

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 21, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. J.R. KOWALCHUK (Melville): — To you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to all members of this legislature, I take great pleasure in introducing and welcoming a student exchange group of 32 students, ages 14 to 26, from Toronto who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are a group of students in the Ukrainian Catholic Youth Organization who were brought here to Saskatchewan under the auspices of Open House Canada. And for all of us here, Mr. Speaker, and the legislative members, we say welcome to them. In Ukrainian I would say 'uetymo'.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Hosting this group is an equal number of students from Ituna and area, who spent two enjoyable weeks in Toronto, coming back to Saskatchewan just a few days ago. They are also in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Speaker. This exchange was organized by Father Peter Stasiuk, formerly in charge of the Ituna Catholic Mission, who is now stationed in Toronto and by the present director of the Ituna Catholic Mission, Father Kushko, who, if I may say, is a former employee of the Saskatchewan Department of Education and also has been a Saskatchewan teacher for 11 years. They have arranged a two week tour of many interesting places in Saskatchewan. Leading this tour today, as I've already said are Father Kushko and Father Stasiuk and chaperones from Ontario, John Shalagan and Inez Kulaczycky. Many parents and other people from Ituna and district are here as well.

I would like to indicate, sir, that one of the senior members of this group from Toronto is a young university student, John Shalagan, who took a year off from his university work to study and take part in the operation of the legislature at Queen's Park, Toronto, as a legislative intern. The practice of having parliamentary interns first began in Ottawa and has extended to several provinces including Ontario, where there are a number of legislative interns. These interns work for different political parties.

Mr. Speaker, these 32 students are living with their counterparts in Ituna and district, learning how Saskatchewan rural people work and play in the midst of a frigid Saskatchewan winter. For quite a number of these students it is a first experience. To some it was coming home, as many of their parents and grandparents had formerly been residents of Saskatchewan. As I indicated to them the other day, Mr. Speaker, in coming from the metropolis of Toronto with the CN Tower and Maple Leaf Gardens and so on, they are finding that in our small Saskatchewan rural community the motto of life is 'small is beautiful', with the exception of our great, wide, open and beautiful prairie and parkland. I'm sure that all members of this legislature wish them a most enjoyable and educational two weeks in Saskatchewan. They are warmly welcomed by all of us to this great province. And our wish is that they have a most enjoyable and worthwhile experience in this legislature this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. member in welcoming the exchange students and those representing the Ukrainian Catholic Mission. I had the pleasure of attending university with Father Kushko and I would like to say not only will they enjoy their stay in Saskatchewan (I know they will; we all hope that they will; we hope that they'll find it educational) but I also know from personal experience that they're in very good hands.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome a special group of students and young people to this legislature. They're seated in the west gallery. We have with us this afternoon eleven students from Thom Collegiate and seven exchange students from the state of Montana. On behalf of the members of the legislature, I would like to welcome all the students. It is my hope to meet with them at about 2:45 p.m. We can have a little bit of a discussion. I'm particularly pleased to see the students from the state of Montana are spending some time in Regina and visiting the legislature to see how our legislative process works. I would like to express the hope that their visit in Regina, Saskatchewan is a pleasant experience and one that they will remember for many years to come after they return to their beautiful state of Montana.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 47 students from Grade 7 and Grade 8 in Thornton School located in the Saskatoon Nutana constituency in Saskatoon. From the information I'm given, they're seated in the west gallery, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. John Ellis and Mr. John Ross. I'm sure that all the members of this Assembly will wish them an educational and pleasant day in Regina and a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to the House, I'd like to introduce 15 students from the Toronto Institute of Medical Technology from Toronto, Ontario. These 15 students are seated in the front row of the Speaker's gallery. They're here on an exchange visit with the health sciences division of Wascana down here. They will be returning to Toronto on Sunday. I believe during the Easter break, the 15 students from Wascana will be returning to Toronto on that exchange visit. I know that all people will join with me in welcoming these students to Saskatchewan and to our House and wishing them a safe journey home. We hope that they enjoy their stay here very much.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce and welcome to the House a distinguished parliamentarian from our province who is visiting with us, Mr. T.C. Douglas.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Tommy Douglas was first elected to the House of Commons nearly 44 years ago. He was Premier of this province for 17 years, the longest period of

anyone in the history of our province. He was the former Leader of the New Democratic Party in the federal House of Commons and is now the Member of Parliament for Nanaimo-Cowichan and the Islands. I know that members on both sides of the House will wish to extend a welcome to Tommy Douglas, who is sitting behind the rail.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me also on behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus to welcome Mr. Douglas to the Legislative Chambers in Saskatchewan.

Over the years, Mr. Douglas has given some very, very wise counsel to governments throughout our land, especially in opposition. I hope that counsel is being listened to by the members opposite and by the Premier and the Cabinet, especially, in their deliberations in the coming weeks.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. N.E. BYERS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the member for Melville, (Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk) in welcoming the Ukrainian Catholic Mission exchange students, as well as the students who are here today from Ituna. I do so particularly, because a number of the students from the Ituna High School reside in the Kelliher and Jasmin districts which are within my constituency, and particularly because I think Father Kushko, who is with them today originates from the Foam Lake district in the Kelvington-Wadena constituency. I have had a chance to meet with the group earlier today and will join them for a brief chat after they depart from the galleries in about one-half hour.

I sincerely hope their stay here is productive, and their visit to this Assembly rewarding.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The question period has been so pleasant and interesting today, I hesitate to go on to the next subject which is oral questions.

QUESTIONS

Denison Mines Investment

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. In May, 1978, the Government of the province of Saskatchewan, through SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) refused participation by Denison Mines Ltd., of an \$158.5 million investment in the Province of Saskatchewan. It has been reported that Denison Mines is now going to spend that 150 some odd millions of dollars on developing a potash mine in New Brunswick. Would the Premier agree today, that it was extremely short-sighted of the Government of Saskatchewan to turn down the investment of Denison Mines in Saskatchewan, to have them invest the money in New Brunswick, to compete with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan?

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — No, I would not. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any

connection between the arrangements whereby SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) and the Eldorado Nuclear exercised the Denison option or the Inexco option so that Denison could not buy that. I am not in any way aware of any arrangement whereby the money, which would have been used to purchase the Inexco interest in the Key Lake mine, is now being used in New Brunswick. One has to remember that Denison has a very, very large flow of funds resulting from an arrangement whereby the Conservative Government of Ontario is paying them in the order of \$8 billion for uranium. It would seem to me that with that flow money from a provincial government, they would be able to afford many ventures (as I'm sure they will) ventures which will be owned by Mr. Roman and his associates rather than the people of Ontario notwithstanding the fact that . . . (inaudible) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier will be well aware that Denison Mines Ltd. is a significant partner of the Government of Saskatchewan in developments in the North. Has the Government of Saskatchewan approached its partner, Denison Mines Ltd., with a view to encourage them to invest their money in Saskatchewan rather than to invest their money in New Brunswick, which is going to be competitive against Saskatchewan potash interests and is going to seriously jeopardize Saskatchewan potash markets especially on the eastern seaboard?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I'll allow the Premier to answer the question but I must remind the House that questions should be asked only in respect of matters of sufficient urgency and importance to require an immediate answer. It is one of the guidelines of the question period. I'm not going to permit a further supplementary on this question. Mr. Premier.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I say that we will not, I take it, have approached Denison on the point that the hon. member raises, based upon yesterday's rumor. We have indeed approached Denison (not Denison as such but all private sector companies in Canada) in saying, yes, you are more than welcome to come to Saskatchewan and invest in Saskatchewan provided you abide by the rules which we set. Those rules stand for Denison as well as for other companies and in fact they are joint venturing with SMDC on some uranium ventures in northern Saskatchewan.

With respect to whether or not Denison's investment or rumored investment in New Brunswick will compete with the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, I think we would all be wise to wait and see. It seems to me that last year it was that the Potash Corporation of America's investment in New Brunswick was going to mean vigorous competition for PCS, perhaps it was two years ago. In any case so far as I am aware the Potash Company of America, notwithstanding the many press releases, has not commenced to sink a shaft and so far as I am aware Denison has not commenced to sink a shaft. Not many tons of potash are produced by press releases only by shafts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take a new question.

MR. COLLVER: — I suppose the reason for our questions is so that the Government of Saskatchewan doesn't get the shaft. We happen to consider this an important matter. Has the Premier of Saskatchewan or any official of your government commissioned any study to learn or ascertain what the impact will be on the development in Saskatchewan

and on the sale of Saskatchewan potash, vis-à-vis the development of potash mines in New Brunswick?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, we have considered what the effect of potash coming from other sources will be and we have tried to estimate what sources potash might come from and at what price level we could compete with them in various markets. I am not aware that these have been in the formal studies, but undoubtedly those questions have been addressed. We simply do not know what the production cost of potash from New Brunswick would be, nor do I suspect does anybody in this House, nor quite frankly, do I expect does Denison. Accordingly, it is not easy at this point to indicate whether or not New Brunswick potash is likely to be significantly competitive with Saskatchewan potash.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, would the Premier not admit, since he has now admitted that he has not commissioned any study specifically to examine the potentiality of the New Brunswick situation — would the Premier not admit that unless the government conducts a study of the situation as it relates to New Brunswick and Saskatchewan, or/and unless, and I say and/or, unless the government of Saskatchewan develops alternative markets now, we are looking at a situation by 1981, which is when the Potash Corporation of America is expected to begin production of potash from its mine, and by 1983, which is when Denison Mines anticipates that it will begin production with its mine, we could find ourselves in the situation of facing serious competition with its mine, we could find ourselves in the situation of facing serious competition for our markets and that the only prudent situation for the government today, is to conduct a study on what the implications will be and to conduct a study on alternative markets?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I think we should remind the House that what has happened is that IMCC (International Minerals and Chemicals) has, it is rumored, sold some potash interests to Denison Mines. Now IMCC is one of the largest producers of potash in the world and is one of the largest dealers in potassium and phosphate fertilizers in the world. They have decided presumably that this did not fit into their plans. We were a good deal more worried when IMCC had property than when Denison had the property. IMCC is, after all, in the fertilizer business and they mine potash. Denison are in the hard-rock business and they have never mined potash.

So, to that extent the proposition is an improvement rather than a deterrent. Please understand that nothing that I had earlier said should indicate that the Government of Saskatchewan has moved any money to Denison since we have not. That ought to be clear. So far as we are concerned, the information which the management of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has in hand gives it sufficient information to make judgment at this time and as the situation develops, if it appears that there's going to be mining there, we will obviously consider the situation further at that time and perhaps will have additional information on mining costs.

Employment of Northerners

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Byers), Mr. Speaker. The government has stated its policies regarding the hiring of northerners in the economic development of northern Saskatchewan. Given the significant levels of unemployment and welfare in areas just outside the DNS boundaries, would the minister consider extending that hiring policy to include northerners who live outside the northern administration district in areas like Meadow Lake, Big River, Prince Albert?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Well, Mr. Speaker, the opportunities now available in northern Saskatchewan for employment that were not available in like numbers in previous years are providing opportunities that previously did not exist for a good many northerners and people South of the NAD line. With respect to the employment of northerners, we are currently working out an employment program with Amok. In addition to that, we are working out a business opportunity plan with Amok and that may well apply to other companies as well. The job opportunities in northern Saskatchewan — road construction, the construction of the Amok mine and the other activities that are going on — are providing opportunities first to northerners, but not exclusively to northerners.

