

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
October 23, 1987

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce four people seated in the west gallery this morning. They are Robert Coulter, Midge Mack, Ken and Marge Olson, friends of mine from the city here who've come to see how their tax dollars are being spent on this 102nd day of the sitting of the legislature, I believe. I'd ask all hon. members to join me in welcoming them here.

Hon Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure to introduce to the Assembly 12 guests from the Yankee Ridge — it's a social and charity club from Wilcox, Saskatchewan. If they would stand and be recognized, Mr. Speaker.

They have an interesting history. The club was started in 1921, some 66 years ago, and is named for a school built in 1905 called the Yankee Ridge School, which was 15 miles south of Regina. And of course most members would know that many settlers in that area came from the United States. They've been active in the area for many years, and have contributed to numerous charities and have made a real contribution to the area.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all hon. members to join with me in welcoming the members to this Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to the House, through you, a constituent of mine, a man who has made great contributions to the field of education in Prince Albert and district, Mr. Larry Syverson.

Hon Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

United States Trade Subsidies

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday in this House, Mr. Minister, on the question of subsidized wheat sales by the Americans to some of our most important customers, you disregarded the concerns of Joe Clark that we put forward as rumours. Mr. Clark is now going to Washington to see George Shultz to lodge a complaint about this. And he says:

"It is being protested because it poses a threat to future sales," external affairs minister Joe Clark said Thursday.

A threat to future sales. I ask you, Mr. Minister, do you have the same regard to this apparent American breach of trust as does the Minister of External Affairs, Joe Clark?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I can say my regard is for farmers and agricultural people, not only in Saskatchewan but indeed in western Canada. My regard is to make sure that they get enough money to compete with subsidies. My regard is to make sure that we stop the American subsidies wherever possible, to get them to agree to stop subsidies. On those two points, Mr. Speaker, I will be going to Washington myself to convince Americans to stop the export subsidies. I'll begin doing that next month.

I've sent a telex to Mr. Clark, Minister of External Affairs, to make sure that he advises Americans that we don't like the subsidies and that the subsidies should stop. So I can say on both counts, Mr. Speaker, that I am encouraging the federal government to provide us with more money to compete with the subsidies, and at the same time encouraging our people and Americans, particularly Americans and Europeans, to stop the subsidies altogether.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Upshall: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, when an agreement is breached, there's no agreement in my books. When the Americans have tripled their enhancement program, you're talking to them about cutting back support for subsidies.

Will you now do the honourable thing and withdraw your support for this agreement until such time that we see some response for the Americans toward Canada, dealing fairly with our customers across the world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could respond to this, very briefly, with an appreciation of what we face today and compare it to what we faced in 1929.

Mr. Speaker, in 1929 when the stock market crashed, governments, particularly in the United States, passed legislation that said that they would not trade with others. They doubled the tariffs — they doubled the tariffs. As a result of doubling the tariffs, after the stock market crash — don't trade with people — there was massive unemployment not only in the United States but all across western Canada, all across the nation. Across the western world the reaction to a stock market crash was: put up tariffs, don't trade with people, and it led to the biggest and largest depression in the history of the world — the developed world.

Mr. Speaker, now when we see a stock market crash we see severe economic conditions. The NDP are saying, don't trade with people, put up tariffs, just walk right into a recession. They don't care about all the jobs in potash, all the jobs in uranium, all the jobs in towns and villages. They don't care about agriculture. All they say, Mr. Speaker, is just put up tariffs, as they did in 1929 and 1930, and put everybody out of work.

Mr. Speaker, they don't understand the economy. They don't understand the Depression. They don't understand the crash. They don't understand what to do about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. Will the Premier acknowledge that, at least in the minds of most economists, what caused the recession and depression in the 1930s was the very thing that is happening now in the United States, an increase of tariffs and the retreat from multilateralism, the making of a fortress North America and the retreat from multinationalism, which you are advocating and which will, indeed, cause distress not only to Canada but to all the world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I mean, this is the nub of what the country will be debating for now decades. Now let me, just as briefly as I can . . . In 1929 we had the stock market crash. Two things took place in the United States: one, they raised interest rates up. They thought that would solve it and obviously that led to further problems.

And secondly, they passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930 that more than doubled tariffs — more than doubled the tariffs. Now what does that mean? That means you can't trade with other countries. The result was world trade stagnated and declined. U.S. imports dropped from 70 per cent from 4.4 billion to 1.4; exports dropped from 5.2 to \$1.6 billion. And you had massive unemployment all across Canada as well as the United States and the trading world.

Mr. Speaker, when you have a stock-market move now and you have people in Canada or the United States saying that we should put up tariffs, it is absolutely absurd. The thing you do is reduce tariffs and trade with people and lower interest rates — just the opposite.

The NDP doesn't understand the implications of high interest rates, and they wouldn't deal with them, and they don't understand the high implications of high tariffs. That's exactly what leads to depression and recession.

So we are saying, bilaterally and multilaterally — our suggestions to the Prime Minister and to the President of the United States — multilaterally and bilaterally, reduce the subsidies, reduce the protectionism. In every forum, in Japan . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Obviously you are saying that, Mr. Premier. But do you believe for one minute that if Canada enters into a free trade agreement with the United States we will not have to increase our tariffs against Japanese and European goods, as surely as the United States is increasing their tariffs. They are going to increase their tariffs. Nothing that you do will stop that. To get us into fortress North

American will mean that we will cut ourselves off from Japan and Europe. You know it. Why do you recommend that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, they have dug themselves a very, very deep theoretical and academic and real hole, because they are saying when two countries agree to lower their tariffs, either in Europe or in . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just respond to the hon. member. Just let me respond carefully so that the opposition understands. When you reduce the tariffs between countries in Europe, in the European Common Market that is consistent with GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) in reducing tariffs world-wide. When you reduce tariffs between Canada and the United States, it's a bilateral agreement consistent with reducing tariffs world-wide.

Why would anybody argue if two countries or if 12 countries in Europe reduce their tariffs between each other that it is adding to tariffs some place else? It doesn't follow. You're looking and you're grasping for any single argument that you can find to say, don't deal with Americans; don't trade with them.

That's what happened in '29, that's what happened in 1930, and that's what led to the Depression, Mr. Speaker. The key is, the world needs an example. It needs an example of reduced tariffs and reduced protectionism, not the example of go hide and take your toys and don't play with anybody else. It needs just the opposite to what you're talking about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, your argument makes sense only if you believe the United States is going to reduce its tariffs vis-a-vis the rest of the world.

I am asking you: do you believe that in the next, let's say, 48 months, the United States is going to reduce its tariffs vis-a-vis the rest of the world, or increase them? Because I assure you that what they do, we will have to do, if we enter into an agreement with the United States. Tell us: do you believe the United States is going to reduce its tariffs vis-a-vis the rest of the world?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I hope people will really follow and look at the proposed logic of the opposition member. He is saying that the United States is going to turn more protectionist, therefore we should turn more protectionist and that will make the world better.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order! Order, please. Order please. The Premier is attempting to answer the question. If we get into debate back and forth across the

Legislative Assembly . . . you cannot do that, so please allow him to carry on.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I think that we can agree the leaders . . . the Leader of the Opposition and I can agree . . . we can be as calm in here as possible to debate this very important issue.

To be free does not mean to be alone. It means that you reduce your tariffs world-wide, with your neighbours and with others. Because we decide to reduce our tariffs with Japanese or we've decided to reduce our tariffs with Americans does not then follow that we would not be freer with other people. I mean, if you took your logic to the largest extent, you would not have a tariff agreement with anybody because then you would be free. That makes no sense, makes no sense.

Look at what Prime Minister Hawke . . . Prime Minister Hawke has just tabled yesterday in Geneva his ten-year and ten-point plan to reduce tariffs to zero. The President of the United States at the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) agreements has said they will reduce their tariffs to zero. He says we need an example of two countries, large trading countries, that can reduce their tariffs to zero and the subsidies to zero.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Speaker, that's the example the world needs. It does not need isolation. It needs the courage to say, I will trade with less subsidy and less tariff and that's precisely what we're offering.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakenev: — I ask you, sir, this very precise question. Do you believe that in the next 48 months, or any comparable people, the United States is going to lower its tariffs vis-a-vis the rest of the world? And do you believe that if they raise their tariffs, Canada can follow any other course than to raise its tariffs if we are in a free trade agreement with the United States? Two questions.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any doubt that there is protectionism in the United States. There's no doubt about it at all. It's the biggest world battle that's going on right now with respect to what they're doing with respect to protectionism and their subsidies. They are in a very ugly mood, and for five years we have been saying we want to get them off their protectionist kick wherever possible, and if we can cut a deal so our tariffs will go to zero, it will be good for us because we'll be exempt from anything that goes on there, and we can provide an example for the rest of the world.

I fail to see the logic, Mr. Speaker, that if United States applies tariffs to Japan, that Canada would have to apply tariffs to Japan. We have a bilateral deal with the United States and a multilateral arrangement with people all over the world, Mr. Speaker. And he's saying we might as well just raise our tariffs or be alone, because if you add more tariffs it would be good for people.

Mr. Speaker, let me just add finally . . . Mr. Speaker, just let me make the point . . . let me make the point, Mr. Speaker: people all over the world, they don't . . . Well,

Mr. Speaker, they don't want to listen because they're finally starting to learn something about trade.

If I can add, when you have a bilateral agreement between two countries and your tariffs go to zero and you have an opportunity to export and import back and forth between the two countries, it also increases the opportunity you have with other countries, not decreases it — it increases it. You've got it precisely backwards.

We need an example world-wide to reduce tariffs, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we're going to support this bilateral deal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Impact of Proposed Educational Council

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — And it concerns, Mr. Speaker, his planning to create the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology.

Mr. Minister, at the same time as you were abolishing the collective agreement and the seniority rights of every employee in the technical institute and urban community college system, you were establishing an interim governing council to run the super-institute for seven months. That council, Mr. Minister, is made up primarily of your departmental staff, and it has the power to fire employees and delete positions now that employee seniority rights are gone.

My question to you, sir, is this: in light of the fact that the interim governing council is mostly made up of your departmental staff, is this council not a vehicle for you to extend your reign of terror for another seven months on a group of employees, 142 of whom you've already fired, and the remainder of which have now no collective agreement or no seniority rights to protect them?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's unfortunate for the very fine and dedicated educators that work in the four campuses and the four community colleges that will become part of the Saskatchewan Institute of Science and Technology for some members to in fact create fear and uncertainty and insecurity when there is no need for that. I don't think those educators are well served by that kind of fear-mongering and rumour-mongering, Mr. Speaker.

