

EVENING SITTING
COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
Motions for Interim Supply

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, this is the third interim supply appropriation Bill.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$287,170,100 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1988.

I've advised the hon. opposition critic that I'm advised that the only one exceeding the one-twelfth or less, where in previous interim supplies we've done more than the one-twelfth, is the legislative amount of \$30,000 for additional postage costs, again for legislature.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to make the speech I made last time because the member from Regina South really wants me to make it, but I think rather than doing that I will simply mail him a copy of it and he'll be able to read it — or to any of his constituents who may request to receive it.

The minister is correct, Mr. Chairman. He did inform me that there was a slight additional amount of money beyond the regular one-twelfth. This one-twelfth is a normal procedure. We have never, in this session, stopped the passing of the interim supply Bill on the basis of one-twelfth. The money needs to be there to pay the wages of people who work for the government and to provide funding for municipalities and so on. But I might add that the money is also in this one-twelfth being provided for what still is continuing to be a massive government advertising program, much of it not necessary — money that could have been better spent on other good purposes like dental care programs and so on.

We make those points in the estimates, and we'll be asking the ministers all the questions that must be asked as to how much money is being spent, who's benefiting from these expenditures, which advertising firms, and so on. I would far rather there be less than one-twelfth in some of the departments so some of the money be held back for a day further in the fiscal year when they could be better spent. But nevertheless an interim supply Bill needs the one-twelfth, and we certainly are going to agree to it.

The other point I want to make is here we are passing an interim supply Bill for the sixth month of the fiscal year. Now that is extremely unusual. It's never happened before, and it's only being done now, and it has to be done, because the budget didn't come in till June rather than in March or late February — but usually in March as it usually has. We've made that point before, and I won't take the time of the House to make that point again. I think the record is there, and the public knows and the public has expressed concern not only to my colleagues on this side of the House, but I'm sure to all the members on the other side of the House.

It is only my hope and my wish that they have gotten the message so that the next fiscal year, when we are about to go end this one and start the other one on April 1st, we will have a budget in place, delivered in this House, debated or in the process of debating; so that the school boards and the municipalities and non-profit organizations and other groups that depend on government to redistribute the wealth of the province, so that they can operate so that the budget is timely, so that they don't have to wait again, so that they know where they stand.

But also in the spirit of that same argument, Mr. Chairman, I want to close by saying we're going to agree to the passage of this interim supply Bill now and expeditiously, for the sake of those people and those kinds of organizations who rely on this funding and must have it and must know that they are going to be able to get it so that they can plan appropriately and get their very important functions and their jobs done.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to be very brief because my colleague has on previous occasions covered off the various areas of our concern. But I think one of the things that should be pointed out here is our problem in being able to deal with this present Minister of Finance.

Here is a Minister of Finance who last year indicated that he was going to have a \$389 million deficit, and brought in a deficit of \$1 billion in addition. And what we see today, he indicates that he wants appropriation of part of the budget. But not only is he asking for one-twelfth of what is appropriated, but he hasn't apparently even completed bringing in his budget. Because he presented to this House his budget, and then a week, or about two weeks ago, he stood up in this House, or at least one of his ministers did, and said, I want to have further taxes on the people of this province because this is not really the budget; I'm continuing to extract more money from the people of Saskatchewan. And so what he did is to add on some more taxes in respect to the licence fee and the registration fee, and he taxed the people of this province another 18 million over and above what he had in his budget.

What I'm saying to . . . I'm saying to the people of this province that Finance minister lost his credibility and everybody in Saskatchewan knows it. For him to stand in this House, the way that he has mismanaged this province, and to continue in office, is absolutely a disgrace and an insult to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — As my colleague has said, here we are sitting on August — the 64th day of the sitting of this House; we're almost into September. And this outfit across the way is saying we're going to be managing the province. What a farce, what an incredible farce to be putting forward that these people are in charge of anything.

And so I say in approving this here, because many of the municipalities and the school boards and so on require

their money . . . But I want to make it perfectly clear to the people of this province that this Minister of Finance is incapable of continuing in that office, and what he has done is to ignore the people of this province and this budget and now is continuing to tax 18 million on licence and registration, subsequent increases in liquor and beer – additional revenues.

So when he brings in a budget, it doesn't mean a thing to this legislature. It didn't mean a thing when he went into the election, when he said at 389 and then he spent another billion trying to get you birds elected. And today, even today he hasn't learned his lesson, because he has brought in his budget and he is scorning the people in this legislature by putting in additional taxes outside the purview of the budget.

And so I say, we will support it, but the management of the affairs of this province leaves a lot to be desired. To think that we're into September and we haven't even passed the budget. And the Minister of Health sits and laughs. He thinks it's funny. The only reason that we're sitting here with this here appropriation is the fact that you wouldn't face the people in the normal time of the year. That's the reason that we're here. We're here because you're trying to slide it through in the summer-time when people may not be able to pay attention to it.

And so I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that while we're going to support the appropriation, we have many misgivings in the respect to the affairs of this government, the increased taxes outside of the budget, and the disrespect for all of the citizens of Saskatchewan in providing a budget in an orderly fashion as it should have been in March or in February, so that we could be . . . and the people would know, and would have the full amount of money.

So we'll support it. But let it be clear that this government has lost its credibility with the people of this province. They're incompetent, they're wasteful, they can't manage – and that's the short of it. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the hon. member from the Quill Lakes for his usual contribution to the high level of debate in this Assembly, and his statesmanlike approach was obviously, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the first step in his leadership campaign. I know most hon. members on this side of the House wish him well in his endeavours. I know, Mr. Chairman, that as leader of the party opposite, if he ever girded his loins and screwed up his courage and did what he really wanted to do when he tried to dump the Leader of the Opposition a few years back, I would hope that the hon. member really, really put his money where his mouth is, Mr. Speaker, and jumps into the leadership race. I know that . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Could I have order, please! Order, please. Order. I'd ask all members, please, to try to contain their enthusiasm from both sides at this time, please.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Be it resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty in account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, the sum of \$287,170,100 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$41,063,800 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1988.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lane: —

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1988, the sum of \$41,063,800 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

(1915)

The committee reported progress.

FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lane: — By leave of the Assembly, I move that the resolutions be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the resolutions read a first and second time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Mr. Lane: — By leave of the Assembly, I move:

That Bill No. 35, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending on March 31, 1988, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — By leave of the Assembly, and under rule 48(2), I move the Bill be now read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill read a second and third time and passed under its title.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Human Resources, Labour and Employment
Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 20**

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, just before the supper break we were talking about the one form of job creation undertaken by the government of the minister opposite, in terms of creating jobs – patronage jobs – for his former political colleagues. However, we won't pursue that any longer this evening. Everybody in Saskatchewan knows that this is probably the most patronage riddled government in the history of the province, and the amount of money flowing into the pockets of Tory hacks and friends is probably unprecedented in the history of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, as the minister responsible for . . . however, minister responsible for the Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, development, I wonder, sir, if your department in 1986 or 1987 . . . or whether there is any in the budget for 1987-1988, for payments from your department to pay for the Coopers & Lybrand consulting study re the government reorganization.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the answer is no, we haven't paid anything to Coopers & Lybrand.

We have a little unfinished business from earlier this afternoon, and that is that . . . and the member opposite continues the evening talking about patronage, and he even raises the former member Rousseau, now in London representing the province of Saskatchewan. And this is not . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order. I did make the ruling just at 5 o'clock that we would try to stay more with the topic. I know the topic was raised at that time. I did not rule it out of order. So I would like you to answer the question and let's just continue on from there.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you may have made the ruling before 5, but it certainly was forgotten by the member from Rosemont who carried on. And if he's going to talk about Rousseau, I want to talk about Johnson, their MLA who was defeated and served in the position before Rousseau did. It seems that's fair.

I have a list this long in reply to his allegations of patronage. I won't read it here – I respect your ruling – but it is a very long list. It's a very, very long list, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

The question here is . . . I will abide by your ruling and not talk about NDP patronage if they will abide by the ruling, and that seems fair. And so, therefore, I won't, and I will see if they can follow a ruling for a change, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The answer to the question is, no, we haven't paid anything.

Mr. Lyons: — Did you say, no, we haven't paid any? Is that your answer, that your department, the department responsible for, paid nothing for, and paid out any amount whatsoever for the Coopers & Lybrand consultants sum? Was your answer, no, we did not pay any?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, my paymaster tells me that we haven't received a bill, and we haven't paid a bill because we haven't received one.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister: did Coopers & Lybrand carry out a consulting study in regards to your department? Did they carry out a consulting study, and are you anticipating the bill from Coopers & Lybrand?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The answer is, yes, there was a study in our department. The answer to your second question is, we don't know if we will receive a bill. We are not certain whether the Executive Council is handling the bill for that or whether it's paid by each individual department. At present we have not received the bill.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister: are you saying and telling the people of Saskatchewan that your government doesn't know who is going to pay the bill for Coopers & Lybrand, that the government hasn't made up its mind, despite the fact that they commissioned a study? Are you saying that they commissioned a study to study government reorganization and didn't know who was going to pay them? Do you expect anybody to believe that?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — From what I can gather, excellent work has been done by this firm and their bill will be paid either out of the right pocket or the back pocket or the chest pocket – not the left pocket. The left doesn't pay bills from that point of view, but it will be paid out of one of the pockets. It will be paid by the taxpayers. And I can't tell you exactly which form it will be paid out of, but it will be paid out of the supply that we vote here regularly and out of the budget.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, do you happen to know who the authorizing agency for the contract was? Who contracted Coopers & Lybrand, and precisely, how you see them being billed for the services they have rendered? Has your department submitted a bill? Do you know if the Executive Council intends to submit a bill?

Since you sit on the Executive Council, it seems to me that you would probably be someone who would have access to that kind of information, or in fact, if you're saying that there was no budgetary items to your knowledge, am I to take it that in fact there was nothing in your department budgeted for this?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The answer, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is that our department did not specifically retain these people to do a study of our department. As part of the overall review of the government, they appeared one day and did their work and left and wrote a report.

And I've had a glance at the report. And I don't have a copy of the report, and when it's made public, you will get a copy the same as everyone else, and if it's not made public, you won't. And as you know, the decisions and discussions of Executive Council are not matters of public record, and I won't go into what Executive Council did.

(1930)

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, I'm not asking you to reveal all the internal discussions within Executive Council. I am asking you about decisions that Executive Council took. Those decisions, sir, are in regards to public spending. They are open for public scrutiny, and you are incorrect when you say they're not.