MR. McLEOD: — Supplementary question. You're saying that they're offered first to northerners but not exclusively to northerners. I would submit to you that people who live just south of that line, almost trapped south of that artificial demarkation line drawn by your government, and who have, for years, been running off to B.C. to work in Prince George and Quinell and so on . . . are you telling them, Mr. Minister, are you telling these people in areas like I said before — Meadow Lake, Big River, just to give some examples — that they aren't to benefit from the economic development in their own province now. And it's been three generations.

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, we are not saying to them that they cannot benefit from the employment opportunities in northern Saskatchewan. There are many opportunities for people who live south of the NAD line in both southern Saskatchewan and in northern Saskatchewan as well. We are asking, for the most part, employers in northern Saskatchewan to employ up to 50 per cent northerners — a northerner being defined as one who has lived at least 15 years in the North or half of his or her life in the North. The employment opportunities on construction and other economic activities going on in the North are not restricted entirely to northern people. There are a number of types of work where the percentage of northerners employed is in the 60 to 80 per cent range. The other 20 per cent may be from the North because they do not meet the definition of northerners or they may be from south of the NAD (Northern Administration District) line. There are a good number of employment opportunities for all.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll have a new question.

Northern Residents

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — New question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Would you not admit that people, take for example in Meadow Lake, who have been considered northerners for all of their lives and people who . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take a new question.

FarmStart Loans

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture on the matter of the political involvement of the Department of Agriculture into various sectors of government programming. I have before me a duplicate or a certified copy of a certificate of title wherein an Ed. Wallace has received a FarmStart loan in the amount of \$80,000 (Mr. Wallace being director of Special Projects of STC, I believe a former executive assistant and a defeated NDP candidate in Swift Current.) Could you tell me how this hon. gentleman got an \$80,000 FarmStart loan contrary to

the very regulations and criteria established by the Department of Agriculture?

HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any loan that Mr. Wallace may have received. If he has received a loan from FarmStart, I am sure that it went through the regular hoops, which anyone who applies for a loan through FarmStart has to go through. I am sure that if he got a loan he qualified for the loan under the terms of the FarmStart program.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary. Perhaps you would check with your officials and explain how, contrary to the FarmStart criteria, a full time government employee making over, I believe \$15,000 a year net was able to get an \$80,000 (and that's on a quarter, I might add, which is extremely high) FarmStart loan other than through political patronage. Will you check that out and report to this House as soon as possible?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that whatever arrangements were made were within the criteria of the FarmStart program.

Purchase of Jet-propped Aircraft

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister responsible for CVA, the Central Vehicle Agency. Will he tell this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan why the government have purchased and are operating jet-propped aircraft as opposed to owning and operating ordinary twin aircraft by the government members?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue): — CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) has a Cheyenne aircraft which is used for executive travel. It is a plane that can fly at considerable heights because it has a pressurized cabin, etc. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it's a much, much less expensive plane than the Government of Alberta uses to move its people around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. First of all, they own three executive jet-prop aircrafts in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, would the minister please tell not only the Assembly but the people of Saskatchewan — do the government members in Saskatchewan have to ride in Cadillac aircraft? Can they not ride in ordinary Chevrolet aircraft?

MR. ROBBINS: — First of all, the member's terminology is incorrect. They are not jet-prop aircraft. They are turboprop aircraft. There's a big difference between the two and he should study his aircraft manual to find out what the difference is. Secondly, I must point out that that is not a Cadillac type aircraft. It's a good aircraft and it does its duty well for us.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'll take a new question.

MR. GARNER: — Does the minister realize that it costs the government about \$300 an hour to own and operate these aircraft which are twin jet-prop aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I'll take a new question.

Operation Costs of Government Aircraft

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — To the minister responsible for CVA. Is the Government of Saskatchewan aware that before they turn a wheel outside the hangar, it costs over \$220,000 per year to operate one of those jet-prop aircraft which are in the hangar out at the airport in Regina and that one of those aircraft has 2,200 hours on it (which means that that cost before payment of gasoline or anything else . . . some \$300 per hour . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Is the member asking a question?

MR. COLLVER: — Yes. The question is, is the minister aware that it costs him \$300 an hour to operate the Cadillac aircraft when he could rent for \$145 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order. I'll take a new question.

Answer to Question re High Energy Equipment — Pasqua Hospital

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to respond to a question put to me yesterday by the hon. member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson). The hon. member was referring to a press release outlining some of our new initiatives in the health program for this fiscal year. His specific concern related to funds for the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission for the purchase of a high energy linear accelerator at a cost of \$800,000 and construction to house the unit at a cost of \$450,000.

The hon. member used some figures attributed to a former employee of the Saskatchewan Cancer Commission to suggest that statements I made in this House last May were not accurate. Mr. Speaker, I stand by my previous statement that all considerations and provisions were made for installation of that equipment at a future point in time. The expansion of the radio therapy department, which was only recently completed, was designed to accommodate the addition of a special structure to house a high energy linear accelerator. And because of this advanced planning the new construction will be a relatively simple matter of adding a room. Items such as waiting areas for patients and corridors and a special wall were all included in the original expansion program.

The member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) does not seem to be aware that a high energy linear accelerator must be enclosed in a special concrete structure designed to prevent radiation produced by the equipment from escaping.

Further, Mr. Speaker, linear accelerators are produced by a number of manufacturers and the size of these machines vary. A concrete structure of the sort necessary for this equipment is a very expensive item. I think that even the member for Souris-Cannington would agree that it would be poor planning to build such an expensive room before we knew whether the equipment was even needed in the city. And it would have been quite, I think, ridiculous, to build a concrete room and then be forced to select a piece of equipment on the basis of its size rather than its advantages in terms of patients' therapy.

The members opposite quoted some figures that suggest that this construction will cost about \$400,000 more now than it would have cost a year ago. That, I would like to assure the House, is not correct, because we made provision for this addition in our original plans. All we need to do is add this concrete room to hold the equipment.

The total cost for this structure is in the order of \$450,000, which I announced in my press release. Mr. Speaker, the cost would have been about the same a year ago as well.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I can assure the minister that the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) is aware of far more than he might think. Will you deny, Mr. Minister, will you stand in your place and deny that a Dr. Mallik and some of the construction people at the Pasqua regeneration site, indicated to you or your department, but particularly to you, through letter that had these provisions been made at that time it would have cost \$100,000 as opposed to your \$450,000 today?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I will stand by my statement and my statement which I made in reply to the member's question this afternoon. If he had been listening he would have noted that I said, in conclusion of my answer to his question of yesterday, that the cost this year is practically the same as the cost would have been last year. Indeed, we probably save some money for this year because of the forward planning that was put into the design of the radio therapy facility that was built and the provision of such things as the necessary special kind of wall, which was already put into place, even though it was put in last year and the linear accelerator had not been selected.

So, I think the member should be advised to read what I said in my reply to his question back in May 17, 1978, when I said, in that expansion all considerations and provisions are being made for the installation of the new equipment which will be necessary at a future point in time. I want to assure the member that that is not a problem and all that has been looked after. I said that and I stand by that.

Potash Sales in 1979

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan).

In 1978 PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) stated that they would not be able to complete all of their potash sales due to the shortage of hopper cars. Can you tell us what that situation is today? You mentioned you were going to lease cars; you've made arrangements to lease. How do you stand on delivery of potash sales this year?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, the member asked a question that remains a concern for PCS as it does for other shippers of products. We have indeed pursued the leasing of hopper cars and we have also pursued the purchase of hopper cars in order to provide sufficient rail capacity to meet the growing markets we have been able to achieve over the last year or so. I think it would be correct, Mr. Speaker, to say to this Legislative Assembly that the problem is not as severe now as it was in 1978 because we have been able to attain more rail capacity than was the case at that time. But I do not want to be interpreted as saying we do not have a problem with the movement of potash. It's not only PCS operations that have that problem but the other potash companies as well. I do believe, having said that, that we are in as good, and in many instances, a better position than other potash shippers in the province of Saskatchewan as far as moving our product is concerned.

MR. LARTER: — Could you tell me and this House, how many of the new hopper cars that you ordered you have taken delivery of? And are you hauling some potash by truck, particularly from PCS at Rocanville?

MR. MESSER: — I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be best for me to take that question under advisement. We have taken delivery of some cars. I would like to be current in answering the question. I can provide the information to the member later today, and if not, by tomorrow if that's satisfactory to him.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary. Could the minister tell me if PCS is delivering any potash to the United States by truck at the present time?

MR. MESSER: — I am not aware of deliveries of potash by truck out of Rocanville to the United States. I'll check that as well.

Public Service Salaries

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek). Yesterday, in reply to my question of about a week ago, you indicated that the average public service salary for Saskatchewan was \$15,500. Did you arrive at that figure from the 1978-79 estimates?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the information is provided by the Public Service Commission. Perhaps the hon. member, in making his calculation as he indicated, got the information from the estimates. I haven't got the estimates in front of me, but if the hon. member, for example, took the estimates for the Department of Health and its grants to the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Commission to administer the health programs of \$4 million, its grants to the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan for administration of \$2,978,940, or its grants to the Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan of \$2,193,000, the figures involved are not salaries; they are partly salaries. I don't know how the hon. member could possibly make his calculation because no one can derive an average salary through adding up the estimates in the way they are prepared. And I'm afraid that the hon. member might have taken those calculations, which would have given him the higher figure. I can assure the hon. member that the calculation that is provided of the average wage being \$15,500 is the accurate information if he wants to show me his method of calculation, I would be glad to discuss it with him. The additional thing, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, Statistics Canada publication only takes care of about 25 per cent of the labor force, not 75 per cent of the labor force in Saskatchewan.

Verbatim Record Correction

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Continuing Education): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to bring to the attention of the House that there is an error in the verbatim record of yesterday — page 830, the third last line — it should read 12.5 per cent instead of 2.5 per cent.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — CONTINUING EDUCATION — VOTE 5

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. Before we start our estimates today, it is the custom, and will be the custom, for the ministers to introduce their supporting staff, and I give the minister the privilege of doing that now.

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Continuing Education): — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce the people, my officials, that are with me here today. Immediately in front of me is Lou Riederer, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Program Operations. Right next to

him is Bob Barschel, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Occupational Training. Right next to me is Alec Guy, Dr. Alex Guy, the Deputy Minister. Immediately behind me is Dr. Peter Glynn. He's Director of Policy Planning and Management Information Systems, and right next to him is Frank May, Director of Administrative Services. The rest will be introduced as we will need them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Again, might I say to the new members that under subvote 1, we allow quite an opportunity for you to discuss in general terms that department which we are dealing with. But any specified items that come up under the other subvotes, I would ask you to bring them up in the proper place and that expedites the procedure of going through estimates and, if you will co-operate with us in that way, I will try to co-operate with you and we will get on with our Continuing Education estimates.

ITEM 1

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I can't agree with this and I have a few words I would like to say regarding the Department of Continuing Education.