I went to those institutes and met with something in the order of 1,200 of those educators and staff, Mr. Speaker, at those four institutes a couple of weeks before the Bills were tabled in this House. What I learned there was this, Mr. Speaker: the same kinds of rumours that the member opposite is proffering up this morning were rampant then. There was some view that somehow, when the legislation in this legislature was passed, there would be more lay-offs, just as he's suggesting. And I said to them, and I

say to this House today, and I say to all of those educators and that staff across this province, Mr. Speaker, when this Bill passes or when these Bills pass, there will be no lay-offs.

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

Mr. Prebble: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, perhaps the minister can explain why the collective agreement of all those employees has been abolished.

But I have a new question for the minister, Mr. Speaker, and it concerns his actions to abolish the certification orders by which community college and technical institute staff in this province chose to join the trade union of their choice. The instructors and staff at the Westside Community College in Beauval voted this summer to join the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union. I have here, Mr. Minister, a copy of the certification order and a copy of the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board ruling dated September 15 establishing that union as the legal representative of the employees.

My question to you is this: you've claimed you want employees to be able to choose whether to belong to a union or not, but these instructors at Beauval, Mr. Minister, just made this choice. Why are you now telling them that they have to choose all over again? And does this example not highlight the real intention of your Bill, which is to undertake union busting and the erosion of employee rights under the pretence of an education Bill when this is really a rewriting of the labour laws of this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What the hon. member fails to realize, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this legislation is all about. This legislation creates the new Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology. There were four community colleges involved before and four institutes. Now we have a single institute — a single, new, educational institute. These people will no longer be employees of government, Mr. Speaker. They will no longer be part of the broad spectrum of government. They will work for an educational institution — not unlike those people who work for universities, an educational institution.

This new educational institute has new goals and new mandates and new objectives. And don't you think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be fair to those employees to have, as they always have in this province, the right to decide how they shall be represented and by whom they should be represented. That is the position, and we will stick by that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, will you not acknowledge that it's standard practice in this province that whenever employees are transferred from one institution to another, their union rights go with them; their collective bargaining agreement goes with them; that you are making a special exception of these employees by denying those rights to

them, and in so doing you're demoralizing the instructors in the institutes and the colleges of this province and therefore reducing the quality of instruction that's offered in the class-room as a result of the poor morale that you are creating. Do you deny that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What is being kept patent and will always be the case of this province, Mr. Speaker, is that employees have the legal right to choose how and by whom they want to be represented, and this Bill keeps this intact, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I address this question to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, not only are you grabbing power from the local communities through a protracted extension of your interim governing council made up largely of your political appointees, but you continue the power grab process through appointing a puppet board to your technical institutes.

Mr. Minister, do you deny that you are using an education Bill to seize total control of the urban community colleges and technical institutes by controlling the board's budget, by controlling the institute's program, and by refusing to allow for independent, locally elected boards.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, what we hear this morning is on one occasion an opposition member referring to the new institute and the creation of that institute as a reign of terror, and now another member talking about somehow that I or our government is going to seize total control.

Well what is happening as it relates to governance at this new institute? Those members opposite, Mr. Speaker, less than six months ago in the province in Prince Albert said the current form of governance where institutes are an arm of the Department of Education must go. We can no longer tolerate our institutes being run out of the Regina head office, the department of advanced education.

Now we make the changes, Mr. Speaker, we make the changes and then they say, oh, you're trying to grab power and centralize. Well I ask you and all people across this province, how does setting up a board of directors, like a board of governors at the University of Saskatchewan, fall into the category of seizing total control and a reign of power? It works at the University of Saskatchewan, it works at the University of Regina, and it will work at the new institute of applied science and technology, Mr. Speaker. That's what will work.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Supplementary. Mr. Minister, your proposal is a power grab. Your proposal is to abolish the urban community colleges and replace them with one appointed, powerless board. Our proposal is to make provisions for independent boards, the majority of whose members are elected.

Do you not agree that this structure would provide for better input from students, instructors, and local community groups? And in view of the consistent and reasoned opposition to your single, appointed model, Mr. Minister, will you now do the right thing and accept our proposal?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, there were a number of models that one could have moved to in terms of a new form of governance. What we were all agreed on is that the present form was unsatisfactory. We had 8 institutions, 9, 10, 11 even, if you look at the entire structure. Very difficult for them to plan and have some co-ordinated approach in so far as how adult education should look at this level as we move towards the year 2000. I think the opposition will agree, with this model you get co-ordination.

We will have province-wide representation. We have already given the commitment that those four centres where we had the community colleges and the institute campuses shall have representation on there. I have already tended with the faculty the notion that I would entertain at least the notion to have a faculty representation on there, as would I entertain the notion of having student representation. By every measure, Mr. Speaker, this is going to be an institute for the 21st century and will continue to keep us ahead of, literally, the rest of the world when it comes to adult education, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

No-hunting Corridors in the North

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Premier, and it deals with no-hunting corridors which your government has created along roads and highways in northern Saskatchewan — corridors which violate the treaty rights of Indian people to hunt on unoccupied Crown land. In a letter to you, Mr. Premier, on October 2, Chief Thomas Iron of the Canoe Lake Indian band wrote, and I quote:

I think this is nothing but a . . .

If the Attorney General would just sit down and listen, I'd like to get this question on, Mr. Speaker.

I think this is nothing but a racist reaction by government officials aimed at the native population in the North.

Mr. Minister, will you stop this policy which violates the treaty rights of many northern people, and which denies them the right to hunt for food for their families along hundreds of miles of northern corridors?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding — and the minister, I believe, can provide more details — but when you have traffic corridors, when you have cars and trucks, and particularly truckers that are travelling back and forth on highways, you don't want

people with high-powered rifles too close to the highways, just for safety reasons. I mean, a rifle will carry a long ways, and if you have people that can hunt along the highways or shoot across the highways, it's not as safe as it could be, Mr. Speaker. And my understanding is that when you have truckers going back and forth hauling goods and services, and cars, then it's a safety measure to make sure people don't get hurt or get shot, frankly.

Mr. Speaker: — Time has expired. Time has elapsed. Order, please, Order. Order, please.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 55 — An Act to provide for the Division of Saskatchewan into Constituencies for the Election of Members of the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I move first reading of a Bill to provide for the Division of Saskatchewan into Constituencies for the Election of Members of the Legislative Assembly.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hepworth that Bill No. 46 — **An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology** be now read a second time.

Mr. Prebble: — Well, Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks have elapsed since we last debated this Bill. And in the intervening time period I have had the privilege of meeting with many technical institute and community college instructors around this province, as well as public interest groups who are interested in education. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that those groups almost unanimously condemn this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 46 is one of the most unfair and deceptive pieces of legislation ever to come before this Assembly. Under the auspices of being an education Bill to establish one super-institute by amalgamating the four technical institutes and community colleges in Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Regina, and Moose Jaw, Bill 46 is in reality primarily a Bill designed to rewrite the labour laws of Saskatchewan and to sacrifice the rights of employees in our institutes and community college system in the process.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, does this Bill, under the allusive guide of creating an autonomous board to govern the urban institutes and colleges, this Bill in fact sets up a bureaucratic hierarchical structure and an appointed board that can only act with ministerial approval. Far from granting real autonomy to the so-called

super-institute, as the Minister of Education claims he's doing, the minister is establishing a structure that he can control completely while claiming publicly that responsibility for decision making rests with the super-institute board.

The Minister of Education says that we are entering a new era and providing a new direction for post-secondary education in Saskatchewan. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill does not represent a new era at all. It is simply an extension of the attack on professional educators and public servants that this government initiated this spring when it fired 142 technical instructors and staff.

Bill 46 has very serious and immediate implications for the quality of instruction we can expect in Saskatchewan post-secondary classrooms. After the widespread firings and forced early retirements imposed by the government this summer, morale in Saskatchewan's technical institutes and urban community colleges was already very low. The content of this Bill simply compounds that problem, Mr. Speaker, even further, and poor morale inevitably has negative spin-offs in the classroom.

Quality of instruction is ultimately being sacrificed by this government as a result of its continual efforts to attack professional educators. Instructors and staff have every reason to be dismayed, Mr. Speaker. I want to summarize what Bill 46 does for their rights and their job benefits.

First, Mr. Speaker, seven certification orders that established the rights of community college employees to be represented by Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union are abolished; so are the union privileges by technical institute faculty and staff.

It is the law in this province by way of section 37 of The Trade Union Act that when employees are transferred from one institution or business to another, that their right to continue being represented by the union of their choice is transferred with them. But the Minister of Education in Bill 46 is choosing to single out technical institute and community college employees to make them an exception, Mr. Speaker, and to assert that the law does not apply to them. Time and time again this Bill specifically exempts employees of the institutes and the community colleges from protection under section 37 of The Trade Union Act.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, under the Bill, collective agreements that have been bargained on behalf of faculty and staff are abolished. Now the Minister of Education will be able to implement unilaterally what he was unable to bargain collectively as minister responsible for the Public Service Commission. This Bill could potentially pave the way for set-backs in employee working conditions and job benefits. Once again, this is all being accomplished by the government ignoring the laws of the land, putting aside The Trade Union Act and, Mr. Speaker, asserting the government's own "divine" rule.

With the abolition of collective agreements, Mr. Speaker, goes employee seniority rights. People who've worked for the institute system for 15 or 20 years are being told

under this Bill that recognition of their seniority is gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, what sort of a situation does this Bill present itself with? First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in which the government chooses to set up an interim governing council to operate the new super-institute for a period of seven months. And who's on that interim governing council, Mr. Speaker? It's primarily made up of the minister's own departmental staff.

And, Mr. Speaker, that interim governing council, first of all, will obviously have the power to delete staff positions and to fire employees, but this time those employees, as a result of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, will not have a union to represent them. They will not have a grievance procedure that can be followed. Their seniority rights will be gone; people who've worked 15 or 20 years in the system have no seniority protection under this Bill. The Minister of Education is nodding his head. I say to the Minister of Education, if he wants to assure the employees of this province that their seniority will be recognized, then all he has to do is put that in the Bill, because when the collective agreement goes, employees' seniority goes.

The minister, who's also minister responsible for the Public Service Commission, Mr. Speaker, knows that full well. And if he wants to protect employee seniority, then he can vote for the amendment that we will be making, that places protection for employee seniority in this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation, as I was mentioning, where this interim governing council will assume power, and it will have the right not only to delete positions and to attack employees whose seniority and collective agreement has been abolished but it will also, Mr. Speaker, have the power to arbitrarily transfer employees, instructors, and staff of the technical institute system from one bargaining unit to another.

That is unprecedented in this province, and it gives you and your departmental staff complete control, Mr. Minister, of the new super-institute for a period of seven months. It's an opportunity for you to put your stamp on this institute and then to turn it over to an appointed board that you establish, who will essentially, Mr. Minister, already have had their dirty work done for them by your interim governing council and your Department of Education staff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the alarming things about this piece of legislation. But it doesn't stop there, Mr. Speaker. Not only, Mr. Speaker, does this Bill abolish the certification orders and the trade union rights of employees in the super-institute, not only does it abolish their seniority rights. Mr. Speaker, and their collective agreement, but it also chooses to undermine other job benefits they have.