What I'm asking you is: if you do not have any item budgeted to pay Coopers & Lybrand for their study, where would one look to find the budgeted items, to find that budgetary item which would pay for the study on government reorganization? Where would I look to find that in the budget?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I think you should look to the Premier and his estimates; he's overall in charge of the government. And simply put, we are not going to give you an explanation of things that we do not control in our department. We have not budgeted for it, we have not received a bill, and should we receive a bill, we would be prepared to pay our fair share. But as you indicate, we don't have any money, so maybe they won't get paid. I don't know, they'll have to worry about it.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I wonder, Mr. Minister, given that you said that the department has done good work, and it is obvious from the state of affairs in your department, there's certainly some question as to whether or not they did good work or not given what's happening with your department. I wonder could you tell us, has the Coopers & Lybrand group made any recommendation in regards to the study they did that affects your department. And I wonder if you would tell us here tonight what those recommendations were, if any, and how did they affect the question of job programs and employment development in the province.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well they gave us some suggestions and we are looking at implementing them.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I wonder if the . . . I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd be so kind, given that you're consuming large amounts of taxpayers' money when you, yourself, admit you pay over \$50,000 a year in personal income tax, I wonder if you'd do your job and tell the people of the province precisely what kind of recommendations they put forward and which recommendation it is that you are considering.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well to say to the member opposite, we're considering all of the recommendations. But on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, I was, as you were, elected to apply our judgement, and we have a greater duty on this side of the House, being the government, to use this judgement wisely. And we will give all of those recommendations consideration, and when government has decided which of those recommendations are beneficial to the people of Saskatchewan, we will either advise you through ministerial statements or through a press release or through regulations that you will read as soon as they are published. In the usual manner, you will find out. And we have really no greater duty to you as a member to advise you of the government's decisions than we do to the

public, and the public will be informed when we've decided. So there are some useful suggestions and they will be implemented and they will save the public money.

Mr. Lyons: — I shudder, Mr. Minister, I shudder when I hear you say they will be implemented and they will save the public money because, given your government's records of saving the government's money, we've gone from a surplus budgetary position in this province to a \$3.4 billion debt, which is your record when it comes to saving the government's money.

Mr. Minister, you say that you are elected to exercise your judgement and the public is paying you to exercise your judgement. And with all respects due to you, sir, I think the government certainly has got a bad bargain in terms of persons who are elected to exercise that judgement in dealing with yourself when it comes to the question of job creation.

I have here ads, Mr. Minister, that deal with the question of job creation, that deal with the whole question of your government and yourselves judgement. And I refer to a document from 1985 called *Partnership for Progress* — "Working Together to Build a Stronger Tomorrow," and under that there's employment. I'm sure you're familiar with this document. And there's a picture of a worker with a hard hat working in one of our publicly owned potash mines so that the benefits will accrue to the people of the province.

It talks about employment development strategy, and it goes on talking about the next five years and the national perspective and the annual rate of unemployment in Saskatchewan and how the rate of unemployment has been rising and rising in Saskatchewan. And here on page 18 of that document under the title "Saskatchewan Strategy: The Next Five Years," there is a little part which says:

A five-year plan of action for the first of these — education and training — has been proposed earlier in this document.

The government wishes now to propose a corresponding five year plan of action to address the second and third stages of employment development — transitional programs and long-term economic growth.

And I want to remind the minister, this is a 1985 document and it's talking about a five-year plan for job development. And it says:

To finance and direct this plan, the government is creating a new Employment Development Fund. \$600 million will be allocated to this Fund over the next five years, beginning with \$120 million in 1985-86.

And then it goes on to talk about that in 1985-86 the money will be allocated in the following way. And at the back of the document it says:

For further information call or write: The Hon.

Gary Lane, Minister in Charge of Employment Development Agency, Room 345, Legislative Building, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Now \$600 million was promised by your government in the employment development fund to treat the problem of steadily rising unemployment in this province. That was 1985; that's not so far ago.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, could you tell us what happened to your government's promise to put \$600 million into the employment development fund? In fact, Mr. Minister, could you tell us where the employment development fund has gone and why it doesn't even appear in this year's budget estimates?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I remember the *Partnership For Progress* report very well. As a matter of fact, I drove past the Santa Maria nursing home in Regina yesterday, and I saw a sign that said Partnership For Progress, 48 nursing homes beds being built there at Santa Maria. And there you have some of the employment development fund — people employed to build care homes for senior citizens.

The same sign stands in front of St. Paul Lutheran Home in Melville, which is in my constituency, and there's a 30-unit addition to St. Paul Lutheran Home in Melville. There is part of the employment development fund, and I might say it was a long time in coming.

I recall that under the NDP government, the city of Melville actually had a reduction in nursing-home beds — an actual reduction when the old wing closed and was not replaced. And it took until now, and, as a matter of fact, on September 28 of this year, there will be the official opening of the addition to replace the beds that were closed by the NDP government many years ago. So Melville will now be getting back to the number of nursing-home beds that it had before the NDP started reducing the number.

That fund has been spent in many ways. Every day I drive past the Wascana Hospital — Rehabilitation Hospital — spent on health, \$54 million on the Wascana Hospital. And on the Wascana Hospital, a \$54 million expenditure that no one on your side of the House remembers, notices, seems to care about, it's forgotten. Do you realize that \$54 million is a substantial expenditure for a hospital, and if that hospital were built, in parts of Saskatchewan, it would be a monument. It would be noticed by every person. But you don't want to talk about that. You don't want to talk about rehabilitation of workers. You don't want to talk about that because it's in Regina, and all the jobs are going to your constituents.

So there you have the employment development fund. Money has been channelled back to the departments. We no longer operate, out of my department, a massive fund of that nature. Each department is using it for education or for health. And there you have the explanation.

And the member from Moose Jaw talks about St. Anthony's. I believe he's very interested in having that nursing home proceed. I can point out that it will proceed.

An. Hon. Member: — When?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — When, is what the people of Saskatchewan were asking, and you ask, when? When, is what the people of Saskatchewan were asking for many, many years.

And I recall the first political speech I made. It was for the NDP when the candidate, John Kowalchuk, fell ill in 1975, and he asked me to go and speak in Neudorf, Saskatchewan, and he had a prepared speech. He had a prepared speech in 1975, and the prepared speech denounced the Liberal government for closing the hospital in Neudorf, Saskatchewan, and promised them a nursing home. And it still isn't there. So, when — when is the question, when?

These are the kind of promises that were made by your government, and when, is: we will build it very soon. But you had many, many years. How long was your constituency represented by an NDP? And why isn't it there now? That's the question. So when you say "when," it will be done when possible, and that will be in the very near future. In the very near future, you will have the nursing home in Moose Jaw, not because you as the MLA have earned that, but because your people need it.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, well, Mr. Chairman, we talk about digressing from the topic, and there's a . . . the question, and there is, I think there's a very good reason why the minister stands there and liked to talk about everything else under the sun except the question.

And the question was very simple, Mr. Minister. In 1985, *Partnership For Progress* promised \$600 million for an employment development fund. Now in 1985, plus five years will take us to 1990 — that's five years, that's five years. I know your Minister of Finance probably can't add that way, given his record of addition and mathematics in this province, but surely you who are a highly-trained lawyer and someone who pays \$50,000 a year in income tax, surely you can add 1985 and five to come up with 1990 together.

In those five years, your government promised \$600 million, and it's signed by the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Gary Lane. That's what this document says. He promised \$600 million for the employment development fund. Now for the people of the province who haven't had the opportunity to look in the budget, I defy them should they pick up a copy of this budget to find where there is — not just the \$600 million that you and your government promised the people of Saskatchewan — but the employment development fund. Not only have you not lived up to your promise of \$600 million for jobs for Saskatchewan citizens, you've done away with the vehicle that was supposed to deal with those jobs, which over and over and over again, in budget speeches and in hundreds of thousands of dollars of ads which you plastered all over this province, that you promised, you promised the people of Saskatchewan \$600 million for jobs.

You have failed to carry out that promise. You have failed to carry out that promise. You have abolished the

employment development fund. There is no employment development fund with \$600 million despite the fact that you were going to carry this over a five-year action plan for jobs.

(1945)

The question to you is, Mr. Minister, was it you who decided to do away with the employment development fund, or was it your . . . was it the Premier, was it Executive Council, or in the Coopers & Lybrand study to which we've already referred? Was that one of the recommendations that you are going to save Saskatchewan people money, that you're going to save the people of Saskatchewan money by not putting money into employment development, something which you promised to do for five years, two years ago, in another Conservative promise broken? Is that what happened? You broke your word again?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Some of my colleagues indicated that question wasn't worthy of comment. I'm rather sympathetic to that view. The member has forgotten about the home program, the Saskatchewan home improvement program. I would submit that if you had that program and hospitals and nursing homes and new technical schools in Prince Albert, and you add all of these things together, you have an expenditure in excess of \$600 million. It is not 1990 yet, or whatever year you've decided the five-year plan will end on. But when we have gone through that full five years, \$600 million will be a small sum compared to what will be spent in this province, and that will be spent primarily on health, education, seniors, and justice, and all of those things are essential in this province.

The Premier has already advised you that the home program has created 17,000 jobs in this province. I have already pointed out to you this afternoon, after you boasted about creating 9,000 jobs per year, that our average is running at 12,000 jobs per year. I really don't know what you would expect. The government does not work miracles but this government is efficient. This government does what has to be done. This government does what is right. This government has principles and they do not revolve around socialism.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Chairman, the question, very simple: Mr. Minister, did you make the decision to do away with the employment development fund?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The employment development fund is allocated as part of my department. We're talking here about estimates, about a budget. We're talking about accounting. It's a question of accounting, where you allocate the money. This year it's not allocated in my department, it's allocated in the departments that will be spending the money on employment development.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, well, that's interesting. Mr. Minister, where would one go to see the \$600 million that's been allocated? And why was it that you talked about as one of the four pillars that along with health and education and something else, that you were going to build jobs through the employment development fund? You abolished it. You don't have any money for job development in that

fund.

You are the minister who's mainly responsible for employment development. And are you trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan that you're drawing down a salary that makes you pay \$50,000 a year or more in income tax alone and you don't have any money to administer? That when it comes to responsibility for employment, you don't have any responsibility for employment development, and that it's some other minister, and that you're drawing your salary through a façade and a sham? Is that what you're trying to tell the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well you will find the expenditures in the blue book, pages 16 to page 100. And in there you'll find all of those expenditures that we've referred to.

I don't really know why the member opposite has such a dislike for people like myself who pay income tax. The member opposite always wishes to tax the rich and because he wishes to tax the rich . . .

An Hon. Member: — Aren't you rich?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I don't know if I'm rich; I'm certainly not poor. But he should like people who have incomes that are large and incomes that can be taxed and used for expenditures. Expenditures is something that the member opposite clearly enjoys — spending government money. And I do my share to contribute towards it. And certainly my salary as a cabinet minister is quite clear, and I don't pay that large amount of income tax on my cabinet salary.

I was not like the NDP. I saved for leaner years and have some savings. The NDP government squandered in the seven fat years, and now we're in world economic times that are leaner years, and there is nothing saved. Well the legacy of the members opposite is Crown corporations with debt and a Heritage Fund that is fictitious. And that's the legacy we are left with.

And personally, I saved my money when I earned it. I paid my taxes, and I saved the balance. I am not ashamed of paying taxes. I'm not particularly happy to pay gigantic amounts of taxes, but I do pay them as a matter of duty.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, once again you've failed to answer the question. Your government did away with the \$600 million employment development fund. You can look all you like through the budget and you won't see \$600 million dedicated to employment development in one kind of fund or another.

And if you're saying that it was given to somebody else, then you're drawing your salary . . . you're drawing your salary as the minister responsible for employment. The people of Saskatchewan are certainly getting a bad deal when they're paying you to do something that you don't have any money to do anything with.

However, it's no wonder that you want to talk about everything else under the sun except employment development and your government's record. I mean, you can talk about the \$50,000 that you pay in income tax or

how hard you worked.

And by the way, by the way, in regards to how hard you work, Mr. Minister, wasn't it true that you yourself said you're a self-confessed parasite on the people? Didn't you say that's what lawyers were – that they were self-confessed parasites that didn't earn their keep and that you were taking money out under false pretences?

