

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 22, 1979**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to introduce to the Assembly, 21 Grade 8 students from St. Luke School in the Regina Elphinstone constituency. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery with their teacher, Jim Frolick.

In the absence of their MLA, Premier Allan Blakeney, I plan to meet them for a question period.

Members join me, I am sure, in welcoming them, congratulating them for their interest and wishing them a pleasant and informative visit to the legislature.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw South):** — As has been the custom in the past, Regina has superseded Moose Jaw on occasion, but I do want to take this opportunity on behalf of the hon. member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. J.L. Skoberg), to introduce to the Assembly, a group of some 26 Grade 8 students who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by Mr. Boudeau and Mrs. Bender. I understand that they have had an opportunity to do a tour of the Legislative Buildings. I will have the opportunity, on behalf of John Skoberg to meet with them a little later.

Mr. Skoberg wanted to express his welcome to this group in particular, and I will have an opportunity to meet with them and discuss a few things with them a little later.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Canora):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you, to the members of the legislature, eight young people from the Canora Christian Academy, an educational institution there.

Accompanying the young people is their chaperone, Mr. Virgil Hrywkiw. I do hope the group has an enjoyable and informative visit while visiting our capital city and the legislature. I will be meeting with the group following their departure from the Speaker's gallery.

I am sure that all members of the House will join with me in extending a warm welcome to them.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Humboldt):** — Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to join with the members in extending greetings to all of the students who are with us here this afternoon, and in particular, through you, welcome students (48 in number) from the Grade 8 class at the Bruno High School in my constituency.

**March 22, 1979**

Bruno High School comes to this Legislative Assembly, I think, annually now and has for several years. It is always a real pleasure to have those students here. I intend to spend some time with them after the question period, answering questions that they may have, and I look forward to that.

I would like to have the members in the Assembly join me in extending our greetings to them.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **QUESTIONS**

### **Saskatchewan Land Bank**

**MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding), the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan land bank. On many occasions in this Assembly, Mr. Minister, you have stated the purpose of the Saskatchewan land bank to be to assist the young farmer who otherwise could not get a start in farming, and to allow the older farmer to retire in dignity. Do I properly state your position and the position of your government on that matter?

**HON. E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture):** — That is one of the criteria.

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Minister, are you aware — and I'm sure you are — that one Senator Hazen Argue has in the past three or four years sold a substantial amount of his farm land to the Saskatchewan land bank? Are you aware of that?

**MR. KAEDING:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give you . . . I've heard that this is a fact. I haven't checked into it. I think that it's possibly so.

### **Senator Argue's Use of Land Bank Money**

**MR. ANDREW:** — A new question. Are you further aware, Mr. Minister, that Senator Hazen Argue, using the proceeds of the sale of his land . . .

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

### **Senator Acquiring Land**

**MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Are you aware that Senator Hazen Argue is using the proceeds of this land sold to the land bank to acquire more land and thereby, increase his holdings?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what Senator Hazen Argue is doing with the money he got from the land bank nor am I particularly interested in that. He can do whatever he wants. If you sell land to the land bank, you can do what you want with that money.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Minister, I have in my hand a document.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Table it.

**MR. ANDREW:** — That does in fact . . . I will table it, at any proper time . . . that proves beyond any doubt that Senator Hazen Argue is in fact, purchasing more farm land in that area. And you say you agree with that . . .

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

### **Abusive Use of Money Received from Land Bank**

**MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):** — Would the Minister of Agriculture not admit that the practice of farmers selling their land to the land bank, taking the money and investing in more farm land is in fact, contrary to what you're trying to accomplish and is stopping young farmers from getting on the land and adding to the competition for farm land?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, the major objective of the land bank is to try to get land into the hands of farmers who do not have the capacity to get into it otherwise. What the guy does with his money after he gets paid for his farm, is none of our business. He can buy anything he wants with it. He can go on a holiday to Hawaii if he wants to. Are you trying to suggest to us that we should somehow keep track of what everybody spends their money on?

