him in Calgary on the 20th of June. I had moved that meeting to meet with that particular point in time. So, Mr. Speaker, number one, I could attend to that delegation in Regina, I could attend to my brother's son's wedding, and I could attend to that meeting - all on the same day.

That is in fact what I did. My office, Mr. Deputy Speaker, then booked the air flight to Calgary for the purpose of attending to that meeting. That's exactly what happened. I then was able to all in one day attend to the intergovernmental affairs issue, attend to a business issue, and attend to a family issue. And I think that's not bad.

Mr. Brockelbank: Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I look forward to the opportunity to respond at length, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the minister.

Mr. Minister, inside the Assembly yesterday you denied that this trip with your family on the government aircraft at taxpayers' expense had anything to do with a wedding. Your words are there for all to see.

That is absolutely not true . . .

That was your statement, Mr. Minister of Justice. Yet outside the House you said - and this is interesting considering the member's answer to my question:

I wouldn't have taken the airplane if it had been just to meet this business guy. The purpose of the trip was the wedding.

Mr. Minister, how can you stand there and claim you didn't mislead this Assembly?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the previous question, I indicated that I wished to clarify the details of this particular situation. The hon. member, in posing the question, Mr. Speaker, if he goes to *Hansard*, on page 1269, did not talk about attending to a wedding in Calgary, he talked about, Mr. Speaker:

... are you aware that the trip sheet, which is the official government document ...

Referring to that particular trip sheet, and what I said that that was not true - I indicated ...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order. Allow the minister to respond.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear in my first answer that number one ... Number one, Mr. Speaker, I indicated: number one, I had a meeting with a high level delegation from the Soviet Union in the morning. Number one, it's I had to attend to. Number two, that I wished to attend to the wedding in Calgary. Set number two. Number three, that I arranged a meeting in Calgary to meet with a Calgary business man interested in doing business in the province of Saskatchewan; that I arranged the flight to attend to that meeting, so I could also accommodate the wedding. Okay? I made it very clear I had three things I had to do - had to attend to the Soviet delegation. I had to attend to this meeting, and I was intent on attending to my brother's son's wedding which I think is perfectly proper.

Mr. Brockelbank: Further supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The minister, in reading the question as he portrayed was asked in the House the other day, misleads the House once more. And I want to complete the statement that the minister failed to read to this House. It said:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. (And this is where I asked the question.) (You are) aware that the trip sheet, which is the official government document for billing purposes within the government, states that the purpose for this trip was to attend a wedding? Can you explain that, and can you tell us how this wedding qualifies as government business?

The minister's first statement after that said:

(This) is absolutely not true.

Now this is not the only occurrence, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There is more than one misleading statement from the minister in the Assembly the other day. You told this House, Mr. Minister:

I had clearance to travel to Calgary.

And that's a quote. But you claimed the Deputy Premier had cleared the trip. But outside of this Assembly the

Deputy Premier denied that. Mr. Minister, who gave you official approval to use the government aircraft at taxpayers' expense to fly you and your family to a wedding in Alberta?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Speaker, in my first two responses I set out, as accurately as I possibly can and possible know the situation to be, the facts of the particular case. If the statements from *Hansard* yesterday, and if the statements from the media seem to be in conflict, then I apologize for trying to in some way led different facts to the hon. member.

What I indicated to you in the last two statements is exactly what happened. Those are the facts of the particular situation. I found myself in that situation. I opted to go in that particular way. I believed it to be consistent with government policy, and I believe it was the proper thing to do, to cover all three things at one time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minister failed to answer my question that I asked him. Who gave you clearance to use the executive aircraft? He has not answered that question. I want to understand the minister's position quite clearly. You told reporters outside this Assembly that you would have used the government aircraft to fly you and your family to this wedding in Calgary whether or not you had arranged any government business. You told them that you felt justified in using the government plan at taxpayers' expense for this family business. Can you tell the taxpayers why?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: With regards to the initial question ... I believe the hon. member asked two questions. One, question number one, the authority to use the government airplane is ministerial discretion, as you know. And it's been in existence for some 15 times ... (inaudible interjection) ...

If the member will allow, Mr. Speaker, for me to indicate the situation. Number one, the government airplanes are approved by ministerial discretion. I indicated to the House, number one, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House that I was advised by the Deputy Premier that I was to attend to the meeting with the Soviet delegation. because of my position as Minister of Trade, I was to attend to those meetings. I then arranged the meeting with the particular business man in Calgary. I had to have that meeting with him sometime in the near future, so I arranged the meeting to coincide with the date of the wedding so I could cover all three things at one time.

Now that's what I said to you earlier, and that's what in fact happened, Mr. Speaker. So in response to your question, that's the way the facts were.

Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the Minister of Agriculture was at that time, but you said the

man you were meeting with, the Soviet person, was equivalent to the Minister of Agriculture. And the Minister of Trade was meeting with him.

Now, Mr. Minister, let's face facts. This job was not forced on you; you ran for election; you were elected; you accepted the responsibility to the provincial cabinet, knowing its responsibilities. You collect more than \$65,000 a year in salary, plus thousands more in expenses. Why do the taxpayers owe you anything more?

Lots of people work long hours and choose between their work and their family events. What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is . . . They don't have a government aircraft at their beck and call. And I want to know: why should the taxpayers be forced to put out thousands of dollars for your personal business?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: First . . . two questions there. The first one is that this was the Minister of Agriculture from the Soviet Union. It was, in fact, the Minister of Agriculture from the Soviet Union. I met with him on Friday evening. I met with him for a breakfast meeting on Saturday morning. He subsequently met with the Premier at lunch on Saturday. The purpose of the meeting with the Trade minister is the fact that the trade imbalance between the Soviet Union and Saskatchewan or Canada is very marked in our favour. The Soviets are very interested in obtaining some type of product from the Soviet Union to bring that to a balance. And that was the reason and the purpose why I, as Trade minister, was meeting with this particular delegation.

Now you come to the second situation is that you ask yourself, are you to be at this particular point doing your government work and, in so doing, are you to somehow say the family doesn't matter - that go to a family event doesn't matter. Somehow you can't do that, that somehow I should not do that. All right. Now I can't accept that. My family is important to me, and I believe that I should be able to live a family life the same as anybody else.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: So the hon. member would have me go to the meeting in Calgary a week later or four days later or ten days later; it's still going to cost the same amount of money. I have to go to the meeting in Calgary; I have to stay here, and I have to miss the wedding. And that is not the way I approach my family, and if that's the way you don't like it, then I don't apologize to anybody for that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Justice. And I would like to take this opportunity to plead the case of my family, too. I was a cabinet minister, and I don't think if the member was to examine the record he would find that I put my family ahead of the people of Saskatchewan's business at any time. And I suggest to the minister, he's out of order to get up here and attempt to plead that kind of case before this Assembly.

I've heard from the minister a number of tortured explanations about why he misled this Assembly yesterday in question period. This is not an isolated case. This has happened before. In November 1985 the minister of Highways misled this Assembly about his use of the government aircraft. He did the honourable thing. He tendered his resignation. I want to know, sir, if you are going to do the honourable thing?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I indicated to the member opposite, and to this House, what the facts were as they unfolded. I attended to the Soviet delegation; I attended to a meeting in Calgary that I was going to have to meet too, on some point in time; and I attended to the wedding. All right. And I did those three things in one day.

I believe I have told exactly what happened. I have told the truth. I have no intention of resigning my seat in cabinet, or in this House, or anything else. And I believe my people stand behind me in the work that I do for this province, and the way I stand behind my family, and I intend to stay in my place and be very proud of it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I would like to understand the position of your government with respect to the use of government aircraft by cabinet ministers.

You, sir, and your government, have during the last several months made a point of this being a period of economic restraint. To use your phrase you have been saying, "every dollar counts". Now in the light of calls for restraint, and in the light of the actions which you have taken, which have blighted the lives of thousands of families in this province, is it your position that cabinet ministers should be able to use the government aircraft on family business, however, pressing, at public expense?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member knows that cabinet ministers can use government aircraft at their discretion. If they are to make business arrangements with international delegations or others, then they can use the planes to go to Edmonton or Calgary or Craik or the United States, or various other places.

You heard the minister just respond. He cannot set the date of a wedding any different than it is. He knows, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, he knows that he can set a business meeting on Monday or Tuesday or Saturday. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know, the hon. member knows, as well as I do, that if the minister goes on Monday to meet . . . the members of the opposition, I would think, would give me the courtesy to respond.

The member knows that if the minister goes there on Monday, he goes at government expense, but he can't attend the meeting and the wedding at the same time. If

he goes on Saturday at government expense, he can attend the business meeting for the government, and he can attend the wedding.

And you're telling me that he can't do three things. He shouldn't attend the Soviet delegation here in the morning, he shouldn't go to the meeting in Calgary, and he shouldn't go to the wedding all the same day. Well he went to the three events on one day. He went here on Saturday, in the morning; he went to Calgary on Saturday at noon to attend the business meeting which he set because he could change that; and at the same time, he went to his brother's son's wedding.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that it makes sense, if this man can look after his family and still attend government business, that he should be doing it on Saturday as opposed to Monday because, quite clearly, he could go on Monday or Tuesday, and you wouldn't argue with the expense. But you're saying because he went on Saturday it's unfair.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully say he can set the meetings with the business man any time he wants, but he can't change the wedding date. He put the three together because he was working for the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Premier, my question was of a more general nature, asking: is it your position that a cabinet minister can use the aircraft for family purposes, however pressing? I take it your answer is yes.

Mr. Premier, following the resignation of the minister of Highways in 1985 in not dissimilar circumstances, you claimed, as I recall your statement, that you were personally going to crack down on the use of government aircraft by cabinet ministers. And we are entitled to wonder what you did, and when, because yesterday the Deputy Premier said that he:

... to be completely honest, (I) don't know what the policy is relative to the use of government aircraft ...

And that's the quote attributed to him. And that is the Deputy Premier. I ask you Mr. Premier: if you had laid down the law with respect to travel on government aircraft, why would your second-in-command, the Deputy Premier, claim blissful ignorance of any rules you may have laid down?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely true in terms of cutting back in travel; it has been the case. And in my last set of estimates I noticed and pointed out the reduction of travel. I'm sure we get into the estimates this time, we will do the same.

With respect to rules and regulations, they're published. And the hon. member knows it's Executive Council that makes them and use them at their discretion. And this is

the discretion of the ministers and their judgement. And he knows that, and I know that.

What I'm advising the ministers, and particularly when we have a smaller cabinet, is to use it at your discretion, and where you can combine meetings, for heaven's sakes, do that; or where there are more than one cabinet minister can attend in the same plane, do that. Make the most efficient and effective use if they can. Now if you're telling me that if a minister can take advantage of a particular business operation at the same time he wants to attend a wedding, that he shouldn't be doing that because his family doesn't matter, that's maybe your point of view.