First of all, what I would like to draw our attention to is the cutbacks that the universities have had, the reduction in their amount of allotment. We saw the students march a few days ago and we know that they're concerned about tuition. I spoke to a number of them out in the rotunda here. It wasn't only tuition that was their concern, Mr. Chairman, it was certainly program. As the minister will know, I have raised the question in the House numerous times about possible program cuts at the Regina campus. Just so that this Assembly wouldn't think it was a militant bunch of students that were expressing their concerns, I would like to draw your attention to some comments by Dr. Leo Christianson who is the vice-president of planning session of the University of Saskatchewan. Dr. Christianson says that the budget will not cover the inflationary costs for the coming year. He also points out that it may necessitate some reduction in program. He points out that tuition fees have risen at the University of Saskatchewan perhaps 10 per cent per year for the last four years which puts them as the highest in western Canada. He points out that probably there will have to be very prudent negotiations on salary levels or else they may have to cut back on some staff. If we have a high contract settlement he says, we may have to cut back on members that are employed and as I say, also to cut programs. He points out that although there is a decline in enrolments, there are only four colleges that are not operating under quotas and there are colleges that are turning students away. So, I'd like to say that these cutbacks at the university level or this lack of funding as seen by the university people is a considerable amount and is a prime consideration to the university communities in Saskatchewan.

I also have been in contact with many school boards and while I'm talking on education, I'd just like to point out again that the 6 per cent increase in the computation of mill rate has been quite shocking to the schools. We have heard many of the schools in my constituency are under pressure. Also, I'd like to point out that today Moose Jaw school has said that their increase was basically only two per cent and they're going to have a \$500,000 deficit. I know that the question that will be put forth is declining enrolments. I agree that there are declining enrolments at the universities and also in the school systems. But also, we must have some degree of program left regardless of the declining enrolments.

Now, the next thing when coming to continuing education is what about the institutes? What's going to happen with the STI (Saskatchewan Technological Institute), the Kelsey Institute, Wascana and the various institutes? We haven't heard from them yet. Have they analyzed their budgets and seen whether this is going to result in a decrease in their services? What about the community colleges. I have complimented the minister on the community colleges in Saskatchewan. I think they are a very fine movement. I have suggested programs that he could include in his community college package. What about the funding for these? We haven't heard from these people. Are they also going to be under the pressure that the universities and the school boards find themselves under?

You know I think we all realize, and I am sure the minister must realize, the importance of education in our technological society. There is a great relationship between educational standards of the people and their productivity. I think education spending in the society that we live in today is of prime importance especially in the field of continuing education. There are many people in our society whom we all know, many of our acquaintances, who perhaps did not have the opportunity to complete their schooling when they were in their young years and are now taking advantage of continuing education. We know that these people, who take advantage of the continuing education department, certainly aspire to some of the top jobs and top positions in our society and become the leaders of our society. So I think that this is a very important area in which we must have adequate expenditures.

The Minister of Education in talking to the Regina teachers' convention quoted a quote from a Mr. Cody, who was a maritime educator, in which he said he feels that education is coterminous with human life. 'Education begins with birth and continues until death', he said. I happen to agree with the minister on that statement and I think this shows the importance of education, the importance that must be placed on education in our province.

As I have said a few words on education, I would like to turn to what constitutes a good education. I think you all realize that education is made up of a curriculum or a program. It is made up of facilities in which you put this program across and it also is made up of people. I would like to say, in my estimation of education, of course, the most important aspect is program. Facilities are important but they, to me, do not rank with program as being the all important aspect. When I stress program, I would like to point out that it is program that satisfies human needs. You know, we read a lot of things and we hear about the needs of society, social needs. We hear about industrial needs. We hear that education should be utilitarian. I think if we look at these things and seriously analyze them we will see that whether it is a societal need or an industrial need, it all comes back to a human need. I would like to indicate that in satisfying the human needs in education, whether it be in elementary or in continuing education or where it would be, that a good program with a good teacher is probably the primary requirement.

I would like to just cite back in history, as I see it is rather the trend in this House. Many go back to the days of the Bennett buggy. I suppose that is quite an interesting time to some. I would like to go back to some of the great teachers in history and state just three of these teachers for this House. They are: the greatest teacher we have ever had, Jesus Christ; Socrates, one of the great teachers; the Indian philosopher, Tagore. If you have studied anything about education you will know that these three great teachers, are probably the three greatest teachers in the history of the world, especially the first two, who taught without any facility other than a stimulating environment — a good teacher and students with a human need.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about Confucius?

MR. TAYLOR: — He had a few good sayings too. I will agree with that.

I would like to point out that in your considerations and concerns with continuing education, it isn't the bureaucratic structure and it isn't the elaborate facilities, but what takes place within the classroom that constitutes a good education. I don't care whether this be in the realm of elementary, secondary or continuing education. Adults have needs just the same as young students and if these needs are being met, then a good education is taking place.

When I am talking about facilities, (and I know that there is an awful demand in many areas to always be building new facilities). I would like to again draw attention to a submission from Weyburn that caught my eye. It states that the decentralization of technical-vocational training will play a vital part in shared economic growth by smaller urban centres in Saskatchewan. They go on to point out that there are many of these facilities that could help with continuing education, excellent facilities that are presently here in our province. They state that there is excellent co-operation among the Weyburn Comprehensive School, the Western Christian College, the Canada Employment Centre, the community colleges and the industries. They find out that many of the things that are taking place in the field of continuing education could perhaps be offered within the facilities that are available in the town of Weyburn. They also point that this creates a snowball effect, which helps draw industry to this type of small town.

I would say that if this government is really interested in decentralization, which they claim to be, they would pay heed to this proposal by a town such as Weyburn.

I visited the Yorkton Comprehensive School and have been amazed at the excellent facilities they have there. They have a very good technical-vocational wing and a very good commercial wing. I am sure that the same things hold true in Swift Current and Estevan. These are composite schools; we know they are very well equipped and well staffed and that many of the people in the communities have the expertise.

I would like to suggest to the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. Rolfes) that he pay heed to the submission from Weyburn and see if this type of thing could be worked out in Saskatchewan. It would certainly save us a lot of money in facilities because these facilities are there; they could perhaps be used on a night school basis or on the weekends.

We have done this. I see by your reports, Mr. Minister, that you have such a plan going in Meadow Lake and in Prince Albert. My suggestion is to go one step further. Let's do this in some of the other rural areas, our smaller cities of Saskatchewan, thereby saving money by not duplicating facilities.

Another thing that I would like to draw attention to, Mr. Chairman, while speaking in this opening talk on continuing education estimates, is that I have heard an awful lot from the other side of the House about how you can't have it both ways, how you cannot expend money and save moneys and so on. Every time there has been a suggestion (I see some of the members agreeing) they have done this. They have said, look boys you can't have it both ways. Now, I don't accept that. I believe that you can have it both ways. I believe, as I said in my budget address, that it's a matter of priorities and in some areas

you should be spending moneys to best serve the needs of the province but in other areas you should be cutting back. I think if you would look over Hansard of the last few days and look at some of the remarks from members on this side of the House, you will see that we have put forth many positive suggestions in areas in which we feel that the Government of Saskatchewan would be better serving the people of Saskatchewan. So, I would say that is one direction we can go in. However, I have got to be fair and say it is necessary to cut some of the expenditures that are not in my view in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

I would like to go back to a discussion I had with the minister about the creation of a permanent head for the Universities Commission. Now I know in his indications to me that he says this will probably only be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30,000 or \$40,000, which I will accept may be the amount. I don't know just what you are planning to pay this man. But I say, could not this \$30,000 or \$40,000 be spent on an instructor for a program? . . . going back to what my initial remarks were, that it is a good teacher in a classroom environment in a learning situation that constitutes education and not a building of a bureaucratic structure.

Now, another area one could look at, and I have mentioned this before, is if you are wanting to cut corners and you can't have it both ways, then let's cut out some of this government advertising that we see continually. There is another area in which moneys can be saved and can be channelled into what I feel is a very important aspect: education and continuing education. We have had a lot of discussion about hiring defeated candidates. Now I don't know how many you have hired, I have heard of talk of two. I hear this afternoon that somebody got a big FarmStart loan of \$80,000. I don't know how much you are paying these defeated candidates but I would guess \$30,000, \$40,000 again. So there are two or three of these fellows kicking around; there's an \$80,000 loan. It doesn't take very long of paring away at that until you find the money and you can go in the other direction in which we are suggesting.

Of course, needless to say, I think you know our feeling on this side of the House on the land bank purchases. I believe the figure of \$200 million was being kicked around in this regard. That would go a long way, Mr. Minister of Continuing Education, to help you do some of the things that perhaps we have suggested. I think deep in your heart, Mr. Minister of Continuing Education, you know they are sound and good programs. I think you are the kind of guy that would like to institute some of these.

Now of course, we have the borrowing by the Crown corporations; there is another place that I would take the paring knife to the situation and cut back again in that regard. Yesterday, this will probably raise a good one, but yesterday we heard a lot of discussion on both sides of the House on the CPN program. There is an area where converters . . . \$80 a converter, some say \$120 . . . I don't know just what the price is but I hear there's a lot of them kicking around. Then this morning I heard that the Attorney General was maybe considering an operating subsidy to CPN. That is another area that I would suggest to you, members of the government, that you take a look at. You question and say, are we serving the people of Saskatchewan best in that regard? Again, Mr. Minister, having the important portfolio that you have — Continuing Education — the one portfolio which is really going to put productivity into this country and develop the mental abilities of the people here. You pay serious consideration to these things please.

We have heard of scrapping and cutting of programs and we yesterday heard of a

program called SCAPO (Saskatchewan Council of Anti-Poverty Organization) that was being cut. Now my question is, there is a program where you are right at the people level and that being cut while we are going ahead with land bank purchases, CPN (Co-operative Programming Network) and so on. To you and to some of you on the other side of the House I realize that this may only be a jot and a tittle, but to me, it is rather a serious problem and I would suggest that it is rather a serious problem to the people of Saskatchewan.

Another point I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman, while I am talking on this matter, is the continued comparison I hear in this House to Alberta and Ontario. Well first of all I think we all have to realize that no one in this legislature is responsible for what is going on in Alberta and Ontario. We are interested in the priorities for Saskatchewan and this is where we should be focussing our attention. I realize it is rather difficult for us on this side of the House to make a comparison to another socialist government because actually they are rather scarce in Canada and thank God they are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — But if you want to make some comparisons there is one country that I think we could compare it to and that is Great Britain. Some of you historians sitting over there — the member for Wascana (Mr. White) he'll know the facts here. They have had a labor government during much of the 20th Century. If we are going to make comparisons we could make some comparisons to Great Britain, although I don't think anyone wants to be compared to them at this point in history.

There is another matter that I just want to mention while I'm here and that has to do with the Regina campus. I understand that there has been a research program that has had to be scrapped because of some tampering with the figures. Now I don't lay any blame on your department; it's the internal operation of the university. However, I think I should raise it in this House in that it was public moneys that were wasted. They weren't Saskatchewan funded moneys, but they were federal moneys. That's right, Mr. Minister, they were federal moneys. But it was \$63,000 of federal moneys. Now what I am trying to point out here, Mr. Minister, is that that federal money, some of it, came from your pocket and my pocket also. I'm just wanting to point out that we must be careful in our research and I am giving you a bit of a warning (I think you are aware of this sort of thing, but I would just like to reiterate it,) that not all research probably is as sound as it actually should be. I think we have had a glaring case here in Saskatchewan. I think it is a blot on the intellectual community, on the university and I think we as people in government should keep this mind. We should be very careful about the research that comes in. I don't know how carefully the government checks the research it has done for it. But you know, you are an educated man; you have had a career in education. You know you can prove whatever you want if you want to ask the type of questions. The very fact that there was some tampering with these figures I think is very disappointing.