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, are you telling this Assembly, Mr. Minister . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. I'm going to try to bring the member for Kindersley into order and ask him to bring himself into order. He is abusing the regulations and rules by which the question period is run. I will advise him, and I've tried to impress upon him that he's out of order, that he should review the rules of the question period. I will take a new question.

### **Buying Land from Retiring Farmers**

**MR. LANE:** — I'll direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and we're dealing, Mr. Speaker, with stated government policy. Will you not admit that if a farmer is to retire, which is one of the goals of the land bank system, when he sells for that reason, that in fact he should retire, instead of becoming a competitor for the young farmer trying to get on? You're creating competition by your practice. Will you not admit that?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't accept that at all. Certainly, we like to buy land from retiring farmers. But that doesn't mean we're restricted to retiring farmers or anything else. We can buy land if land is offered to us, and if that land can be used to get another young farmer started, certainly that's a legitimate purpose for the land bank.

**MR. R. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, my question again, to get back to this issue, is simply this. Do you agree that a farmer should be able to sell his land with a lease back to his children, who qualify because they have no other assets, then simply take the proceeds and go and buy more land, to the point where the guy has something like 35 or 40 quarters of land that they're farming?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, again I simply ask the member if he feels that it's up to us to monitor what everybody spends their money on? Is that what you're proposing, that

we monitor what they spend their money on — after they get it, after they've sold the farm? We can't prevent a farmer from doing that, anymore than we can prevent him from buying a hotel or anything else.

### **Answer to Question on PCS Order of Rail Cars**

**HON. E. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this Assembly, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale (Mr. Messer) took notice of a question from the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) with respect to rail cars.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I have it here. I have it, it's okay.

**MR. COWLEY:** — It's okay. The answer is that PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) has received all 500 of the rail cars which it had on order, and has 300 additional cars on delivery for the early spring of 1980. With respect to the trucking, their response was that only very small volumes are shipped by trucks — about 15,000 tons in 1978 — and only in cases where the customer in the United States makes the arrangements for trucking.

### **Senator Acquiring Land**

**MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition):** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the issue that is being presented to him? Is the minister aware that what is happening is the farmer, in this case Senator Hazen Argue, is buying farm land today, and selling that to the Land Bank Commission tomorrow? Then he leases it to his children, takes the money that he receives from the Land Bank Commission, and buys more land. Next year he goes out and he sells that land to the Land Bank Commission, rents it to his children. The next year he does the same thing. So it's year after year after year . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Does the member have a question?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like the Leader of the Opposition to document for me the transactions with Senator Hazen Argue. I suggest that he has not done. He may have sold the land to the land bank and leased it back to his son. That's a legitimate operation. I suggest that he cannot document for me a case where that has happened a second time. I'm sure that he can't.

### **Land Bank Abuse**

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — If I might just direct one question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). Twice today in this question period in reply to questions from our side of the House, the minister has asked for our suggestions. I'll ask the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, do you not agree as the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) has documented and is prepared to document, and table, that there are examples in this province of people who are capitalizing and abusing the land bank program. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Agriculture very simply is are you prepared now, in light of this evidence, to tighten up the guidelines, Mr. Minister? Tighten up the guidelines and stop this abuse of the land bank program on the backs of our prospective young farmers in Saskatchewan?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KAEDING:** — I think what the hon. member is suggesting is that we document and we keep a dossier on everybody that buys land from the land bank, and somehow go around and follow him around and see what he does with his money, and I don't think this party wants to be involved in that. That party over there might do that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