I want to give another example. All employees, Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the fact that they belong to SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union), have a long-term disability insurance plan. And as a result of this government arbitrarily abolishing their memberships in Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union, they no longer have a long-term disability insurance plan.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, when we get to Committee of the Whole on this Bill, will be introducing in another amendment to ensure that those employees are protected under a long-term disability insurance plan, and again I'll invite the Minister of Education to support that amendment when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is, in effect, an attempt by this government to rewrite the labour laws of Saskatchewan under the auspices of an Education Bill, because never before, Mr. Speaker, has this kind of arbitrary attack on the employees of an institution been launched by a government in this province.

An Hon. Members: — You're all wet.

Mr. Prebble: — And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has just said that I'm all wet in my remarks. But I say to him, Mr. Speaker, he's not only Minister of Education, he is minister of the Public Service Commission. He understands exactly what he's doing under this Bill. He's the man who just laid off or forced early retirement upon 2,000 public servants in this province. And now, Mr. Speaker, that same man is continuing his attack on professional educators in Saskatchewan, and I say to him, shame. And all members on this side of the House say that it's a disgrace, it's disgusting. And I say to the Minister of Education that it's time for him to withdraw his Bill from this House.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. Order. Allow the hon. member from Saskatoon University to make his remarks without intervening quite as often.

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for calling the Minister of Education to order. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on some of the other unusual labour provisions in this Bill.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education who's also, as I mentioned, minister of the Public Service Commission, is in effect trying to impose upon the employees of the technical institute and community college system, by legislation, what he was not able to accomplish when, as minister of the Public Service Commission, he bargained collectively with those employees.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, he is establishing in law what the bargaining unit shall be for the new super-institute in the event that the employees at the super-institute sign up union membership again and receive a new certification order to be represented by SGEU or by some other union. The minister is taking the unprecedented step, Mr. Speaker, of laying down in law what the bargaining units for the new super-institute shall be, when he knows full well, Mr. Speaker, that it is standard practice in this province for the Labour Relations Board to make that decision, Mr. Speaker, and not for the Minister of Education to make that decision.

And not only is he deciding what the bargain unit shall be, Mr. Speaker, but he is giving the new super-institute board, and in the first seven months his interim governing

council, the power to arbitrarily decide what bargaining unit individual employees shall be in and to transfer them from one bargaining unit to another.

An Hon. Member: — Balderdash.

(1045)

Mr. Prebble: — The Minister of Education says balderdash. He knows full well that the provisions of this Bill clearly establish what the bargaining unit shall be, and allow for individual employees to be moved from one bargaining unit to another. That is unprecedented.

And the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, shakes his head. But, Mr. Speaker, he continues to mislead the people of Saskatchewan about the nature of this Bill. I'm going to look forward to being able to ask him direct questions in committee, Mr. Speaker. We'll see then, Mr. Speaker, whether he denies this, because I think clearly he will not be able to.

Mr. Speaker, those are not the only unusual provisions. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, also goes on to specifically lay out who can be in the trade union, in the event that employees unionize again, and who cannot be. It specifically states who shall be in the managerial group and who shall not.

That again, Mr. Speaker, is never done by legislation in this House. That is always done by the Labour Relations Board. The minister knows that, and what he is doing here in this Bill is arbitrarily overruling the powers and the authority of the Labour Relations Board in this province. And he is making a special exception for community college employees and technical institute employees, and he is essentially continuing the attack that he started this summer when he fired 142 of them, Mr. Speaker.

He has said, Mr. Speaker, that there'll be no lay-offs the day after the Bill becomes law. What I want to see, Mr. Speaker, is whether there will be any lay-offs seven months after this Bill has become law. That will be the test, Mr. Speaker. That will be the real test, and I will be very interested to see what the results of that will be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've made reference to a number of the unusual provisions with respect to the contravention of trade union legislation and labour law in this province. And that alone, Mr. Speaker, is reason enough for members of this Assembly to vote against Bill 46 because I want to point out, Mr. Speaker . . . and we will have a legal opinion which I will be bringing forward in Committee of the Whole to substantiate it.

But upon seeking legal advice, Mr. Speaker, we are informed that the Minister of Education could have brought in the new super-institute without requiring legislation before this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. He could have established the new super-institute and amalgamated the community colleges and technical institutes without legislation. I'm not saying that that would have been advisable, but he could have done it.

What he could not have done without legislation, Mr. Speaker, is violated the labour laws of this province and

brought forward a Bill that specifically exempts the employees of the institutes and the colleges from The Trade Union Act. That's what he could not have done, Mr. Speaker.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that that is the number one reason for this Bill. It is specifically being brought down to exempt the employees of the institutes and the colleges from The Trade Union Act and other labour legislation in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on some of the other issues that Bill 46 raises because in many ways, Mr. Speaker, what we have been seeing in the province of Saskatchewan in the past few months, and what we continue to see with Bill 46, is the kind of attack which the British Columbia Socred government launched on its employees in the post-secondary education system in which hundreds of them were laid off, in which their collective agreements and their trade union rights were eroded. We are seeing that same kind of strategy now, Mr. Speaker, being applied here in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Education has tried to claim, Mr. Speaker, by way of Bill 46, that he is establishing a new era in which a new super-institute board will be created that is an autonomous board, that will now be able to act, Mr. Speaker, according to the Minister of Education, in the same way that the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan boards of governors are able to operate. Well I say to the minister that that is also a very, very false notion.

The minister if not setting up an autonomous board, Mr. Speaker. He's not setting up an autonomous board at all. Instead, Mr. Speaker, what the minister is doing is setting up a board that he will continue to exercise complete control over, and anyone who reads Bill 46, particularly section 7, will realize immediately that the minister has not passed on the authority, full authority, to the new super-institute appointed board at all. What he's done instead, Mr. Speaker, is set up a board that he will be the ultimate controller over.

I want to read section 7, Mr. Speaker. It says:

The minister may:

(a) establish policies in consultation with the institute and give direction for post-secondary education and training to be provided or undertaken by the institute;

The minister may:

(b) co-ordinate programs and activities in the continuing education area between the institute and government . . .
(That's reasonable.)

The minister may:

(c) give directions to the institute on programs, courses, functions or activities to be provided or undertaken or discontinued by the institute,

including core program specialties to be provided at any campus of the institute, and where they are to be provided or undertaken;

And the minister may:

(d) establish policies or procedures for the approval of programs, courses, seminars, or . . . instruction to be provided . . .

And the minister may:

(e) give directions to the institute on educational, operational, administrative, management or other standards or procedures to be established or maintained by the institute . . .

The minister may:

(g) give directions to the institute on fees to be charged by the institute;

The minister may:

(h) direct the institute to acquire any property or services or any category of property or services that it may require from or through the (Saskatchewan) Property Management Corporation;

And the minister may:

(i) require the institute to provide to him any (reports,) information, financial or expenditure plans . . . that he may request.

And above all, Mr. Speaker, here is the clincher:

The institute shall comply with any directions or (any) requirements given or made by the minister pursuant to subsection (1) within any period that the minister may require.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what section 7(1) and (2) of this Bill in effect do, Mr. Speaker, is clearly establish that the Minister of Education is in complete control of the super-institute. He can go so far, Mr. Speaker, as even to determine the fees that the institute may establish. He has complete authority with respect to the establishment or the deletion of programs at the super-institute. He has complete authority, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the budget that the super-institute may establish.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, under section 26 of this Bill, that the board of the super-institute may only undertake its financial budget for the year with the approval of the minister, and they may only borrow money with the approval of the minister.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an autonomous board. This is a board that is, in effect, a puppet board. It lacks the autonomy that the board of governors of the University of Regina or the University of Saskatchewan would have. It in effect leaves a large degree of control with the Minister of Education or anybody that he chooses to appoint from his department to exercise that control, Mr. Speaker. And

in that sense, this board and this legislation do not represent what the Minister of Education has claimed that they represent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on a third element of this legislation which is very disturbing to me. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the decision that the PC government has taken to establish one centrally appointed board to govern the technical institutes and the urban community colleges of this province instead of, Mr. Speaker, adopting an alternative model that was favoured strongly by students, by technical institute instructors and staff, and community college employees in this province, Mr. Speaker, and that was a model that adopted a more decentralized approach and that favoured the establishment of elected boards rather than one centrally appointed board.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to contrast the model that the New Democratic Party is putting forward, a more decentralized model of local governments and elected boards, with the model that we have in Bill 46 which is for one centrally appointed board that will largely be made up, Mr. Speaker, of the government's own political supporters, with no doubt two or three professional educators who are respected in this province added to the board as well, and perhaps, if the minister is serious, a representative from either students or faculty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are of the view that the Government of Saskatchewan ought to be establishing autonomy for the technical institute and community college system, but ought to be doing it by way of four boards, locally elected boards, one in Regina, one in Saskatoon, one in Prince Albert, and one in Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker. Each of these boards in their respective cities would be responsible for the operations and governance of the local community college and technical institute in that community, Mr. Speaker.

And the model that we propose, Mr. Speaker, we believe would be much more responsive to the interests of community groups concerned about adult education, much more responsive to local employers in the respective communities that the institutes serve, and much more responsive to the needs of faculty, students, and staff who work, or are engaged in studies, at the respective post-secondary education institutions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our proposal is that the Minister of Education ought to establish these four local boards and that these boards ought to be structured in the following way. The majority of members of the boards would be elected, Mr. Speaker. And first of all, there would be an elected representative from the students at the local community college and technical institute on the board. Secondly, there would be an elected representative from the faculty of that institute and college on the board. Thirdly, there would be a representative, an elected representative of the alumni, the former students of that institution on the board.

And then in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, a local community council would be established in each of the four communities that I made reference to. And that community council would be made up of organizations

that are interested in adult education, Mr. Speaker, and would have representatives on there from everything from the Métis society through to the chamber of commerce. Any organization in the community that was interested in adult education and the operations of the local college and institute would be eligible for membership on this council, Mr. Speaker. That council in turn would elect four or five members to sit on the local board that governs the institute and community college, Mr. Speaker.

So the elected representatives would be made up of members of the council and, in addition to that, elected representatives from the faculty, from the students, from the staff, and from the alumni. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there is a need to ensure that local employers are represented on the board, and that should be done either by ministerial appointment or by having local employers become members of the council and in turn, through the local community council, be elected onto the local board of governors, Mr. Speaker.