It seems to me that in one of your forays into some sort of folksy humour, you've kind of slandered the lawyers of this province by calling them all parasites. Or is it just yourself that's the parasite and is taking money under false pretence? I think maybe the lawyers on this side would certainly like to know.

However, Mr. Minister, the \$600 million that you promised for jobs and didn't deliver, is not the first time, is not the first that you or your government have broken promises that you've put down in writing. I refer right now to an ad that I have here from 1982, and it's got your picture on it, and it says:

Elect (your name – and I know it's not the custom to use people's names here – so your name) the progressive alternative. There's so much more we can be.

I just want to read, Mr. Minister, of promises you made to the people and how it relates to job employment and the fact that they haven't got jobs in this province because your government hasn't kept its promises.

In 1982 you personally, with your picture on it here, promise to roll back the 20 per cent gasoline tax, sales tax, to reduce provincial income tax by 10 per cent, to remove the 5 per cent E&H tax. And that was all part of your plan to stimulate investment in the province and create jobs. You haven't carried out any of them.

Government management – to ensure efficient management of the Crown corporations and provide service at cost to the public. Well the cost of the public in this province that your management of the Crown corporations is \$3.4 billion in debt and a \$2.3 billion debt on Sask Power alone.

It says here that you promise to protect consumers by Public Utilities Review Commission. Where is it? Is that another one of your promises broken?

It says that you'd open the books on government business. And we have your Justice minister saying, we're not interested in freedom of information, we're not going to open the books.

So there you sit, there you stand during these estimates and not answer any of the questions put forward to you – simple, straightforward questions. It doesn't matter what we on the other side ask, you find some smart-aleck remark to try to answer back, some smart-aleck remark. We know where that gets you, Mr. Minister. We know where your smart-aleck remarks get you.

To establish freedom of information – that's another one of your promises. Because the people of this province

want to see where their money is going and what your government's plans were, particularly when it comes to job creation, because that was your number one priority.

It says, concern for people – real families can count on a Progressive Conservative government to provide mortgage interest assistance. You carried that out, I'll grant you that.

Reduce taxes, another promise broken. And to hold the line on utility costs, another promise broken. Funding for health and education will be increased. It was increased, but not with the rate of inflation and not to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people. But to get to the point:

. . . rewarding permanent jobs will be the major emphasis of the Progressive Conservative development strategy. You know, there is so much more we can be.

And it's got your picture here and it's signed as a progressive alternative.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, since you put your name on this kind of document and made it public and that you promised that you would have an employment development strategy for this province, where is it? Where is your employment development strategy, and why is it that you did away with a \$600 million employment development fund, and why have we seen unemployment in this province double since your government took office?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The question, Mr. Chairman, is: are we still on the topic? That's the question.

The question of where lawyers fit into society, I could probably understand. And you will notice that socialists in their manifesto talk about the means of production, and, therefore, we have some common agreement that the most elementary forms of our society, the most necessary, are the means of production. And that's where we differ. You wish to have the state own all of the means of production.

When I refer to lawyers and politicians and other elements of society, you are talking about people who are not involved in primary production. You are talking about people who provide services to those people who provide primary production.

Our differences are so great politically in that you believe in the means of production being owned by the state, for the state, the people working for the government.

Now on the other hand what we are looking at is the means of production owned by individuals, the people. People working for themselves, with a government to govern them, not to own them. That's the difference.

And when you talk about who is a parasite on society, the only parasites that I can think of are democratic socialists. That's the only that I can think of . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Everyone else pays their way. Lawyers operate in a free market economy, and they're paid what people think they are worth. And if people think they are worthless, they starve or they go broke. And there are lawyers who go bankrupt. Other lawyers are considered to be worth more and are paid more. And usually lawyers are judged by the amount of business that they have, and certainly I stand proud against that standard and have been a long-standing member of the law society who has never been accused of any dishonesty or any sharp practices.

You talk about election promises in 1982, and when one makes a promise or a prediction on how they would govern, it has to be based on some facts. And one of the facts of that prediction and that article that you read was made on, was based on the facts that the NDP government said at the time, we have a \$1 billion in our Heritage Fund. And if you assume that to be correct, that there's \$1 billion in the Heritage Fund, then it is quite possible to reduce taxes.

However, you said, why didn't we open the books. We did open your books, and what we could find was an atrocious management mess. And tell me, why did the shredders in this building work continuously? Why did people shred documents after the 1982 election? Because you as a government at that time had much to hide. You tried to have the people believe that there was \$1 billion Heritage Fund.

And then you say, well the Conservatives didn't keep every promise. Well maybe we didn't keep absolutely every promise. But I could tell you this, that we kept about 95 per cent, and that is a pretty good track record considering that the world changes from day to day and from year to year. And the economies of the world, the economics of our life, and the lives of people in this province, in Canada, in the world, change from time to time. However, you wouldn't understand that, so I'll leave it at that.

(2000)

Mr. Lyons: — Well I find it, Mr. Chairman, somewhat amusing to decide . . . have the Minister of Human Resources and economy decide what I know and I don't know.

We were talking about the \$600 million employment development fund, which a long time ago I asked him: was it the minister who made the decision to do away with it? He still has refused to answer that question. He's refused to answer every reasonable question put to him. So maybe we'll have to start asking some unreasonable questions, ask him about things he doesn't know about, like adding two and two together, doing things like that. Because obviously he can't do his own arithmetic.

Here in the estimates, he talks about the Heritage Fund, Saskatchewan Heritage Fund, and when he inherited it, there was an awful mess, and that there was no money in the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund. And if people in this province were to look at the records that are contained — and they're all public in the estimates, put forward by

governments — you would find a record in this Saskatchewan Heritage Fund that absolutely contradicts what the minister just said.

Now I don't believe it's because the minister is a stranger to the truth. I just think that the minister doesn't know what he's talking about when it comes . . . he doesn't know what he's talking about when it comes to employment development. Because if he did know, he'd be able to answer some very direct and straightforward questions put to him.

But I would just remind the minister that in '85-86, for example, the total budgetary revenue for the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund was \$826,775 times 1,000. It's doesn't take very much to add three zero's on that. You will see that the Heritage Fund was more than \$1 million. It was getting closer to 1 billion. And if you go back, you will see that in the back of this book, for the year when the NDP was in power, the balance books when the NDP was in power, that the Heritage Fund had those kind of revenues in it.

Tonight, Mr. Minister, we just passed a Bill of interim supply which took, I believe, 41 million out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund. While you and your party go around and try to persuade the citizens of Saskatchewan that the Heritage Fund was empty, that there wasn't anything there, the facts once again speak for themselves. And it's those fact, sir, that you are a stranger to. The truth may be relative in instances in politics, but the facts will speak for themselves. The facts, in terms of your performance in government, will speak eloquently, particularly when it comes to the next election as it did in the last election.

Because while you talked about, in your diatribes against the socialist hordes, or whatever, that their day was done . . . and I remember the speeches between 1982 and 1986 when you and others of your ilk would go on in your flights of fancies and your right wing ideological meanderings, while you were getting out there in right field with Madsen Pirie and the Adam Smith Institute and Maggie Thatcher. While you were doing that you were also destroying the economic and job opportunities for people in this province.

Now I'm asking you again, sir, a very straightforward question. Did you, as Minister for Human Resources, Labour and Employment, make the decision to do away with the \$600 million employment development fund? Was that your decision?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well the member opposite, Mr. Deputy Chairman, talks about the last election and the election before that and looks forward to the next election, and he will be looking forward to the election after that and the election after that, and will be looking forward to many, many elections. I didn't really hear him say that he was going to win the next election. And I look forward to it as well. But when you really get back to who is right or wrong, who is right or wrong here in this political discussion, you should really check. October 20, 1986 was the last major play-off game and I recall the score was 38 to 25. And it's the score that counts. I would submit that the better government won.

Therefore, it's rather strange that you refer to Margaret Thatcher and how unsuccessful she is as a political leader and in running a government. It seems to me that if you will check the records, her record is three and zero, and she has yet to lose to your socialist colleagues over there, and she will probably retire the champion – undefeated.

In answer to your question that did I make the decision to transfer the employment development fund back to the department, the answer is, I was part of it and it was the right thing to do.

Mr. Lyons: — I wonder, Mr. Minister, would you tell the people of Saskatchewan why you decided to abolish the employment development fund?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — We didn't abolish the fund, we're just not doing a separate accounting of the fund at this time.

Mr. Lyons: — No, Mr. Minister, that's not true. There is nowhere in this budget estimates, as there was in last year's budget estimates, an item called employment development fund. Once again, once again you are not telling the truth to the people of the province. Just as you said, we didn't do away – what was it? We didn't terminate the . . . No – we didn't abolish it, we terminated it. Once again you are up to your jiggy-pokery with your tongue, and it's going to get you in a whole pile more trouble.

Now you have done away with the employment development fund. There is no item in this budget called the employment development fund, as there was in last year's employment development fund. Why did you do away . . . You said you had good reasons to do it. Why did you do away with the employment development fund? What good reasons were there to abolish a \$600 million job creation fund?

Perhaps you'd like to elaborate on that for the people of this province. You abolished the fund. Why did you do it?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, the question has already been answered.

Mr. Lyons: — No, Mr. Chairman, the question has not been answered. The question was, why? The first question that the minister answered: did he? He answered yes. Then he said he had good reasons for abolishing the employment development fund. I want the minister to tell us why he abolished the employment development fund. What good reasons were there when we have the highest unemployment rate, particularly among young people, in the history of Saskatchewan? Why did you abolish the employment development fund?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, the question has already been answered. I could only repeat that the member should drive past the nursing homes in this province and the hospital projects, and the Wascana hospital at \$54 million. He should probably go drive around the province, look at every one of the signs, add up the sums on the signs, take into account that this is a \$600 million fund over five years, which would be what?

An Hon. Member: — \$120 million an year.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — \$120 million a year. Thank you. That was very helpful of you.

At \$120 million it doesn't take long for a \$54 million hospital and a \$12 million Northern Institute of Technology to add up to that kind of money. So all I can say is that the members opposite should drive around the province, look at those signs that say "Partnership for Progress," add up the dollar signs that are on those signs, and they will get to a sum in the range of \$600 million when the appropriate time has expired. I believe the member from Moose Jaw North will be able to add St Anthony's on to the list. And so you have to be patient and wait until the five years are expired.

Mr. Lyons: — Just a final little question on this. Mr. Minister, are you saying you spent \$600 million and that the fund is therefore depleted? Is that what the impression you're trying to leave with the people of this province? Did you spend \$600 million out of the fund, and is that why the fund's been abolished?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — No, I told you, for accounting . . . Hello. There, that's better. Thank you. Now that I'm no longer the deputy minister, I'm back to being the minister, I can answer the question.

I've indicated to you that this is a matter of accounting, and those funds that were lumped together as the employment development fund are being used in the departments, and that the business of the government is carrying on as usual.

And I don't know what you want us to do – bring a pile of money here and stack it on the centre of the floor and say: there it is; look at it; there is \$600 million. That's not how we operate in the legislature here; we tend to deal in figures and allow the banks to deal with the cheques.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, it's obvious to everybody in Saskatchewan that you're trying to hide the fact that you abolished the employment development fund; that it is not an accounting procedure; that you have, in fact, given up on job creation as the number one priority of your government.