### **Purchase of Hopper Cars by Canadian Wheat Board**

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, obviously the Minister of Agriculture can't answer our questions in this regard so I'll direct a new question. A new question to the Minister of Agriculture. As you have stated in this House your position regarding the purchasing of hopper cars by the Canadian Wheat Board, being such that you are in support of the Canadian Wheat Board purchasing hopper cars for the Canadian National Railways — and it has been brought to our attention as indicated by the Canadian Wheat Board they will also be purchasing hopper cars from the Canadian Pacific Railways. Mr. Minister, very simply, do you agree with that position taken by the Canadian Wheat Board?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board didn't ask for my opinion. However, the Canadian Wheat Board has made the decision to buy 2,000 hopper cars. At the time they made that decision, CPR (Canadian Pacific Railways) said that they didn't need any more hopper cars, that they could get along fine with what they have. Since that time they have made a submission to the Wheat Board saying that we do need some hopper cars. That's not surprising either. The Wheat Board has made the decision now apparently that some of them will go to the CPR, and that is a decision of the Wheat Board not mine.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. The minister did not answer my question. I asked him specifically if he agreed with that decision by the Canadian Wheat Board. Do you, or do you not? Simple question.

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, again I point out that the decision is not mine to make, and whether I agree or disagree is not relevant in this particular case.

### **Purchase of Hopper Cars for Canadian Pacific Railways**

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — A question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding). You suggested the other day in the House you agreed with the 2,000 hopper cars on behalf of the CNR (Canadian National Railways). Are you now saying you are also agreeing with the producers' money against their will being used to buy an additional 2,000 cars — not the same cars, an additional amount for the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railways)?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that nor do I think that is a proposition.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Now, if that's now the state of position by the Minister of Agriculture, what changed your mind? Very simply, what changed your mind now with regard to that policy? Is it because the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool is opposed to it, which would be a good reason for changing your mind? Is it because the Palliser group is opposed to it? Is it because the National Farmers' Union now has a class action case against the rail company? Are these the things that are changing your mind, Mr. Minister?

**MR. KAEDING:** — Mr. Speaker, I haven't changed my mind about anything. He talked about 2,000 additional cars. I did not agree nor disagree at any time with 2,000

additional cars. We were talking about the original 2,000 cars.

**Saskatchewan Power Corporation — Route E**

**MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River):** — A question to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, in the matter of the Cumberland power line, Saskatchewan Power Corporation has commenced clearing of the land on Route B, contrary to the recommendations of the Nikiforuk inquiry. Will the Minister of the Environment today tell us that his department has ordered SPC to follow the recommended Route E?

**HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment):** — Mr. Speaker, I answered this question a number of times previously in this House and the answer today is the same as it was then: that when the Nikiforuk report was tabled and when we had received it, I granted approval to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation that they proceed on the modified E Route. However, providing they were unable to obtain the additional materials that would be required for going the modified E Route, they then would be able to proceed on Route E. That's the permission they have. They have subsequently provided to me the evidence that they were not able to obtain the additional materials required and therefore they are proceeding on Route E.

May I suggest that the most recent report does indicate that, with the supervision which the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is receiving from the Department of the Environment and from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources, they are not following the direct E Route, but somewhere in between 'modified E' and E on the basis of following the route which is more environmentally approvable or acceptable. They are neither on Route E as outlined on the map, or modified E, but something in between those two, on the basis of the recommendations of the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources and the Department of the Environment in order that the environment may be protected and the forest cover may be protected in the best interests of the province.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — A supplementary. Are you saying then, Mr. Minister, that this modified Route E is going back on to some of the Route B?

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — No, Mr. Speaker, the member obviously doesn't have a grasp of the outline of the various routes. If he has the map, the hon. member will see that there is a common route for the first 10 or 12 miles. That common route then branches into four or five different routes; one of them was initialled route E. The recommendation of the Nikiforuk Report was that they go on the first few miles as recommended as a modified E route.

What I am saying is that the approval which we granted to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was that they were to take modified E; however, if they were unable to attain the additional materials which were required — the anchors which would be required in the more muskeg area — if they were unable to obtain those materials they could then proceed on route E. That's the approval we gave . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I indicated to the hon. member that they are now neither on clearly modified E or clearly E; they are somewhere in between the two. They are only about three-quarters of a mile or a mile apart and they run parallel with each other. What I am saying is that the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources (which is looking after the timber interests and covering off the concern which Professor Nikiforuk had), their surveillance of Saskatchewan Power Corporation is that they are not either following one or the other but somewhere in between in order that they might proceed on a route