But he knows he has to go to the meeting. He can set one meeting, but he can't reset the other. So he puts the two together and he's already attended one meeting on behalf of the government that day. So if he can work here and he can work in Calgary and he can also defend and be part of his family, I think that's pretty reasonable request from a cabinet minister who's been here and worked for the government for several years already.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Two questions I have asked about government policy. Two questions have been answered in relation to the member for Kindersley, and not a government policy ... (inaudible interjection) ... Another Speaker in the House?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question to the Premier now is this: in the light of the facts revealed by *Hansard* and by the clear report of statements which the minister made outside the House, particularly with respect to the purpose of this trip, are you proposing either to ask the minister for his resignation, or alternatively, are you even examining into what the minister said in this House and outside the House to see whether he was frank with this House yesterday - as we say he was not?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: Mr. Speaker, a couple of points. I certainly expect my cabinet ministers to follow the rules that have been laid down and the rules that have been published with respect to executive air travel. And Mr. Speaker, I expect them to follow that. And I will watch and I will scrutinize that very carefully in response.

Secondly, I can certainly understand why the opposition would attack the minister when somebody says, well, at the same time he went to a business function he has a wedding. And I can appreciate that. All I'm saying at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the facts that are presented ... (inaudible interjection) ... Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the members opposite want to know what happened on Saturday, I'll tell them what happened on Saturday. If they don't want to know ... Well, Mr. Speaker, they evidently don't want to know.

Three things happened on Saturday ...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order! Order. Order. The Leader of the Opposition asked a question; allow the

Premier to answer.

Hon. Mr. Devine: The Leader of the Opposition said, have I examined the record? I said to the minister, I want you to put everything on the record today in the House, in the legislature, and he did. Okay. He said three things happened on Saturday: I was here in a meeting; I was in Calgary in a meeting; and I was in Calgary at a wedding. That's what happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's the record. He was at all three places and confirmed that he was at all three places.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if in fact he was here, and if in fact he was at a business meeting in Calgary, and if in fact he was at the wedding of his family, he did all three in one day. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've asked him to cover that, and he did in some detail in the legislature, and that's exactly what he's done.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Brockelbank: Before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise pursuant to rule number 6 of this Assembly to raise a question of privilege. In accordance with the rules, I've provided you with a written notice earlier today of my intention to raise such a question.

I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that parliamentary authorities are unanimous in their view that a breach of privilege is a grave and serious matter and should be dealt with firmly.

In order to preserve and protect the ability of our parliamentary institutions and our ability as legislators to fulfil our responsibilities in a parliamentary democracy, I raise this question of privilege with respect to the responses made by the Minister of Justice during the oral question period yesterday. I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that his remarks constituted a deliberate attempt to mislead this Assembly, and thus constitute a clear breach of privilege.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, article 16, and *Ersine May's Parliamentary Practice*, Nineteenth Edition, Chapter V, define privilege. In Chapter X, May sets out the relationship between breach of privilege and contempt of parliament, and states at page 142:

The House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt.

Yesterday in the oral question period the Minister of Justice was asked about the trip he took with his wife and children on a government executive aircraft to attend a wedding in Calgary on June 20. The minister flatly denied that the purpose of the trip was to attend the wedding. He said: "That is absolutely not true." Unquote. That is recorded at page 1269 of *Hansard*.

Later, however, outside the Assembly the minister changed his story. He admitted publicly to the news media that he and his family flew to Calgary on the executive aircraft in order to attend a wedding. I refer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a Canadian Press story in which the

ministers is quoted as saying the following to the reporters: "I wouldn't have taken the airplane if I had been just to meet with this business guy. The purpose of the trip was the wedding." End of quote. I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in his remarks in the Assembly the minister was deliberately misleading this Assembly.

I note that the former minister of mineral resources, Mr. Colin Thatcher, was found to have deliberately misled the Assembly in July, 1982, and dealt with accordingly. I also note that when the former minister of Highways, Mr. Garner, was found to have deliberately misled the Assembly regarding improper personal use of the executive aircraft in November of 1985, he resigned his cabinet post.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I respectfully submit that the parliamentary authorities specify the appropriate role of the Chair in such cases. Beauchesne specifies in article 84 that:

... the speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question ... and does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed - a question which can only be decided by the House itself.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask you to rule on the issue I have raised here today. If you rule that, indeed, a prima facie case of breach of privilege, I shall then move the appropriate motion permitting the Assembly to take the appropriate action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the privilege ... moving ... speaking to the hon. member's application for privilege, can I indicate ... can I indicate, Mr. Deputy Speaker ...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order. It's perfectly in order for me to hear an opinion from the other side of the House. It's customary ... (inaudible interjection) ... The member from Quill Lakes repeatedly talks from his seat while the Speaker is on his feet. I would ask him to refrain from that.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's privilege application, let me indicate to you, as I did in the House today, as clearly and as distinctly as possible, the facts as they unfolded on that date, on the 20th of June, 1987. Now if ... (inaudible interjection) ... I set that out today. If there was some confusion, and clearly there was some confusion from yesterday, I indicated to the House - I believe in my first or second statement - that I would openly acknowledge that there was that confusion, and I would be apologetic to this House for any confusion I created by that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order. I've heard both sides of the issue. I only received this at 11:50 today, and I will certainly review the record, and I will bring back a ruling at a later time.

Mr. Brockelbank: Mr. Speaker, you said you only received it at 11:50. Are you suggesting that somehow the question of identifying the point of privilege with you and getting it to your office in time was not met? Or was it fully met?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It was there prior two hours to sitting time, but I reserve the right to bring back a ruling at a later time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 7 - Implementation of the Principle of Pay Equity in the Public Service

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this resolution, no. 3, dealing with pay equity is based upon three principles which I believe will be recognized and accepted by all members of the House. The first principle is that men and women in our society are equal and are entitled to enjoy equal rights. I don't think that there is any member in this House that will quarrel with that principle.

The second principle is that men and women are capable of performing any job for which they're qualified. Again, I don't think there's any question that that principle will be accepted. You can get into an argument about whether all women can do all jobs, or whether all men can do all jobs. And I don't think that's a serious argument. Obviously, everybody can't do every job. But everybody, regardless of sex, can do every job for which they're qualified. And that is the second principle upon which this resolution is based.

The third principle underlying the resolution is that discrimination on the basis of sex is wrong and illegal, and that has been recognized by the legislation, by the legislature of this province and this country and, indeed, by our constitution. And I don't think again that there would be any question from any corner of this House that that is a sound and universally accepted principle in Canada.

(1445)

So on the basis of those three principles, Mr. Deputy Speaker, lies the resolution that I have the honour to bring before the House today concerning pay equity.

Now the reason why it is necessary to bring that resolution to this House is because the three principles that I have described to you have not resulted in men and women being treated equally at the work place. There are still many forms of discrimination that continue to exist at the work place regardless - regardless of all of the legislation that we have in place, regardless of the clear wording of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and regardless of the broad consensus that exists in this Assembly and outside this Assembly with respect to the principles that I described a few minutes ago.

The sad fact is that, in particular, men and women are not earning the same amount of money for the work that they do. The sad fact is that women continue to earn

substantially less than men for the work that they do.

Now I want to turn, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to some of the statistics that bear out the proposition that I've put. The statistics tell us that in Saskatchewan, with respect to full-time employees, women earn 65 per cent of the wages that men earn. If you take all kinds of employment - full time, part time, and piece work - you find that women earn only 57 per cent of the wages of men.

Another way of examining the question is to look at the people who work at the minimum wage in our province. And there are a very high number of people, a very high proportion of our work force, who are working at the minimum wage. And we find that fully 70 per cent of the people who are receiving the minimum wage are women.

It goes even deeper than that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because on examining the employment situation in Saskatchewan very carefully, we even find that when men and women are doing exactly the same job, that women are earning 15 per cent less than men on the average for doing that job—and there I'm talking about exactly the same job—a situation which our law has covered for over 35 years and has made illegal for that period of time.

Now a lot of time and study and effort has gone into the question of how that situation can be corrected. And we've had affirmative action programs; we've had special employment programs; we've had a variety of policy initiatives designed to cure that problem. They haven't worked, Mr. Speaker. I'm not saying they haven't improved the situation because obviously they have, but they haven't worked fully.

For example, with respect to education, we know from studies that have been done that if a man and a woman have not reached the level of their grade 12, have not graduated from high school, the woman will earn on average less than half of what the man earns. If that woman goes back to school and completes her university education, you'd think that would solve the problem, but it doesn't.

We find there that as between the woman university graduate and her male counterpart, who is also a graduate, she can expect to earn something like two-thirds the salary of the man. As a matter of fact, if that woman graduates from university and takes a job in the work-force she will on average earn slightly less than the man who has a high school diploma. So as I said, education, while it's improved the situation, has not been a complete answer.

We have also thought about this problem in terms of promoting women into positions of greater responsibility. But there again we find, on examining the salaries of people with supervisory responsibilities, that the situation is pretty much the same as it is in the general work-force. In other words, female supervisors are discriminated against to the same extent as their counterparts in the general work-force.

Now, part of the problem is that a very large number of

women in the work-force are employed in low-paying, low-status jobs. Altogether too large a proportion of women are employed in jobs which our society has traditionally seen as being "women's work", "female work". And I think here of secretaries; I think of clerical people; I think of nurses.

And at the same time there exists a group of jobs that we consider to be traditionally "men's work". And here I have in mind tradesmen, like plumbers, electricians. I have in mind certain of the professions, and such jobs as pilots and that sort of thing. And for a long time our society has seen these male jobs as having a high value, and therefore attached to them a high wage.

At the same time our society has looked at these female jobs that I talk about and has seen them as having not as high a value, and therefore the wages that have attached to them have been, and continue to be, low wages.

Now the governments over the years, and right across this country, have taken policy and legislative steps in an effort to get at this problem and eradicate it. Every legislature in Canada, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has agreed that this situation is wrong, and that it deserves to be resolved, and they've taken steps to try to resolve it.

And to briefly describe that evolution, I have to go back to the 1950s, when legislatures and the Parliament of Canada adopted legislation requiring equal pay for equal work. The expectation was that this would solve the problem I've described, and to some extent it helped. But the legislators quickly understood that it was not a complete answer to the problem, for the very simple reason that the legislation applied only to work which was exactly the same.

And so if a man and woman were sitting at a typewriter typing letters all day and their jobs did not differ from each other, then the legislation applied, and they had to pay equally . . . they had to be paid equally. But if, in their job, there was any element that was different at all, then the legislation was held not to apply. And so that legislative approach was considered by all of the legislatures in Canada, and the Parliament of Canada, to be deficient.

And the governments went back to the drawing board, and they came up with another concept, and that was the concept of equal pay for similar work. And the effect of that legislation was that if a man and a woman were doing similar work, which required similar skill and effort, and which involved similar responsibility, and which was done under similar working conditions, then they had to be paid the same wages.

Now that was a good law, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it did a lot towards the resolution of this problem, and it resulted in a large number of women being paid at a higher and fairer level of wages - fairer because it brought them up to the wages that were being paid to the males.

But again, it has become quite clear that the standard of equal pay for similar work falls short of what is required to properly address this type of discrimination, because

there remains no way in which you can compare dissimilar jobs. There is no way, under that law, that you can compare the work being done, for example, by a secretary with the work being done by a plumber. You can compare the work being done by two secretaries. You can compare the work being done by two plumbers. But you can't compare one to the other.

And so the law, while it was and remains a good law, is a law that had within it some limitations and shortcomings that resulted in the law falling short of the expectations of the various governments that passed that law.

And I want to reiterate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that every legislature in this country looked at this problem and decided that these measures were necessary in order to cure a social ill which all of them agreed existed. And my point today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is simply that this social ill continues to exist and continues to deserve our attention.