In fact, I would suggest that in about the middle of the summer of 1986 when your poll trend line decided that agriculture would probably earn you more votes than talking about jobs . . . because I know in my own constituency of Regina Rosemont it was about the middle of the summer of 1986 that the Conservative candidate was left out there high and dry because he certainly wasn't winning any brownie points when it came to talking about your job record – that, in fact, that that decision was made.

I still think and submit, Mr. Minister, however, that the actual decision to abolish jobs was yours, and so that you as the minister responsible for employment, now have to bear the brunt, have to bear the brunt of the rising unemployment rate in this province and the kind of economic hardship being wreaked upon the people of

this province.

However, I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can explain to the people of the province why it is that employment has dropped in this province and that unemployment has risen in this province since 1982? Perhaps you'd give us . . . If, in fact, if what you're saying is true – that you've created all these jobs, and you've created all this wealth, and that the free enterprise system is the way to go – why is it that your free enterprise system has not produced the jobs for the people of this province?

And why is it that in 1981 when Saskatchewan was number one in job creation, why it is that you now have been down that long and slippery slope into second place and into third place, and so that provinces in which us socialists play a more important role, because we recognize the need that the government has to lead the way in job creation – why is it, Mr. Minister, that your so-called and vaunted and much defended by yourself free enterprise system isn't able to deliver the goods when it comes to job creation in this province?

And why is it that between 1971 and 1981 the unemployment rate in this province never rose above 6 per cent, and between 1982 and 1986 it's never gone below 6 per cent in this province?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have the labour force statistics – some of them I gave to the members earlier – and that was that Saskatchewan since the election of our government, has increased the labour force by 15 per cent, or 66,000 people. In comparison, British Columbia was up 13 per cent; Alberta, 7 per cent; Manitoba, 11 per cent. So in the last five and a half years the Saskatchewan labour force has increased by 15 per cent; British Columbia, 13 per cent; Alberta, 7 per cent; Manitoba, 11 per cent.

Now that bears further analysis. You will note that Alberta's increase is only 7 per cent and it probably has something to do with the world's economy in oil.

You'll notice that Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, all produce grain. Saskatchewan produces half of the grain in western Canada – about half in Canada, as a matter of fact – and Manitoba produces very little grain and very little oil, so they would not be affected as much by a downturn in agriculture or by a downturn in oil.

Yet Saskatchewan, which produces 15 per cent of Canada's oil, half of the grain, Saskatchewan led the four western provinces in job creation in the labour force with an increase of 15 per cent; Alberta was lowest with 7 per cent because of oil; British Columbia at 13 per cent; and Manitoba at 11 per cent. And so even when oil, potash and grain – oil and potash, they don't have much of it in Manitoba and wouldn't know what to do with it, considering the people they have in charge of potash over there . . . But in any event, when you compare that, Saskatchewan compares very well with the other provinces in western Canada.

(2015)

And so standing on the record, the participation rates are up; there are more people working in Saskatchewan now by many more people than there were five years ago. Five years ago the actual – this is employed people in this province – 420,00 in April of 1982; employed people in July of this year, 475,000. There are 55,000 more people working in Saskatchewan today than they were when the NDP were defeated. And I submit that is progress.

Mr. Lyons: — Well once again, Mr. Minister, you are the ones who have been praising the virtues of free enterprise when it comes to job creation and how all you great capitalists over there are going to create jobs.

I wonder if you'd explain this little news story to us – headline, "Spending down 21 per cent". It's from the *Moose Jaw Times Herald*. It's a Canadian Press story. It says:

Capital spending by large corporations in Saskatchewan is expected to fall 21 per cent in 1987, says a survey by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion. It's the biggest decrease in any province (the biggest decrease in any province). The survey of capital investment plans was conducted by the Department during April and May on 315 large companies, and excludes spending by smaller firms as well as housing, agricultural, fishing, and direct government expenditures.

The survey shows capital spending by large corporations across the country will increase 9 per cent to 26.5 billion this year. The increase is evenly divided between manufacturing and other spending. The largest increases are in electrical electronics and machinery, food, beverage, and all metallic minerals, forest products, trade, finance, and communication. Decreases will occur in oil and gas, pipeline and transportation companies.

Now, Mr. Minister, you have gone up time after time talking about how the . . . that your free enterprise approach to creating jobs and creating investment in the province is working. Perhaps you can explain to the people of the province that your large capitalist friends who control the capital pools in this country are not increasing their spending in Saskatchewan, under a Conservative government friendly to capitalism, but, in fact, here in Saskatchewan are decreasing their spending by 21 per cent, while their increasing their expenditure by 9 per cent across the country.

And I expect, Mr. Minister, if you explore that statistic a little further, you will see that there'll be an increase in capital expenditure by large corporation, including in socialist Manitoba, and that capital investment will create jobs.

Why have your large capitalist buddies bailed out on you here in Saskatchewan, decreased their spending by 21 per cent while they're increasing to 29 per cent across the rest of the country to create, hopefully, some spin-off effects in terms of jobs?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, it's an interesting discussion going on here about the merits of capitalism or the merits of socialism. And I challenge the member opposite to show me the Detroit wall, or the Chicago wall, or the New York wall, or the Toronto wall, or the wall in Vancouver. There is no wall to keep people in the United States. There is no wall to keep people in Toronto. There is no wall to keep people in Regina. We do not have walls in free and capitalist countries. But I could show you the Berlin Wall.

And so you talk about the merits of socialism. Then one of the great advantages of socialism is that there is a lot of employment building walls to keep the people from escaping. That's one of the great job creation projects of socialists. Why is it that China is trying to go to a free market system? Why is it that Russia is considering the same? Why is there such a difference between East and West Germany? I can tell you that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the member opposite asks: do I have any ideas about Saskatchewan? Yes. We are part of the world, and we have to compete in the world, and we have to look at other parts of the world and take their best examples. And you're submitting to us that we follow the worst examples in the world — the worst examples.

I have a cousin who works for Fording Coal, a corporation that you would despise because they're owned by CP (Canadian Pacific). And he has been travelling in and out of China for many years. And the greatest revolution that China ever had took place in one year — the year that they allowed farmers to farm for themselves rather than for the state. He said he came back the following year and you wouldn't know it was the same country. There were farmers who had money. There were farmers who were buying consumer goods.

So I think the world examples settle the argument. There is no discussion. The world argument settles the dispute over which system is best.

In the month of June, unemployment rate in Regina was 5.5 per cent. That, in the very words of your former leader, is very near to full employment. I grant you that the figures weren't as good in Saskatoon as they were in Regina, but could it be that in Regina there was an upgrader being built at that time? Could it be that in Regina there is a \$54 million Wascana hospital and a nursing home? Could it be all those things? I think it's quite possible.

When you talk about capital investment, it's quite possible that investors were scared off. If you recall, we had an election last October. No investor with any ability would consider investing in this province when there is any danger of the NDP forming a government. And there was some danger, but the danger has passed. And I expect that in the next four years the stability will lead this province to greater prosperity.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I've been sitting here with a great deal of interest listening to the philosophical discussions that we are having. I would ask the members to try to get a little bit back on the specifics of Human Resources, Labour and Employment. And although I'm

very interested in China and all this kind of thing as well, I would ask both the questioner and, certainly, the minister to try to be a little bit more specific and to the topic, please.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Chairperson, the question I had asked that led to the minister's wanderings were in regards to capital spending by large corporations, which according to his reckoning will create jobs, and the fact that it fell by 21 per cent, or is expected to fall by 21 per cent in 1987.

Now the election, to my recollection, was held in 1986. They formed the government prior to 1987. I take it then that what the minister is saying is that the election of 1986 led to the scaring away of capital investment out of this province. He says, and I think it's only fair, he said that if it was scared away by the thought of an election of an NDP government . . . I think what has happened in fact, are the opposite has been proved. In 1987 it's expected to fall by 21 per cent. I guess the only conclusion that we've got is that capitalists around the world knew that people like the Minister of Human Resources, Employment and Labour were going to be in charge, and said: no way, Jose, don't want my bucks in Bozoville; I'm not putting into Saskatchewan with these people in charge, not with the kind of record budgets and the kind of economic mismanagement that these people have built up.

Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned the fact that there were going to be walls built, that we didn't have to build walls. Well I may suggest to the minister that maybe he should start building some walls around this province to try to keep in the people who are desperately leaving this province. They are leaving here, since the last two years, they are leaving here in droves.

Mr. Minister, I have here the out migration by family status from your own Saskatchewan bureau of statistics. Between January and July of 1987, a total of 13,555 people left this province, sir, and they left it because the Tories were in power. And they knew this was the land of no jobs because your government broke its commitment — your government broke its commitment to spend \$600 million in job creation.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, can you confirm the fact that there were 13,555 people left Saskatchewan between January and July of this year, and that between January and July of last year, an additional 15,493 people left the province, for a total of close to 30,000 people — just a little bit less than 30,000 people? Are those figures from your own bureau of statistics accurate?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I believe that it was Vince Lombardi, but I could be wrong, famous football coach, who said, statistics are for losers. And I've heard a lot of statistics this evening.

As far as I can ascertain, the population of Saskatchewan was very nearly 1 million people in 1931. Statistics verify it; my grandfather told me that; he was always honest with me. And I think we can accept that in 1931, the population of Saskatchewan was very nearly 1 million people.

It took from 1931 to 1984 for us to get over the 1 million mark. And finally in 1984, we show a population of 1,006,900 people. That has gradually grown to 1986, we have 1,021,000. And so our population is gradually growing. It is ageing and it is growing. These are two interesting factors. An ageing population suggests that you have fewer people in the work-force as a percentage, and yet our work-force is growing. So if we're really going to deal in statistics, I would submit that from 1931 to 1984 is a long time for the population of Saskatchewan to not show any substantial growth or to recover.

And I won't even blame the NDP who were government for most of that time, from 1944 until 1981, for all of that problems during that period of time. But even when this province made money in the '70s, our population did not go over a million people. And so where are all those sons and daughters? And I suggest that most of them are in Alberta and British Columbia, and that's why the population of British Columbia is nearly 4 million people and Alberta is over 3 million people, because they did not have a socialist government in those provinces during that period of time.

And in addition, they toyed with a socialist government in Manitoba . . . or in Manitoba they still toy with it. But in British Columbia . . . and it lasted three and a half years and they've never gone back to one again. And I doubt very much if Saskatchewan will ever go back to one either.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, once again the fantasy land rules between your ears. The fact of the matter is this, very simply, sir: you lost 30,000 people from Saskatchewan in the last two years. Do you have any idea how many people Manitoba has gained? Do you know how many people are fleeing the harsh, iron heel of your capitalist rule here in Saskatchewan? Thirty thousand people fleeing from underneath the jackboots of totalitarian PCism.

Do you know how many people have left the province? Thirty thousand.

Do you know how many have gone into the warm embraces of warm, loving motherhood of Manitoba, socialist Manitoba? Got any idea, Mr. Minister? I suggest you check it out.

I suggest you check it out because what's happening — using your own statistics — all those sons and daughters of Saskatchewan are going into the warm and loving embraces of socialist Manitoba because they know they're going to find jobs there and they know they're going to find security for their families there. And they know they're going to find economic well-being in Manitoba because the socialists in Manitoba care about people, while you drive people out of the province and drive capital spending out of the province, because you care for only one thing — your narrow right-wing views of the world, the Madsen Pirie vision of Saskatchewan where everything is in the hands of that great all-encompassing god called dollars and the market-place. That, Mr. Minister, is the real world. The real world is that we have lost people — 30,000 people — because of your economic policies.