which is of less environmental impact than either of the routes.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I have a statement from the Saskatchewan Power where they have said that, regardless of where the environment department say we are going to go, we're going to go against their approval and go on route E. Now answer this one.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, we have the same kind of a situation coming from the hon. member today as we have had from members from that side of the House on many other occasions. We are still waiting in fact, Mr. Speaker, for the previous member to table a document that he said he was going to table. We've talked about tabling documents in this House and never have. The member for Arm River makes an accusation that he has either talked to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation officials, or somebody has talked to him, saying that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was going to proceed on their route regardless of what the Department of the Environment said. Now, I say that the member making a statement like that ought to be required, Mr. Speaker, to verify or at least to substantiate what he is saying. There is no question about the fact that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is proceeding on the construction of the power line in the Cumberland delta on the approved routes.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. You have indicated that we now have a situation where we had a public inquiry into the best route (I might add that the minister knows that you can't table documents in question period, that's for the Minister of Agriculture); we've got a situation where we had a public hearing that now has been totally ignored by the Department of the Environment; now we have a completely new route chosen by the Department of Tourism, Department of the Environment and the SPC, why bother going through the hearing process if you're just going to do what you want to do anyway.

**MR. BOWERMAN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts of life in a democratic society when a government is elected, are that there is no question that the government (nor any government) will turn over to a public hearing process the entire responsibility for making decisions on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Nykiforuk was requested to make a public review, to undertake a public inquiry. He made that inquiry. He tabled his recommendations with the government. The government as a result made a subsequent decision which followed as nearly and as closely to the recommendations of Nykiforuk as we thought were practical and responsible in terms of the government itself.

### Government Acquisition of CPN

**MR. LANE:** — I would like to direct a question to the minister responsible for CPN. Mr. Minister, there was a rather significant statement as to the government policy on television last night, not by the government, I state that. Is the government in fact negotiating with a 'consortium' of co-ops to acquire CPN? If so, on what terms, and would you table those terms or the position of negotiations to date?

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could take credit or responsibility for those statements, or somehow get Mr. Ron Shorvoyce sitting here beside us to take credit or responsibility for us. (It might significantly improve some of the questions and answers given in question period.) The answer to the question is that at this stage in the game, there have been no negotiations embarked on with respect to the sale or the resuscitation if you will, revival is perhaps a better word, of CPN by the

government. The situation is that Mr. Strang from Clarkson and Gordon, the Receiver-Manager, has given the Northland Banks a copy of his financial look in his capacity as Receiver-Manager of CPN. I now have a copy of that report. Frankly I have not read through it yet; I skimmed through it. It has not gone to the members of the Cabinet. Nothing will take place until such time as the officials in the Department of Finance, my communication secretariat have had a chance to analyse the report, advise me, I have had a chance to look at the political options, policy options, then make a recommendation to Cabinet. At which time something will take place.

**MR. LANE:** — Just responding quickly to the minister's comments about question period. One of the criteria for how well the Opposition is doing is when the hacks start bringing out their note pads — I notice they are out in droves today and with their note pads taking them down.

My question is, there was some indication that there are people with whom the government or CPN is discussing, with a view to the sale of CPN. I will assume and I think the minister will agree, that those people must have had access to the Strang report in order to determine the position, the financial position, of CPN, or the Department of Finance reports. Would you now be prepared to table those reports in the Assembly because I think they are considerably more widespread than what the minister has indicated.

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, no one has a copy of the Strang report who is an interested purchaser. So far as I know, Northland Bank has a copy, the government has a copy, there may be some copies circulated downwards from Northland and downwards from the government. But so far as I know, subject to a leak or something of that nature, making it available to the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . surely that's not thought to be the government's ministerial responsibility. I mean the receiver manager is an employee of Clarkson Gordon, acting on the appointment of Northland Bank, neither of which are government. So, I can only assume that the report has been kept confidential and they don't have it. I'm advised that that is the case. So I believe that any expressions of interest — and by the way, I hope there are expressions of interest — belie the argument of the opposition which says that the thing is a dud, a worthless waste . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Why was I cut off? I want to know that before the orders of the day . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services):** — Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) directed a question to me and I want to read from Hansard. He said:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, you've refused to indicate financial support to the program Project Health.