Now in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for each local board to have a province-wide perspective as well as a local perspective. We want this board to be responsive to local community needs, but we also, Mr. Speaker, want the board to be responsive to the needs of the province as a whole. Because whether it be Kelsey Institute, or Wascana Institute, or Saskatchewan Institute ... the Saskatchewan Institute of Technology at Moose Jaw, or NIT (Northern Institute of Technology) at Prince Albert, each institute in each community college must endeavour to serve the needs of the province as well as the needs of the community that they are in.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that we propose that the Minister of Education appoint three or four members on to each local board — members that will live around Saskatchewan, that will come from all walks of life, and that will be able to bring a provincial perspective to the work of each institute, as well as having the local perspective through the elected function, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's our view that this model would be far more desirable than the model that the Minister of Education has put forward. This model would provide faculty and students with a real say over program decision at the local institute. This model, Mr. Speaker, would allow local employers and employers in the region that the institute and college serve to have real input into new program initiatives that ought to be taken.

(1100)

We have heard time and time again around this province that what faculty and students and staff in the community college and technical institute want is some kind of say, first of all, over program decisions that are made in their institute, and secondly, over the way that money is spent in their institute.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, if someone who is an instructor in one of the laboratories or one of the industrial art shops at a technical institute want to go out and buy a new piece of equipment, and it's ... They want to be able to go and get approval for that purchase locally, Mr. Speaker,

where they can do it quickly and go out and get the piece of equipment purchased rather than have to wait for some bureaucracy that's based in Regina to make the decision about whether they can go out and buy that piece of equipment. And, Mr. Speaker, under the model that the Minister of Education is bringing forward in Bill 46, all that will happen is that the bureaucracy that makes the decisions is going to be changed from the Department of Education in Regina to one central appointed board and its staff based in Regina. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not going to make for a more responsive educational system at all.

So it's our view, Mr. Speaker, that decisions about the local budget, decisions about staff hiring, and decisions about program development and program priority are best made at the local level and ought to be made by a local board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not our view that all things governing the technical institutes and community colleges ought to be decided at the local level. There are some things that need to be decided at the provincial level, and I want to give members of the Assembly and members of the public an example of what I mean.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we have to overcome the problems of credits and courses that are taken at one technical institute not being transferable to another institute. The Minister of Education has no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for that situation existing. He has had full control over the institutes for the past five years, and yet he has not created a situation in which credits and courses are transferable between institutes. But, Mr. Speaker, provision for this does need to be made at a central level, either by way of action by the Department of Education or by way of action by some central co-ordinating council made up of representatives from each of the locally elected boards.

Mr. Speaker, there are other things that need to be done centrally. It's our view, for instance, that a collective agreement with the employees ought to be negotiated centrally. It ought to be negotiated either between the Department of Education and the trade union representing college and institute employees or, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be negotiated between some central co-ordinating council representing the four boards and the respective trade union of the employees, Mr. Speaker.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we want to see a situation in which the rights of employees to be represented by SGEU are transferred to this new structure, and that the collective agreements that all employees have in the institute and college system are also transferred to this new structure that we are proposing, that the seniority rights and the disability insurance coverage that all employees have are transferred as well, Mr. Speaker, to this new structure. So we would have a situation in which the collective agreement was still negotiated on all central basis.

And obviously, Mr. Speaker, another decision needs to be made centrally, and that is a decision about what the global budget for each institute shall be and what new programs each institute is allowed to initiate because, Mr.

Speaker, we do not want to see a situation in this province where the institutes and colleges are unnecessarily competing against one another. And surely the decision about the global budget that each institute has, has to be made on a central basis.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are in essence proposing that either the Department of Education continue to make these decisions that I've outlined as they do now, or that a co-ordinating council with two representatives from each of the four local boards be established to make these decisions. And it would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Education and the Department of Education to also have a couple of representatives on this central co-ordinating council.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of model that we propose, a model that provides faculty staff, students, local employers and community organizations with real input into educational decision making which they cannot possibly have with one centrally appointed board; and on the other hand, a provision that ensures that the decisions that need to be made on a province-wide basis, in the interests of the province as a whole and from a provincial perspective, continue to be made centrally either by the Department of Education or by a central co-ordinating council.

Mr. Speaker, that's our vision of what the technical institute and community colleges decision making model ought to be. And you can see, Mr. Speaker, that it is in very sharp contrast with the model that the Minister of Education has provided us with in this Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that could be said about this Bill, but I think that most of them are best left to Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker, but I want to clearly indicate at this point that members on this side of the Assembly will not be supporting Bill 46. We see it, Mr. Speaker, as one of the most unfair and deceptive pieces of legislation that has ever come before this Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, therefore, I wish to read the following motion, seconded by my colleague the member for Prince Albert:

That Bill 46 not now be read a second time, because:

1. It fails to develop a governing structure for the community college and technical institute system that will provide for adequate faculty, staff and student input and that will be responsive to community needs;
2. It fails to respond to the wishes of many members of the educational community to have local governance and elected boards made up of representatives from interested community groups, employers, faculty, students, staff and alumni;
3. It is a flagrant union busting measure under the auspices of an education bill;
4. It abolishes the collective agreements, (the) seniority rights and the long-term disability

benefits held by institute and college staff, and in doing so serves further to demoralize instructors and staff, thus damaging the quality of education available to students;

5. It fails to grant real autonomy to the new institute board but instead makes provision for the minister to exercise complete control over all aspects of the new institute's operations.

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the member for Prince Albert.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to second the motion put by my colleague, the member from Saskatoon University. And in opposition to this Bill which is Bill 46, the institute Bill, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is not a good Bill.

My colleagues and I have had the . . . spent a great deal of time examining this Bill and its consequences. I've heard many representations from people who are affected by this Bill. And I've had the opportunity to listen to many people — educators, administrators, people in the community, students, people with board experience, people who have accumulative hundreds of years of experience. And I must say that outside the hard-rock Tories who still believe in Brian Mulroney, and outside of your political paid employees, out of the dozens of people that I've met, I've only met one who genuinely believed that this was a good Bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad Bill. It's bad because it does little or nothing for education, and its introduction is causing grief around the province. This is not an education Bill; it is a political Bill. It does not address the problems of educators as much as it addresses a political agenda.

What is this Bill 46? What is it that Bill 46 does? Well first of all, Mr. Speaker, it centralizes power over the entire urban community college system and all institutes at Prince Albert, Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw. And I say that's political because it takes away from local input. It takes away the community input, and it takes away from the input on the parts of the students and the staff.

This Bill, secondly, has resulted in the reducing of the offerings of personal development classes, and I say that's political. The minister is deciding for the people what they should take and what they shouldn't take.

Thirdly, this Bill sets the stage for user-pay education, and that's a political move. We on this side have always believed that the best way to stress the importance of education is to have low tuition rates — low tuition rates, not the same as that instituted by private institutions.

And fourthly, Mr. Speaker, this Bill disrupts the instructional process through forcing a loss of employee contract benefits. And I say that's political. You are breaking a contract. You are using political power to break a contract — a contract between the government and the employee, and instructors as employees.

Because you have delivered a political Bill, Mr. Minister, I am saddened. I am saddened because I know that the

people who work with the institutes and the community colleges, I know what they're feeling. They are feeling manipulated. They are feeling used. They feel their professional experience gained from years of dedication is being disregarded, ignored, and deliberately avoided.

People in Saskatchewan who have put their hearts and their minds to work and to evolve a community college system, an institute system, suddenly see an outsider, a Tory politician turned Education minister, bring in his agenda under the guise of an amalgamation Bill. And I say this with all due respect for your office, Mr. Minister, this is not a good Bill. It is a bad Bill for education. It is a politically motivated Bill. It does not build on the strengths already achieved in Saskatchewan, instead it aims to change the course of Saskatchewan education to Tory education. That's what makes it a bad Bill.

I want to elaborate on each of the four points I mentioned. But first let's recall what the government says it wants to do. The minister has repeatedly stated he wants to prepare for the year 2000, that we are in a changing world, that we must adjust to new technology and to earning a living.

(1115)

These pat phrases, Mr. Speaker, are harmless enough, and some people even find them inspiring to hear a little futuristic jargon. But let's look at the action, let's look at the action that's built right into this Bill, Bill 46, The Institute Act. The first thing it does is centralize all of the institutes and community colleges under the direct power of the minister with a cosmetic puppet board. It concentrates the ultimate decision making in the hands of one person, the minister in charge.

Yes, it does make provision for a board and it says in section 11 that the board shall manage and conduct the business affairs of the institute. But it also instructs the board to report to the minister, and I want to read from page 5 of the Act, Mr. Speaker, section 11 (page) 5, says:

The board shall:

- (f) promptly on the conclusion of each meeting of the board or any committee of the board provide to the minister a copy, certified by the secretary of the board, of the minutes of the meeting and any resolutions and bylaws passed at the meeting.

It also instructs the board to comply to all of the directions from the minister. And I want to quote directly from the Act in this respect, Mr. Speaker, section 7(2) from page 4, and it says here:

The institute shall comply with any directions or requirement given or made by the minister pursuant to subsection (1) within any period that the minister may require.

This section gives the minister ultimate power, but also leaves budgeting approval in the hands of the minister, Mr. Speaker, budget approval. And I read to you from page 11 of the Act . . . of this Bill, from page 11, section

20(2), and it reads:

The minister shall review the budget submitted to him pursuant to subsection (1) and may approve the budget or may, after consultation with the board, require the board to revise all or any part of the budget in any manner that he considers.

That means, Mr. Minister, that the board does not get a global sum and then appropriate it according to the way it seems that they would feel it would be the just way. It really means that the board has to try to satisfy the minister, item by item.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is a puppet board. Further to this, it is an appointed board and not an elected board, and that is one of our objections to this. And I want to go to page 9, and enter section 9(1) into the record, this section, Mr. Speaker, which talks about how the manner of the board is appointed. It says:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint a board of directors for the institute consisting of not less than 10 and not more than 20 members.

And I read that as section 9(1) from page 4.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is a board with no real authority. This appointment system, and those items that I read, make it into a puppet board dancing to the strings pulled by the minister.

Mr. Speaker, that may be what the minister envisages as a future for our youth who graduate in the year 2000, but it differs greatly from the vision for the people of Saskatchewan, and it differs greatly with my vision for the year 2000. The last thing I want to see in the post-secondary education system, the second-largest education system in Saskatchewan, is to have it controlled by one person. That's not my idea of educating for administrating into the future.

When it comes to control of our public institutions, the people of Saskatchewan want a system that is run by the people in the community and for the people in the community, and not by the government. They don't want a system where the government pulls the strings at the top and the puppets below are seen to dance.

Just think about it for a minute, Mr. Speaker. How many people in this Assembly or in Saskatchewan would be prepared to give the powers, those same powers, to the minister, over our kindergarten to grade 12 schools? Would you accept a system where our children from kindergarten to grade 12 education and their education would be controlled by a minister with a single puppet board? Would anybody accept that?