(2030)

The question I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, is: given that in the last budget brought down by the present Minister of Finance that the number one priority is no longer jobs, in fact, that jobs have been relegated to almost the bottom of the heap in terms of government priorities, the number one priority seems to be now the selling off of Saskatchewan's resources and of its industries? But given that jobs are no longer your priority and that you've been stripped of the money from the employment development fund, how is it that your government plans to create jobs to bring back some of the 30,000 people that have been lost in the last two years, the majority of whom are between the ages of 20 and 35 — 20 and 35, i.e., the prime of the labour market, those with new ideas, those with the initiative, those with the enthusiasm of youth who you are driving from the province?

How do you propose to bring them back, and how do you propose to put them to work, and how do you propose to promote their economic well-being of themselves and of their families, given that you have had all responsibilities for this matter, in reality, stripped from you?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't have a wall around this province. People move in and people move out. Some people want to experience other parts of Canada and other parts of the world. I may wish to move out of this province some day, and I would hope that I would be allowed to do that.

And I certainly do acknowledge that I have had a hand in having some people moved to Manitoba, and I understand that their civil service has gone up under the NDP from 13,000 to 18,000. It's the big growth industry in Manitoba. And their deficit grows in addition. And members opposite are touchy about the Manitoba deficit. Manitoba receives nearly as much in equalization as this province runs up in a deficit and still has a deficit. Saskatchewan stands up on its feet and takes care of itself, while Manitoba lives on the federal government trough.

If you will look into the civil service of Manitoba — this is why the NDP are so grouchy — you . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Can we have both sides of the House please be quiet. I cannot hear the speaker. Mr. Minister . . . Order, order. I don't believe the minister finished his statement.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, I'll be brief. I was just concluding that there are friends of the NDP that are now working in the civil service of Manitoba, and I am pleased that they're serving in the Manitoba civil service rather than in our civil service. And that's why their numbers are going up over there.

Mr. Lyons: — Well I find it disgusting, Mr. Chairman, that the minister responsible for Human Resources, Employment and Labour in this province makes jokes about the fact that his government has heartlessly and cruelly thrown people out of work. And he has just admitted he threw them out of work, that his government has thrown them out of work because they were members

of the New Democratic Party. And if that isn't the kind of Fascist totalitarianism that we're seeing coming out of the Madsen Piries and the Grant Schmidts of the world, I don't know what is. Here he says, you can't be an NDP member in this province if you want to work in the civil service because he's going to fire you and send you to Manitoba. And that's what he said. That's what he said.

You know, Mr. Minister, it is no wonder, it is absolutely no wonder that, given your insensitivity, given your heartlessness, given your slimy little view of the world, sir, that we have here columns written about you by people like Dale Eisler from the *Leader Post*. It's no wonder that you need five executive assistants to try to put a gag on your face. You've just admitted to the people of this province that you're sending people to Manitoba, that you're firing civil servants because they hold NDP memberships, or may support the NDP party.

Now leaving aside for the moment, leaving aside for the moment how you and that social service Gestapo that was built up by my predecessor in Rosemont, give and leave aside the fact that you love to keep track on people, leave aside the fact that you're going to put people's personal records that are held now in the Crown corporations and will put them out to the private enterprise sector, leave aside that — you're partly in charge of that — I wonder, sir, given your statement in regards to employment development and that it's okay to fire civil servants if they're NDP members . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I cannot hear the speaker. I will ask everyone to be quiet so we can hear the speaker.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, is it any wonder that people like Dale Eisler . . . And I happen to think . . . I want to say this, Mr. Minister. I want to say this with sincerity. I don't like to see public figures savaged in the way that you've been savaged. I happen to think that John Conway, in the article he wrote in *Briarpatch* magazine, that your party hanging you out on a pole and allowing the public to turn the blow torches on you to roast you alive, is probably correct, and that you're the victim of some kind of cruel political joke. I don't like to see public figures held out and roasted like that, but when I read things like this about your . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. I cannot hear the speaker again.

Mr. Lyons: — It goes like this, Mr. Minister, August 13, the *Leader-Post* column by Dale Eisler:

On and on it went. Schmidt bounced from one political *faux pas* to the next, leaving controversy and embarrassment for the government in his wake.

Privately, he was ordered to bite his lip and choose his words carefully. These kinds of statements simply could no longer be tolerated.

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, I think it's time, and I think it's time your government did more than tell you to bite your lip. I think it's time that your leader cut your tongue

off when it comes to saying things . . . coming to have you say things like: we fire the civil servants of Saskatchewan because they hold NDP memberships and we'll send them off to Manitoba.

And I am going to make this prediction, Mr. Minister. And I'm going to make this prediction. Given that you don't take job creation very seriously and that you don't tell the truth about what happens in your government, and you're there as a lightning rod and as a cruel political joke on the people of Saskatchewan, I want to say this to you, I want to say this to you . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I cannot hear the speaker again. I will ask for co-operation once more.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Health wants to enter the debate and defend the kind of statement just made by the Minister of Human Resources and employment development, that in fact it's okay to fire Saskatchewan civil servants if they hold an NDP membership — if he's declared open season on them — then perhaps you would like to go to Meadow Lake, sir, and tell the civil servants in Meadow Lake that if they hold a membership in the NDP, or if they support the NDP, it's open season on them. Perhaps you'd like to tell them that.

Mr. Minister, it's obvious from the government's record that you have given up on employment development as part of your overall economic strategy. That's okay. If that's the political decision you made, you'll have to live with that political decision.

But the other kinds of decisions you are making, reflected by what you've just said in regards to Saskatchewan's civil servants, aren't okay because that's not just a political question, sir, that's a question of political morality. That's a question of democracy and of democratic freedom. That goes to the very heart of the right for people to hold differing political views and not be penalized in this for differing political views.

You do very well, sir, to talk about those countries with walls around it, and you try to make a big political issue out of that. Well I tell you, sir, your attitude, your attitude towards people of alternative political views in this province are exactly the same as any other totalitarianism regime. You, sir, would fit in well with the old commissars of Stalin who fired people, quite literally, just as you fit in quite well with those of the junta in Chile or those of the contras in Nicaragua. Because one thing that they have in common, one thing that they have in common is that they do not like the march of human progress represented in country after country by the political movements of the left. And the one thing that they have in common is that they resort to is repression.

And it's the same kind of repression, whether you're fired from your job as the junta as just done with 24,000 teachers in Chile, to the same kind of repression if you're a civil servant in Saskatchewan. And the thousands of civil servants that you have laughed here tonight about, that you think it's okay to fire them and send them off to Manitoba.

And I want to say, sir, I want to say, you may be a joke in

terms of your party, you may be the political brunt of a joke being played on yourself, not necessarily to your understanding as part of a greater political game in terms of the back benches and in terms of, excuse me, the front benches of your party, but I want to say, I want to say the people of Saskatchewan, when it comes to your personal record, do not think you're a joke, do not think you're a joke. They think, sir, that you are a menace to their jobs, to their job security, and to their economic well-being, and now, by your own tongue, to their political well-being as well.

And I think that the honourable and decent thing for you to do is resign your portfolio. And I will certainly be trying to urge my colleagues to reduce your salary to nothing or \$1 so that you won't have to pay the \$50,000 in income taxes which you have admitted here is what you paid last year. I think, sir, I think you're a disgrace to the legislature.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, how do I reply to that? Could I possibly . . . Would the member opposite, after he calls me all of those names, have the decency to at least stay and hear the reply? No, he doesn't.

I could not possibly get to a level so low as to reply to all of that. It's not possible.

We have civil servants in this province that do an excellent job and nobody ever asks what their politics is. We only ask that they do their job. But when I have a deputy minister who works against me, who cannot tell me how much it costs per year to run Valley View, then I have no choice but to have no faith in that deputy minister. And it turns out that that deputy minister is now the deputy minister in Manitoba. They have faith in that deputy minister and that's their business and it's not my problem.

But certainly, I can stand in this legislature and hold my head high and say that that deputy minister was a friend of the NDP, and I have proof of that. And we only expect government workers to work for the government, not to campaign for the government, but to work for their pay cheque and to do the job that the public expects — to carry out the policies of the government. There are civil servants that have outlived three governments, six ministers, by doing their job. But if a civil servant does not do their job, they cannot be kept.

And I can tell you that I have dismissed a civil servant who I believe to be a Progressive Conservative because that civil servant was not doing his job. And I will dismiss anyone — Conservative, Liberal or NDP — if they do not serve the public and if they do not take good care of the taxpayers' money. But if there's a civil servant, as I have had, who have cost the taxpayers their weight in gold, I will not keep them. And that is very simple and I think that's all the public expects.

(2045)

And that is how we operate as a government — good stewardship of the public treasury. And that's all we ask for. We do not ask that people go out and campaign for

the government, as in 1978 when my father was a crop insurance adjuster and the NDP president phoned my father and said, you'd better get out and campaign because you have a government job. Well, I won't repeat in this House what my father told him to do with that job.

And we do not operate that way. We do not expect civil servants to campaign for the government; we expect them to work for their pay cheque and to take good care of the public's business. And that's all we ask. If they're working against the policies of the government, if they are not trying to carry out the policies of an elected service, then I don't care what party they're in, they have got to go and that is a very fair way of operating. And there are thousands of civil servants in this province who have nothing to fear, who do their job — we are very pleased with what they do — who will be with this government longer than I am, longer than my colleagues, who will be with this government until they retire because they are good at what they do.

Now the member opposite is gone so there is no need to respond the lowest form of debate I have ever seen in this legislature.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct the minister's mind to the women's secretariat and his responsibilities concerning the women's secretariat.

The Women's Secretariat Act, Mr. Chairman, requires the minister to co-ordinate policies and programs and activities of the Government of Saskatchewan relating to the status of women. It also says that in carrying out these responsibilities, the minister may provide any assistance that the minister considers appropriate to improve the status of women in Saskatchewan.

I just basically wanted to set out what the objects of The Women's Secretariat Act was. And I also want to state, Mr. Chairman, that a very serious problem has developed over the last few years — the years that the PCs have been in government — a serious problem that affects all women in Saskatchewan. And that problem is that while the PCs may say they are advancing in the interests of women, they are doing an entirely different thing. In fact, Saskatchewan's lagging far behind other provinces, and Saskatchewan is falling behind. And even worse, Mr. Chairman, the PC government has been cutting and slashing programs that have a direct benefit to women.

For example, funding to transition homes. Women who are fleeing violent situations, in many cases life-threatening situations, are finding that the funding for transition homes are being cut. They are being left out in the cold, Mr. Chairman. Funding for the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission has been cut. One-third of complaints to the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, Mr. Chairman, are complaints on the grounds of sex discrimination, and yet the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission's funding has been cut by 15 per cent.

Welfare reform has affected many single parent mothers who are struggling to make ends meet. Education cuts,

health cuts, they all affect women, and they affect women very drastically, Mr. Chairman. And I am led to the conclusion, after seeing all the cuts that have taken place in the recent budget, that women just don't count with this government, Mr. Chairman, they just don't count.