That brings me to the resolution itself which asks the government to implement the principle of pay equity in all of the departments, the Crown corporations, and the provincial agencies. In my submission, Mr. Speaker, that is the next logical step which ought to be taken in respect of this form of discrimination. What pay equity would do would be to introduce into this system of determining compensation the principles of job evaluation.

Now the principles of job evaluation are well-known, they're well-recognized, and they're well-tested by countless examples across this country, including examples within our own province. What is done when a system of job evaluation is being put into effect is that jobs are evaluated against certain long-established and universally-accepted criteria.

The skill that is required to a job is assessed and evaluated, and a point level is attached to it. The amount of effort that is required to do a job is similarly evaluated and a point total attributed to it. The level of responsibility is then considered, and again a number of points are allocated on the basis of that item. And finally, the conditions under which the work has to be performed are taken into account and evaluated, and again points are attached. And then it's simply a matter of adding up the points written down opposite each of those four heads and coming up with a total.

In effect, it is comparing apples and oranges in a way in which they can be compared. And I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we have across this country countless examples of where that has been done, and where the system has been put into effect, and the pay structure within that undertaking, within that business, has been altered to reflect those evaluations. We have, in Saskatchewan, the best example, the example of the Saskatchewan hospitals who went through a very comprehensive exercise in evaluating all of the jobs in the hospitals in the province, and assessing their point value on a job evaluation scheme, and then superimposing on that a structure of wages which actually took into account the value of jobs.

The system is not inflexible, and I hope that today we

don't hear any argument that it is, because every job evaluation scheme of which I have knowledge takes into account the market. And if the market requires that there be adjustments, or a different approach, or a different salary level in order to enable the employer to compete for employees, then the job evaluation system will take that into account. But it is the only way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have yet conceived where dissimilar jobs can be compared to each other, where their value in the work place can be computed, and where the salary structure can be adjusted in order to reflect the value of the work that is being done.

(1500)

Now in my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is at stake? In the question of pay equity is exactly what was at stake in the 1950s when we were debating the prospect of equal pay for equal work. It is exactly the same principle that was accepted in all of the legislatures in this country at the time that equal pay for similar work was accepted in the 1970s. And that is a simple matter of fairness and human justice - that's what's at stake here.

What kind of a province do we want? That's the question in which we in this Assembly have to ask ourselves. And I suggest that it is not a province where 52 per cent of our population are handicapped in employment simply because they're women. We don't want a province where a young girl is doomed for the rest of her life to earn only a fraction of what her brother may expect to earn. Indeed, I want a Saskatchewan where women are treated fairly and equally in the work world. I want a Saskatchewan where a woman may have an equal chance to get any job for which she is qualified, a chance equal to that of a man who is similarly qualified. And I want a Saskatchewan where women are paid fairly and equally for the work that they do without any discrimination whatsoever.

And I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all members of the Assembly want that kind of a Saskatchewan too. All members of this Assembly accept the principles upon which the idea of pay equity rests. And indeed, it is a principle that ought to be adopted by this province. In my submission, it will contribute . . . the adoption of the principle of pay equity will contribute to the kind of a Saskatchewan that I've described.

Now the resolution limits the application of the principle to the departments of the provincial government, and to the government agencies, and that it be effective in this fiscal year. Now the resolution was cast in those terms because there are many logical reasons why the government should be the trail-blazer with respect to the matter of pay equity. After all, government employment ought to be non-discriminatory. Government employment should treat women fairly and on the same basis as it treats men. And in my view, there is simply no logical reason why the government cannot accept the principle of job evaluation in its departments and Crown corporations as it has already accepted that principle so far as its application in the hospitals are concerned.

There's another reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for taking

this approach - that is the approach that it be tried in the government first - and that is so that the private sector will have an opportunity of seeing how the principle can be applied in practice, how it works, and what the outcomes are; how much money is involved; what sorts of dislocations, if any, are there? And it would give us, in this Assembly, an opportunity to demonstrate to the private sector that the principles of pay equity can, in fact, be adopted and implemented without dislocation at the work place. I would respectfully ask members of the Assembly to support the resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I have the resolution for the Clerk, and the resolution is seconded by the member from Regina Lakeview.

I'll read the resolution, Mr. Speaker:

That this Assembly call on the Government of Saskatchewan to implement the principal of pay equity in all provincial government departments, Crown corporations and agencies, beginning in the 1987-88 fiscal year.

That's seconded by the member from Regina Lakeview.

Ms. Simard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the motion in effect requests the immediate implementation of a pay equity system in the public service in Saskatchewan. And because we believe that it's essential that we move in the direction of pay equity in the province of Saskatchewan, I would urge the government members to listen to the arguments we make today, to vote in favour of the motion, and to take immediate action to implement pay equity in the province of Saskatchewan.

Pay equity, Mr. Speaker, means recognizing the relative value of the work performed, irrespective of the gender of the employees. It means that employers do not pay different salaries and benefits to male and female employees who are performing work of equal value. What we're really talking about here is social justice - social justice for women. The question of pay equity is as much a moral issue as it is an economic issue for women. As you know, women earn approximately 57 per cent of what men earn. And 34 per cent of women are single and depend on their income - 34 per cent. And many women who are single have dependants for whom they are responsible, and yet they're earning approximately 57 per cent of what men earn.

And I might point out also, Mr. Speaker, that groceries don't cost 40 per cent less for women, nor does housing accommodation, nor do clothes. But they earn approximately only 60 per cent of what men earn - 57, I think, is probably more accurate.

The argument, Mr. Speaker, that it's too expensive and that the cost is prohibitive is just not acceptable; it's not at all acceptable. It's not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, because what that argument says is that it's okay to discriminate against women because we can't afford not to discriminate against them.

And if it's necessary, Mr. Speaker, for our government to exploit women in order to keep costs down, then we have to look at our priorities. We have to re-examine our priorities; we have to re-examine our policies, because that's simply not right. It's wrong.

And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, the government doesn't want to do that. Government doesn't want to do that. And I know the opposition certainly doesn't want our government to be exploiting women for the purpose of keeping costs down.

So we really have to take a very serious look at this whole question of pay equity and start moving on it and doing something concrete with respect to resolving the problem. The failure to implement it would be a condonation of discrimination against women. So it's imperative that we begin to move on this question of pay equity.

And I suspect, also, that a hard-pressed study in Saskatchewan would show that there are inequities in the system, as such studies have shown in other jurisdictions in North America and in Canada. And in particular, I might refer to the Minnesota study, which I'll deal with in further detail a little later on, Mr. Speaker.

As I said earlier, women earn approximately 60 cents for every dollar a man earns. This also affects their unemployment insurance benefits, and it affects their pensions, if they have any. So the discrepancy continues after they are on pension and are seniors.

Why is this the case? Why do women earn less? Some people say they don't have to take those jobs; they can take some other jobs. Well that, Mr. Speaker, is unrealistic, and it's unfair to women.

Women do not choose to go into low-paying jobs freely. It is not a free choice. There is social conditioning from a very early age which entrenches the notion of division of labour with respect to women. Women see themselves as occupying traditionally female jobs and, therefore, those are the jobs that they pursue.

Women are streamed into so-called pink-collar jobs, such as sales, service, clerical work. And in these jobs, they receive low wages, and there is very little opportunity for advancement. Women are often forced to take part-time work. And, as you know, part-time work pays them little if no benefits. And there is a trend in society towards part-time work because it's less expensive for the employer.

And training and educational programs to upgrade the skills of women, so that they can go into higher paying jobs, are often inaccessible to women. They're costly, the hours are inflexible, and when women have small dependants and young children at home, it is sometimes impossible for them to afford or attend these classes because of the inflexible hours. The classes pose an unreasonable demand on them, trying to meet their family demands and upgrade their skills. So we have to look at support services if we're going to ask women to take educational upgrading. But presently many of these programs are not designed to accommodate women who

wish to upgrade their skills.

The tight labour market that exists in Saskatchewan today presents another problem for women attempting to upgrade their skills and get into higher paying jobs. It's only natural, Mr. Speaker, it's only natural that when there is a tight labour market, that women will attempt . . . will look for those jobs that women have easy accessibility to as opposed to attempting to go for something that may be more difficult.

Women's jobs have been traditionally low paying, not because they're menial and worthless - *au contraire*, Mr. Speaker, many of the jobs that women perform are very valuable jobs to our economy and to society. But they've been traditionally low paying because employers and societies place too little worth, too little value, on women's work and so it has become easy to underpay.

Equal pay for work of equal value will not solve everything. There is no way that that's going to solve everything, and we don't pretend to suggest that, Mr. Speaker. But it is a key element in reaching the ultimate goal of economic justice for women. It's a basic, bottom line demand for women. And not only do we have to continue the fight for pay equity, but we also have to be looking at affirmative action in conjunction with that: quality child care; more flexible working hours and, of course, accessible upgrading programs as I referred to earlier.

But women have been moving towards the goal of equal pay for many, many years. This isn't something that's new in the 1980s or the 1970s. We have been striving for this since back in the 1800s, because the women's suffrage movement was asking for equal pay as well as the right to vote. In 1952, in fact, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan passed legislation requiring employers to pay equal wages to women and men doing identical work. And in 1956 the federal government passed equal pay laws. The problems, however, with these laws were that it didn't address the real problem, not because there wasn't the will to address it, but the real problem hadn't been properly identified at that time, the real problem being that there are female jobs and there are male jobs, and these jobs aren't necessarily identical. And because they're not identical, the laws didn't apply, and the female jobs were lower paid.

(1515)

In 1978 Saskatchewan amended The Labour Standards Act to include equal pay for similar work. And my colleague, who moved the motion, had spoken to that. And that law did help, but it was still not completely effective because of the division of labour, because we still ran into the situation where the male job may not be similar, as opposed to the traditional female job. So the wage gap, even though it helped in some situations, the wage gap was not substantially reduced.

In 1977 the federal government passed equal pay for equal work, and it applied to all federal public service employees and to employees of federal Crown corporations, agencies, and boards; and Quebec took a similar approach about the same time. The problem with

this legislation, Mr. Speaker, was that it was complaint based. And by that I mean that if the law was to be enforced, the woman or the group of women who were complaining had to take an action to either the Human Rights Commission or the courts, whatever the case might be, to prove their case and to complain about not being paid equal pay.

That's not effective. That's not as effective as it should be, and it's not as effective as it should be because it's putting the onus on the complainant to make the complaint and prove her case. It was not an employer-initiated program. The onus was not on the employer to make sure that there was equal pay for equal work and to enforce this. The employer became involved only after a complaint had been made.

In July of 1985, however, Manitoba became the first province to put in a pay equity system that was proactive, mandatory, and the responsibility - by that I mean, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility was on management to ensure that pay equity was installed and that the system was implemented in his or her department.

And we have seen recent developments in this area in Ontario in the last several months. Well, it's been going on longer than that, Mr. Speaker, but there have been bills tabled in Ontario in the last several months . . . And the information I've been able to acquire is that in Ontario there has been a pay equity bill with respect to the public service that has received assent, and a pay equity bill with respect to the private sector which, I believe, has not been given third reading. At least that's the most recent information I have. It may have been given third reading since then, but I'm not sure exactly what the status of that is.