At that time, I was unable to ascertain which program he was referring to and it's my understanding now that it's called Project HELP (Home Enrichment and Learning for Preschoolers). That would have been no help to me either because now, if I understood, it's an amalgamation of two former programs. They have in the last two weeks called it Program HELP. But anyway, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I took notice of the question. I



want to inform the member, no decision has been made on funding that particular program. We are looking at it right now, but one of the problems we have is that they have requested a substantial increase in funds from what we were funding the two programs last year.

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Supplementary. I did mention Project HELP but it may have been taken down wrong, O.K.? I would encourage you to fund this. I think the substantial amount is \$100,000. Will you see that as help for the retarded children of Saskatchewan in this International Year of the Child? I repeat my question to you.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, again, as I indicated to the member, it's certainly under consideration. But I think when a particular organization asks for about a 100 per cent increase in moneys, it is very difficult when it comes after the events have taken place as far as budget finalization is concerned. I am looking at it. I think it is a good program, but I think I have to live within my ministerial and fiscal responsibilities. Certainly it will get serious consideration and as soon as we can possibly find it within our means, within the budget to fund it, we will. But I doubt very much that we can fund it up to \$100,000.

## STATEMENT

### Apology to Speaker

**HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I think I owe you an apology for making an offhand remark about being cut off. I think I was properly cut off for an extended answer to a question and I apologize to you and the members of the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I might say to the Attorney General, it wasn't an extended answer. It was lapsing into debate. The Attorney General knows well I do not allow that.

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — CONTINUING EDUCATION — VOTE 5

### ITEM 1 Cont'd.

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — I just want to preface our discussion of the estimates today with a few remarks. First of all to the deputy minister: in yesterday's discussion we were asking a number of questions about your position. I want you to understand, sir, that it was in no way directed towards your competency but we are wanting to find out for ourselves and the people of Saskatchewan the amount of public moneys that are expended at the deputy minister level and at the higher echelons of these departments. You heard my introductory remarks, you know my philosophical stance that the money is best spent lower down in the level, closer to the student. So I just want to assure you and other members of your department that there was no attempt by me or the other members of this party to try and cast any reflection upon your competency. I wanted to try to make that point to start with. However, I think there are a number of questions that we asked yesterday — things for which the minister, at that point in time, I believe, was looking for some answers.

Perhaps you would like to supply some of those at this time, Mr. Minister — answers to questions that were left over on Vote 1. I would like to hear these at this time.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure just which questions we were to

answer but I will give those which I think we agreed to answer.

First of all, the Deputy Minister's salary. I think there is some difference here as to what figures we were giving and I will, in order to make absolutely certain that there is no mistake, the 1978-79 projected actual salary for the Deputy Minister was \$45,085. The 1979-80 budgeted salary (that's what we are talking about, the budgeted salary) is \$48,460 which includes provision for the 6 per cent economic adjustment, as of October 1, 1978 and any amount over and above the 6 per cent, which is discretionary, as I pointed out yesterday, based upon perceived performance. O.K.?

That's the one on salary fringe benefits. I think you wanted to know about fringe benefits. I indicated yesterday that fringe benefits were sick leave, group life insurance, pension, vacation, statutory holidays, long-term disability insurance, unemployment insurance commission benefits and Canada Pension Plan benefits. O.K.?

The Deputy Minister's car, as in other jurisdictions in Canada, persons at the Deputy Minister's level, are provided with an automobile for performing business travel requirements. The recipient of said automobile pays 1 per cent per month of the purchase price of the automobile for personal mileage. The maximum purchase price of said automobile is \$8,000.

Memberships in organizations — all organizational memberships in the name of employees, including deputy ministers are: those directly related to the duties of the employee in carrying out the function of his office, or, memberships required as a condition of employment to practice his profession in carrying out his duties. Those are the ones that would be paid for him. As we indicated yesterday, there are very, very few in this regard.