The PC government has failed to implement real affirmative action for women in the public and private sector – I mean effective affirmative action, not simply paying lip-service to affirmative action. It has failed to implement the principle of pay equity in the public service to ensure that women get equal wages for work of equal value, or beyond the public service, in fact. It has failed to protect women across the province from life-threatening situations. It has reneged on these commitments, Mr. Chairman. It has reneged on its commitments.

In one area where this government thinks it has forged ahead, Mr. Chairman, in the area of pensions for home-makers. What it has done is so lacking in thought that it will prevent or seriously retard progress in achieving a national plan. And it does nothing to solve the poverty that exists today amongst seniors, Mr. Chairman, nor will it help those who really need it 25 years from now. Those people who cannot afford to contribute to the plan today will not have the benefit of it 25 years from now.

The government also pats itself on the back for incentives to small-business women, and I say, good, to these incentives. But the fact of the matter is these incentives are meaningless to the vast majority of women in Saskatchewan. It helps the new entrepreneur class of women, and that's good. We're not saying we shouldn't do that, but it does nothing for the vast majority of women in this province.

In education the PC government has come up short, Mr. Minister. The provincially and federally funded Regina Plains Community College bridging program, which began two years ago, was the first of its kind in Canada. It was designed to help women enter or re-enter the work-force by providing counselling, pre-trades and pre-technology courses, and skills upgrading classes.

Since then, Mr. Chairman, similar programs have been established across Canada, but this program was recently cut and eliminated. And other educational programs in our technical institutes have been cut. And women are by far the largest group affected by these unthinking, wrong-headed cuts. Reorganizations of colleges and institutes is clearly forcing people to drop out of their chosen courses and to abandon career plans because it becomes very difficult for women to move families to another location, especially if it's a single parent, Mr. Chairman, in order to take courses.

These Draconian measures by the PC government to reduce their \$3.4 billion deficit – a deficit that was created by them through mismanagement and by give-aways to big out-of-province corporations – these Draconian measures, Mr. Chairman, will push women further into job ghettos and force them to continue in low-paying jobs. Cuts in education are a major stumbling block for women.

Health cuts are another example of the PC attack on women, especially on low income and poor women, Mr. Chairman. The health cuts by this government, the move to privatize the drug prescription plan, the move to privatize dental care, hospital waiting lists that are longer than ever before in the history of this province – all these regressive government actions are devastating, and they put new stress on the women of this province and their families.

Women bear the brunt of government cuts in many areas, especially health cuts and changes to the prescription drug plan. Women who make up the largest portion of working poor can ill afford to pay up front drug costs for themselves and their children. Women who work in our health care system are being overworked and burning out. While the government funds home programs and establishes gas taxes, women, seniors and children are being hurt. And this government simply does not care about the plight of the majority of women.

When the health care system is cut back, women get hit with a triple whammy, Mr. Chairman. First, they tend to be the health care workers, and they're losing their jobs, like the dental therapists, and they're burning out because of understaffing. Secondly, women and their children tend to be the heaviest users of the health care system. And when health care is being cut back, it reduces their access to health services, Mr. Chairman. And thirdly, I might add, women pick up the loose ends when government inadequately funds health care services. They will be forced into traditional roles, caring for the elderly or the sick, when these individuals should be receiving professional care.

And let's take a look at the area of violence against women. Let's look at the area of violence against women, Mr. Chairman, or wife beating, to be more precise. In 1984 the PC government made great pronouncements on family violence, especially on wife beating. And the Hon. Pat Smith, then minister for the then women's secretariat, explained that wife battering was absolutely dehumanizing. That was strong words . . .

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

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Point of order. I believe it is not the custom in this House to refer to members by their name, but rather by their position.

Mr. Chairman: — Order.

Ms. Simard: — These were strong words for the minister to use for media consumption, Mr. Chairman. But has this government done . . . but what has this government done for victims of abuse? This year's funding for transition houses has been frozen, and no funds were made available for new shelters despite the urgent need.

The provincial Association of Transition Houses of Saskatchewan estimates, Mr. Chairman, that 4,134 women and children have been turned away in the last two years to insufficient shelter space. Near 50 per cent of all women and children fleeing from desperate situations are being turned away from existing shelters, Mr.

Chairman.

This government has reneged on its commitment to women. And the Regina Transition House, for example, has been cut back by 14.5 per cent, and I find that totally unacceptable. And this government continues, Mr. Chairman, to ignore those women and children who are turned away from transition homes – some 4,134 women and children in two years – 4,134 women and children, Mr. Chairman.

And if we look at other services for women in crisis, for example, the Mobile Crisis and Crisis Intervention Services provide immediate support and counselling in cases of domestic disputes and other crises, Mr. Chairman. The Mobile Crisis Unit in Prince Albert was hit with a 28 per cent cut-back. In Regina, it was slashed by 14 per cent. And the Saskatoon Crisis Intervention Services was cut by almost 10 per cent. The Regina native women's family workers program was cut by a whopping 38 per cent. Other native family service programs across the province were also severely slashed. The Family Service Bureau, which provides support services and information referral and counselling in Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, all received small decreases. And in the area of sexual assault services, the Regina Women's Community Centre and Sexual Assault Line was hit with a 13 per cent cut. Saskatoon, Battlefords, and Lloydminster were held at zero.

The government – there's no question, Mr. Chairman – the government is systematically shutting off the avenues open to women to enable them to leave violent relationships. And we can't forget about the grave situation of day care in this province, Mr. Chairman. Last year only 5,524 licensed child care spaces were available in Saskatchewan. And when we consider that there are 72,000 children aged two to five in this province, and that in 1985 the participation rate in the labour force of Saskatchewan women with children aged three to five was 64.9 per cent – 72,000 children and the participation was 64.9 per cent. It is clear there is a desperate need for an increase of spaces in our day care system. Provincial cut-backs are threatening existing day care facilities; for example, the University of Regina day care.

While the federal government, Mr. Chairman, is interested in setting up a cost sharing, child care system with the province, the Saskatchewan PC government is resistant to the idea. And once again women and children are not a priority for this government, and once again they don't count with this government.

And as far as wages for women are concerned, Mr. Chairman, this government has done nothing to ensure that women earn equal pay for work of equal value in this province. Women's participation in the labour force is expected to increase 75.1 per cent by the year 2000. Seventy per cent of all minimum wage earners – 70 per cent of all minimum wage earners are women, and many are single parent mothers. And yet all we have, to date, all we have to date, Mr. Chairman, is the promise of this minister to look into the concept of pay equity.

(2100)

And with respect to minimum wage, let's look at the statistics with respect to minimum wage, Mr. Chairman. They only say they will monitor it. That's what this government has said. It has said it will monitor minimum wage. But most people on minimum wage are women, Mr. Chairman. It's primarily women that earn minimum wage in this province, and minimum wage is a poverty wage. So when the PC government says that they feel the minimum wage is adequate, they are voting to keep these women working at a poverty wage, and they're voting to keep these women and their children in poverty.

In its minimum wage survey of 1985, the provincial government estimated that some 30,000 people earned a wage near the minimum, while approximately 10,000 earned the minimum wage only. According to the 1985 study, 70 per cent of those earning the minimum wage are women. Some of these women have dependants, and in 1985 statistics the Canada poverty line for a single person was 9,719 per year or 810 per month. For two individuals, a single parent and a child, it was 12,815 per year or 1,068 per month.

So a worker making the minimum wage for a 40-hour work week would earn approximately 756 per month. So a mother with a child who's earning minimum wage – and most of the people on minimum wage are mothers, or women, many of them being mothers – is earning something like \$312 a month below the poverty line, according to 1985 statistics.

I think the government should be aware of that when they talk about monitoring minimum wage. They should be looking at those women who are out there trying to support dependants on minimum wage, and the fact that they are living substantially below the poverty line.

This government, Mr. Speaker, is also denying women basic rights in the work place. The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, whose largest portion of cases deal with discrimination on the grounds of sex, received a cut of 15.7 per cent at a time when the commission has a backlog of cases. Because of this backlog the commission was ordered last December to withdraw two sexual harassment complaints. Speedy judicial process could not be guaranteed.

But what do they do? They cut it back by 15.7 per cent, even though a substantial amount of the complaints to the Human Rights Commission are complaints brought by women.

And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is another example of this government's disregard for women's rights and dignity. Similarly, the imposition of fees for legal aid will undoubtedly cause serious difficulties for women. Women who are poor, but not poor enough by the government's definition, will be forced to pay fees as high as \$400 for legal services or forgo legal aid.

Legal aid clinics in Saskatchewan open over 1,000 divorce cases, over 700 maintenance order cases, and almost 1,000 custody cases per year. The overwhelming – the overwhelming majority of these cases are cases filed by women. And many women who seek legal aid are

women who are fleeing violent situations and life-threatening situations. They are in constant turmoil, having to look for new homes, new furniture, and get their life together so that they can start afresh. And what the PC government has been telling them of late, Mr. Chairman, is that they will now also have to pay for their legal services to aid them in getting their life together.

This government allows flagrant discrimination against women in our correctional system, a situation which is a source of some shame to many women in this province. The lack of adequate medical facilities, community training residence, educational program, and a family visiting area for the 83 per cent of inmates who are mothers is yet another example of this government's lack of respect for the rights of women. And finally, this government has been silently reorganizing the functions in government which serve the interests of women since 1982. And in the process, Mr. Chairman, I submit that they've been downgrading issues relating to women.

In 1986 the women's secretariat, which was a free-standing agency which was to co-ordinate government policy, research and planning on matters of importance to women, was dismantled. We understand it has lost staff positions and was moved into the unwieldy Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment. The employment equity branch of the Public Service Commission was also dismantled and moved there with a loss of staff positions.

This government has not made the interests of women a priority. More and more women will be more isolated because of a lack of support services, Mr. Chairman, more will be forced to return to the traditional role, and many will be faced with a greater sense of hopelessness as more and more opportunities become unattainable or are lost altogether.

And this government has lost communication and contact with some of the major women's groups in this province, and I think this is a strong indication that women do not have the confidence in this government to pursue issues pertaining to women that it should have. And I think it's a strong indication that this government has mismanaged matters relating to women.

When your government was first formed in 1982, Mr. Minister, there was a women's division, and it existed independently of the labour standards branch and reported directly to the deputy minister of Labour. It acted as a real advocate in the promotion of women's issues in the public and private sectors, and it had a great deal of support from the mainstream women's groups all across the province. But in March of 1983 it was dismantled.

Mr. Minister, when I look at what has happened to the women's division over the years, your government's political shuffling of the division from one department to another, separating it and trying to bring it back together again, I'm very concerned. I'm very concerned with what has happened.

You have taken a women's bureau that was unique

amongst women's bureaus in Canada – it was referred to as the strongest women's bureau in Canada, and a model across Canada – and it played a real and a vital role both within and outside government in improving the status of women. And you, Mr. Minister, have seriously impaired its ability to be as effective as it should be.

As far as we can tell – and it's very difficult to tell because there's been so much shuffling going around that it's difficult to ascertain what the real situation is with respect to the agency that is supposed to be looking after women's rights – but as far as we can tell, it only has half the staff it did before. And I'm not criticizing the staff, Mr. Minister, because I know that they're very hard-working and dedicated people, but you have made it almost impossible for the women's division today to meet its mandate and perform the responsibilities assigned to it.