Mr. Speaker, staunch opponents to pay equity will say that such a program is unworkable and overly complex, but success in places such as Minnesota indicate it is an achievable goal. Minnesota took a co-operative, common sense approach, and they have positive results to show for it.

A hard-pressed data study showed after job evaluations were done there was obvious inequities in Minnesota. And I would just like to point to some of those to illustrate the sort of inequities that job studies have shown across the country.

An administrative secretary, for example, an administrative secretary's job was evaluated at 173 points; a senior groundskeeper's job was allotted 160 points. But the administrative secretary earned only \$1,343 compared to the \$1,423 a month earned by the senior groundskeeper.

Other discrepancies were, for example, a registered nurse - and these jobs are valued with the same points - a registered nurse earning \$1,723, whereas a male vocational education teacher would earn 2,260. A typing pool supervisor, being a traditionally female job, was earning 1,373 as opposed to a job of equal value, a painter, earning, 1,707. A senior legal secretary, being a traditionally female job, was earning \$665 as opposed to a senior carpenter, being a traditionally male job, earning

1,040. Jobs of equal value, Mr. Speaker.

A secretary, being a traditionally female job, earning 1,122 as opposed to a traditionally male job of maintenance carpenter, a job accredited with the same points, a job of equal value, at \$1,707. That's \$500-and-some a month more. Mental health technician, traditionally female job, earning 1,135, as opposed to an automotive mechanic male job earning 1,681 - assessed at being jobs of equal value.

And the list goes on, Mr. Speaker. But I believe that these sorts of discrepancies will be found right here in Saskatchewan in this government if a similar study was done.

And the thing about Minnesota, because they took a common sense approach - and I'm referring to Minnesota because this program has been ongoing for some time, and they've got some experience that we can look at - no wages were frozen, no wages were reduced, there were no lay-offs, no strikes, no lawsuits, no elaborate bureaucracy. The staff turnover was reduced as a result of fairer pay practices, and then the employees' morale improved, and this has created a more productive and a more stable work environment.

Opponents of the pay equity system will often say, Mr. Speaker, that women work for pin money only. But that's not true; it's not at all true. Two-thirds of women who work, work because of financial necessity; 60 per cent of Canadians living in poverty are women, and 85 per cent of single parent families are headed by women. And out of those 85 per cent of single parent families headed by women, 47 per cent live in poverty - 47 per cent.

Now that's very important, Mr. Speaker, because it's not just women we're talking about. We're also talking about children here, the dependants of these women, and children are our future. And yet some 47 per cent of all minimum wage earners are women. And even when jobs are the same, we find out that women are paid less.

Labour Canada statistics show that educational upgrading does not guarantee higher incomes for women. Of those who didn't have a high school education, women earn an average of 9,500 compared to an average of 19,100 for men. Women with university degrees earn an average 21,400 - significantly less than the average 32,000 for male university graduates.

In fact, the average high school male graduate earns more than the average female university graduate, at 22,200 for men as opposed to 21,400 for female university graduates. And I can cite many more statistics on this, Mr. Speaker, but I believe I have made my point.

Some opponents, Mr. Speaker, some opponents of pay equity will argue that equal pay will upset the balance between supply and demand. Oh, we've heard that argument often, but that's simply not logical, Mr. Speaker, because supply and demand does not affect the wage of nurses, for example. When there's a shortage of women workers, such as nurses, the employer goes outside of the jurisdiction to hire more workers; he

doesn't pay nurses more. So that argument just doesn't wash.

Some argue that it's too difficult to evaluate the jobs, but this has not been the experience in other jurisdictions. Of course we'll never have absolute perfection in evaluating jobs, but absolute perfection is an unreasonable goal. The fact of the matter is, it's being done in other jurisdictions, and it's working. So I say, Mr. Speaker, it's time for Saskatchewan to get on with the job.

Some opponents will say that the free market system will be interfered with if we start insisting that women be paid equally for work of equal value. But, Mr. Speaker, that's ridiculous. Right now we already legislate labour laws in the so-called free market system. We have holidays, vacations, we have minimum wage, and so on. And legislating equal pay for work of equal value isn't going to interfere with the free market system any more than we already interfere with the free market system. And business, of course, is always anxious to get a government hand-out, and is totally unconcerned about the free market system when it's being offered a government hand-out. So I think that argument does not wash either.

Another myth that's out there is that pay equity will destroy collective bargaining. And that's simply not true, Mr. Speaker, it's not at all true. Labour laws provide minimum standards now. We have minimum standards, minimum wage; we have holidays set, working hours set, and collective bargaining improves upon those minimum standards.

It's not true that pay equity will interfere with collective bargaining. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if women are paid better it will put more money back into the economy, and there will be a beneficial effect on businesses that deal with women. There will be a beneficial effect on small businesses across Saskatchewan where women buy their groceries and buy their clothes. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, more importantly than the beneficial effect on business, is the fact that this is the only fair - the only fair and just way for Saskatchewan society to be moving.

Women should not have to move into traditional male jobs in order to be paid a decent wage. No, Mr. Speaker, they shouldn't have to do that. The jobs that women do are fundamental to the economy and invaluable to society. And it's time for Saskatchewan to get on with the job of making sure that women, at least in our public service, are being paid equally for work of equal value.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: Some people may say, well, we have to bring in some high paying consultants and do a major study. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should just use some common sense and keep it as simple as possible. And I think what we have to do is simply ask ourselves, first of all: is there a dual wage system based on sex? And I believe firmly that the response will be yes. Secondly, what is the size of the wage gap? And thirdly, what will it cost us to correct it? And lastly, what is the timetable for implementing it?

And when we know all those things, and we've set

ourselves a timetable for proceeding upon this just path, then we get on with it and we implement it in the public sector.

And I want to say something about the pay equity division in the Public Service Commission. There were reports in the media before the legislature was opened that the pay equity division in the Public Service Commission was going to be dismantled. And there was some argument about whether or not it was dismantled or moved or whatever. The fact of the matter is, is that even if it wasn't dismantled and it was moved to the human resources department, there were a number of employees from that division who had been working in the area of pay equity for a substantially . . . a fairly long time, who were dismissed and their employment terminated.

(1530)

So I have questions to ask. I want to know whether this government considers pay equity a priority, and why the pay equity division was moved to human resources, and what it intends to do about pay equity in the future.

And as I indicated earlier, we can't look at pay equity in isolation. Pay equity has to be looked at hand in hand with affirmative action. And by affirmative action we mean a program specially designed for the purpose of making sure that the target groups, being women, natives, and the physically disabled - but I'm speaking to women right now because that's what we're primarily talking about, although it does apply to the other two groups just as equally and they will also be a part of this pay equity system - but affirmative action ensures that these individuals, that these groups of people will rise to higher-paying jobs and to senior and management level jobs in the public service.

And I don't have any recent statistics at this point in time as to what the government's been doing about it. But the last time I looked, Mr. Speaker, it was very dismal. And I urge the government and I want to see the government move towards a system where pay equity and affirmative action become a priority.

And along with the affirmative action program, we also need support programs that will help these individuals to achieve the higher level of employment, if you like. It's not good enough to say we need equality in management positions with women when we don't provide them with the training programs or the support services to make sure that we achieve this goal. So we need the support services with that as well, Mr. Speaker. We need support services to ensure that women can take over and properly function in management positions.

And only after we make pay equity, affirmative action, and other support services such as quality accessible child care available in Saskatchewan, can we stand up and say to the people of Saskatchewan that we believe in a society where men and women are equal, where we stand on an equal footing, where we believe in the equality of people across Saskatchewan.

And for that reason, I speak in favour of this motion, and I urge the government - I urge the government - to take a serious look at what we've been saying, to take a

serious look at the statistics, and to move in that direction; not tomorrow, but today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: Well, I have some agreement with the members opposite in that I've observed and studied the point, and the situation is this: it's certainly not easy to be a woman in Saskatchewan or any part of the world. And there have to be some changes made to improve the lives of women.

With respect to the topic at hand here, the equality of pay in the Government of Saskatchewan, we believe that we have equality of pay in the Government of Saskatchewan. We will look into it further, but we clearly agree with the principle of equal pay for similar work, and that is the law in Saskatchewan, both in the private sector and in the public sector.

With respect to the Government of Saskatchewan, we do have a unionized public service that has a negotiated contract. And I would hope that in that contract . . . Nobody has yet pointed out a specific example of inequality in pay between men and women in the Government of Saskatchewan. And if there is such an inequality, I would like it to be pointed out to me. I look forward to it, if it's there. I certainly hope there is none there.

The situation that we have, though, is that the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union) bargains this contract in the Government of Saskatchewan. And what the members opposite are asking is that we overrule the collective agreement with respect to what's happening in the government civil service.

And I'm more inclined to go to SGEU, and I will be writing them a letter asking them if they have identified any specific instances of inequality in pay between men and women in the government. And if they can identify any, we would try to address them, and we would welcome them to put them on the bargaining table.

And I will ask my colleagues certainly not to oppose equality should this principle be raised at the bargaining table. But we have a complicated situation here in that we have a union contract, and if there is inequality, then it has been negotiated in the collective bargaining process. And I will look into this further with respect to SGEU, and we'll be contacting them to see if they have any instances.

As the minister responsible for these issues, I take it upon myself to check with the union. I further invite any citizen in Saskatchewan to point out to me, or bring to my attention, examples of inequality in government pay, and we would have a look at that situation. We may be amending certain laws in this province, and I would like to remedy any equality there is in pay between men and women in the public service in Saskatchewan.

There are some interesting developments taking place in Manitoba and Ontario. They are going through some experimental procedures, and we will be studying that and watching those procedures very closely. We clearly,

on behalf of the government - and I speak on behalf of all of my colleagues, male and female - believe in equality for men and women in economic equality and, even more so, in the equality of opportunity. And that is an area that we have to do a lot more in, and can do a lot more in - the area of equality of opportunity for women and for men.

And we clearly believe in equal pay for equal work, equal pay for similar work. However, we also agree in the principle of fair pay and pay equity for both men and women. And it's a complex issue because does this issue - and that's the question in an equal world - does this issue also apply to equal pay for men? And I'm referring to individual men, not men as a group. And I think that members opposite have been referring to women as a group and men as a group. But does . . . The question then also arises: does it apply to equal pay for individual men? And does it also apply for equal pay to identifiable minority groups in society?

There's a very complex issue . . . And we're watching very closely what is happening in other provinces, and even in Minnesota. We do watch Minnesota, although it's the only state to vote Democrat in the United States, but we do watch Minnesota. And we will be studying the issue closely and, as indicated, I will check into the matter further with respect to a situation in the provincial government, in the Public Service Commission, to see if there are any instances of a female in a particular job being paid less than a man in another job where the jobs are equal or similar or of equal value as we can ascertain it. And we will have to see what can be discovered in that area.

Because we will be studying this matter further, I move leave to adjourn the debate. And I'd like to say more on this topic once I've investigated it a little further.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 11 - Provision of Jobs and Opportunities for those Entering the Work-Force

Mr. Lyons: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, fellow members on this side and on the other side of the House. I notice, with somewhat glee today, that I picked up the *Leader-Post*, and saw on the front page of the *Leader-Post* a headline which says: "NDP sweeps byelections; Conservatives fare poorly." And it relates directly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that headline and the events that are going on in the political life of the country relate very directly to the topic of Resolution No. 11 which is before the House. That is, Mr. Speaker:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to adopt a long-term economic development strategy which will provide new jobs and opportunities for all Saskatchewan people, particularly young people struggling to enter the work-force, and further, that this Assembly express concern with the fact the number of unemployed in Saskatchewan has doubled since 1982.