Attendances at conferences — I think someone asked about attendance at conferences. All meetings and conferences attended are directly related to the duties of the employee, including the deputy minister. While attending such conferences, the employee is representing the department and has been assigned to attend the conference. Compensation for employees attending conferences is set out in Articles 81, 82, 83 of the collective agreement, and Regulation 5(4) of the Public Service Commission. The rates are the same for all employees. I think those were the questions that you had asked and I agreed to bring answers.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister, for looking those answers up for us. That helps me considerably. I don't want to belabor the point of cars but one question, there's a lot of discussion on cars. Yes, there's one question that I was going to ask. In the executive administration branch the deputy minister is the only member that has a car. You mentioned something about 40 cars in your department. I'm not planning to pin you down on all other 39 but he is the only one in the executive branch that has a car? . . . All right fine, thank you. Now I'd also like to just indicate that it isn't my intention at all to hold up proceedings. We have a lot of estimates to go through. As you realize Vote 1 is the one where we get into the wide discussion of things and I don't want to hold these up. I'll have various questions to ask and so will the other members of our caucus as we go to succeeding votes so I would be willing to proceed on at this time.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South):** — Yes, Mr. Minister, if you had given it in Hansard yesterday, I think we'd have saved ourselves an awful lot of time. Unfortunately, we don't have the Hansard for today and I can't confirm the figure, but as I understood the figure you gave us yesterday on salaries, you suggested \$48,640 the '79-80 budget,

right? You also indicated last year it was \$42,000 not \$45,000.

**MR. ROLFES:** — You asked the actual. My understanding was what I gave you was the estimated salary, yesterday.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Then the '78-79 estimate was \$42,000 is that right? I'm still not clear on it and if you can clear that up we'll move on.

**MR. ROLFES:** — The deputy minister's salary 1978-79 projected actual salary . . . how much he got, \$45,085. The 1979-80 budgeted salary, that's what we've budgeted for, \$48,460. O.K.?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Where did you get the \$42,000 figure? Let me put it to you that way.

**MR. ROLFES:** — That given number was budgeted for last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . For '78-79 what was budgeted for was \$42,240.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Now, you budgeted for \$42,000 paid \$45,000. Will the same thing happen this year where you have budgeted for \$48,000 and increase it by \$3,000 it comes \$51,000.

**MR. ROLFES:** — That will depend on the salaries that are negotiated and whether or not he will get the performance increment, and I can't tell you. I'll ask.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Seeing that we are still on this, has the deputy minister been getting the merit over let's say three years? Let's go back three years, Mr. Minister, and see if there's been merit in each case.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm a little hesitant here to get up and make a definitive statement but my understanding is that it started only this past year. It started only one year ago. He didn't get it three years ago because it just started this past year.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Would it be safe to ask if it's going to be included again this year? Is this a pattern you're establishing or is it a one-shot thing?

**MR. ROLFES:** — It's a government policy and I really can't speak for the entire government here but I would think that if we find that the merit performance increment is worthwhile we will continue with it. If government decides to cancel it, I suppose some time in the future, that will be the government decision, but as far as I'm concerned right now it's in effect. That's government policy and it's not automatic. They're under review and it's not automatic so I can't tell you whether he'll get it or not. I don't know.

**MR. P. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, if the answer had been given yesterday this way we would have understood. But I made the point yesterday and was laughed at for making the point. I repeat the point that I made yesterday: that, in fact, using the figures you've given us, using the projection that perhaps there might be a merit increase, we are talking about a 15 per cent increase in the deputy minister's salary, not 6, if you take the two into consideration. And that's all I have to say on it.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman, if I might direct this question to the minister (and, Mr. Minister, I think this is a very straightforward question). You make

estimates for the expected expenditures for deputy ministers' salaries. Now you were \$3,000 out. You have made an estimate now for the next year. My question, very simply, Mr. Minister, what is the criteria by which you made the estimate?