The thing that I would like to get into now that we're getting closer to the actual estimates, Mr. Minister, is that it seems socialist governments sometimes are a little inclined to be a little top heavy, become a little bureaucratic, have a large number of assistants . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I said socialist; that's right. No, socialist, my friend. Therefore, I would like to kind of zero in on your department on Vote No. 1. There are a few questions I would like to ask you, Mr. Minister, concerning Vote No. 1. I'll go through these slowly so that you can pick them up.

First of all, I would like to know how many executive assistants you have presently in your department. I would also like to know what their qualifications are. I'd like to know how long they have been employed in your department, their tenure of employment. I would like to know what their salaries are. I'd like to know if they've ever had any time off in the last year and if they did, when they had that time. So, we'll open with those questions, Mr. Minister.

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Continuing Education): — Mr. Chairman, just a few comments. I'm not going to make any lengthy statements as to my particular philosophy on education. I think I have spoken often enough in this House so that people know where I, as an individual, stand and where, I think, the government also stands as far as education is concerned.

First of all, let me say that I appreciate very much the complimentary remarks made by the member opposite in various areas, particularly those in the community colleges. That's slightly different than some of the concerns that were expressed to us last year by members of his own party, and also by other members who were in opposition at that time, who were very critical of the community colleges. In fact they went so far as to state that the government should do away with the community college concept. I disagreed with that and I think, the government disagreed with it. The community colleges have proven themselves. They are a very decentralized form of delivering the educational programs where the people are, I think that I could give you a list of some of the major facilities in areas or in centres that we use — P.A. for example, North Battleford, Swift Current, Lloydminster, Estevan, Weyburn, Yorkton, Melville, Nipawin, STI, Kelsey, Wascana, just to name a few.

I agree with the member. Whenever the government and the community colleges can use present facilities, we should do so. We have I think established a fairly good relationship with some school boards, with the STI, with other organizations within the communities, to use the facilities that are there. I think we've been very successful. The program has been very successful. We had last year, close to 100,000 adults participate in the program. Many of them were of the upgrading program. Others were to receive degrees. Many of them, of course, were in the social area. The programs have been very successful. And for the amount of money that we've spent in that area I don't think that we could ask for too much more.

So the philosophy of the government in education, particularly continuing education, is to make sure that the programs that are available in the larger centres are also available to the people who live in the smaller centres and who live in rural Saskatchewan. That's what we want to do. We haven't come to the optimum yet, but I do believe that we've gone a long, long way in making sure that the person, for example, in the little town of Annaheim, my old hometown of 100 and some people, and the people who live on the farms are able to take advantage of community college programs like I would be able to take advantage of in Saskatoon, or some other people could here in Regina or Prince Albert, or wherever it might be.

I'm not going to go through, as I have in the past, the support this government has made available to post-secondary education and particularly to universities. I know that none of you were able to see the program but last night I had the opportunity to be on a phone-in program on Cable 10 in Saskatoon. I was on my phone in my office speaking to the president of the University of Saskatchewan, President Begg, and the student body president, Brett Fairbairn. My pitch simply was, look, you may say there isn't sufficient funds available to universities. Now everybody would like to have more.

That's just human nature. But I said if the president of the University of Saskatchewan was fair with the government he would have to admit that over the last four or five years this government has been very generous to the universities. And without hesitation he said, yes, I have to agree with that. They have been. When you look at a 13.1 per cent increase over the last five years and compare that with what is happening on the national scene, there is no comparison because ours is almost double the grants that other universities have received. And not only that, but we took it upon ourselves to make absolutely certain there was no hardship on individuals who would not be financially able to attend a university. We substantially increased bursaries, and this year they've gone up to 31 per cent.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I agree with you. We've got to make sure that those facilities are accessible to everyone geographically and also financially, that no one will be barred from a post-secondary facility because he or she can't get there because of finances. If you go back a little bit further from 1970-78 to the present day grants to universities have increased by 198 per cent — on an average by 19.8 per cent per year — in this province. Now that, I think, shows that this government is committed to good post-secondary education. And we recognize that the future of this province in no small way depends upon making sure that we have people with degrees, people who will be able to stay here and pick up those jobs that will be available and that's what we want and that's what you want. With that I don't think I have any disagreement with you in that regard.

I'm not going to talk about all the other things that you mentioned. I don't think they were really controversial, I have no great disagreement. I do want to say that it doesn't make any difference: if you spend \$1 million in a particular program and you take 10 people, 10 people will have different views as to how it should be spent. I know it's your job as an opposition to say that it should be spent differently, we shouldn't spend it in this area, or we shouldn't spend it in that area; but that's why we got elected. The people put us into government; we are here to make the decisions, you are here to scrutinize those decisions. Obviously, I expect, that in certain areas we will differ; but the people judged and we will be judged again in the next election. I think that basically we have no disagreement as to where we think continuing education should go.

Now, I am not going to comment on what happened at the university in the research area. I think that would be improper on my part. If you have concerns about that I would simply ask you to direct that to the president of the U of R or to the board of governors. I think it would be improper for me to intervene in an internal decision made by the university and I will not comment any further on that.

Now, going to your questions — how many executive assistants do I have and did they get leave and how much are they earning, what experience did they have — that's very easy to answer: none.

MR. TAYLOR: — Are you saying none?

MR. ROLFES: — That is correct. That's in continuing education.

MR. TAYLOR: — There are 12 permanent positions, there were 10, there are 12 now for \$247,000. If you do not have the executive assistants, would you explain what positions these are and who the people are that occupy these positions? I should mention while I'm on my feet that I didn't expect you (and I think you realize that) and I didn't ask you to interfere in this research that was done at the university. I realize that's

within their jurisdiction. I did put it forth though as a warning and as a suggestion to the government that we who are in control of public moneys, or you who are in control of it, must pay particular attention to this because here is one glaring case of the misuse of public money under the guise of research. That was my point there.

MR. ROLFES: — I was not being critical of the member; I was just simply pointing out why I can't get involved in that particular area. I just wanted to point that out to you that if you wanted further information — not being critical — I'm just simply saying that I think it would be wrong for me, as minister, to make a comment on it whether inside or outside the House.

The 12 positions are deputy minister, the assistant deputy, assistant deputy MS 1, assistant deputy MS 2 research officer, chief program development, deputy minister's secretary, clerk steno IV, clerk steno III, and four people who will be hired to strengthen the program and curriculum areas.

I just want to make it clear, as the Minister of Social Services, when I took on the extra responsibility, I did not add any staff to my own personal staff.

MR. TAYLOR: — I see. You mentioned as Minister of Social Services. You meant as Minister of Continuing Ed., did you?

MR. ROLFES: — When I took the extra responsibility as Minister of Continuing Ed., right.

MR. TAYLOR: — You mentioned that you're planning on hiring four people, four extra people. Could you outline to me in what regard and why you feel the necessity of these four extra people please?

MR. ROLFES: — I am told that we are going to be hiring one in the area of program development, one in the area of curriculum (strengthening the area of curriculum) one assistant to the operation part of the administration. The one in curriculum is for community colleges. That's three. There is one possibility for an executive assistant for the minister but we have not hired anybody.

MR. TAYLOR: — I thought if we asked enough questions we'd find that one.

Program — I understand the curriculum in regard to the community college curriculums. I hope some of my suggestions will be filtered into that curriculum. What about program? In what aspect of program in your continuing education are you looking at this person working?

MR. ROLFES: — That one is an assistant to the program operation part of the administration. That is to make sure that we can have programs modularized in small packages so that we can take them out to the various parts in the communities as you had indicated you would like to see us do. So we are strengthening that particular area.

MR. TAYLOR: — Right. Thank you very much. What do you intend to pay your new executive assistant?

MR. ROLFES: — Look, I have no particular decision as to whether I am going to be hiring one, but if I do . . . I don't know what it is — \$1,200 or \$1,300 a month, something in that neighborhood.

MR. LANE: — You're budgeted as to what you are going to pay that particular individual.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — As this is my first time working on estimates, I would like to go through this slowly so that we get the grasp of it all. Under 'other personal services', I see there is a decrease in that. Would you explain what that is to me, what 'other personal services' are?

MR. ROLFES: — I think your question was: why has it dropped from \$11,190 to \$10,180? Is that your question?

MR. TAYLOR: — I made that observation. I wanted some explanation as to just what that entails.

MR. ROLFES: — That is temporary help that we may hire during the summer, or some other peak time, and we are cutting back. That was last year at .93, and we are cutting that back to .83.

MR. TAYLOR: — How many positions would that be, Mr. Minister?

MR. ROLFES: — A one person-month, I am told.

MR. TAYLOR: — Would you explain that? It seems a little vague to us, what a one person-month is?

MR. ROLFES: — Well, it is one employee per month at 22 days per month; so we are cutting back 22 days, I guess. That is the difference of the . . .

MR. TAYLOR: — All right, I'm hazy on that one. You just haven't come across yet what a one person-month is, really, to be honest with you. But seeing that there's a reduction in the expenditures, we won't press you too much.

MR. ROLFES: — One person-month is 22 days per month.

MR. TAYLOR: — 22 days per month. All right. Let's go to the other expenditures under No. 1 and that's a considerable amount of money, \$50,000. Again, what are some of these other expenditures? I don't expect you to detail each one, but basically what do these include? What are the major ones?

MR. ROLFES: — It takes in a whole range of things and I'm sure that the member . . .

MR. TAYLOR: — Just the major ones.

MR. ROLFES: — It's simply the purchase of goods and supplies, equipment, travel in the province, travel outside the province, the purchase of periodicals and newspapers and things of that nature, services, materials and supplies, miscellaneous obligations, acquisition of some property and so on.

MR. TAYLOR: — When you mention contractual services, that indicates to me employing more people, giving them a contract to do something for you. I see you have 12 there as the number of people employed. Would you kindly show me how many people would be employed in that first section, the contractual ones?

MR. ROLFES: — When we said contracting, it's not contracting with people. It means contracting for telephones, for automobiles, for equipment. Those are the contractual services that I was talking about, not contracts with people as far as employment is concerned.

MR. TAYLOR: — What you are indicating then is that the number of people under Vote 1, Executive Administration, is 12 plus the one person that we are talking at this one person month.

MR. ROLFES: — . . . 12.83.

MR. TAYLOR: — 12.83.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Minister, I am sure that everyone in this Chamber and in Saskatchewan is in favor of and wants to see that university education and the higher education under all headings is conducted in the province of Saskatchewan with the greatest care and with the greatest enthusiasm. I wonder if the minister would be prepared to tell me whether he knows a gentleman by the name of Mr. Eric Klein?

MR. ROLFES: — I have met Eric Klein, I think on two or three occasions.

MR. COLLVER: — Do you know a gentleman by the name of Mr. Danny Wir?l?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, I do, but I wonder what this has to do with Continuing Education? Would you mind clarifying yourself? I know a lot of people in this province and if you go through them all there would be quite a few people. I would like to know what that has to do with Continuing Education?

MR. COLLVER: — Perhaps I will just mention two more and the minister can indicate whether he knows them.