And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the headlines in

today's papers relate directly to that, because in 1984 the now Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Brian Mulroney, stumped from one end of the land, from St. John's East to the Yukon, saying jobs, jobs, jobs - jobs, jobs, jobs.

And now, three years later, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see that once again the Conservative Party, both federally and here provincially, have disappointed the people of Canada and of this province when it comes to the question of the creation of jobs, and the question of employment, and the question of long-term development of employment for people in this province, particularly young people.

And I predict, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the kind of results echoed today in the newspapers will be echoed again several years hence when the Prime Minister screws up his courage to call the federal election.

And let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the reasons that I'm sitting here, and that a large number of my colleagues are sitting here today, were because that prior . . . between 1982 and 1986 the provincial government, the government of the members opposite, did not deal with the question of jobs, did not deal with the long-term economic strategy.

It's not just me saying that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You can turn to any newspaper in this province and see headlines like this: "High school students find jobs scarce." High school students find scarce. And not only high school students - students from technical universities and . . . from the technical institutes and at the universities are finding jobs scarce. In fact, all Saskatchewan working people are finding jobs scarce, and it's reflected in the unemployment statistics which we will get to in a few minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion deals with the question of the development of a long-term economic strategy to create jobs and to provide employment in this province and to stimulate and get economic activity going in this province.

And it does that deliberately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it's evident from the record of the government opposite that they do not have a long-term economic strategy - despite what they themselves have said in some of their own written materials - that they do not have a strategy to deal with the question of unemployment and those things that are causing unemployment in Saskatchewan.

Because if they do have a strategy, to paraphrase the words of the Premier, it's the best kept secret in Canada. It's the best kept secret in Canada because the facts dealing with unemployment reveal that this government has not been able to deal with unemployment; it's not been able to provide the kind of economic opportunities for young people.

What are those facts? Well, I think if we look at, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the record of this government, you will see that the facts pretty well speak for themselves when it comes to unemployment.

The first fact that members should be acquainted with is the fact that unemployment has doubled in this province. It has doubled in the last 10 years. And that increase in the unemployment rate has come directly during the years when this government took power from 1982 onward.

I just want to refer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to some of those statistics. And we'll use May as the base month. In May of 1977, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan was 4.2 per cent - 4.2 per cent. And that was divided - and I'll get into this a little later - between those workers under the age of 25 and those workers over the age of 25. We'll get into the division of that because there's certain facts in here that don't bring any gladness to my heart.

(1545)

But we see in 1977 the unemployment rate was 4.2 per cent; in May of '78 it was 4.9 per cent; in May of '79 it was 4.2 per cent; in May of '80 it was 4.2 per cent; in May of 1981 it was 4 per cent. Then May of 1986 we see a slight jump, 5.6 per cent, and we began to have a little economic difficulty in this province. But then we come to May of 1983, May of 1983, with the present Conservative government in power for one year. We see unemployment going from 5.6 per cent to 7.1 per cent.

But let's just go back to the last full year when the New Democratic Party was in power, and that's the statistic for May of 1981 - 4 per cent. Four per cent in May of '81 and that was the last full year in which the government of the former New Democratic Party government would take responsibility for. Between May of 1981 and May of 1983 it has gone from 4 to 7.1. And then in May of 1984 it's gone to 7.7 per cent; in May of '85, 7.9 per cent. May of '86, 7.6; May of '87, 7.5.

And I use May, Mr. Assistant Deputy Speaker, I use May because it fairly reflects, I figure, a month that doesn't involve the winter doldrums when in fact everyone in the province knows that the construction industry is dead. And it also doesn't deal with the June and July's when there is a large number of students who are out on the work force and may be able to distort the economic activities, the figures of employment in this province. So I picked the month of May. And these statistics were derived from the government's own figures and Statistics Canada labour force surveys.

So what we see in May of '77 to May of '87, 10 years, just about a 25 or 50 per cent jump in unemployment rates. And if you look at those figures, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a little more closely, you will see that the figures are somewhat misleading in the sense that they don't tell who is unemployed. But if you're looking to see who is unemployed, we'll get a little better picture of the kind of hardship that this unemployment is wreaking on this province, and the kind of destruction it's doing to the future of the people of this province, and why, in fact, we're seeing a massive migration out of Saskatchewan to other provinces in Canada.

In May of '77, workers between the ages of 15 and 84, 8.5 per cent of those workers were unemployed. Only 2.7 of workers over the age of 25 were unemployed - only 2.7

per cent. Now 8.5 per cent isn't anything to boast about, but if we jump ahead 10 years . . . If we jump ahead 10 years, or not even 10 years, if we jump ahead to May of '84, which is only seven years, we will see that in fact those workers between the ages of 15 and 24, under the age of 25, the 8.5 per cent has jumped up to 15.3 per cent - almost doubled. The number of young people who are out of work in this province almost doubled in that seven-year period. And those who are 25 years of age and over, their unemployment rate rose from 2.7 per cent in 1977 to 5 per cent. And that just about doubled as well.

And the statistics carry on, and the statistics go forward in that manner till today we have an unemployment rate in this province - May of '87, using Statistics Canada's own figures and their seasonally adjusted rates - of 13.8 per cent for young workers under the age of 25, and 5.6 per cent for older workers, workers over the age of 25. I think that any reasonable and fair interpretation on the statistics, Mr. Assistant Deputy Speaker, will point out the fact that when we say that the unemployment rate has increased and shown a steady increase, the facts speak for themselves.

Now I'm not going to put the blame for that on the . . . all the direct blame for that on the government of the members opposite. I don't think that the unemployment that we're seeing here in Saskatchewan is totally the direct fault, and I say direct fault, of the government. I think there's a number of factors that have entered into the situation, and I want to deal with that for a few minutes.

I think the primary factor beyond the control, the direct control, and I won't speak here of what the government can do in terms of controlling it directly, but in terms of the indirect control or the indirect problems that the government faces, is the question of technological change, and what that's done to employment in Canada, and what's that done to employment particularly in Saskatchewan.

And I have friends who live and work at the chicken plant up at Plains Poultry plant in Wynyard, and I always use this as the kind of example of technological change and the effect it has on communities when I deal with that phenomena. And it used to be that there was over 300, over 300 people who worked at the Plains Poultry plant in Wynyard, and they did this chicken eviscerating, went through the poultry kill line, went through the eviscerating line, the packing line, and it was a plant that was in some ways . . . form of the plant used to be an outmoded plant in terms of the meat packing industry. And it was highly labour intensive and required people to do those jobs - the kill on the kill line, and on the eviscerating floor, in the freezer storage used to require manpower to do the jobs.

However, Plains Poultry undertook a modernization program over the last, say last five years, and are still in that process, so what we've seen is a drop in employment at Plains Poultry from over 300 down to their present complement of somewhere - and it depends on the season of the year, whether it's chicken and they've got a big . . . or it's Christmas and they've got a big turkey kill, or what have you - that the complement has almost been

cut in half. And it's been cut in half, not because of the lack of capital investment in the industry. It was cut in half because of technological change. And this is happening throughout the meat-packing industry.

It's happening throughout all industries here in Saskatchewan. That technological change is in fact changing the nature of the work force and is also changing the kind of jobs that people are doing and, quite frankly, is throwing people out of work. I say that the government is not directly responsible for this in the sense that they can't control the technological change. But they are indirectly responsible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the sense that they haven't dealt with technological change, and they haven't dealt with the kinds of technological change that is going on in this province, and they haven't responded to that technological change within a long-term economic program which will provide jobs and provide economic opportunities.

As well, we've seen this record of this government fail to respond to unemployment directly by their refusal to use the instruments of public ownership to pour money into the economy, to create jobs, and create long-term economic activity which provides jobs.

And that has to do with their ideology. They don't believe that the public sector has a role to play in job creation. They don't believe that the government should take the role in job creation. They're blinded by their ideological blinkers. They say: we'll let the Peter Pocklington and the Weyerhaeusers and all that crew - they're the ones that we'll provide . . . let them provide jobs for Saskatchewan people. And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it hasn't worked.

The facts, as I've outlined, speak for themselves. Their extreme right-wing views when it comes to job creation in this province haven't worked. They've got records going back to 1982 which shows that it hasn't worked. It's not working now, and it's not working in the future. And if you don't believe me, as the 400-and-some dental technicians who provided a valuable service to the people of this province. Ask them. Ask them, because they're out of work now, joining the ranks of the thousands and thousands of other people in this province that this government has put out of work directly.

So they're directly responsible for a great part of the high unemployment rate in this province. High in regards using Saskatchewan standards, and I want to deal . . . make it perfectly clear I'm dealing with the potential of Saskatchewan and not some place else. But it's a high unemployment rate when it comes to Saskatchewan, and this government has failed to respond to that.

But I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they haven't responded to it on the one hand because they're guided by their . . . blinded by their ideological blinkers, guided by their greed, guided by the dictates of their corporate masters in the boardrooms of Toronto and New York and Dallas, and Weyerhaeuser - wherever they happen to come from - Tacoma, Washington, and so on. But that's who tells the members opposite what they should be doing, what they shouldn't be doing.

But in dealing with this issue, because it is a serious issue, because it affects and is going to affect the very social fabric of this province in the long term and in the short term, that we believe that we need some new approaches, and that we believe that we need some new ideas and some creativity when it comes to job creation. And I think the first - I think the first, first thing that we need is to redefine in some ways what constitutes work and the whole notion of what is work. The members opposite have a definition of work that says: if it ain't producing goods and services which are producing profits for our corporate friends, then it's not work.

And they've shown that - they've shown that, Mr. Deputy Speaker - in their approach to the dental technicians. They've shown that approach. They say that's not socially useful work and government money shouldn't be used to go in employing people in that. And that it's much better . . . it's much better if we pour money into Pocklington's pockets or into Weyerhaeuser's pockets than, in fact, to employ 400 people on the dental plan.

Well, first of all, our party takes the view that socially useful work is work that's just as valuable. And if you're a dental technician, your work is just as valuable as a logger or a miner in northern Saskatchewan, or a wheat farmer across their province. That it's socially useful work, and that it certainly has got a strong place to play in this province, and we will defend it.

But we think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we should go beyond that. We think that socially useful work can include work like community service work, including community service work for . . . perhaps in the recreational field, whether it's coaching soccer teams or coaching baseball teams or what have you. That that, in fact, constitutes socially useful work because it deals with the lives of our children and the reproduction of the values of our society. And we think that that's socially useful work, and we as a society have got to begin to take a look at defining work in that manner.

There's also the question of so-called women's work. The member from Regina Lakeview eloquently outlined what happens to women when they're in the work-force. There's also the question of what happens to women outside the work-force. Women in the home and the kind of work that they do, and the lack of rewards that women in the home have gotten, and the lack of recognition that they have gotten from this government.