How would the people of Saskatchewan react? How would the people of Saskatchewan react, Mr. Minister, if the minister grabbed the power from the school boards, and the school boards had to react in any manner that the minister chose, and he had a complete veto over all budget items? It goes without researching that Saskatchewan residents would not accept such a thing in

K to 12 education, yet the minister is consolidating this power in that manner in post-secondary training, Mr. Speaker. And I say it's wrong. I say it's scary, and it should not be done.

The question arises then, why does the minister insist on being the puppet master of this board? And I believe the answer becomes clearer when we consider the other three effects of this Bill, the three effects being, reducing the offerings of human interest, personal development, and lifelong learning classes; setting the stage for user-pay education; and breaking of the employee/employer contract, in other words known as union busting.

First, one — by reducing the offerings of personal development classes and lifelong learning opportunities. We had a system where the people in the communities around Saskatchewan had made conscious decisions. They made the decisions on how to improve the quality of their lives, and one of the ways that they decided was to engage in adult education classes of their choice.

It caught on around the province like wildfire. People from all walks of life — whether they be shoe-makers or truck drivers or home-makers, teachers, business men, or business women — met in halls and in church basements, and they met there to learn new things that they wanted to learn, learning for the purpose of gaining a greater understanding of our culture, of developing our culture, and of learning about life itself. They were developing personal skills in areas they had always wanted to pursue but had hitherto been unable to.

But what does this minister do? He cuts these classes from the sponsorship of the community colleges. He wants to control what you and I learn. He presumes and has the arrogance to say no. No tax money for Ukrainian or Scottish dancing, no tax money for learning cabinet-making or ceramics or photography or crafts or arts, or skill development in those areas that he regards as frills.

Well, Mr. Minister, I want to say two things about that. Many a person in Saskatchewan has experienced a revitalization and a therapeutic benefit through the classes you have put a stop to. And secondly, many a small entrepreneur got his or her start, or his or her inspiration, or have opened a small business because of an opportunity they had to take art or learning to produce other products that have come up for sale. And this collective benefit has even added to attracting tourists to our province.

I want to turn then to the second thing that this Bill provides for that I think should not provide for, and that is it makes provision for the minister to set up for a user-pay system. The minister gave himself the power to fix and determine the fees for any of the instruction, and this is taken right out of section 7(1). I ask the minister, are the days of the \$1,000 per year tuitions gone from our technical institutes? Are you trying to put in some type of a level playing field so that the fees that they pay, going to the technical institutes, will be the same as the fees that they now have to pay, going to private institution, or to institutions in the United States which are closer to

\$4,000 tuition per year?

This would make post-secondary education beyond the reach of many people. It will be inaccessible to many who now look at education as their only way to be successful. Then if that is not the reason, Mr. Minister, I would like you to explain why you want this article in the Bill.

The third big problem with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is the problem that my colleague from Saskatoon University has elaborated on, and that is that it takes away the contract benefits that the employees now have with the technical institutes, and it makes provision for decertification of those employees and it forces them to recertify. They already had those choices, Mr. Speaker — they already had those choices.

But now what it's done, this Bill, in disguise as an education Bill, has overridden section 37 of The Trade Union Act. And it also overrides the role of the Labour Relations Board to determine the scope of collective bargaining, and it permits the indiscriminate transfer of employees from one bargaining unit to another. It gives the minister provision to move employees, indiscriminate provision for him to move from the public service to the institutes.

Again the minister, through this implementation of this section, indicates that he wants to be a puppet master, and this time pulling the strings of the employees. Why did you not face that as a political issue head-on, I ask this government? Why did you do it this way? You're doing more harm to education than good by introducing this type of union-busting tactic into an education Act.

The friction and the tension and the resentment on the part of employees demoralize the entire staff and, as a result, it's reducing the efficiency of education service delivery. If your agenda was any good, Mr. Minister, you should have clearly and openly consulted and come to an agreement with the employees. But you chose instead this cowardly route. You chose the back door to carry out your political union busting. That's deceitful and the employees know it. You're using an education Bill to do your political transformation of employee/employer relations. That's dishonest and that's why this Bill is so distasteful. That's why there is so little support for it outside the members sitting opposite.

You had an alternative, Mr. Minister, and I've told you about it in estimates, and my colleague from Saskatoon University has outlined it in detail today. You would be wise to scrap this Bill, Mr. Minister — scrap the Bill and start anew.

(1146)

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

Yea — 16

Blakeney	Kowalsky
Prebble	Anguish
Shillington	Goulet

Koskie
Tchorzewski
Thompson
Simard
Solomon

Lyons
Calvert
Lautermilch
Trew
Van Mulligen

Nays — 27

Devine	Martin
Duncan	Toth
McLeod	Sauder
Berntson	Hopfner
Lane	Petersen
Taylor	Swenson
Smith	Baker
Swan	Gleim
Hodgins	Neudorf
Gerich	Gardner
Hepworth	Kopelchuk
Hardy	Saxinger
Klein	Britton
Pickering	

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yea — 27

Devine	Martin
Duncan	Toth
McLeod	Sauder
Berntson	Hopfner
Lane	Petersen
Taylor	Swenson
Smith	Baker
Swan	Gleim
Hodgins	Neudorf
Gerich	Gardner
Hepworth	Kopelchuk
Hardy	Saxinger
Klein	Britton
Pickering	

Nays — 17

Blakeney	Kowalsky
Prebble	Anguish
Shillington	Goulet
Koskie	Lyons
Tchorzewski	Calvert
Thompson	Lautermilch
Upshall	Trew
Simard	Van Mulligen
Solomon	

The Bill read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hepworth that Bill No. 47 — **An Act respecting Regional Colleges** be now read a second time.

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that members on this side of the House support the central thrust of Bill 47, which is the offering of expanded technical institute programming and community college programming throughout rural Saskatchewan. We support, Mr. Speaker, the notion of offering first- and second-year university classes in rural communities to be delivered through the proposed regional college model that the government is putting forward, and we support the notion that expanded technical institute programming ought to also be delivered in rural communities through the regional college model.

Mr. Speaker, what is unclear from this Bill and what is unclear in the sense that the minister has given no indication of his financial plans with respect to the funding of such programs, is whether the moneys will be in place to assure that first- and second-year university courses and technical institute courses can be offered in rural Saskatchewan through the regional colleges without, Mr. Speaker, sacrificing the quality of education at the University of Regina, the University of Saskatchewan, and the four technical institutes as we currently know them.

If the Minister of Education is talking about putting new money into the system to provide university and vocational school courses in rural Saskatchewan, then we commend him for that. If he is talking about eroding the budgets of the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan and the technical institutes even further in order to offer this extension programming, then we say that that will be a set-back to education in the province, and although it may enhance rural accessibility it will be at the expense of the core programs offered in our major urban centres. And, Mr. Speaker, in addition it will result in second-class programming being offered in rural Saskatchewan.

So the key to the success of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is not the legislation as we see it, but rather the question of whether a government that has steadily eroded the education budget in the last couple of years is now going to be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to come forward with substantial amounts of new funding to allow for this rural extension initiative to be successfully put in place. And that is the key with respect to the Bill. But we support the basic principle, Mr. Speaker, of the Bill, which is to enhance the thrust of post-secondary education in rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, unlike Bill 46, Mr. Speaker, which is simply a blatant attack on the collective bargaining rights, the trade union rights, the seniority rights of employees in the urban community colleges and technical institutes, Bill 47, Mr. Speaker does not single out rural community college employees, and does not exempt them from the laws of The Trade Unions Act in the way that Bill 46 does to urban community college employees.

Bill 47, Mr. Speaker, does make provision for rural employees in the community college and technical institute system to retain their union status, and it also makes provision for them to maintain their collective

agreement. And therefore we also feel more favourably disposed to Bill 47, Mr. Speaker, on that account.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have three important and fundamental objections to Bill 47, and I want to outline those now. These, Mr. Speaker, are not objections with respect to the basic principle of the Bill, but they are substantive objections to the way in which the legislation has been drafted.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we object to the government's conscious initiative to delete community interest courses from the mandate of the rural community college system. We've debated that matter in this legislature before. I only want to say today, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has consciously left the impression with the people of Saskatchewan that the community interest courses that were being offered by the rural community college system were somehow adding a financial burden onto that system, Mr. Speaker. The minister has somehow left us with the impression, and attempted to leave the public with the impression, that the community interest courses were costing Saskatchewan taxpayers a good deal of money. This, Mr. Speaker, was not the case.

I invite the minister or any other member of this House to go to the rural community colleges of this province and to inquire about the financing arrangements for community interest courses, and that member will find that in the large majority of cases in rural Saskatchewan, community interest courses, Mr. Speaker, whether they be in the area of health care or in the area of agricultural machinery repair or whether they be such courses as cooking and ballroom dancing, were for the most part being offered on a break-even basis, Mr. Speaker.

These community interest courses were not costing the taxpayers money. They were primarily being paid for by the users of the courses, but they were being co-ordinated by the community colleges. And that, I think, Mr. Speaker, is the important point to make, that the community colleges were playing a co-ordinating role and role as the central resource for putting on these courses, Mr. Speaker.

And as a result of that, the loss of these community interest courses mean that many rural communities who had community college courses being offered in that community this spring do not have community interest courses being offered there this fall, nor do they have any other community college courses being offered. In other words, there are many rural communities that have completely lost all their courses being offered by the community college because the only courses that were being offered were community interest courses and they are now no longer part of the mandate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister is yelling across: 4 per cent of the courses offered. And I want to say to the minister that this is a calculation based on the number of hours of study. And this is just one of the ways, Mr. Speaker, in which the minister opposite has misled the public because he's tried to leave the impression that these were 4 per cent of the courses. Well that's not the case.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that more and more the community college system has gotten into adult basic education, which is good. But the students in adult basic education are full-time students putting in 35 or even 40 hours a week. Mr. Speaker, the people taking community interest courses are taking them for two or three hours a week, so naturally the number of hours that are associated with community interest courses are much less than the number of hours associated with adult basic education.

(1200)

But the point, Mr. Speaker, is that many rural hamlets and small rural communities in this province didn't have adult basic education courses or university courses or vocational institute courses being offered in their communities, and they won't have after this Bill passes. But they did have community interest courses being offered in their communities, and they were an important source of enjoyment and education and socialization in those small rural communities. And that provision, that part of the mandate of the community colleges, is now gone.

And I say to the Minister of Education that this part of the community college mandate wasn't costing the taxpayers of this province very much, not very much at all. In most cases, these courses were being run on a break-even basis. There's simply no good reason for the Minister of Education removing these community interest courses from the mandate of the community college system, because what the minister is saying when he does that, Mr. Speaker, is that is no role for education for enjoyment and pleasure and for learning just for its own worth in the new mandate of the system, Mr. Speaker.

The minister is instead saying that the mandate of this system ought to be job-oriented, work-oriented only, training for a job. We don't support that change in the mandate, Mr. Speaker, and we say there is no good reason, financially or educationally, for the Minister of Education to make that move.