MR. ROLFES: — I will not indicate unless you make the connection with Continuing Education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to direct his questions to subvote 1 . . .

MR. COLLVER: — Yes, I am devoting it to subvote 1. I think it is extremely important that the minister responsible for the portfolio of Continuing Education exhibit the highest possible degree of concern for higher education and concern as it relates to the people with whom he associates. Now, if he says he just knows these people out-of-hand, that is fine. It is perfectly satisfactory. If, on the other hand, the minister . . . Well I suggest that it is important, it is essential to the people of the province of Saskatchewan that the minister of Continuing Education also indicate whether he is aware of some people who have, over the course of time, the last little while, made some comments and statements that, perhaps, the minister might not want to associate with. And that having been said, I just wanted to know whether he knows these people. And the other two names I would like to ask him about are Mr. Gary Church and Mr. Douglas Kulba. Does the minister know these people?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, let me just say it is none of his business whether I know those people unless he makes some connection with Continuing Education. I don't

know what he is driving at and if you ask me if I know my father, yes I do. What has that got to do with Continuing Education? So if you don't make any connection my answer is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I am going to call the minister to order. I am going to ask the Leader of the Opposition to make his comments more pertinent to subvote 1 and I consider the previous comments not pertinent to subvote 1 and, therefore, I would request him to make his comments more direct.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that it is not important that the minister responsible for Continuing Education . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Maybe he knows somebody.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, let's find out how he knows them and in what capacity he knows them. Yes, that's the point. The point, Mr. Chairman, is quite simply this, I'm interested in whether the minister knows these people and whether the minister has had dealings with these people and whether the minister has had involvement with these people. If he has, I would like to know in what capacity he has had involvement with them. I think that's fair enough. That's a fair question.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Talk to your lawyer. Forget it.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General wants to enter this debate. I don't know that he can. I'm sure he can . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Oh yes, I can.

MR. COLLVER: — Well then perhaps he would like to enter this debate. Perhaps he would tell us if he knows those four people. I see the Attorney General is not prepared to enter this debate and is not prepared to tell us whether he knows these four individuals or not. I notice the minister responsible for continuing education is not going to answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — If I might rule, subvote 1 deals with the administration of the Department of Continuing Education so I'm going to request the Leader of the Opposition once again to make his comments pertinent to the administration of the Department of Continuing Education. I would ask him to make sure there's a direct relationship between his questions and the administration of that department.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that you will be aware that it is traditional on subvote 1 to enter into a discussion of all educational matters as it relates to continuing education. The importance of our universities and the university system in Saskatchewan has been called into question in the last little while by meetings that the Minister of Continuing Education has had with university students around the province. I think those matters were reported in the press rather clearly. I think we had a demonstration in this very building not a week ago against the policies of the Minister of Continuing Education and against the policies of the government of the province of Saskatchewan. I think it's extremely important that the minister responsible for continuing education assure the people of the province of Saskatchewan and assure the people who are the recipients of higher education in our province, that the associations he may have had in the past and the associations he may have at the present are in keeping with his responsibilities as minister responsible

for continuing education. I asked him a simple question about four individuals — not his father and not a great many other people. I asked specific questions about four individuals and he's refused to answer me. That having been said, we'll go on to other matters. If that's the case, if he has refused to answer me, what can I do? He's not prepared to tell that he knows these people. He says he knows one of them. But he's not prepared to say in what capacity or how he knows them or in what way he knows them. Well, I think the people of the province of Saskatchewan will in due course find out how he knows them, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure they will out in due course . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why don't you just go outside and say it right now and find out fast. Just go out and say it.

MR. COLLVER: — I'm sure they'll find out in due course, Mr. Chairman, so we'll go on to other matters pertaining to . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — He's just a muckraker, I'm telling you — just an absolute muckraker.

MR. COLLVER: — I didn't hear any muck at all. The Attorney General is referring to muck. I didn't hear . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I'm going to ask the Leader of the Opposition to direct his questions to subvote 1 to expedite the discussion on these estimates. So if he would make his comments more pertinent to subvote 1, then we could get on with the business of the . . .

MR. COLLVER: — You're not surely ruling that we are not allowed on subvote 1 to talk about continuing education the entire spectrum of continuing education. Surely you're not ruling that, are you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, I'm not.

MR. COLLVER: — Therefore, I want to talk about continuing education and the fact that we have made a lower commitment relative to inflation. We have made a lower commitment to continuing education in the province of Saskatchewan's history. We have made a lower commitment to educating our young people in the province of Saskatchewan's history. We have made a lower commitment to the utilization of university facilities, for example, to administer such programs as 4-H, a lower commitment than we have ever made before. The fact is continuing education is becoming a serious problem in Saskatchewan. The universities are recognizing today that they can't meet the obligations. They are going to be suspending courses. They are going to be suspending the press course, the journalist course. They are going to be suspending other courses at the University of Regina because of a lack of commitment of the Government of the province of Saskatchewan.

I think the actions of the minister responsible in this area are downright scandalous. I think the actions of the minister responsible for continuing education in his dealings with students, in his dealings with young people who have expressed their sincere concerns to him have been downright scandalous. I think other actions of the minister responsible for continuing education have been downright scandalous and will in due course come to the light of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

I would say this, Mr. Chairman, the minister responsible for continuing education must

make a much larger commitment, dealing openly with the people of the province and dealing openly as it relates to matters pertaining to the university system, instead of dealing behind closed doors and walking out and saying this is the way it is going to be, tough luck. He wants to bring in full-time paid people when he is cutting off courses and cutting off the abilities of the universities to provide the services to the people of Saskatchewan. But he is going to bring in full-time administrators from the STF. That's the kind of behavior we don't agree with. When the minister refuses to answer a simple question about four individuals in the province of Saskatchewan, I think that too tells me a lot.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, I am really not going to respond to the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I simply want to say, if he had been in the House, he would have heard me say that over the last 10 years the average increase to the universities has been 19.8 per cent; over the last 5 years it has been 13.1 per cent, the highest increase in university grants anywhere in Canada. In fact, it is double the amount that some Conservative governments have given. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, we have increased our bursaries by 31 per cent to make absolutely certain that those people who are in financial need will have the opportunity to continue their post-secondary education. I am not going to get into an argument with him as to whether that should be more, should be less.

I think even the president of the university last night had to agree that the provincial government has been fairly generous with the universities. Sure, they would have liked to have had more, who wouldn't, Mr. Chairman? I will admit that. But I think as the president indicated last night, the graduates from our universities here are second to none anywhere. He said if we measure the success of the universities by the graduates who have come out of our universities, Saskatchewan can be very proud. I want to reiterate that. We are committed not only to maintaining first-rate standards of education in this province but to be the first. I think our increase in grants as compared vis-à-vis other provinces show that we have that kind of commitment. So that's all I am going to say in regard to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver).

MR. TAYLOR: — I would like to go back here. In my opening talk I pointed out to you I felt the money was better spent at the student level than in a bureaucracy. I am still a bit concerned, Mr. Minister, with your permanent positions. You pointed out to me that you were creating four new staff positions there. The statistics show that there are two, from ten to twelve. You mention four. I would like to ask you what you did have that you have dropped (and you have mentioned the other four — I know the four that you are asking) I would like to know what two positions you cut out.

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, the executive assistant, for example, to the minister, who has not been hired — that's one. The minister's secretary — that's two and the assistant secretary — that's three. They have not been hired.

MR. TAYLOR: — No, but you had ten and you went up to twelve; that shows two. You tell me you are adding four. Now to me then and . . .

MR. ROLFES: — O.K., the minister's secretary and the assistant secretary are vacant.

MR. TAYLOR: — They are vacant?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: — O.K. Could you tell me the salaries of some of these people — your deputy minister and some of the people who are in these top echelons in your department? I would be interested in knowing what some of this high-priced help is worth.

MR. ROLFES: — Are you asking for the current year or 1979-80?

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Minister, I notice that it is your tendency to go back on your past record. No you were doing this, Mr. Minister. You said, over the last five years we have done so much. Really, what influences the people of Saskatchewan is what we are doing right now. What are you paying these people right now?

MR. ROLFES: — The deputy minister, \$42,240; branch heads — Mr. Riederer, right in front of me, \$41,690; R. Barschel, right in front of me, to the right \$40,610; deputy minister's secretary, \$14,370; clerk steno IV, \$12,300.

MR. TAYLOR: — O.K., Mr. Minister, we have the main ones. You have answered my question; that's fine.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you said a minute ago that you have two vacant positions, secretaries, that you mentioned. Are you not going to be filling these vacancies, and if you are then why are you not including them on these estimates?

MR. ROLFES: — I don't intend to fill them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, yesterday it was indicted in this House during question period that one area covered under continuing education through the university (and I understand some other areas, that's why I'm asking it on item no. 1) was the services provided for the betterment of the 4-H in the province which came from the University of Saskatchewan extension division. My understanding is that approximately \$90,000 to \$93,000 in the university's budget was allocated by way of means to the 4-H, and if the 4-H is moved now to agriculture the reflection in this budget for the university doesn't show that. In what other area did continuing education expand and the university use funds from the continuing education department?

MR. ROLFES: — It can be simply answered that the contract between the university and the Department of Agriculture has nothing to do with my department so, yes it is, fine.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'll explain it one more time. Prior to the decision of the other day to move the department to the agriculture department, the funding was all through the university not from the agriculture department. And what I'm asking you is now that the total funding will come from agriculture and not by the back door from the university, how much funding was allocated and are you aware of how much?

MR. ROLFES: — Here again the member has to understand that we don't make those decisions. The university made the decision to allocate a certain amount of money out of their global funding for 4-H. It is not for us to decide. My understanding now is that they no longer are funding it, and it will be a contract between the Department of Agriculture and the university. It has nothing to do with me or the Department of Continuing Education. Nothing. If you want to know the answers I think you'll have to direct that to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) and I don't know if he can answer

it, that's up to him to decide.

MR. LANE: — I'd like to ask a couple of general questions on subvote 1. The Non-Registered Indian and Metis program. You and I have had this debate on another department, and you've indicated that it's discriminatory to identify people as Indian or Metis. And, oh yes SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) program for example — you said we don't keep records because their Indian or Metis because that's discriminatory. My question is: how do you do it here?

MR. ROLFES: — It's very simple — how do you do it here — the member well knows. The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan is an agreement between the federal government and all the provinces where you simply deliver a service to everybody without regard to ethnic groups or any regard to the background of the individual. The NRIM program is a specific program designed for Indian and Metis people to upgrade them to the standards that are acceptable in society. And you know that as well as I do. It's a designated program for Indian and Metis people while SAP isn't.

MR. LANE: — Yes, except that I can recall a debate . . .

MR. ROLFES: — I'm sorry, it's for Metis people, not for treaty Indians.

MR. LANE: — Non-registered Indians.

MR. ROLFES: — That's right.