The lack of recognition, for example, around day care . . . around child care. The lack of recognition they've got for building up a network of support services, particularly for those women who are on the lower end of the economic scale. Particularly for those women who are on the lower end of the economic scale, this government has failed miserably - has failed miserably, Mr. Assistant Deputy Speaker. So despite all the rhetoric about the family, we think that work done around the home in terms of maintenance of the home and the caring of children is valuable work, and we should begin to, in fact, look at that kind of work within the framework of providing a basic and adequate income for women who do that work in the home.

And we say that that's one way that we can, in fact, define what work is and how we can, in fact, make what occurs in our community socially useful and give it that kind of legitimacy.

Now also, Mr. Speaker, in terms of approaches to job creation - and it's certainly a new approach in this province, at least new from 1982 - is that in terms of dealing with employment and the creation of employment opportunities, you need an integrated and you need a long-term approach. It can't be holus-bolus. It can't be solely at the whims of the international market-place. It can't be primarily at the whims of the international market-place. In fact it is our view that the role of government in provinces like Saskatchewan, with a small internal market, and that has a large export and resource base, that to rely solely on the terms of the international market-place is to leave us totally at the whims of what happens in the Singapores, the Bangkoks, and Atlantas, and the Tacomas, and the Japans, and everywhere else.

And that that is not necessarily the path of development that we want to pursue in Saskatchewan. We don't think . . . the members on this side of the House don't think that we should be at the mercy of the bond dealers of Bay Street, or Wall Street, or the Tokyo Stock Exchange, or the London Stock Exchange and that, in fact, we can develop an integrated and long-term approach to economic development, here in Saskatchewan, which doesn't rely on the forces of the international market.

(1600)

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that is one of the fundamental dividing lines between my party and their party. We don't think that the rule of international capital should determine how people in Craik, and how people in Ile-a-la-Crosse, and how people in Bankend live. We think that it's a responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan to, in fact, help those people, to protect them from the kinds of storms of international finance which are occurring now, and which are gathering speed, and which are going to crash down on this province. And they're going to crash down on this province in a major way within the next several years.

You think that we've got it bad now. You think that you've got it bad now, given their economic or lack of economic approach, just wait. Just wait to see what long-term low prices in agricultural commodities do to this province. Just wait - just wait to see what long-term low prices in potash does to this province. Just wait to see what long-term low prices in our other exports do to this province. But the members opposite say, well, that's part of the game; we're all part of the international market-place. And we say, we can do things here in Saskatchewan to create jobs and to protect people from that international market-place that they love so well.

What are some of those things? Well, let's look at what . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Wascana asked, what would we do? Well, let's deal with some of the things that what we'd do.

First of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, between 1971 and 1982, Saskatchewan had consistently the lowest rate of unemployment in the province. It had the highest number of people who were working in this country - consistently. It also consistently had the highest, the highest level of capital investment of any province in Canada. Those facts speak well for themselves because there was a strategy, a long-term, integrated strategy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with that.

What are the keystones of such a strategy? As it was, '71, '82, the primary keystone of our economic strategy is this: we believe that the resources of this province should be utilized in this province to develop this province for the benefit of the people of this province. That is in marked contrast - that is in marked contrast with the government of the members opposite who believe that the resources of this province should be ripped off from this province by the Pocklingtons of the world and the Weyerhaeusers of the world and the Hees International of the world and the other oil giants of the world, to siphon off the resource benefits which should belong to Saskatchewan people. They believe it should be ripped off and taken out of the province to line the pockets and develop the profits and the bottom lines of large international corporations; large international banks; large international, vertically-integrated multinationals which have no interest in developing Saskatchewan, but have only one interest and that is making sure they've got a black bottom line, that their profits in fact increase.

And let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have seen that approach. We have seen that approach at work. And what it has led to is a doubling of the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan and a lessening, a halving, of the benefits of resource development to the people of this province. To put it in simple terms, while the Peter Pocklingtons and the Weyerhaeusers and the North Canadian Oils of the world are benefiting, utilizing Saskatchewan resources, the government opposite is cutting back on dental programs to children, is increasing drug fees for senior citizens, is putting people out of work because they say there is an economic restraint.

Well, they haven't practised that kind of economic restraint with the multinationals. In fact, what they've done is fed them, that giant insatiable maw of capitalism - they have shovelled dollar after dollars, millions after millions. And as we've seen in the Energy estimates, despite the fact that the price of oil between '82 and '86 is almost three times what it was between '71 and '82, despite the fact that the production of oil in this province has doubled - has doubled between '82 and '86 compared to '71/'82 - we have seen that the resources coming to the people of Saskatchewan have been halved.

So, if people want to know why they're throwing dental technicians out of work, and why they're raising drug fees, and why they're putting the gas tax back on, you better go down and ask the oil companies of this province because that's where our money's gone. And that's where jobs have gone, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's where they've gone; they've gone south; they've gone into the maws of the corporate barons of this world.

So as I said before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the key - the key

- to job creation in Saskatchewan will be to utilize the resources of this province for the benefits of the people of this province, and not to give it away. That's point no. 1.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: Secondly, Mr. Assistant Deputy Speaker, what we're going to . . . what we would advocate is that we develop and utilize some innovative forms of production. If you look next door at the province of Manitoba, a have-not province, a province poor in resources compared with Saskatchewan, you see that they have been forced to do the same thing. And not only forced, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have realized that there is certain economic advantages and benefits to developing new forms of economic production in Manitoba.

Primary among these are the concept of the worker co-op, in which the workers who work in an enterprise own that enterprise. Or, the workers who work in an enterprise own that enterprise in conjunction with the community, or own that enterprise in conjunction with the province.

And we have seen a number of examples in Manitoba, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where this has worked, and which has provided jobs - which has provided jobs of a scale which is suitable for the Manitoba economy, and which is why Manitoba, the have-not province of the West, the ones without the resources, month after month after month challenge Saskatchewan when it comes to who's got the lowest rate of unemployment.

So we have a have-not province who's able to utilize those innovative forms of production, providing jobs for its people. And the net result is that people from Saskatchewan are moving to Manitoba, and they are leaving. And they are part of the out-migration that's occurring in this province. They are part of the tens of thousands of people which have left Saskatchewan to go other places looking for work.

And there's . . . As I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the worker co-operative form of production is a method, and it's a cost-efficient and cost-effective method of creating jobs.

There's also the method of using community-owned enterprises. Again, it's a concept that is not new to the world but it certainly alien to the government, the members opposite, because it's not based on bottom line, feeding some multinational. But it's based on, in fact, providing useful services or useful goods to the members of a community. And the members of the community participate in that through share ownership, which is limited to that members of the community.

And one of the advantages of that particular economic initiative, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that community-owned enterprises tend to last a long longer than so-called economic developments like venture capital corporations, which the members of that government are very well acquainted with. And we'll get in with that a little bit later.

There's also the question of the private and public mix -

production based on money that comes in from both the public sector and private sector, with directed benefits which are regulated, where they have a certain number of jobs assigned to them and a certain number of units of production that's base goes into the community. And that's another way that we can create jobs in the province.

And again, those are locally based type of operations. And a good example which presently exists in Saskatchewan is the Plains Poultry, which I had mentioned earlier, which is a private and public mix, and which provides jobs in the community of Wynyard, and which services the internal market, and is in fact a successful and viable enterprise in this province.

There are the traditional forms of small-scale private ownership - the local entrepreneur who plays an important part in this province. You see him up and down the main streets of small town Saskatchewan - people who use their initiative. And whether or not their money was inherited, or whether they were able to gain their money through their own work, is irrelevant. The fact is . . . the fact of the matter is that they do provide jobs in the local area in Saskatchewan. And of course that's going to be an important and long-term part of any integrated plan for economic development in the province.

Thirdly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a whole question of what we produce, and the question of production based on use. Like I said, Plains Poultry, and I'll use that as an example. Here we have a market in Saskatchewan. People like eating Kentucky Fried Chicken, like eating that particular fast food, and we all know that people . . . While it may not be the most nutritious form of food, at least it's quick and it's readily available.

It's production that's based on use. Food, the most useful of all products, is the kind of production that we've got to move towards, whether we deal with exports or whether we deal with products which are produced internally within Saskatchewan. It's the Plains Poultry example, and we can replicate that example throughout the province provided that we have the local initiative and local input into that kind of operation.

So we've seen that the member from Wascana asked, what would we do? We would utilize innovative forms of production, for example, the worker co-ops; we would use the resources of Saskatchewan for the benefit of Saskatchewan. And the key to that of course is through public ownership - not through private ownership, not through the Pocklingtons, not through the Weyerhaeusers, but through public ownership. Because the issue, when it comes to the question of the utilization of resources in this province, is the issue of public profit versus private profit.

And I don't think there is any clearer dividing line between the two parties that sit in this legislature than that issue - public profit versus private profit. The other members opposite say, you'd better believe it, because they stand for private profit. They stand for the profits of the Weyerhaeusers; they stand for the profits of the Pocklingtons; they stand for the profits of the banks; they stand for the profits of all those people who have sucked

the resources of Saskatchewan since 1982.

We, on the other hand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, stand for public profit. We think that resources in Saskatchewan, and the profit from those resources, should be going to the use and should be directed towards the public good. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we see here the Minister of Finance is yapping from his seat once again. Here we have the great statistician, the prince of darkness, the man who is only \$500 million or thereabouts out, and who goes, whoops, when it comes to making a deficit. Here he is trying to lecture us on what constitutes good economic management.

You know, you'd like to see that the Finance minister who has presided over record deficit after record deficit, who's presided over the spoilage and spillage, the pillage of resources out of this province, who's seen Weyerhaeuser given away . . . PAPCO given away to Weyerhaeuser, who's seen Pocklington given tens of thousands of dollars, who's seen out-of-province multinationals fed with our resources, this is the minister who is trying to lecture us on what constitutes good economic management.

I challenged that member once before during the budget debate, if he thinks he's right and his vision of economic management is right, to put up his seat and I'll put up mine. That challenge still stands, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that challenge still stands. But I doubt very much it's going to be taken up. I doubt very much it's going to be taken up, because she's a little lonely out in Lumsden. It's a little lonely out in Lumsden, and it's going to be a lot lonelier. "NDP sweeps byelections; Conservatives fare poorly". Let me tell you. That headline can be written for Canada; that headline is being written for Saskatchewan, and it's being written by the hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. He is one of the key architects of your defeat, gentlemen. He is one of the key architects of your defeat. He's one of the key architects of your non-economic strategy - a strategy of nothingness, a strategy of feed the multinationals, the strategy of pouring our resources out of province.

So as I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll resign my seat if the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden resigns his seat. We put it up. It's either a put up or shut up situation here, and it's obviously, judging from the silence on the side there from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, that it's a much rather shut up on his point of view, from his point of view.

(1615)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we have done is outline, what we have done is in the broadest possible terms outline what we think would be the key elements for the economic development strategy for this province, and for the question of building jobs and long-term jobs for the young people of this province, so that they stay here in Saskatchewan as opposed to having to immigrate out to Ontario, or immigrate to British Columbia, or immigrate to Manitoba.