An analysis of what your government has done to the women's division leaves us with only two conclusions, Mr. Minister. Was this another example of incompetent PC bungling? Or was this a deliberate attempt to destroy the advocacy of women's issues in government, and a deliberate attempt to limit the role of an agency, clearly designed to improve the status of women in this province? Did you do it deliberately, Mr. Minister, or did you do it through incompetence? Either conclusion is frightening – either conclusion is frightening.

You divided up the women's agency into three – the women's division between three agencies, and in the process of doing that, you cut it by some 27 per cent in the budget. But as a result of public pressure, some 60 national women's groups across Canada and in the province of Saskatchewan, you patched it together and called it the women's secretariat. But you never gave the women's secretariat the power that it needed to go out and publicly lobby with respect to women's issues and to advance the interests of women in this province. You never gave it the power it needed.

In two short years – but even so, in two short years you're reorganizing this agency once again. And this agency has now been amalgamated with the unwieldy Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment, lessening, once and for all – and I hope I'm wrong about this, Mr. Minister, but it appears to me that this . . . that for once and for all you're lessening this administration, under this administration, the role of government with respect to women's issues.

And I ask you: what's the logic to all this, to start out with one agency, divide it up in three, put it back into one, and then send it off to another department? While you're spending your time reorganizing and shuffling this agency around, you're not getting on with the real business, the real business being to protect the rights and advance the interests of women in this province. And I have to seriously ask myself the question whether this reorganization isn't your government's method of downgrading the role of your government with respect to advancing the interests of women.

Mr. Minister, you have intelligent, competent women in that organization. And I would like to see you quit tying their hands and give them full mandate to perform the

jobs that have to be done, and to improve the status of women in this province, and the right to speak out publicly on issues.

I have a specific question for you, Mr. Minister, at this point, which I will ask. Now just a second, I'm having a little difficulty locating it here. Now what I would like to know, Mr. Minister, is how many positions there now exist in the present women's division?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I could give a long reply to the preamble to that question. I'm going to resist a long reply. Simply, what I can say is that this government has been very sincere in trying to further equality for women. I agree that progress could be faster. If we knew how to have progress move faster, we would; we're trying our best; we are making strides in many areas. The member opposite exaggerates the problem.

In reality here we are changing 6,000 years of culture in 15 years, and I expect that, you know, if you look at how far women have come in the last five or 10 years, great progress is being made.

Specifically to the question, we have nine positions in the women's branch of the department.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, why were women's groups in the province and members of the Saskatchewan Advisory Council on the Status of Women not informed of the reorganization of the women's division . . . or the women's secretariat, rather?

(2115)

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, women's groups were informed of the decisions that the Premier and cabinet had made. There is nothing unique about this reorganization. The government cannot go out and ask everyone whether they want something changed or whether they want a reorganization. There is nothing unique about this in the women's division. Their labour was reorganized into this department. Indian and Metis affairs were reorganized into this department. Senior citizens were reorganized into this department. And we believe that it is a good move and will be to the benefit of the groups affected by the improvements being made by this department.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you said there were nine positions. How many positions were there in the original women's division and then subsequently in the women's secretariat?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are positions and there are positions. We all know that in the Department of Labour, under the NDP, it was a department where they used to hire their . . . or hide their young and budding politicians, and therefore we find that when we operate a Department of Labour without all the political operatives in it, that we can operate with fewer people.

So at the time the NDP operated, the division had 18 individuals. I cannot tell you how many were necessary and how many were on political activity. We now have

nine positions, and none of them are involved in politics; they are all furthering the cause of women's issues.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, are you saying that there were women working in there who were doing political activities? Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I'm saying in the days of the NDP the department of labour was riddled with people doing political activity.

Ms. Simard: — You obviously have absolutely no proof of that, Mr. Minister. I suggest you're doing those employees a disservice, but then I expect you to make a statement like that. Now, Mr. Minister, you obviously have cut the women's . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order. Order. I would ask the members please to calm down so that the member can ask her question.

Ms. Simard: — That's an easy excuse . . . Can I have some order please, Mr. Chairman. The member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden is shouting across at me, and I can't ask my question.

Mr. Minister, that is a pretty poor, feeble excuse for cutting the women's division by 50 per cent to say that they were playing politics and we didn't need them — pretty weak, pretty weak, Mr. Minister.

The other . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I'd ask the members please to contain themselves.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you said that women's organizations were contacted with respect to reorganization. What women's organizations were contacted, and when were they contacted, before or after the reorganization?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — The department of labour under the NDP had people like Bob Sass, and Larry Brown was there, and the member for Saskatoon Fairview, is it? — Fairview, Saskatoon Fairview, was the deputy minister of labour and you know . . .

At the time they probably were non-political, and you know, they just happened to join the NDP recently and become partisan, you know, within the last few months. So I don't think anybody would believe that, and we all know that the department of labour was riddled with NDP politicians waiting to find a seat to run in or do other things within the party.

I think that you weren't listening close enough when I said that women's groups were informed of the changes that cabinet had made in the department and . . .

An Hon. Member: — So they were informed after or before?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I said informed of the changes. I didn't say that we asked for anyone's permission. The Premier reorganized the government, reduced the

number of cabinet ministers, and interested groups were informed as to the new situation in the government and how new departments would function.

With respect to women's issues, I've been minister, what, for about eight months now. I know you've taken a dim view that I was not an expert when I was appointed, and I know you were an expert of the Human Rights Commission when you were appointed to your . . . and I know you were quite neutral, and that you were not a member of the NDP in those days.

So you know, I know we aren't all without fault. But circumstances being what they are, the government was reorganized. As I go on in this portfolio, I hope to accomplish many things with the help of the capable people I have there. They have come up with many good ideas, and you will see considerable progress in the next few months.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, with respect to your comment about individuals in the Department of Labour, perhaps some of these individuals, like my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Fairview, took one look at the mess that this government was creating and decided it had to become politically active. It's you that drove them to it.

Now, Mr. Minister, you had said that women's organizations have been contacted, or informed of the reorganization.

Mr. Chairman, could I have some order, please?

An Hon. Member: — The member for Souris-Cannington is making too much noise.

Ms. Simard: — That's right.

Mr. Minister, you had said you'd contacted women's organizations, but you refrained from telling me which women's organizations. And you didn't tell me whether you had contacted them with the intent of consulting them, getting their input into it, or whether you just informed them.

Now I suppose I could interpret your comments as to the effect that you just informed them, but I'm asking you to clarify whether that's, in effect, all that you did, or whether you were consulting with these individuals. And which organizations, Mr. Minister? Which ones?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well I'll answer the question for the third time. We informed all of those people that we thought would be interested, and we informed them that the department had been reorganized. And we tried to contact everyone that we thought had an interest in the reorganization. And if we left anyone out, we apologize, but we tried to locate every group that we thought was interested.

Ms. Simard: — Is it possible for the minister to provide me with a list of agencies that were contacted by him?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — It might be possible, but I don't really see that it's relevant. We tried to contact

every one that had an interest.

Ms. Simard: — Obviously, Mr. Minister, you don't want to provide us with the list, because you haven't contacted the organizations that you should have. That's why you're not forthcoming with that information.

Mr. Minister, I would also like to know how many positions now exist in government which serve the interests of women?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well we don't differentiate between serving women, serving men, serving male children, serving female children. And so I believe we have about 13,000 positions in the government — they serve men, and they serve women, and they serve children, senior citizens. That's about as close as we can calculate.

Ms. Simard: — Are there any positions in the labour standards branch, for example, which remain designated to serve the interests of women?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — They all have the responsibility in that branch, as I indicated, in the public service, of serving men and women in Saskatchewan. And if there's an issue that relates to women's issues that arises in labour standards, they will try to solve the problem. And they may refer it to our department, or the branch with respect to women's issues, for guidance or assistance, or just to advise that this is a problem, and we then try to get solutions to the problems.

So I really don't know why you want to cut such a line between men and women and try to divide them, and separate them, and categorize them. We could have all lived in this province together, and the government serves men, women, children, and everyone in this province, and I don't really know why you want to keep dividing everybody into categories. Maybe it has something to do with the socialist idea of a class system, but we don't believe in that kind of division.

Ms. Simard: — Now you're getting absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Minister. The fact of the matter is: the women's division has been cut from 18 to nine people, and I'm trying to find out whether your government has seen fit to put them in some other department, working some place else. I'm giving you an opportunity to come forward and tell us whether or not you have designated any other positions as pertaining to women.

Obviously, you haven't. Obviously, you only have, specifically, nine positions that work in the area of, specifically, women's issues. To pass this off with a trivial remark, such as you made, is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Minister. We'll never get through these estimates if you continue with that attitude.

Now I'd like to know, Mr. Minister, whether it's true that the employment equity branch of the Public Service Commission was disbanded this past May?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, I know the member opposite is easily offended. I would try not to offend the member opposite, but I know her propensity to be

offended easily.

In the Government of Saskatchewan, slightly over 50 per cent of the employees are women, Women in management are 21.3 per cent, which is up from . . . depends when you want to go back . . . a year ago it was 17 per cent, two years ago it was 12 per cent, three years ago it was 9.8 per cent, and in March of 1981 it was 7.7 per cent. And so we've come from 7.7 per cent in women in management to 21.3 per cent women in management. You can see that we are moving fast towards more women in management in the Government of Saskatchewan, and it's not tokenism — powerful positions. There are women here in this Chamber that hold powerful positions, more powerful positions than the member opposite will ever hold.

(2130)

And the progress has been quite good, and will continue to be good. And we will have more and more women in management because we are emphasizing for women that they interest themselves in skills that lead to management. In education, we encourage women to go into administration, commerce, engineering.

In the Department of Highways it's hard to have women in management; there aren't many in engineering, so we encourage women to go into those things. Business administration, those are the kind of skills that are required and women are being educated in that area, are graduating, are quickly moving their way through the system. And you can see the progress from 1981 — 7.7 per cent, tripling to 21.3 per cent have women in management doing an excellent job, a very excellent job. And it is because these women are doing an excellent job that they are moving up in the ranks of management in this government. So we agree that it is not 50 per cent as yet, but I expect that in the not too distant future, as that trend continues, that we will get closer and closer to women being 50 per cent of the managers in this government, and you will see more of them in upper management.

So on this side of the House, as the government, we don't just speak and talk in . . . we don't deal in rhetoric, we tend to deal in action. And that record, you will have to admit, is a very progressive record.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Chairman, the minister obviously didn't answer my question. He deliberately tried to avoid it because he knows what the answer is. The answer is, yes, the employment equity branch of the Public Service Commission was disbanded this May. That's the simple answer, Mr. Question. That's what the minister should have told me, but he chose not to. And I suggest the reason why he chose not to say that, Mr. Chairman, is because he is ashamed of that move on the part of the government.

Now my next question to the minister — having answered the other question for him — is that while the positions were deleted, Mr. Minister, from the employment equity branch, it has been stated by the member from Weyburn that the function was absorbed

by the Human Resources department. The positions were deleted, but the function was absorbed by the Human Resources department. Could you please comment, Mr. Minister, and tell us just how this function was absorbed?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in reply to the question on the absorption of the employment equity function, the Public Service Commission has made some progress in employment equity. We feel that the new Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment can do more in that regard. We have a co-ordinator who was the former head of the women's secretariat. We have, in our branch, Indian and Metis affairs; we have senior citizens; we have women; and we have labour. We have a co-ordination of many functions that are interrelated.