MR. LANE: — I can remember many debates where you stood lauding the government for not keeping records on that basis and saying to do so was discriminatory. We asked about the programs because we believe that there is a significant social problem and you don't. We asked, for example, about the correctional system and you denied that records were kept in that way. I just point that out to show you the rather contradictory record keeping of your government. What I'd like you to tell me is the number of unpaid student loans, the amounts unpaid, the amounts that are unpaid for more than a year. As I indicated to you, I would ask this now rather than come back to the particular subvote. If you object to that, I don't mind leaving it. But I indicated that I would ask it now and then leave that subvote alone . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Whatever you want. Let me just phrase it this way. I would ask your officials at that particular subvote to advise me of the outstanding student loans, the amounts by year, the number in each year, how long they have been outstanding and what efforts you are making to collect on ones that are outstanding for more than a year. If your officials . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. O.K., go ahead.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You indicated three executive salaries of \$42,240, \$41,690 and \$40,610. I believe those three gentlemen are in this Chamber. Could you indicate to us the three corresponding salaries for last year?

MR. ROLFES: — Would the gentleman please make clear to me . . . I asked the member for Indian Head-Wolsley (Mr. Taylor) what salaries do you want, '79-'80, or current year? He said, we want to know what you're doing now. I gave him the salaries as they exist now. I ask you, are you referring to '77-'78? If you are, then I'm sure we can get those for you. I don't know what you're asking.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — He may have asked for the salaries now. I take it that these, first of all, are the '79-'80 estimates — the figures you just gave — or are they the '78-'79

estimates?

MR. ROLFES: — '78-'79.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Very well, then, do you have the figures for the '79-'80 estimates for these three?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, we have. Oh, we're efficient here. For the deputy minister \$48,460; for Mr. Riederer \$47,300 and Mr. Barschel \$45,290.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, quick calculation, it looks like about a 15 per cent increase. Well, a \$6,000 increase on the deputy minister, \$6,220 would amount to 15 per cent, would it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't worry about who said no.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — In the Finance Minister's budget speech, the Premier's address to this House, you were going to show restraint in your spending this year. Is a 15 per cent increase restraint? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He suggested you cut back in the right areas not where it counts; there is a difference, Mr. Attorney General.

MR. ROLFES: — I'm sure that the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) fully understands this, being a teacher. I think he understands what increments are. He also understands what merit increments are and he also understands what salary increases are too. I wouldn't have to explain when I say that there generally is a 6 per cent increase but you have to take into consideration automatic increments and for those people whom we feel deserve a merit they have received also a merit increment. I believe that Mr. Guy was one of those individuals whom the government felt deserved a merit increment and he has received one. That is not automatic.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I am well aware of increments. In teaching I am not too aware of merit increments, to be honest with you. Usually when we are talking about negotiating teachers' salaries, somewhere along the line there is a maximum on the increments. Where is the maximum, Mr. Minister?

MR. ROLFES: — I don't know. If there is one, I think I was being somewhat facetious when I said that but the member knows the increment system. Really I don't know when they reached a maximum or if there is one. I think the merit increment system that has been established certainly, if I may use the term again, has a lot of merit. It's not automatic. People have to be assessed and if they deserve an increment they will receive one. If in the opinion of the government they don't deserve a merit increment, I suppose it will be held back in a particular year.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Like MLAs?

MR. ROLFES: — I think the 6 per cent increase over \$42,000 will give you the figure.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you talk about increments on merit, I still see 15 per cent increase in the figure. That's fine. Is there any one of the 12 that did not get a merit increase?

MR. ROLFES: — Maybe for the hon. member, there is a little script prepared for me, and maybe I should read to you exactly what . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, you didn't ask it, so I'll ignore you and speak to the member who asked the question. I'm talking to the

other member now, so I'll ignore you at the present time. If you have a question, stand up and ask it and you'll probably answer it yourself.

The 1979-80 estimates include a 6 per cent provision for salary increases based on the salary schedule in effect to September 30, 1978 to cover salary agreements and schedules extending to September 30, 1979. The 6 per cent is the negotiated average bargaining unit increase for that period. The 6 per cent is applied to the entire fiscal year, but covers the contract period for the first six months of the fiscal year. We've gone through this every year. The practice of not providing for anticipated salary increases in the last six months of the fiscal year has been continued because the new contract for that period is still in the negotiation stage. Also, experience has shown that departments are usually able to absorb the added expenses of the contract settlement due to vacancies — filling of vacancies at lower steps in the range, etc.

Comparison of year to year changes of salary levels in the estimates may be affected by several other factors in addition to annual salary increases, such as changes in the number of positions, annual increments, reclassifications, promotions and the appointments at various steps in the salary ranges. I may have misled the member somewhat in stating that those were the actual salaries of the people for 1979-80. Those are the ones that are approved in the budget. I think they will be very close, but whether or not that will be the actual salary will still have to be determined. But, as I say, those are the approved ones, that we have approved in the budget and I think they will be very close.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, the minister still hasn't answered my question because the question I asked was, is there any one of the 12 that are not going to be included in the merit increase?

MR. ROLFES: — First of all I think that those in the top two divisions, the deputy ministers of branch heads, are in the management series; they are separate from the others. The others simply get the negotiated increases.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Now, the other 10 — the two, first of all, are out of scope, I take it. Are the other 10 within the union negotiations?

MR. ROLFES: — Mrs. Green isn't because she is a deputy minister's secretary.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Just so that I can understand how it works, and I am not really that sure how it does; but are merit increases available to union employees?

MR. ROLFES: — . . . you only have the two out-of-scope and that is automatic 'three'.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The three that you listed, and the other nine are in the union?

MR. ROLFES: — Except for Green.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — . . . an automatic merit for out-of-scope. Well, it happened in those three. Who didn't get the merit increases? . . . getting back to that . . .

MR. ROLFES: — All three this year got the merit increases.

MR. LANE: — Well, how many also got the increments. Did they all get the increments?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I am going to let the minister answer the question.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that if you do a satisfactory job, you can be eligible for an increment and if you do an excellent job, you are also eligible for the merit increment. But there's also the possibility that if you don't perform well you could have a reduction. So, it's my understanding that in the management series, if you perform satisfactorily, you can have an increment, but it's not automatic, and if you perform exceptionally well, you can also be eligible for the merit increment.

MR. LANE: — I'm fully aware of that and the minister knows precisely what my question is. I ask how many got the increment? Did anybody not get an increment this year?

MR. ROLFES: — Could the member tell me, is he referring to people who are in the unions or people who are out of scope?

MR. LANE: — Let's start with the out-of-scope ones first. Who didn't get an automatic increase this year? They all got it and they got the merit increases as well?

MR. ROLFES: — I think it's still under negotiation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I will recognize only one speaker at a time. I am now going to allow the Minister of Continuing Education to answer the question. I recognize the Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. ROLFES: — O.K., it depends as I indicated before, when the person was hired and when his anniversary date comes due.

MR. LANE: — You've already told us, all of them got the merit increase and all of them got the incremental increase and then all of them got the 6 per cent. That's all we've been trying to get out of you because that brings it up to about a 21 per cent increase and that's all there is to it.

Now, the next question is, what out-of-scope people have now been given government cars?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I take it that would be the Deputy Minister, is that correct? What benefit is added to the income of \$48,460 for the use of the automobile? The question I am asking is, first of all, was it a taxable benefit, and what was the benefit assessment for the automobile, what kind of a car is it, what grade, what level and what expenses are being paid as well for the automobile?

MR. ROLFES: — The Deputy Minister pays 1 per cent of the value of the automobile per month.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — How did the minister manage to negotiate a 1 per cent benefit through the income tax department? That would be my first question. The figure should be two and one-half but the 1 per cent is the assessed tax benefit, I take it since it is what you are giving us. What I am asking is: what kind of an automobile did he get, the value of that automobile and what expenses of the automobile are being paid by the department?

MR. ROLFES: — A 1977 Royal Monaco.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you didn't answer my other question. How did you manage to work out the 1 per cent benefit when two and one-half per cent is the tax law on that?

MR. ROLFES: — Maybe the member didn't hear my answer. The Deputy Minister pays 1 per cent per month of the value of the car.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Is that to avoid the taxable benefit for the income tax? The two and one-half per cent, if he is allowed the automobile as a benefit, the tax benefit would be two and one-half per cent a month. Well, fine. You say, a 1977 Royal Monaco. The value of that automobile would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$7,000 or \$8,000. The depreciation on an automobile is 30 per cent a year. That is an additional benefit to the . . . forget the income tax for a minute. This would be an added cost to the taxpayers of this province — all 30 per cent of \$7,000 or \$8,000. Now, I don't know what equipment he has on that automobile. It could be \$10,000.

MR. ROLFES: — If the member wants to know the actual working out, that question would have to be directed to the Minister of Revenue rather than to myself because that's my understanding it's government policy throughout. The deputy ministers will have the use of a car. They pay 1 per cent of the value of the car for their personal mileage, per month.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I said to forget about the income tax benefit on it. I was suggesting to you that you are indicating a \$48,460 salary. In addition, fine, 1 per cent would be \$70 or \$60 a month, I don't know what price you pay for the car. But the actual cost to the Saskatchewan taxpayer, the taxpayer of this province, is far greater than the 1 per cent we're talking about that he as a minister is paying to the government. The depreciation cost on that would be at least 2.5 per cent a month plus the cost of the operation of the automobile. My question is: what is the government paying in addition to the supply of the automobile licence, insurance, gasoline, maintenance and all the rest of it that goes with it?

MR. ROLFES: — To the member, previously, if he wants that answer he will have to ask the Minister of Revenue. It's in the CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) budget. The cost I'm sure you will ask the Minister of Revenue when his estimates come up.

MR. COLLVER: — What other benefits does the deputy minister receive besides the benefit of the, roughly, 2.5 per cent of the value of the automobile per month that the Government of Saskatchewan loses. As the minister is aware, to rent an automobile from just Joe Doke's local or Paul Rousseau local auto dealers, whoever, is about 3.5 per cent per month. You are charging the minister 1 per cent, he therefore gets a benefit of 2.5 per cent per month of the value. What other benefits does he receive besides that automobile benefit?

MR. ROLFES: — I don't know exactly what the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to know but he is entitled to sick leave of one and one-quarter days per month; he is entitled to annual holidays of one and one-quarter days per month; he is entitled to a pension into which he pays 9 per cent, I believe, of his salary; he's got long-term disability and he pays into that.

MR. COLLVER: — What does the government pay on his behalf?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I recognize the Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. ROLFES: — I don't think there are any others.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, the reason I'm asking this question is quite simply this. The deputy minister responsible for continuing education receives \$48,400 per annum in salary. In addition to that he gets another, for lack of a better response, \$1,000 a year in car benefit. I don't know whether that's right or wrong. In addition to that he gets another 12 per cent, I understand; if he contributes 9 per cent then the government contributes 12 per cent of that \$48,000 up to a certain number for pension. The government takes so much for pension. In addition to that the government pays an additional amount to him with reference to any sickness and accident disability insurance he's got — he pays a certain portion, the government pays a certain portion. What I'm getting at is what is the total of the ancillary benefits of the job? The reason that I am asking the question, Mr. Minister, is surely the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know how much a deputy minister gets relative to how much a professor gets. How much does a deputy minister get relative to what a doctor gets? How much does a deputy minister get relative to what a university president get? How much does a deputy minister get relative to all of these people in the continuing education field that you have now caused to cut off programs because of your chintzie behavior, because of your chintzie attitude on this budget and because of your lack of good priorities where you are going to spend money on administration rather than on programs, where you are going to spend money on administrators, bookkeepers, deputy ministers, assistants, executive assistants and others instead of spending money on professors and people who will provide the services to the people, you want to spend the money to administer it?