And you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the last . . . since the election, since the election 250 working people from Saskatchewan, 250 more working people have moved to

Manitoba from Saskatchewan than have moved in here. And the reason is very simple - is because there is jobs in Manitoba and there is nothing but the kind of political and economic wasteland in Saskatchewan, the kind sown by the government of the members opposite.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to conclude my remarks with the following observation. Creation of jobs - not only does it require a long-term and integrated approach in terms of how all the parts of the puzzle fit together. Creation of jobs fundamentally requires political will. It requires a commitment, requires a commitment first of all to full employment; requires a commitment to the concept that people in Saskatchewan have a right to a job; that it's not a privilege and that it's not just something that's handed out by this boss or that boss; or it's not a crumb from any table of the owners of capital in this province; but that the job, a job in the sense of living a full and productive life, is a right.

People, and the members on this side of the House, say that we believe people in Saskatchewan have the right to a job. And that is a fundamental, fundamental difference between our party and the party of the members opposite, because they don't believe that. They believe that a job is something which is a privilege, which only those who beg and scrape should have, only those who kowtow will be entitled to. And that is not our view. And that represents a fundamental philosophical difference between their party and our party. And that's why they don't have the political will to implement and develop a full employment strategy.

You know, during the budget debate and during these estimates we have put forward dozens and dozens and dozens of ideas of how to get this province working again. And I want to mention just a few of those that I've heard coming from different members on this side of the House.

The member from Saskatoon University, in his reply to the Speech from the Throne, talked about conservation of energy as a method of job creation in this province. And that's a long-term project which would involve tens of thousands of people in this province renovating their homes, putting in energy-saving devices, building energy-saving devices, developing energy-saving methods here in Saskatchewan which would last for years and years, and which would have the economic benefits of cutting down the cost . . . and the cost of running Sask Power, just as a side benefit, so that the Shands - the political boondoggles which the other side likes to promote - would not be necessary, because we would be able to save power.

This is one small idea - one small idea, that would produce tens of thousands of jobs in this province, long-term economic activity, save the province and save the provincial treasury hundreds of millions through the operation of Sask Power. It would make this province a better place to live.

I've heard other members speak up. I don't know whether it was the member from Athabasca or the member from Cumberland who talked about the question of forestation and reforestation, and the putting of northern people to work by culling the forest, not through the use of sprays,

not through the use of mechanical means, but in fact making a social commitment that we're going to put Northerners to work and pay them union wages to do that work, so that in fact we can deplete the welfare rolls of Saskatchewan; we can cut Social Services' costs; we give people pride and dignity through the instrument of useful and socially productive work.

You know, we can cut unemployment by a great, great deal in the North just through reforestation, not to speak of the maintenance of roads and the development of the infrastructure - all of which provide more jobs and more jobs and more jobs, and which returns have greater economic returns to the province, and provides cash to the treasury of the province to cut the kind of deficit that has been built up by this totally pro-international, multinational approach of the government opposite.

We've heard suggestions for developing jobs in other sectors of the economy, for developing new approaches when it comes to soil conservation. I remember one of the members talking about soil conservation and the need and the effect that that would have.

And one of the primary effects of soil conservation, Mr. Assistant Deputy Speaker, is through the planting of trees. Now that doesn't seem like a very major thing or very innovative or very radical thing to do. But if we're concerned about the soil conservation in our province, as Senator Herb Sparrow certainly is, if the members of opposite have taken their . . . have taken their direction from in terms of looking at the problems dealing with soil conservation, you will see that the tree planting provides, in fact, a major method of labour-intensive employment and would be socially useful and has a social purpose to it, and would provide jobs for the dozens and the hundreds and thousands of students who are out of work in this province. So maybe we wouldn't have headlines in the papers which read that jobs are scarce for students, because we would put them to work doing socially useful work.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could go on and on and on and list the dozens and dozens of rational, reasonable, cost-effective ways of creating employment in this province, that it doesn't take a genius, or doesn't take the kind of mental gymnastics exhibited by the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, but, in fact, would put people of Saskatchewan in work - which would get Saskatchewan working again, and which would work for the benefit of all the people and not just a small and privileged few.

In saying that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to move the motion as outlined in the Orders of the Day, provided I can find it here in my pile of work. Thank you.

I would like, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to move, and it's seconded by the member for Saskatoon University:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to adopt the long-term economic development strategy which will provide new jobs and opportunities for all Saskatchewan people, particularly young people struggling to enter the work-force. And further, that this Assembly express concern with the fact that the

number of unemployed in Saskatchewan has doubled since 1982.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to enter this debate briefly and second the motion of my colleague and make a few supplementary remarks to some of the points that he's been making in support of the motion.

I think the motion is timely in the sense that this is one of the worst periods of unemployment for all Saskatchewan people, but particularly for young people in this province, that we face now in many decades. And the figures are well known; my colleague outlined some of them.

On a nation-wide basis, we have over 500,000 young Canadians officially unemployed, and we face record levels of youth unemployment in this province which have been exacerbated by the policies of the government. My colleague, the member for Regina Rosemont, outlined a number of those policies. I want to comment on a couple of others.

One of the things that I think has hurt Saskatchewan young people most over the last few months, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there have been dramatic cut-backs in programs for summer youth employment and for year-round youth employment in this province.

We have seen in the last few weeks a decision by this government to cut 6,000 summer job opportunities for Saskatchewan young people, a reduction of over \$6 million in funding for the Opportunities '87 program, in contrast with the funds that were in place in 1986. We've seen this government cut another \$3.25 million in support for youth employment funding with the elimination of the youth access employment program, a program that had been designed to help young people between the ages of 15 and 24, who had been without work for 10 of the previous 26 weeks, get work under this program. That program is now gone, and the hope that was offered by that program to several thousand Saskatchewan young people has gone with it.

So we've seen a government that over the past few years has been uncaring about youth and uncaring about the jobless in this province, and has exacerbated the difficulties of the unemployed in past few months with its vicious cuts to youth employment programs and to summer youth employment programs which has resulted in, first of all, a record number of young people in Saskatchewan being forced to leave Saskatchewan. And in effect this year we're seeing that in May of 1987 there are 6,000 fewer young people between the ages of 18 and 24 working in Saskatchewan than there were last year in May of 1986. So those are the figures that are before us, and I don't want to dwell on those in any more detail.

What I do want to do in the few minutes that I have, Mr. Speaker, is to expand on some of the comments that my colleague from Regina Rosemont made with respect to the kind of youth employment strategy that we would like to see being emphasized as part of an overall, long-term strategy to get Saskatchewan back to work. And one of the

first things that I would like to say that we in the New Democratic Party are committed to, is a strategy of employment and particularly youth employment that emphasizes resolving some of the major environmental problems that we face in this province, and at the same time putting thousands of young people in this province back to work in resolving those environmental difficulties. And my colleague from Regina Rosemont mentioned one of the major areas of initiative that's required is that of reforestation.

One of the things that I'd like to make reference to, Mr. Speaker, is an article in the July 17, 1987 *Leader-Post* that announces . . . It cites Paul Brett, the executive director of the forestry division of the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources in this province, announcing that only 3.5 million trees will be planted in Saskatchewan this year - about half, essentially, of what was planted last year - as a result of government budget cuts. Last year, about seven million trees were planted, Mr. Speaker. And that's no more than 50 per cent, again, of what was planted in 1981 and 1982.

During that period, Mr. Speaker, there were about 12 million trees a year being planted in this province. Now we're looking at 3.5 million being planted - a dramatic cut-back. What that means, very simply, is that this province is cutting a lot more trees than it's replanting. And it's continuing to erode its valuable forest resource and doing very little to replenish it. And we all know that that simply doesn't make either environmental sense or long-term economic sense. There are 8,500 jobs in this province that depend on the forest resource. And we're very unwise to be depleting that forest resource.

(1630)

Now, one of the obvious opportunities for a long-term employment in Saskatchewan is to make a major commitment to replenish the forest resource. And at least 2,000 people in this province could be employed in a major program of reforestation and intensive forest management with the expansion of our tree nursery operations in northern Saskatchewan and the planting of at least 30 to 40,000 trees a year in this province. That's what's required, Mr. Speaker. And if that was done, if that was done for the next 20 to 25 years, we could replenish the forest resource in this province.

It's a matter of political will. We, on this side of the House, have that political will. And we will put that kind of reforestation and intensive forest management program in place when we come to government, and we'll employ at least 2,000 people, particularly from the Prince Albert area, and the northern areas of this province, in implementing that kind of a program when we're elected to government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to give a second example of the kind of initiative that an NDP government would take, if we were in office today, to resolve some of the very serious, long-term unemployment problems that this province faces.

A second major initiative that's required is an initiative to try to prevent the increases in energy demand that we see

in this province that require, as a result, major new capital investments in dams and in energy generating facilities that the taxpayers of this province can ill afford.

Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Mr. Speaker, is already over 90 per cent debt financed. In other words, the people of this province have less than 10 per cent equity in SPC, and every time that we go out and have to build a new generating station, it costs the people of this province at least \$500 million, or to put it another way, at least \$1,000 a taxpayer. And it's money that our taxpayers can ill afford, and it's money that we don't have to be putting out, Mr. Speaker, if we were, instead, prepared to make a major commitment to a conservation program in this province that would put thousands of people, in communities right across Saskatchewan, back to work.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's our view, on this side of the House, that the time has come in Saskatchewan for a major investment in home insulation and in upgrading the energy efficiency of all our major industries and all our major businesses in this province; that it's worth making an investment of several hundred million dollars over a period of 10 to 15 years in that kind of an initiative. And at least 3 to 4,000 people a year would be employed as a result of such initiative, but not employed simply in one community where a new generating station may be built, but employed in every community right across this province in a major attempt by Saskatchewan people to upgrade the energy efficiency of all their buildings, all their industry, all their farms, with the support and the assistance of the government of Saskatchewan. That's the kind of major commitment that's required, that will put thousands of people in communities right across this province back to work, Mr. Speaker.

A third major initiative that we want to see taken, Mr. Speaker, is an initiative to replenish the staff at our hospitals, replenish the staff that are providing health care services right across this province that have been so savagely cut back by this government.

An Hon. Member: Peter, be honest.

Mr. Prebble: The member from Maple Creek asked me to be honest. I will be honest with her if she will be honest with the people of Saskatchewan. Four hundred and eleven dental therapists, to begin with, have been cut by your government, and when we are re-elected, we will put the dental care program back in place and we will hire 400 people to replace the 400 people that you fired, 400 jobs in communities, in rural communities right across this province that you've robbed from the people of Saskatchewan in a thoroughly irresponsible way.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: I say to the member from Maple Creek, it's up to her to be honest with the people of Saskatchewan. We on this side are being honest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the people of this province, there's been a major reduction in health care services, a major reduction. We're seeing record waiting lists right across this province, record waiting lists in my own home community in Saskatoon, with over 10,000 people

waiting to get into the three hospitals in the city. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that there's a major opportunity for new jobs to be created, particularly in the nursing field. There are hundreds of unemployed nurses who would gladly work in our hospitals if the government would only put in place the funding that's required to hire those nurses. We will do that when we come to government, but in the interim we call on members on the PC side of the House to come forward with the commitment that's required to hire more nurses and to put our hospitals back into working order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to outline a few other underpinnings of a long term strategy to create jobs in this province. One of the things that's required, in our view, is the need to institute a policy of Saskatchewan first - a policy under which government contracts to go Saskatchewan businesses first, where jobs from those contracts go to Saskatchewan workers first, not workers from Alberta, not workers from Manitoba, not people like Peter Pocklington who comes in from Alberta to build a plant in North Battleford. We want to see government funds where they are expended going to support Saskatchewan businesses first, with the understanding that people in local Saskatchewan communities will be hired first. And we on this side of the House believe that a Saskatchewan first policy needs to be implemented as quickly as possible.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that we would like to see done as part of a strategy to increase job creation opportunities in this province, is the launching of a new highway and street repair program in Saskatchewan - a program that over a period of five to seven years could create hundreds of new jobs in our urban centres and in our rural areas. Our rural highways are in desperate need of upgrading. Our streets in Regina and Saskatoon and many other urban centres are in disrepair as a result of the major cut-backs to urban assistance that members opposite in the government have instituted.