Mr. Speaker, the second point that we object to in Bill 47 is much the same point that I made with respect to Bill 46, and that is, Mr. Speaker, that we believe the time has come for the rural community college boards to be elected boards and not appointed boards, in the same way that we are of the view that in the urban centres the technical institutes and community colleges would be better governed by a locally elected board rather than by one centrally appointed board as envisioned by the minister.

And as was the case in Bill 46, we believe that the faculty and staff who work for the community college system ought to have an elected representative, at least one elected representative, on the local community college board, in the same way that under Bill 46 we proposed that local faculty and local staff in the community college and institute system ought to be represented on boards in Saskatoon, Regina, Prince Albert and Moose Jaw.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's our view therefore that we would be better served by a board of perhaps 10 people in each

regional college that the minister proposes; that the majority of those members ought to be elected. If the minister wants to appoint a couple of people to round out the board or to bring a particular perspective to the board, he's welcome to do that. We have no problem with that.

But we believe that the minister would be well advised to follow the very successful model of the Prince Albert Regional Community College, in which the majority of board members were elected. And no one can deny that was the community college in Saskatchewan that was the most responsive to local needs, that was most responsive to students and faculty at the college, and that was most responsive to community organizations and employers that were interested in adult education, Mr. Speaker. And we believe that the Minister of Education would be well advised to apply that model to rural Saskatchewan and to the new regional college boards that he is establishing.

So we call for elected boards with representative elected from a local community council made up of employers and community organizations that are interested in adult education. And in addition, Mr. Speaker, we call on the minister to make provision for elected representative of community college staff to be also on that board.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the second area in which we disagree with the Bill that the Minister of Education has brought down. And on each of those scores, Mr. Speaker, we will be introducing amendments into this Assembly during Committee of the Whole to have the points that I've made inserted into the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have a third objection to this Bill, and that is, Mr. Speaker, the provision that is made under this Bill to abolish the collective agreement and the trade union rights of members of the community college system who work in northern Saskatchewan.

For some inexplicable reason, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has chosen to maintain and recognize the trade union rights of rural community college employees in rural Saskatchewan, but is saying to members of the community college staff in northern Saskatchewan that their trade union rights are not to be recognized under this Bill, that their seniority rights are not recognized under this Bill, and that their collective agreement is not recognized under this Bill.

And I ask the Minister of Education to explain to members of this House, Mr. Speaker, how it is that the employees of Beauval at the West Side Community College are . . . who just decided to join Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union in July, Mr. Speaker, and who just had their certification order approved by the Labour Relations Board on September 15, why it is that those employees should have to vote once more, Mr. Speaker, on whether or not they want to belong to a trade union.

Those employees have already made that decision, and this Minister of Education is saying to those employees that their decision is invalid. He is using legislation in this Assembly to specifically deny them the rights that they have just won, Mr. Speaker, and that is sheer and unadulterated union busting, and it is clearly not in the

best interest of those employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we therefore call on the Minister of Education to withdraw the provisions of this Bill that deny northern employees their collective bargaining rights and their trade union status.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on some of the other reservations we have about this Bill from the point of view of its trade union provisions. Like Bill 46, Mr. Speaker, any employee who is transferred from a unionized college to a non-unionized college cannot take their trade union rights with them — once again, Mr. Speaker, in violation of section 37 of The Trade Union Act.

This provision is contained in section 33(2) of this Bill — the Minister of Education or the local boards have the ability to transfer college employees from one college region to another, and should those employees be transferred from a unionized college region to a non-unionized college region, their right to be represented by SGEU and their collective agreement is lost.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we object to section 33(4) of this Bill, which abolishes the certification orders in the urban community colleges of this province. I've already outlined the arguments that we have in opposition to this when we were debating Bill 46, Mr. Speaker. We strongly object to this provision of the Bill, and once again we will be moving an amendment to strike that provision out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we also object to the fact that under this legislation, as was the case with Bill 46, there is no provision for people whose jobs are abolished or deleted in the urban community college system to move into the public service. The Minister of Education is denying the employees who worked for Saskatchewan's technical institutes, and who worked for Saskatchewan's community colleges, to be able to move into the public service if their job in the college or institute system is being abolished, Mr. Speaker. And we also object to that.

It has been standard practice, as I've mentioned in this House before, that when employees are transferred from one institute to another, that their trade union rights are transferred with them, and that their collective agreement is transferred with them. And it has been standard practice in this province, as was the case even with the employees that were transferred out of the public service and into the water corporation, that they were entitled, if their job in the water corporation was deleted, to apply for a job back in the public service. And that right is being denied to them under this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Those are some of the objections that we have to this Bill. There is one final objection that I want to make reference to and that, Mr. Speaker, is our objection to the decision by this government to amalgamate the three northern community college boards into one board, Mr. Speaker. The new boundaries that the Minister of Education has generally set for the regional college boards are not sensitively drawn up.

As has been noted in previous debates in this House, when the boundaries for areas such as Prince Albert and Moose Jaw were drawn up, the rural areas immediately around Moose Jaw and immediately around Prince Albert are no longer serviced by those community colleges. They will now, Mr. Speaker, have to be serviced by regional colleges — community colleges that are very distant from those rural areas immediately around the urban centres that I just made reference to. That's an unwise move by this government. There's no reason why someone who lives just outside of Prince Albert should have to deal with the community college that is based 60 or 70 miles away from them, Mr. Speaker. That's just foolishness.

In the same way, Mr. Speaker, we object to the move that this minister has made to amalgamate the three northern community colleges into one. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that those three northern community college boundaries accurately reflected communities of interest in the North and trading patterns in the North, and there is little to be said for, again, a move towards centralizing decision making into one board that will be appointed by this government.

So we believe that the Minister of Education, and the people of this province, and the Legislative Assembly, would have been much better served by maintaining the three northern community college boards as they were, establishing them as regional community college boards and allowing them to offer university and technical institute programming in the same way that the rural regional college boards are being allowed to do.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the items that we object to in this Bill. Nevertheless, we support the central thrust of this Bill and, therefore, since the second reading vote is simply based on the question of whether or not the opposition supports the basic principle of the Bill, which is in this case offering first- and second-year university and technical institute training in rural Saskatchewan, on second reading we will be supporting Bill 47.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some comments in regards to Bill 47.

I would like to make comments, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the issue of the governance and control of the new Northlands Career College. I would also like to talk a little bit about the staff morale and also programming and also some implied thrusts in the Act in regards to programming.

First of all, in regards to control and governance, I think it's very clear from the outset that the Act itself gives more power and more control to the government. That is very clear. It takes power away from people and moves it to the minister. In other words, what we have is a situation where we have a power-hungry Education minister wanting to wrest control of education from people in northern Saskatchewan to himself at a greater scale than ever before in the history of northern adult education.

I will point two examples to that. The first example is this.

In the new Act it states that there will be an appointed board. One of the clear things, one of the clearest messages I gave to the minister earlier on this year was that northern people were tired of appointed systems which were controlled especially by the minister or the government.

(1215)

They wanted to move in a new era of adult education where the control would be from the people. The people could elect their members and they would be given the chance to be responsible for adult education. This was a clear message that I gave to the minister earlier on before he created this Bill. But the minister of course has complete disrespect for the people of the North. The minister feels that the people of the North are not ready to govern their adult education institutions. The minister feels that there is no way at this stage in history that we could move to a more responsible elected system of adult education in the North.

An Hon. Member: — Just ask the Gabriel Dumont Institute how they feel about our . . .

Mr. Goulet — I would say, Mr. Minister, to the minister that is talking about Gabriel Dumont Institute right now, that the same issue is there. He tried to wrest power from the Gabriel Dumont Institute, but it was only because the board resisted and brought the minister to his senses that a more proper SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) agreement was made, because initially they wanted to do away with the Gabriel Dumont Institute board. The people stood up, and luckily for a change in that one instance, the minister was brought to his senses and he listened for a moment.

But getting back to the control in regards to northern control, that's the real key issue. We've had it for many, many years where we have stated that's the direction to go, and that by only giving the people the responsibility could development occur. You can't have the government hovering over your head and telling you what to do in every case. You have to allow the people the autonomy to govern themselves in their adult education institutions. And that was a clear message that I gave to the minister. But I guess he does not recognize this sensitive and important question as far as the North is concerned. Continually, we have insensitive practice, you know, through what has happened this year and also in terms of this new Bill in regard to northern control.

I would say this, as far as the minister is concerned. I think he is stuck in the Dark Ages of the past. We were moving in the direction of greater responsibility and control in the North. The minister moves to less control.

In regard to the boards, we had 22 board members in northern Saskatchewan. The minister's proposal is that he could cut it as low as four, and he will only agree to a maximum of 10. That's one-fifth to less than one-half of what it was before. There'll be a lot less community representation from the many communities who demand good, solid adult education programming in their communities. That is lost.

What the government is proposing is, and I look at this new Bill . . . And I was in tune with the other Community Colleges Act. As a former principal of the La Ronge Region Community College, and also having taken part in the development of adult education, especially in the community college area for a three-year period, I well recognize what the Act was. And sure, we knew there were restrictions in the former Act in two cases, and we were trying to talk to the ministers and say we should be granted more autonomy in regards to, you know, the ministerial control.

But I see this new Act and it's amazing. We start with control. Everything is subject to the minister. I haven't seen an education Act of this sort for a long time. Here we have section 4. Even dealing with regional areas it's controlled by the minister, and of course he did that unilaterally by moving three areas and putting them into one. The minister has final and firm control on that, and he also has control on section 11 in regards to employees and also the remuneration and salary of it that really . . . what will the future of collective bargaining mean in the North. I mean section 11(b) has it under the control of the minister.

There is also a control element in regards to the setting of the direction of the colleges. The people no longer set the direction in regards to northern education — the minister does. That again is a question, you know, greater control.

When I look at section 14(a) and so on, there's a lot of aspects of even property control. I mean, why don't you have that under the autonomy of the colleges? You look at other . . . section 15(1), (2), (3), section (4) on overspending, section 15(3) on budget. You can even fire the board any time from section 15(5). If they overspend a little bit on their budget he can fire the board — just like that. He has the power to do that.

He has the power to do auditor . . . shades of the auditor Bill that we are talking about in this legislature. We have section 19 on an inspector. We have section 21. I can go on and on.

Mr. Minister, I have never seen such great government and ministerial control in the history of the education Acts in this province, and this pertains to the community colleges in this province. So I as a community college person and a former employee and principal, we're always concerned about that, but now we see that it is even worse. And this is a government who promised up and down that they would go for more local autonomy and local control and community participation. It was said left and right, but now they are moving in a direction of more direct ministerial control on the budget, even controlling salaries of the employees so that the board cannot have autonomy in that decision making. There will be really no collective bargaining *per se*. We were concerned about that aspect before, and so on.