And while we have just received this responsibility, we expect to make progress. I have better things to do than come to this legislature as an elected member just to bide my time, and I want to see some change. I expect there will be improvements, in particular, with respect to hiring more handicapped people. We have shown considerable improvement with respect to Indian and Metis people; I had the statistics here the other day. We have made considerable improvement — in the last five years the number of people of native ancestry has gone from 2.4 per cent to 5.2 per cent of the public service; the physically handicapped has gone from .7 per cent to 1.2 per cent — both of those have virtually doubled. As I indicated, women in management has virtually tripled. And we feel that it's the proper place in the Department of Human Resources, Labour and Employment for employment equity co-ordination. And while we've just received this function, we hope to get it running very efficiently, and see more progress in the next few months.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I didn't want to deal with two things in my last question, so I will deal with one now, but it pertains to your response — not this recent one, the earlier response in which you said there was a total of 21.3 per cent, or something like that, of women in management in the public service.

Well I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Minister, that that includes women in management and professional classification. Professional may not necessarily be management. It also includes, Mr. Minister, feeder positions. That 21 per cent includes feeder positions. So the figure isn't, the figure isn't 21 per cent; it's closer to 17.6 or 8 per cent, and that's just a point of correction, Mr. Minister. In case you didn't have that information, I thought perhaps you should.

Mr. Minister, I want to now refer specifically to the advisory council, and I want you to tell me who the members of the advisory council are, when they were appointed, and for what term?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — On the Women's Advisory Council, we had many appointments . . . their term of appointment expire, and we had a few people move out of the province — transferred. So we're running short on council members at this time, but are actively pursuing bringing the advisory council up to full complement.

The current members are: Donna Roadway, Saskatoon, radio announcer; Marilyn Stradecki, Balcarres, home-maker and farmer; Paulette Vanderlinde, Regina, school principal; Mary Muir, Kindersley, director of the Danny Fisher Centre for Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

We have written the women's groups that we thought might be interested – and there are some professional groups that have also expressed interest – to have them put forth possible names. We are trying to get the advisory council up to strength as soon as the holiday season is over so that they can concentrate on advising us. We expect to have more placements in the near future to get the council up to strength and get it operating in its usual function.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, is it not true that the term of the previous advisory council members terminated in December 31, 1986? Now my question to you is: when were these women that you have named, the four or five, whatever it was, when were they appointed to the advisory council?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — It's correct that the advisory council positions expired at the end of December 1986. Most of the members carried on, unofficially, without reappointment, for a period of time. The current members were appointed in April. And partly because of reorganizational changes, partly because of an extreme work-load we've had in our departments with getting our budgets together under difficult circumstances, and partly because we've spent the entire summer sitting in the legislature, we haven't been able to fill the council positions and other boards and commissions as quickly as we would like to.

You might be interested to know . . . By the way you were correct on the 21.3 per cent of women in management. That should have been women in management and professional positions, but certainly I don't believe that there was any deception on my part. Professional positions actually pay quite well. And when you're talking about lawyers in government, when you're talking about women in the medical field and things of that nature – and agriculture, I'm reminded – you're talking about professional people in high paid positions. So we kind of lumped that calculation together in women who are professional or in management. Some of them are both, of course.

What you might be interested to know is that women comprise 29 per cent of government boards right now, and the numbers are rising. As far as we can ascertain from the information that wasn't shredded after the last election, women comprised 9.5 per cent on boards under the NDP government. So there's more or less a tripling there of the number of women on boards and commissions. And women are having much more of an active part in the day to day management of the government, in day to day policy making, and, of course, we have more women in our cabinet than the NDP ever had. So women are taking a greater part in Saskatchewan, and also, as you raised the point earlier, that women are becoming a majority in small business in this province. So I think you'll have to agree that progress is being made.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, the women that were appointed in April, I would be curious to know when they were notified of these appointments. And I think you should also know, Mr. Minister, that I don't regard the fact that you're sitting in this legislature as an excuse for not getting the women's advisory council rolling. Because what you're telling me is that the women's advisory council is not rolling at this time, and it was the terms . . . the new council should have been appointed back in December or January of . . . December of '86, January of '87, but your government that was sitting around from January to July – January to June rather – never appointed a new women's advisory council. Now when were these women who were appointed in April, when were they notified of their appointments? And is the council functioning today, or is it just being kept on hold until you can decide whom else to appoint to it?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Well the government has been reviewing all boards and commissions, and we have not, during the course of this session, speeded to fill the vacancies on boards and commissions. Part of the reason for that is we wish to screen them to make sure that we do have more women on the boards and commissions. And this board, or this commission, is also caught in that screening process, and while we don't specifically have to screen this one very close to make sure that we have a lot of women on the board, it's caught in the entire process where we're trying to get that 29 per cent up from where it is. But I'm sure the member opposite . . . I believe the member opposite has two children; I have two children, as well, and she knows how hard we have worked here as MLAs during the course of this summer. And I can tell you that before we came into this session we worked just as hard preparing a budget.

You have children and I have children. My son is at home this evening with a slight concussion, and we are here working, and you're suggesting we're not working hard enough. We all sacrifice here, and surely we could show a little patience. The province's affairs are being conducted well, and these boards will be completed when the people are located.

(2145)

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I don't believe you advised me, unless I didn't hear it, as to when these women were notified. Would you please advise me of that?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, the women that have been appointed, and all the women and any men that might be appointed to this advisory board, were all personally contacted prior to April. Any new people will be personally contacted as well. I believe the final confirmation that the appointment had been finalized was given some time in June.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you said that a number of women's agencies have been contacted for the purpose of submitting names for recommendations of individuals to be appointed to the advisory council.

I understand that there have been a number of organizations left off that list, for example: the Saskatchewan Battered Women's Advocacy,

Saskatchewan Disabled Women's Network, the Saskatoon Interval House, the Saskatoon Sexual Assault Centre, Saskatoon Women Concerned About Technology, Single Parents Are Special, Big Sisters, for example. And these are just examples, Mr. Minister, of names of organizations and of organizations that have not been contacted by your department with respect to recommendations. And I've added up the list of women's organizations throughout the province, and it comes to approximately 100. And I believe you've only contacted some — I'm not sure of the figure right off — but maybe 10 or 15 organizations. And I want to know why some of these other organizations have been dropped.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, the following groups were contacted for their recommendations: the Provincial Council of Women, the Saskatoon Women's Network, Regina Women's Network, the Saskatchewan Federation of Women, the Saskatchewan Women's Institutes, the Saskatchewan Business and Professional Women's Club, the Saskatchewan Women's Agricultural Network, Immigrant Women of Saskatchewan, Canadian Federation of University Women, Canadian Consumers' Association, Aboriginal Women's Council of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, the Law Society of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association, the Saskatchewan Nursing Assistants Association, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce, the Saskatchewan provincial Catholic Women's League, the United Church women, Saskatchewan conference, and Saskatchewan Action Committee on the Status of Women.

Ms. Simard: — The minister hasn't answered my question, Mr. Chairman. Why were some of the other groups excluded?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, we contacted the umbrella groups, and we didn't try to exclude any particular group. I suppose we have to draw the line somewhere. And we took the most prominent groups that came to mind, and most of them are umbrella groups. Out of all of those groups, we should get many recommendations, and I don't see any problem. I mean, how far do you go and to how many groups; how many groups do you contact? The church women in my church weren't contacted — I mean, you have to draw the line somewhere.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, you had said earlier that when you're appointing women to boards and commissions and agencies, for example, you do a lot of screening. And you used the word "screening" particularly when you were talking to appointments to the advisory council. Could you please tell us, Mr. Minister, what sort of screening that you do?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, because the member opposite is quoting me out of context, I couldn't recall saying anything about screening people for the Saskatchewan Women's Advisory Council. My capable assistant deputy minister advised me that I did use the word screening and advised me where I used it. It was with respect to screening all boards and commissions to be certain that we have more women represented on all

boards and commissions.

I would think that the member opposite, the member for Lakeview, would consider that to be reasonable, and even a noble thing to do, to screen all government boards with the purpose to make sure that we are getting more than 29 per cent — which is much more than 7 per cent of the past — women on these boards and commissions as we're making appointments to keep in mind that there are women out there who can serve and contribute, and that we shouldn't simply go back to the old boy's network — I was going to say old men's network; I suppose I would offend someone — but I suppose old boy's network is an understood term. And so that we don't simply go back to the old boy's network, we are screening all boards and commissions to make sure that capable women get a chance to be on them. And I submit that that is a logical thing to do.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I may have misunderstood what you said with respect to screening; I understood you to say that you were screening applicants for the positions. Perhaps you didn't say that. *Hansard* will tell the tale tomorrow, Mr. Minister, and we'll obviously be up on this again, so we'll have an opportunity to explore it further, if indeed I am correct.

Mr. Minister, could you please tell me what reports and research of the advisory council are available? And if there are reports, what recommendations did the advisory council make for improving the status of women?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I'm advised that there are no reports made as of last year, but we are prepared to send over all of the reports that have been made in the last few years, and we'll gather them up and send them over to you.

Ms. Simard: — There were no reports made last year. Is that what you said, Mr. Minister? Were there no reports made last year, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I'm advised that last year the advisory council was holding public consultation meetings. At present we do not have a report as to their findings or what the results of their public consultation were.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, will you undertake to provide us with any reports that have been made, and research done by the advisory council, along with their recommendations, and, in addition, an indication of what action you've taken to meet their recommendations? Would you undertake to provide me with that within the . . . by tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Chairman, I have conferred with my officials, and we will send it to the member of the opposition as soon as it's available, but they don't believe that they can get that information together for tomorrow.

Ms. Simard: — When can you get it available then, Mr. Minister? It shouldn't take very long to just put . . . at least send me the reports. You can get them together. You must have them in your office, and you can just put them together and give them to me tomorrow. You may not be able to provide me with information as to what you've done to meet any recommendations in those reports.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:01 p.m.

An Hon. Member: — That may take years.

Ms. Simard: — That may take considerably longer, but would you at least provide me with the reports?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I'm advised that not all of the reports have been made public. So those that have been made public, we would send over to the member opposite, and the others would be given to her when they're made public.

Ms. Simard: — When will you send the reports to me? Will you send them to me tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I'm advised by my officials that it's not possible to have it all gathered up for tomorrow. We will send it to the member opposite as soon as possible. My officials expect to be here tomorrow morning, on the job in the legislature, and won't be able to gather reports tomorrow morning.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I will be looking with great anticipation for those reports.

I would like to know, Mr. Minister, who is the director for employment equity at this point in time.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, at present Leah Siebold holds that position. I'm advised she's technically on vacation right now and will be going on education leave, so we'll be filling that position from within the public service when she goes on education leave. We don't intend to go outside of the public service to fill that position because the incumbent is going on educational leave.

Ms. Simard: — Mr. Minister, I am advised by your department that, by letter dated June 9, that there were a number of conferences that advisory council members attended – a fairly long list of them, stemming from April 26, '86 to March 4 of '87. Seventeen conferences, to be more specific, Mr. Minister.

Could you please provide me with the numbers of council members who attended those conferences, and would you please advise me whether any reports were forthcoming as a result of those conferences attended by council members.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have a list of the conferences and their dates. That's all of the information I will give to the member opposite. I don't really attempt to try to compile which member of the advisory council went to which conference, and how many attended and what hours they might have kept there. I'm simply going to send over to the member opposite a list of the conferences that were attended by members of the advisory council.