We say that those cut-backs are short-sighted, that in the long term the bills that will have to be paid by Saskatchewan taxpayers to repair our streets and our highways are going to be unnecessarily high because of these cut-backs. And we say that the time has come to spend some money now on putting our highway system into repair again and to create the necessary jobs that are required to do that at the same time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are just a few examples of the kinds of initiatives that, if the government took, jobs would be created right across this province. They're common sense initiatives that are going to save the taxpayers a good deal of money, and that at the same time are going to, at the same time, create badly needed jobs for people right now who are looking for work, who have the skills to do the work, but whom your government will not provide the opportunity to make those jobs available.

And I say to members opposite, if you were committed to employment creation, at least use the means that are at your disposal, as a provincial government, to provide the jobs that are required - basic jobs in health care, basic jobs in education, basic jobs in highway repair and maintenance, basic jobs in reforestation and intensive forest management, jobs in energy conservation and

housing.

Those are the kind of jobs that you could be providing and are not providing, because you don't have the political will to take money out of areas like oil royalty reduction and put them into providing the badly needed services that Saskatchewan taxpayers deserve to have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to close by making two concluding comments. One is that one other obvious area where the government ought to be investing money, and is choosing not to do it, and an area that would create a great many jobs at relatively small public expense, is that it is simply time, in my judgement, to see an investment made in cleaning up our lakes and our polluted rivers in this province, cleaning up the hundreds of dump sites across Saskatchewan that are not being monitored, that have hazardous chemicals and hazardous wastes stored at those sites, that badly need to be cleaned up, Mr. Speaker - that badly need to be cleaned up, Mr. Speaker. There are hundreds of dump sites across Saskatchewan that are being unmonitored, and where the employment of two or three students, or two or three young people at each site for a summer could readily clean them up. And it's our view on this side of the House that that's the kind of work that ought to be done, Mr. Speaker, before our aquifers and our streams and rivers become further polluted.

There is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for this government to invest funds in cleaning up our environment, and if the work is not done now the costs will be far greater later on when the pollution of our water supplies and aquifers begins to be more serious and then major, major work needs to be done to clean up the sites quickly and at very substantial public expense. So the time to do the work is now, and it's our view that this work, at modest public cost, could put hundreds of young people back to work all across this province for at least two to three summers.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by quoting Graham Riches, the associate professor of the Faculty of Social Work at the University of Regina, who expresses a concern that I have about the growing number of young people who face the prospect of not working at all in this province over the next decade unless something is done, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Riches says:

One of the facts that really has to impinge upon the public consciousness is that people are being born in Canada and Saskatchewan today, and that probably those born over the last number of years, who are probably never going to work.

Mr. Speaker, that's an appalling thought. And it's our view on this side of the House that it's an unnecessary thought. It's a reality that's only coming to fruition as a result of the callousness of government policy and the lack of political will that governments across this country and in this province have, not to implement job creation opportunities for young people in Saskatchewan today. And it's our view, Mr. Speaker, that if the political will was exercised, there is no need for any young person who is born in Saskatchewan today not to be assured full employment opportunities in this province from the time they enter the work-force at 18, to the time they're ready

to retire at 60 or 65.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: It's a matter of political will. It's our view, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that every Saskatchewan resident ought to have the right to work, and that it's the responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan to provide that right, to assure that right, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by suggesting to members opposite that if they were serious about providing employment opportunities for young people this summer, they'd be prepared to invest 25 to \$30 million in a program for youth summer employment. A program, 25 to \$30 million, would have put to work every young person who was out of work this summer.

And my question to you is: will you exercise the political will and the political commitment to invest \$25 million in a program next summer that will employ every young person in Saskatchewan who doesn't have a job?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1645)

Mr. Prebble: Will you commit yourself to that? Because I tell you, when we next come to government, we'll be prepared to put in place a program that does do that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sauder: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to rise in this Assembly and to join in this debate on the resolution dealing with the long-term economic development strategy for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, our Progressive Conservative government has viewed economic development and diversification as one of its major priorities over the last five years. Mr. Speaker, we believe that we must continue to diversify our economy if we are to be able to provide the opportunities or jobs for the future for the students, for the young people, and for the citizens of this province. It's only going to be through diversification that we're going to have expanded economic development and, with that, employment opportunities that'll come with it - opportunities that are going to be particularly important to those young people, many who are still in school at this time.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has consistently had one of the lowest unemployment rates in Canada. That doesn't mean that we're satisfied with our record. We want to continue to improve it, Mr. Speaker. We're working to see that a good quantity and high quality of opportunities will be there in the future for the people of Saskatchewan. We believe that by following a path of economic diversification we can ensure our province's economic health well into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members in this House are aware of the massive changes that have taken place in the world market-place in recent times. The members opposite may not understand the implications that that has for Saskatchewan. They may not understand that when the price of potash is cut by 50 per cent, it has major economic impact in our province. They may not understand that when the world price of wheat declines drastically, as it has over the last number of years, that it has a major impact on our economy in Saskatchewan. I can understand that they don't understand that. They've never displayed their talent for understanding economic reality or for dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous drop in our resource prices world-wide have not come alone. They've been accompanied by international trade wars as other countries have tried to take advantage of the situation, as they have tried to dump their products on the world market, as we see from countries who have expanded their production over the last number of years have surpluses and are now are trying to use that to balance their trade.

Certainly, when taken together, these factors have caused serious problems. This has led to the problem of rearranging our economies here at home. Some people especially the members opposite, thought that this could never happen. Mr. Speaker, they went through a period of time in government when they thought the only way things could ever go were up; the only thing that could happen was that markets would expand; that there was no end to the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in those heady days of the '70s, when there was surplus funds available, what did they do? They didn't put any away for the future; they didn't plan for long-term diversification and economic development. No, their idea of economic development was to buy an existing industry, buy the potash industry, spend the money of this province, the taxpayers' money, on something that was already here; buy another hole in the ground, not create one single new job, Mr. Speaker - not create a single new job.

Mr. Speaker, then they talked about the uranium industry. That was going to be the way of the future. They spent more hundreds of millions of dollars buying the uranium industry up - an industry, again, facing economic difficulty with declining world markets. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, their solution to those massive funds that they spent in the 1970s is, we'll shut the industry down; we'll close it down.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very interesting that as they sit here this afternoon and talk about jobs in northern Saskatchewan, the members from northern Saskatchewan that represent those communities that have uranium mines are not here to listen to that story. They don't even believe their own colleagues as they stand in this House and speak to us about economic development in the North. Mr. Speaker, the other people of this province don't believe them either.

Mr. Speaker, we have not just talked about it; we've acted on economic diversification. Look, if you will, at the

projects like the NewGrade heavy oil upgrader and the new paper mill being built in Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker - projects which members opposite said would never happen. Let's contrast that to what their solutions were in the early 1980s. They talked about a heavy oil upgrader. And what did they have? They had a name, a location, without anything on paper, no deal, nothing worked out with the industry. They didn't have any concrete plans.

What was their solution to the forest industry? It was to nationalize the pulp industry, spend more hundreds of millions of dollars on that. For what? Not to create anything else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they're going to be the saviours of that industry. They're going to go into a reforestation program and spend hundreds of thousands - hundreds of millions of dollars on reforestation in this province. And I certainly agree that the time has come for more reforestation.

But I would like to contrast our solution to forest management to theirs. Theirs was that they would sell it off, the forest industry, or rape, pillage and plunder with the Crown corporations and then turn to the public treasury to say, we should do some reforestation.

Let's contrast that to what's in place at the present time. Let's look at the management that's there with the forest industries who are utilizing that resource, who are paying dues, who are putting money into a reforestation plan, and who are implementing reforestation projects such as Saskatchewan has never had before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, reforestation projects paid for by the industry who's utilizing that resource in our province. Mr. Speaker, those projects are creating thousands of new jobs and at the same time are broadening our economic base and diversifying our economy.

Other major projects like the Gainer bacon plant in North Battleford and the Intercontinental Packers' expansion in Saskatoon are helping to strengthen and diversify our province's agricultural sector, as well as providing hundreds of new jobs in those industries.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on listing the hundreds of new and expanded projects that are contributing to the process of economic diversification in Saskatchewan. Not all of them, I admit, are large like the larger scale Vanguard recreational vehicle plant in North Battleford, or the Phillips Cable plant in Moose Jaw, but they are creating jobs and they're breathing new life into our province's economy.

The member from Regina Rosemont talked about one of the methods to create economic activity and diversity is through a policy of public ownership, and he said that should take place. Mr. Speaker, we've got community-based enterprises that he talked about, which I believe is a form of public ownership, when you have local municipalities contributing to economic development in their areas.

Mr. Speaker, we've got a major initiative in Department of Rural Development to promote just such things. We presently have a number of them that are up and running, and I would say that the most significant example is in the

community of Wood Mountain, where they have initiated new industry in their community - industry that they felt they needed, industry that utilized the resources that they had available, Mr. Speaker, and industry to create jobs for the young people in their own area. If that isn't an example of community-based enterprises and public ownership, I would like to know what they're talking about. I'm not so sure that they really know about it.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about small-scale private ownership, the individual enterprises. I don't know if they think that small-scale private projects or individual-ownership enterprises operate without profit. I don't know a single one of them that do. It seems to me that they have a double standard: profit is fine if you're just so big, but don't try and get your head above the water because we're going to knock you down. But don't let somebody get bigger, because they don't fit into our plans for the future. We don't want the people investing big dollars. We just want the little guy out in his town.

Mr. Speaker, we've also seen major changes in some of our other things in Saskatchewan, and I think particularly of some of the ones that are creating new jobs, that are looking to the future, Mr. Speaker. The NDP opposite would say, take me back to the past. Take me back to the past. Our solution to economic development is to buy up your farms, to buy up your mines, to buy up your forest industry. We want to own it. We want to control it. We're going to have our thumb on it.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop for a moment and look to the future. Let's look at the new high-technology companies, specialized service companies, small manufacturers and processors who have expanded, who have built since we've taken government. Mr. Speaker, governments . . . or companies that are emphasizing innovation, companies that are emphasizing high technology and, most of all, knowledge. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things of the future, and we are pleased that those companies are coming to Saskatchewan and are expanding within our province. Mr. Speaker, they're part of that new trend that is visible in many places in our world and every facet of our society today as we become more and more dependent on high technology and on the knowledge-based industries.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that they create fewer jobs than the blue-collar industries, due to the higher degree of automation and technology involved. But they are a wave of the future, Mr. Speaker, and Saskatchewan must be prepared for that future. And this government is dealing with that future.

Mr. Speaker, being near 5 o'clock, and I have many, many . . . Mr. Speaker, having many more things to say, I would like to beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 p.m.