One aspect also in regards to the community college employees, which will be the new Northlands Career College employees is that it strikes me as a bit ridiculous when the process of certification was taking place just last month in regards to certifying the people in Westside

Community College to the SGEU, that the minister disallows that now, that it is not considered.

There is no historical continuum from what happens from one month to the next. There is absolutely no planning from this minister. He has absolutely no concept of transition, and I really feel that a lot more consideration should be paid in regards to the transfer of employees from the former three colleges to the new colleges. It's not very clear in regards to the Act, especially in regards to section 32(5) which says that:

... the Northlands Career College is not bound by:

(a) any order of the Labour Relations Board with respect to (the transfers) ...

So that some clarification needs to be made by the minister in that regard. Also, when we talk about the transfers from the rest of the community colleges and the institutes, my understanding is that they may be able to be transferred into the northern areas, and there needs to be greater classification from the minister as to whether or not, you know, that it's true. But again there is contradictions in the Act which says that "it is not bound by." Nothing is bound by in regards to the recognition of the rights of the employees. So that's an important point.

And as we look to any development, the employees, the instructors, and you yourself, Mr. Speaker, as a person who has been working in the education field, educational change comes from the practitioners, the people who work on a daily basis with the students. The essence of change also comes from that. And unless there is good morale and good support and good recognition from their input and their consultation, the impact is a downward trend on morale. A lot of people feel very highly uneasy about the situation.

And as a result, a lot of the concern in regards to the dealing with the new government and their power and control becomes an important problem that they have to deal with, along with the daily aspects of dealing with the special situation of education in northern Saskatchewan. I mean there is tremendous enough problems in dealing with curriculum change and dealing with the aspects of revising curriculum in the North without having to worry about a power-hungry minister in this province of Saskatchewan.

The other aspect I would like to mention a little bit is this: that I felt, Mr. Minister, that there was a little bit of a stress in the Bill in regards to programming, where he definitely looks at private business in regards to the North.

And I looked at other aspects of the ... The same central thing occurred with the development of SIAST, where he says that SIAST will be managed in part using modern private sector management techniques. And the same ideology of open for business and private sector involvement, greater ...

I mean to a certain degree that needs to happen in the adult education system. But the Premier and also the Minister of Education are going a little bit overboard in this aspect. The control of education at the community

level is not only one of business people. Business people are an important aspect of it, but they're not also the only ones. There are people who build the schools that are there. The workers in the community that are an important aspect of the development, they know exactly what the level of training is required throughout, but there is absolutely no mention of that.

There is also the special aspect of the cultural and social realms of northern Saskatchewan — the impact of the Indian-Métis community in northern Saskatchewan. The minister is ... seems to be moving in a direction of getting only advice from the business people, but he won't get advice from Indian-Métis people in northern Saskatchewan or all of the various levels of workers in northern Saskatchewan. He doesn't even get the advice from the people who teach the courses at the community college level. Instead he completely disregards those.

And I feel very strongly that the minister has to move in the direction where he really consults with the educators; he really consults with the community people and not only the business sector; that he really consults with non-native people as well as Indian-Métis people in the North, and that's very clear, and that has to come out in more clarity as he applies this Bill in the future.

But because of his narrow-mindedness, and because of the ... say of the open-for-business strategy in the past six years, Mr. Speaker, I am a little ... I shudder a little bit now that he's going to apply the same concepts. The same disastrous six-year concepts that we've had in our economy he going to apply the same thing in the educational establishment. And I feel, and I shudder to think what impact that will be in regards to education. That'll really put us back in the Dark Ages.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I ... as an educator, has been raised in regards and looked at the development of northern Saskatchewan, am making these comments to make sure that the minister indeed takes the positive approach. I wished he would make a change and get an elected board in the North. Recognize the importance. Pay your respects to the people of northern Saskatchewan. Give them full autonomy and responsibility.

When changes are made in regards to employees, fully consult them. The educational practitioners are the most important and fundamental aspect of change in the educational scene. And if you completely disregard them, there is low-level morale. We want to create a positive thrust in that area, and hopefully, as we move into the future to bring forth this new Bill, we could move in that direction. I certainly hope that the minister can change his approach and start dealing more effectively with the practitioner.

(1230)

The other aspect, I hope that the minister is not stuck on a narrow-minded, open-for-business strategy in the educational establishment and comes out with a two-pronged approach that I hear, you know, via Maggie Thatcher from England, where you try and stream your vocational into academic and vocational education. I

hope that he's not moving in that direction on his open-for-business strategy, because that seems to be what is implied in the adult education world in Britain at the present time, which means that the control is wrested from the community level and that different important groups in the community — such as, you know, the workers who build the schools and the roads and the infrastructure of the community — are involved also in the process of improving the dynamics and the development of education, that the practitioners are also in the same way.

So with these, I hope that the minister takes it to heart and takes these recommendations in a positive manner, so that when he applies the Bill, when he actually votes for it and he moves in that direction, that education is not only business-oriented; it's got to be people-oriented as well, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the minister finally grasps that concept. And I hope that he changes the control also, and I hope to see that as we debate this Bill in the future, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to address a few words on Bill 47. They'll be no more than that.

I want to say that, as my colleague from Saskatoon said, that we will be voting for the Bill.

The provision of university courses in rural areas has long been a goal of many rural areas. I recall 15 years ago in Moosomin presenting a brief to a university commission. We wanted university courses in Moosomin. It's long been a goal of rural people.

I regret so say, Mr. Speaker, that the laudable goal has been badly tarnished by some of the provisions of this Bill, and I want to refer to them. I want to echo what my colleague from Cumberland said. I don't pretend to be as articulate or as knowledgeable as he about northern affairs.

I do recall a couple of years ago having a round . . . we called them round table discussions on family stress. One of the hearings was held in northern Saskatchewan. The then member from Shaunavon, the present member from Elphinstone, and myself were the commission. I recall spending a good deal of the morning talking about adult education. The former concept had been one of the bright lights of northern Saskatchewan prior to '82. There was room for improvement, but it had been one of the success stories, I gather. What happened since then to NORTEP (northern teacher education program) was not one of the success stories. I hope that the comments made by the member from Cumberland are taken to heart and services to those people who so badly need them are restored.

I want to make a comment with respect to the collective bargaining provisions. I say to the member from Weyburn and the minister, this is just not an acceptable way to treat people. The member from Weyburn and the member from Melville and the member from Yorkton have almost a tradition of ignorance with respect to collective bargaining. They don't know what it is. They don't know

the origins of it. They don't know how it works. All they know is they're against it. The member from Melville made that abundantly clear in his comments yesterday to the SFL (Saskatchewan Federation of Labour), that they do not understand what collective bargaining is.

Collective bargaining and a union is a voluntary association of people who voluntarily get together, who voluntarily remain in association for the purposes of bargaining their rights and their conditions of employment with their employer. It is not some sort of a gangster-dominated eastern organization which enslaves workers. Nor, Mr. Speaker, is it an organization which is able to seek unfair advantage for its members.

To listen to the members opposite talk about big eastern union bosses, I'd like to hear them name one that they think operates in this province. To hear them talk, one would think that the trade unions which represent employees in this and other areas are dominated by gangsters, exist solely for the interests of the big eastern union bosses, and they're doing irreparable damage to the Saskatchewan economy. None of that is true — none of that is true.

This particular section, and the section in Bill 46, are as violent a transgression of the rights of people with respect to collective bargaining as I have seen. These sections, which in a few sections sweep away the rights of people, are just not acceptable. This is not an acceptable way to deal with people in a democratic society. And if this government opposite doesn't know that, they're going to be replaced by a government that does understand that. This is just not acceptable to the public of Saskatchewan, and that's true whether you live in Regina, or whether you live in Coronach, or in Semans.

It is part of the fabric of Saskatchewan people that we may disagree with people that live in other parts of the province and their demands, but we all expect everybody to be treated fairly. No one can pretend that this section represents a fair treatment of those employees. We will, Mr. Speaker, be saying a good deal more about this in Committee of the Whole when we get there.

I want to express one other comment, and that has to do with what I regard as the virtual death of adult education in this province. When these colleges were originally set up, they were set up . . . and the philosophy was that learning a lifelong activity. It's something that we do when we're young, but it's something we need to do when we're adults. We need to . . .

And Hon. Member: — Do you disagree with that?

Mr. Shillington: — No, but I think the drafters of this Bill did. When you take away . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wonder if the member from Weyburn might contain his comments until his closing remarks. You'll get an opportunity to do that. I find the member from Weyburn neither humorous nor helpful, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Obnoxious.

Mr. Shillington: — Obnoxious is quite a good word.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of courses, whether it be auto mechanics for housewives, whether it be artistic courses on artistic endeavours — ballet or basket weaving, whatever your tastes may be; whether it be introducing adults to the use of computers, this is basically what adult education is about. We aren't going to attract an endless number of adults into courses which are career oriented. A great many adults, and that's particularly true in rural Saskatchewan, already have their careers mapped out for them and they're not likely to change.

What the concept of lifelong education means is that we should be able to follow interests that we have. If I happen to develop a sudden interest in auto mechanics — and it would be very sudden, it doesn't exist in any large measure at the moment — but if I were to develop that there should be a scope for that. There should be scope for people to learn about things that are of interest to them. That's largely going to disappear and these regional colleges will be, to a far larger extent than they have been, career orientated. But that is needed.

We also need that broader concept of teaching people and giving them an opportunity to learn things which are of interest to them which may have no real bearing on their careers as such. It just enriches and enlivens their lives.

With that I say again, Mr. Speaker, that we're not going to be opposing this. We are going to be introducing some amendments, and we shall see after the amendments what our position will be. Thank you.

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Lane that Bill No. 51 — **An Act to Provide for the Imposition of Taxes on and the Collection of Taxes from Certain Purchasers of Certain Fuels and to Provide for Rebates of Taxes to Certain Purchasers** be now read a second time.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on Bill 51 which is the Bill which will in effect increase the gas tax from zero to 7 cents a litre on every purchase of fuel in this province. I find that the timing of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is quite unusual. We hear from every member of the government that the opposition is delaying the sitting of the legislature. Well I want to point out to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction of the . . . and the announcing of the gas tax was made on June 17, which was sitting day number 22 in this legislature.

It took the government not one week or two weeks or five weeks or six weeks to get this Bill tabled so we could debate the issue and discuss the pros and cons of the implementation of this gas tax. Rather, Mr. Speaker, it has taken over 60 sitting days from the time they announced the tax increase until the time they introduced this Bill — 60 sitting days. It was introduced on day number 22. The first reading of this Bill was not undertaken until October 7, which was day 92, which was 70 days actually, Mr. Speaker, which is in total over four months. And the second reading never came until late last night. You have the government again making an accusation that is totally

unfounded, making an accusation which has no truth to it at all, trying to mislead the public of this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want the people of this province to understand that this is not an unusual tactic of the government opposite. The government of this province has continued to mislead people in terms of every commitment they've made prior to elections, during elections, and even after election campaigns. I see in the *Leader-Post* yesterday, Mr. Speaker, an article where the Premier says:

. . . he is seriously considering steps to limit the amount of time spent in the legislature discussing the provincial budget.