We want to know how much in total does a deputy minister receive so that the people can compare that to what these others get? Now surely that's not too difficult a question to answer . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, we have not been answered. Is the Deputy Minister of Education paid for membership in organizations? Does the Department of Continuing Education pay for the deputy minister's membership in the Wascana Club? Does the department pay for the deputy minister's share in the Lakeshore Estates Club?

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . Whether he has one or not.

MR. COLLVER: — That's what we want to know. What does the government pay on behalf of the deputy minister? How much? How much car, how much expenses? Surely the people are entitled to know how much the government pays a deputy minister.

Now quite frankly, we don't want to know that, part of it's in the revenue department and part of it's in the Attorney General's department and part of it's in the finance department and part of it's in the contract service department. What we want to know is, how much does he get and what are the values of the benefits that he gets?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, the deputy minister doesn't belong to Lakeshore Estates and doesn't happen to belong to Wascana (you can name some of the others) he doesn't happen to belong to those. No, he doesn't have a membership in the Swiss bank, he tells me. But he does belong to (because as Deputy Minister of Continuing Education he must belong to) the Saskatchewan Counsel of Education Administrators. That's \$5 a year; that's paid for by the government. He does belong to the Canadian Education Administrators, but we don't know what the entry fee is. He must belong to those. I don't know what . . . we can look that up for you . . . what it is. Because he's deputy

minister, he's expected to belong to those and that's all we can come up with that the government pays for the deputy minister. There isn't anything else.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, does the deputy minister have an expense account? Does he travel on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan from time to time? Of course he does, and what we're interested in finding out from you is, what is the level of the expense account that he receives? What have you budgeted for, for the expense account for the deputy minister? You said he has to belong to these two educational associations. I am sure that the deputy minister must belong to other educational associations as well, because he obviously has to be an outstanding educator. But he has to be an outstanding educator and he has to be an outstanding administrator, whether or not he's deputy minister for the province of Saskatchewan. For example, some people in that capacity don't have that paid. Some managers of various companies or departments or universities don't get that kind of thing paid for. So, if you say we have \$50,000 for this guy and \$50,000 for this guy, but this guy gets all his expenses paid and this guy has to meet them out of his own pocket, the \$50,000 do not relate.

What we're trying to get at is, what do you pay for on behalf of the Deputy Minister of Continuing Education? And I want to trigger the other ministers who are going to come before this Assembly that we want the same information from them as well. What does your deputy minister get paid? What extra benefits does he get? We want to be able to compare that in the open market place. I think that is a reasonable thing for the people to be able to do. Now, Mr. Minister, you have not answered our question. We have asked you what the automobile benefit is, what you have anticipated in this budget for the deputy minister's expenses? What other kinds of organizations must he belong to? How many conferences a year — there's a good one for the minister to think about, because obviously he hasn't thought about this before — do you allocate to your deputy minister? How many conferences do you pay for? In other words, does he pay for some and you pay for some? Or do you pay for them all? If you pay for them all, how much are you budgeting for? For example, a medical doctor is allowed to write off in the course of a year one medical conference. That's what he is allowed to charge against his tax. Everything else has to come out of his own pocket. The Government of Saskatchewan is in a dispute right now with medical doctors in Saskatchewan. I think that it is important . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I never saw one of them wear a yellow coat and a yellow tie, let me tell you. I can assure you of that.

Mr. Chairman, we are asking the minister to be specific. It's not an unreasonable request. Our members have asked about automobiles; they have asked about the expense accounts; they have asked about other things. We want to be able to compare the deputy minister to anyone else in society. Please provide us with that information. If you can't do it today, perhaps you could make an undertaking to provide it tomorrow and we can get on with these estimates. We want to have that information; we insist on it. We think that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, maybe on behalf of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), I could apologize for his leader. We were doing well and we had it on a fairly high plane and it went down very quickly when your leader walked in. But that's not uncommon in this House.

Mr. Chairman, the expense accounts and the things that he's referring to are the public service rates. That's what the deputy gets. I think the Leader of the Opposition is being somewhat naive to think that if there is a council of ministers' meeting in Toronto, if they

have half a dozen a year and we need to be there as a government, I should expect my deputy to pay three of those and the government should pay the other three. What you are asking the government to do, then, is not be represented at these conferences. That is his job. He is there to represent the government and if he is on government business he ought to be paid for doing his job. I just think it is unreasonable to expect that the deputy minister should pay out of his own pocket when he is there to represent the provincial government. Now, if you want to know those rates, those rates are somewhere around. We can get those. We will provide those to you tomorrow. But he is not any different than any other person in the civil service who goes to Ottawa or to Toronto to represent the provincial government. He gets the same expense account as those people do.

MR. COLLVER: — One isn't asking that question; one is asking whether or not you're paying for his professional trips . . . whether he goes to professional conferences, not where he represents the province. The man's a medical doctor and he goes to a meeting of the medical doctors of Nova Scotia and he's going to be there for purposes of becoming involved or the man is a teacher and he goes to the annual teachers' convention in Toronto and he attends the teachers' convention; now is the Government of Saskatchewan paying for that on behalf of its deputy ministers? We know that they do not pay for that on behalf of the union employees. Are they paying for it on the behalf of the deputy ministers? That's a simple question. Not where the deputy minister is representing the people of Saskatchewan; of course, his expenses should be paid. No one is talking about those kinds of expenses. What we're talking about are personal expenditures that are normally expended by individuals in society that are paid a salary and is the government meeting those obligations? If the answer is no, then we know it's \$48,400 plus the car (which I hope you're going to undertake to give us how much the value of that is) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, we haven't got the information on the car. I understand that if you want us to give a number to it, \$1,000 a year is the benefit the deputy minister receives; fair enough. That's fair enough. He gets the benefit of \$1,000 a year. I'm not even commenting; maybe the guy should be paid \$75,000 a year. That's not the point! He's nodding his head, I can see that and he's looking happy. Maybe that's the point. Maybe relative to the competition, he's underpaid. All we're saying is, we want to know a basis, or have a basis.

You're the first department that's being examined so we thought we'd try and establish the basis for your department so other ministers would come forward and we wouldn't have to waste the time of the House getting this information. What we want to know is on what basis are you paying the deputy minister; what personal kinds of expenditures are you paying on his behalf? Will you undertake to provide us with that information so that we can compare to the private sector?

MR. ROLFES: — The things that are allowed for a deputy minister is a salary which I have told you; he gets a car which is one per cent per month of the value of the car that he pays and he gets paid a p.s. rate, public service rate, when he goes on behalf of the government to conferences or meetings where he represents the government. I think that is it!

MR. COLLVER: — That's professional associations, would you say?

MR. ROLFES: — Well, I told you the \$5 for the Saskatchewan Council Education Association and the Canadian Educational Administrators. That's it, I think. Well, that's it!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — On the question of the automobile, you indicated a minute ago that the deputy minister pays one per cent of the value of the automobile from CVA; I take it that's from CVA. You pay the one per cent to CVA; is that right?

MR. ROLFES: — . . . from his cheque so I assume it goes to the Department of Revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Fine. Then where is the difference charged for the cost of the automobile? There is a difference between the 1 per cent that the deputy minister is paying and the actual cost to the government. Where is that extra cost? I am referring not only to the depreciation of that automobile, but the licence, the insurance, the maintenance, the gasoline. One other question on that subject; is he entitled to use the automobile for his personal use, vacations, etc.?

MR. ROLFES: — Yes, 1 per cent per month entitles him to use that automobile for his personal use. If you want to know what the costs are of a car, I indicated to you when you were sitting over there, that question should be directed to the Minister of Revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, he misunderstood my question again. I am not asking what the cost is; I am asking where it is being charged? Is your department paying to the Department of Revenue the difference in the actual cost and the cost that the deputy minister is paying?

MR. ROLFES: — I'll have that information for you tomorrow.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Fine. You said you will have the information for me tomorrow? Do you have any other cars in your department that you get from the Department of Revenue, CVA? How many cars are allotted to your department? The 40 automobiles that are allotted to your department are charged to your department, are they not?

MR. ROLFES: — They are allotted to our department and we pay a rent to CVA (Central Vehicle Agency).

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Would the minister please indicate to this Assembly what that rent is?

MR. ROLFES: — We will add that to the information that I'll supply you tomorrow.

MR. COLLVER: — You don't get off item 1 until we get this information. It's serious stuff.

MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — I'd just like to move on to another area. I'd like to have an idea why you have reduced staff in all of the Institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — To expedite the discussion of the estimates, I would ask the committee to stop the discussion and keep the noise down so that we can hear the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

MR. SWAN: — The question I was asking you, Mr. Minister, is why is there a reduction in staff in each of the Institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences? It seems if we're going to continue to offer good programs, we should be having the staff in the teaching areas. Why the number of reductions?

MR. ROLFES: — In answer to the member, I think it is fair to say that we are aware of

what the public is saying out there and certainly what the opposition has said. I think many of you have gone around Saskatchewan saying that there are bureaucrats running all over the place and it's about time that government gets out of our lives. Maybe we've listened to the opposition but secondly . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Secondly, not to give the opposition too much credit, we are also becoming more efficient, I think, in providing the services. I can assure the members that no programs have been cut in the institutes. In fact, there has been some increase in programs. Some of these positions, in fact, most of these positions at Kelsey were vacant positions. I think there was a cut of one person at Kelsey so that the answer to your question is that programs have even been expanded. We're hoping to become more efficient in the way we deliver those programs. I guess we are responding to what the public were saying to us during the election and previous to that.

MR. SWAN: — I understand when the people were in the Kelsey Institute or other institutes that they were actually teachers and not political people or administrators, necessarily. You have to have some administration and it's not one person that's been eliminated in Kelsey, it's 11. It goes from 300 to 289; in my mathematics that's 11. And if you look at the one above it, the Wascana Centre goes from 165 to 158 again a fair cut. How do you offer more programs with less people? If you have a secret we'd surely like to hear it.

MR. ROLFES: — The member didn't listen to me when I said that many of those positions in Kelsey were vacant positions, that only one person was cut, the rest were vacant positions. In Wascana the Dental Nursing Program when the government changed was reduced because in Manitoba the Conservatives no longer kept up with the agreement that we had with the former government to educate dental nurses here in Saskatchewan. Consequently those positions became redundant and we had to eliminate them.

MR. SWAN: — Then in fact you really have cut programs . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well you just said that you . . .

MR. ROLFES: — No, we were educating . . .

MR. SWAN: — You just finished saying that you because of what happened in Manitoba you discontinued the program for dental nurses. Now tell us whether you did or not.

MR. ROLFES: — I'll go through it very slowly for the member. I indicated to him that we had an agreement with the Manitoba government to educate dental nurses in this province for the Manitoba government. They wanted to put in a dental care program — the former NDP government. We signed an agreement with them and we had a number, I believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of total of 81 dental nurses. That has been severely cut back because the present government no longer will abide by that particular agreement. They didn't want to have their dental nurses educated here in Saskatchewan. Therefore the program has been cut back but we are still educating dental nurses for Saskatchewan. We are no longer educating nurses here at Wascana for Manitoba but our program is still here for our dental nurses for our program here in Saskatchewan.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, what happened to the guarantee of the Government of

the province of Saskatchewan to provide these youngsters who are taking the dental nursing program in Saskatchewan a job? Since the Government of Saskatchewan guaranteed that these people would be provided with jobs, why are these people running around looking for jobs now?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, just one correction. I first of all want to let the opposition know, there was no guarantee made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, you give it to me. I don't take your word for it. I've learned in this House not to take your word.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, a point of order. It is improper for the member (and he knows better) for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) to make such a reference to myself. It is improper, and I ask him to withdraw it. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure you heard what the member said. I ask him to withdraw it. The member said he would not take my word for it, that he had learned in this House not to take my word. That is unacceptable. Well, I suggest it is improper and I ask the member to withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I think that a lot of these things would not happen if members, when they are speaking and want to speak, would rise in their chairs to speak. This applies to both sides of the House. Furthermore, I think innuendoes on both sides of the House are not necessary to conduct good parliamentary business. I would say that this statement (if you want to refer to it as that) that the minister has referred to, is not a statement which any of us like to hear in the House. I think this comes from both sides, and I ask both sides to try to conduct themselves in the manner in which we should, and they should, representing their people in the manner in which they would like to see them represented. I ask you to do it and keep it to that level and we'll proceed.

MR. COLLVER: — I asked you for a ruling, if you wouldn't mind. I've asked for a ruling that particular statement of the minister. I say that it is unparliamentary. I say that he should . . .

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, may I? I withdraw it so we can proceed. I'll withdraw the statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! As one of the older members in the House (this applies to both) I don't think we need directions from all seats. If you're going to speak, rise in your seat and speak. You asked for a ruling; the minister withdrew. We'll proceed with the business.

MR. TAYLOR: — I'd like to move now, Mr. Minister, to student loans, as my seat mate had raised it. I see it's subvote 3. As you remember in my reply to the budget speech I questioned you about some of these loans that have not been repaid. I refer you to page 10 of your Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund. I see a couple of items here that I would like explained. It says loans written off \$5,935. I'd like to know why these loans were written off, how many of them were written off. Could you give me some explanation on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — As I referred earlier, I know you have a lot of leeway in subvote 1. I am afraid that you're going to ask some of these same questions when we get back to the subvotes to which they pertain. I would ask for you to try to check closely and if that subvote covers one of your questions, I would ask for you to present it at that time. I think it would expedite our matters.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, that's fine. If that's your ruling that it should be asked then, I'll ask

it at that time.

MR. KATZMAN: — The minister has suggested that he'll give to the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) several answers tomorrow. I'm not sure if he can give me these now or not. On the cars, CVA vehicles — last year in the House somebody indicated that people who were allotted cars on a permanent basis were allowed to use them for their personal vacation and were charged a certain amount of money. Is the minister aware of that and how much it is, or does he have to bring that in tomorrow with the other information?

MR. ROLFES: — We'll bring it in.

MR. KATZMAN: — Under the other personal services and other expenses, I do not notice anywhere in the estimates where you pay rent for the premises that you use or that type of issue. What you are saying is that your budget is lacking another area of expense which is supplied by government services, the rental of accommodations. They pay the tab; so really when you're saying to me here that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Attorney General seems to indicate it was a false budget. If he'd like to stick it to his feet and get the light on and say it again I'll sit down but otherwise . . . Repeat you? It's not worth the effort. Mr. Minister, would you have any idea of what the subsidy to your department is from other departments, government services and so forth which are not indicated in your budget?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Chairman, each one of those provides a specific service to government and they have a budget set aside. Government services is responsible for the buildings. You can ask when the minister responsible for government services comes up. Ask him the specific questions and he will have those answers for you. I can't tell you what they are, but ask the individual minister when he comes up with his estimates and he will give them to you.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, may I just make a comment on this.

I think the hon. Minister of Social Services, the Minister of Continuing Education in his capacity this afternoon, makes a good point. Subvote 1, with all due respect to the Leader of the Opposition, is a vote where policy issues are debated. The minister is prepared to debate: Did we put enough money into loans and bursaries or did we not? Did we give enough money to the universities, or did we not? Should there be a different kind of a higher-learning policy approach or should there not be?

I realize some of the questions are related to laying the groundwork for that kind of a position. But it is virtually impossible for any minister to come in and answer details on subvote 1 related to (1) the car, which we have heard about for the majority of the afternoon, when the car comes under CVA, (that is the fact and there is going to be a revenue and supply estimate and you will have a chance to talk about that), or (2) the government services argument, the very point the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) is trying to make now. Ever since I have been around politics, government services has been renting the space and buying the buildings for the department.

If you think that the rent is too much, or someone is building too many buildings, or not enough buildings, you ask government services. You don't ask the Minister of Continuing Education, why don't you have this in the continuing education budget? Aha, it's a big gap. You see you don't have anything listed on rent.

Now, all I am saying is, look, let's be fair about the whole situation. You take five days to criticize the living daylight out of the minister, on continuing education — take 50 days for all I care, as much time as you want to on the important issues of continuing education. But don't nibble him to death on an area which he has no direct responsibility for.

Mr. Chairman, I say as I sit down, Vote 1 is a time for high debate on policies. The separate votes are the specific details. Please, I ask the hon. member for Rosthern and others, make sure that you direct your criticisms to the appropriate and responsible minister. That is all I am saying.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to say three things with reference to what the Attorney General has just said.

First of all, item 1 is to establish whether or not the minister responsible for the department has got a handle on the costs of his whole department. That's No. 1. And if the minister does not have a handle on those costs than he is not doing his job.

If the Attorney General is trying to suggest for one moment that the Minister of Revenue is responsible for the activities of every department of government, then we shouldn't have to have estimates for every minister. We should only have the Minister of Revenue. We want to know whether the minister responsible for continuing education is maximizing the number of dollars that are granted to his total department, maximizing the utilization for the provision of the higher ideals that the Attorney General refers to.

And if the minister does not understand that some of his budget is being frittered away on cars and frittered away on salaries and frittered away on contracts and frittered away on niggling expenditures, there isn't any money left to provide for these important programs. And we hear universities and institutes tell us that they have to cut back programs.

Now, the purpose of an opposition, for what it's worth for the Attorney General, the purpose is to ensure, first of all, that each minister is doing his job, has a handle on his costs and is maximizing the money. If you want to call that niggling, if you want to call that two-bitting, if you want to call that being fair, you can call it anything you like. But our job, we feel, is to make certain that the minister has a handle on these expenses. Secondly, in a field such as continuing education, it is extremely important that the minister understand the workings of his whole department. We have heard today the Minister of Continuing Education say he doesn't know; he has his officials here and they don't know. They know that it might be the Department of Revenue; they know that it might be the Department of Finance; they know that it might be any number of departments. But they don't know what it costs them. How in the world can you get ministerial responsibility if each minister doesn't have a handle on the situation and if his officials don't have a handle on the situation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Now, the purpose of these estimates is to make certain that each minister is doing his job . . . not to hide behind his officials and not to say it's another department's problem or it's this one's problem or it's that one's problem. This is the first estimate that we have had a chance to talk about this year. We have to determine the first one . . . we don't decide which departments you bring in here; you decide which

departments you bring in here. It might have been education, it might have been continuing education, it might have been A.G., it might have been highways, it might have been anything. We want to know on this department; has the minister got a handle on it? Maybe the future estimates will go much more quickly if your ministers of your government have a handle on the expenditures of their department and not try and pass the buck to their officials or pass the buck to other departments of finance, of revenue and the others. We think it's important, we think it's essential and we intend to continue to pursue this matter with every minister. So tell them to come in here prepared and tell them to understand what's happening with the money that they are spending and it will go very quickly. Give us some answers for a change.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I am not going to tell the ministers that they have a responsibility to know how CVA policy for deputy ministers on cars operates.

MR. COLLVER: — Well, they better find out.

MR. ROMANOW: — That's fine, we'll see who has to find out what. I am not going to be standing here as minister in my estimates taking the responsibility for a central controlled policy on cars which is the responsibility of the Minister of Revenue. I'm not going to get up here as minister and answer to you people on the estimates and you had better find out that leasing policies or building policies which is under central control which is Government Services. I'm telling you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Chairman, this House does not need any lectures from the Leader of the PC Party on what the tradition has been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I want to tell the Leader of the PC Party that I've been around in this House at least for 12 years. I've seen some leaders of oppositions come and go. I've seen estimates being presented and debated and I want to tell you that your proposition makes a total sham of estimates. If you want to criticize the leasing policies on cars you do it under the proper vote. If you want to do it on the leasing space you do it on the proper vote. The minister is in charge of continuing education; that what he's here to answer for. Ask him how much his deputy gets paid, ask him any of those kinds of questions related . . . You do that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — He doesn't know.

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . Well if he doesn't then you have a right to hold up the estimate. I agree with you. On his department you can pursue it all you want. But I rose because the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) got up only pursuing again and again I repeat, what the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) first started on the question of cars. Now the minister tried to do it diplomatically, he tried to do it gentlemanly. He tried to say, look it, ask the appropriate minister. No way; those boys opposite don't want to do it. What they want to do is kill time in this Legislative Assembly in this Committee of Finance. Now look it, you've got a big budget, you've got big policy, debate the big policy issues. I'm telling the Leader of the Opposition of the PCs that I am not here and nor will I answer questions related to the cars or questions related to the leasing of the Department of the Attorney General. Those ministers who are responsible will answer those questions and nobody else in this House. Now you can drag out the House for five months if you want; that's the way parliament has been run in Saskatchewan and you are not going to subvert tradition by that kind of an approach. You are not going to come in here under some sort of guise that you people don't know what the business is

all about. You've had members here for three and one-half years who should know what the traditions are and it's shameful, absolutely shameful, Mr. Chairman. I think if anybody saw it and saw the performance that was here by the opposition would know why all of Saskatchewan is talking about the desperate straits that the PCs are in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The desperate straits that you're in. You know it, that's why you react that way. You know it, Mr. Chairman, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) like the member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Progressive Conservatives, knows it. Every one of you knows exactly what the press are saying, what the public is saying as exhibited by this subvote 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please! Order to all of you! Order! I cannot understand; now you've both had an opportunity to speak your piece, if you want to put it that way. I would like you to relate back to the subvote 1 of continuing education and we'll try to conduct it in the manner in which it should be conducted.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to subvote 1. What I am saying on subvote 1 is that: We have had two and a half hours of questioning on subvote 1 . . . which I say to you, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, because I think you are one of the guys who has some potential on that side of the caucus (don't trust me, check with the officials of the Legislative Assembly, check with other experienced members about what the practice and the tradition is) . . . I accept you are a rookie in this operation, but don't let the leader or the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) suck you or the others into a path which is contrary to tradition. Because if your two and a half hour example is what every department is all about, is what the PC Opposition is all about, I am saying what they are saying in the grassroots about the decline of the PC Party provincially is a factor, because of its ineffectiveness as an opposition is going to be in there solidly.

Mr. Chairman, I believe (and I'm sorry I lost my temper for a moment), I honestly believe that estimates are probably the most important aspect of provincial legislative business. I believe that. I used to like coming to them. The policy, the debate, the cut and thrust — please I am simply saying, roast the minister all you want to roast him, but for his field of responsibility. It isn't CVA cars and it isn't airplanes and it isn't leasing. Everybody painfully knows that.

Mr. Chairman, I think this might be an appropriate time for us to consider remarks on everybody's side.

The Committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:59.