This is what he is quoted as saying.

The provincial budget was introduced in the legislature June 17 (he says) and still has not been approved by the legislature . . .

How can we approve the estimates when it takes 70 sitting days, four months after the announcement of the budget, to introduce a piece of legislation which makes the budget an honest budget, in the sense of passing a law in order to collect taxes. What kind of silly statement is this by our Premier? Making a suggestion that the opposition is taking too much time to conduct the opposition's business in this House.

One of our responsibilities to hold this government accountable on the actions that they undertake. The action they've undertaken in this last budget was to increase the fuel sales tax from zero cents a litre to 7 cents a litre.

(1245)

And they have not been called accountable until last night and this morning. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan recognize this is another example of something that they have indicated in public that they are doing, when in fact it's the opposite of the truth.

Mr. Speaker, the fuel tax in my view is an unfair, cruel, bureaucratic nightmare. What this government has done is they have promised, when they eliminated the gas tax back in 1982, never to reimpose the gas tax as long as there was a Conservative government in this province. The Premier himself made that commitment just outside this legislature in May of 1982. What we have seen as well, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier and the other Conservative members around this province going around — and other members in the country going around to various meetings, speaking to various newspaper or radio and television people, saying that the Conservative government when they become government will do away with red tape, that we will minimize red tape for business, that we will minimize red tape for individuals and citizens of this province.

What this fuel tax has done, Mr. Speaker, has not reduced red tape for anybody. What it has done, it has increased the amount of red tape in this province by a percentage

factor that I can't even calculate. What they have done is, not eliminate red tape, they have brought in 641,000 licensed vehicle operators in this province into a red tape nightmare that is second to none, that I'm aware of, in North America. Six hundred and forty-one thousand licensed vehicle operators in this province, Mr. Speaker, who now must on a weekly basis collect their gas tax receipts, put them into a file folder or an envelope and save them up. And next year perhaps, if they still have any left, they'll file for a refund.

If each one of those operators file for a refund as a result of purchasing gas once a week over the next year, they will generate around 34 million tax receipts or 35 million gas tax receipts or more, and that is involving 641,000 operators of vehicles. Plus, Mr. Speaker, I contend, a number of civil servants that they can't even calculate, who will have to go through these receipts and try and determine whether they are legitimate, to try and determine whether they can in fact provide a refund to them.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a clear breaking of their promise once again. They promised less red tape, and they have in fact undertaken through this fuel tax increase to provide more red tape in this province to more individuals than in the history of this province, than in the history of this country, I maintain.

What we also see, Mr. Speaker, which is a very, very sad operation on the part of this government, is that many of these people can see that there is an opportunity for an abuse of the program. You have heard stories, members opposite have heard stories, about individuals who are buying cigarettes by the litre so that they can get a tax receipt. We have heard stories, Mr. Speaker, of gas station operators asked to provide them with blank receipts. We've heard stories of customers saying to gas station operators, oh, just give me another 10 or \$20 on the receipt. And I'm not saying that this is something that I am encouraging. I think it's not a good thing to encourage. But what the system has done, Mr. Speaker, is provided a lot of people with an opportunity to abuse the system.

So I wonder what the government's going to do come next fall or next spring when they finally decide to pay some of this money back when, in fact, the number of dollars that's been requested for refund actually surpasses the amount they've collected. I wonder what the government would do if that was the case?

I heard a story the other day about somebody who robbed a gas station or tried to rob a gas station. And they weren't looking for cigarettes or fuel, they were looking for the gas receipt books. Those are now more valuable commodities out there than some of the products that are in the stations.

But I think that's a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on the type of government that we have today. A government which has, in every campaign promise, promised to reduce red tape, promised to improve our governments, promised to provide the people of this province with some fiscal responsibility, and in every case they have failed on those promises. It's a question in my view, Mr. Speaker, of credibility. They have no credibility with

people that they speak with or people that read their literature. They always make commitments that they can't keep.

What this gas tax does as well, Mr. Speaker, is not just burden more of the people of this province with red tape, but what it also does is it adds extra expense. We've seen the dental therapists, 411 in number, be terminated for providing a very good service to the children of this province. And now we're going to have to see the government hire hundreds of more people to process these gas tax receipts.

I think it's a ludicrous situation, it's a ludicrous tax. People in this province are laughing at that government, they're laughing at the Premier for many issues, but in particular this one. They think it's the craziest thing that's ever happened in this province. They're asking me whether Monty Python is writing their policies. It's just unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in times of tough economy a government has to become more involved in the economy in terms of money generation, job generation and program and economic development generation.

When this economy is in need of a shot in the arm, what they've done with this Bill is shoot the economy in the head. They've taken \$100 million out of the pockets of taxpayers and licensed vehicle operators in this province, and instead of using that money for a purpose which is of some benefit to this province, that is, letting the consumers and taxpayers and vehicle operators spend that money on business items in the economy to generate other work activity, other economic activity, they have in essence, Mr. Speaker, withdrawn that \$100 million a year from the economy of this province when it's in desperate need of an injection of economic activity.

The fuel tax, Mr. Speaker, is a hidden tax which, in my view, and in the view of almost all municipal councillors and politicians that I've spoken to, increased property taxes. And the way that will do it is because the fuel tax now has to be paid by the transportation systems in the cities and the urban areas. They have not budgeted . . . their operating grants have not increased. They've not budgeted for that increase because this provincial budget, this tax increase, was introduced after the municipalities approved their budgets.

So what's going to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that these municipalities will have to transfer this tax increase on to the ratepayers of the urban municipalities. The rural municipalities will be forced with increased operating costs as well, and therefore the ratepayers in rural municipalities will be faced with the same tax increase.

School boards will be increasing their taxes as well because they have a fairly large bus fleet, or number of bus fleets, around this province, and they are committed by this Bill, by this government, to pay these taxes. And, Mr. Speaker, in these times when the economy is down, when rural people and urban people alike are in the same proposition of having to look at increased food and clothing costs and an increased cost of living, they're being asked to contribute towards the mismanagement of

this government.

The fuel tax increase does not address the problem of the mismanagement of this government — that's very clear, Mr. Speaker. Rather than looking at their own operation, looking at the expenditure of \$2 million a month on advertising, rather than looking at some of their patronage appointments, rather than looking at the way that they're providing all kinds of tax breaks for oil companies and banks, they have instead, Mr. Speaker, ignored the options and the choices that they have, and instead, Mr. Speaker, they have increased the fuel tax to people in this province. The other interesting item about the fuel tax, Mr. Speaker, is that the fuel tax is not just 7 cents a litre in an isolated way. It has been increased, Mr. Speaker, from what it used to be. When the gas tax was removed, it was 28 cents a gallon, 6 cents a litre. Now it has gone up to 7 cents a litre, 32 cents a gallon.

Not only has the government opposite broken their promise with respect to never reimposing the gas tax, they have even increased it. They've had the incredible audacity to increase the tax more than what it was before. I think that's hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the citizens of this province would support me in that contention.

Mr. Speaker, the other comments I'd like to make with regard to the gas tax is that it also affects our economy in other ways besides increased taxes to citizens and ratepayers in this province. It's a betrayal of what they have promised that they would not do. But what this gas tax does as well is impose on small business another tax. It represents a contradictory decision, in my view, harmful to small business in both rural and urban centres. I've indicated that there's \$100 million that has been taken out of the economy by this government. What this government does not realize is that that money would have been spent in the business community. To quote one business leader . . . even their business contacts are saying to the public of this province that they are not happy. And Mr. Garth Whyte from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business quotes:

It takes away a competitive advantage Saskatchewan business enjoyed.

Even the business community recognize the dramatic effect that this fuel tax will have. With regard to tourism, Mr. Speaker, it also represents a contradictory policy which prevents growth in the tourism industry. The PC gas tax has helped to increase the price differential between the United States and the Canadian gasoline. This has a negative impact on our economy very generally, and also specifically. And it impacts on industries such as tourism because if you have a number of people who are touring the country, they do it, according to the tourist statistics, 85 per cent of them use private automobiles. They are not going to go to a province or consume their fuel in a province where the gas prices are unusually high. And in this case it's going to have an effect on our tourist business.

I have, Mr. Speaker, as well, some comments to support that. Mr. Whyte said in an interview of the *Leader-Post*, June 18, that he had reservations about the 7 per cent gas

tax. "The one tax . . ." He quotes:

The one tax that concerns me is the gas tax. It takes away a competitive advantage Saskatchewan businesses enjoy.

And I've spoken to many business people, Mr. Speaker, about that, in particular some of the gas station operators in the southern part of the province. They tell me that their gas volume has declined since the increase of the gas tax. They tell me, as well, that this gas tax is something which is being abused more and more on a regular basis, and on top of that it's adding to their costs of doing business.

There's a very fine margin in the fuel business at the retail level. And what this government has done, it's passed on some of their red tape costs to these fuel operators. And that again, Mr. Speaker, means less money spent at the station level on labour costs and other improvements to the station.

"Canadian motorists . . ." I have an article here as well from July 27, and it says that:

Canadian motorists, once sheltered from high world oil prices, have been paying higher pump prices than their U.S. counterparts for the past two years."

And much of the consternation, Mr. Speaker, is on the shoulders of the border service station operators and tourism officials and exporters alike.

And I go on, Mr. Speaker, to quote:

The price difference obviously has a negative impact on the economy and transportation-dependent industries and a severe impact on tourism.

And this is from the national . . . international article in the *Star-Phoenix* of Monday, July 27.

Michael McNeil is a spokesman for the Canadian Automobile Association, and he notes that 85 per cent of tourism travel in North America is done by automobile. And I'd venture to say that even more of that is done in Saskatchewan, and proper.

I have, as well, some supporting evidence, Mr. Speaker, from the school boards. School boards are now paying as much as \$40,000 a year more on school bus transportation as a result of the province's new fuel tax of 7 cents a litre. And I have a quote here from Jake Volk, who is the SSTA director, the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association executive director, and he says:

Some schools boards, especially those in rural areas, have been severely hit by this tax. The Saskatchewan School Trustees Association estimates the gas tax will cost Saskatchewan school boards \$1,500,000 in additional transportation costs annually.

And he goes on to say:

One of the most frustrating aspects of the tax is that it was announced after the school boards had set their school tax rates. If it had been announced before, school boards would at least have had the option of raising taxes to cover the cost of the gas tax.

Roger Zelinski, the secretary-treasurer of the Buffalo Plains School Division, said he expects his board's transportation costs will increase \$14,000 this year as a direct result of the gas tax.

It's nearing 1 o'clock. I beg leave to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker. I have more to say on this.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.