**MR. ROLFES:** — It will depend on the salaries that are negotiated and whether or not the deputy minister qualifies for the merit increase. That is what it is.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, that really doesn't answer the question because that was the answer the minister gave us when we asked why there was the overpayment to the minister in relation to what you had estimated. Now you can provide the same answer to two different questions but there must be some criteria by which you make estimates as to what you expect the salaries to be, other than, well it depends on what the negotiations are going to be. If it depends on that, then why increase the estimated expenditures at all? Why not just leave them as they are? That's all I am trying to get at, Mr. Minister, you must have some criteria by which you make increased estimates or decreased estimates for any expenditures, whether it be deputy ministers or what it may be — supply, services, it doesn't matter.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I'll read the statement again to the member that I read yesterday. I don't know if he was in the House but fine with me, I'll read it again. Provision for salary increases in 1979-80 estimates. 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. 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 increment; reclassifications; promotions and the appointments at various steps in the salary ranges.

Item 1 agreed.

## **ITEM 2**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Will the minister please explain to me some of the things that are in the administrative services, just kind of an outline, Mr. Minister, of what this covers?

**MR. ROLFES:** — In the Administration Branch, this branch of the department is responsible for administrative functions including: accounting; budget preparation and control; personnel transactions and records; office accommodations; office services; telephone services; mail and messenger services; and information services.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I notice an increase under other personal services here from \$24,000 to \$35,000, an increase of \$9,000. Is that another position or is that a negotiated increase? What would that be? \$11,000, excuse me.

**MR. ROLFES:** — O.K., we dropped the permanent by one but we have increased the

non-permanent from 2.5 to 3.42.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, you dropped your permanent positions by one, increased your costs by 10 per cent in salaries. Has there been a realignment of positions? Is there more at the top? Why the 10 per cent and fewer people? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I said fewer people — more and fewer people.

**MR. ROLFES:** — That includes the 6 per cent increase of course and the increments plus the temporary staff . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, yes, from 2.5 to 3.42.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I'm not referring to the other personal services. I'm referring to permanent positions.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Last year's estimate in that particular subvote for permanent positions was underestimated once the agreements had been signed. Therefore, it takes into consideration that underestimation plus the 6 per cent, plus the increments. Our estimate last year wasn't high enough once the contracts were signed.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, last year you say the estimate was underestimated so what was the actual?

**MR. ROLFES:** — We'll have to get that for you. We haven't got the actual for that branch with us. You are only interested in the permanent positions in that particular branch. The officials tell me that they haven't got that with us here; we'll have to get that. You have to also remember that the year is not over yet.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You indicate that your estimation last year wasn't correct — this is the second subvote here. Were your estimations not correct in many of the other areas last year? Do you feel that your estimates are high enough this year for what may be the negotiated increase?

**MR. ROLFES:** — . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, I know but they should be somewhere close, shouldn't they?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Well, I think it is fairly close. We're not that far out. We're hoping that we're as close as we could possibly be. If you ask me do I think I'm under, my answer would be no. If you ask me do I think I'm over, my answer would be no too. I hope we're right on, but are we right on? I don't know. It will depend on what the final outcome of the negotiations will be.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — One question on that. You say you don't know; you could be low or high. But if, in fact, you know, the average . . . well let's say the salary of the person you dropped is around \$20,000, you could be out 20 per cent, on this one subvote 2. The top two or three, could you give us that in salaries in that department, please.

**MR. ROLFES:** — The top two or three people?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes.

**MR. ROLFES:** — The actual for Frank May, who is sitting directly behind me here, which is in the management series, the actual that he's receiving right now is \$31,368.84.

**March 22, 1979**

The approved for 1979-80, the estimated, is \$33,560. Now, I can only give you one, because the only actual one we have in the management series is this one.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — One question on that one point, and very quickly. Was the \$31,368 estimated or was that actual?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Actual.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That's actual. What was the estimated?

**MR. ROLFES:** — \$28,710.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — \$28,710, which makes an increase of \$2,500 over estimated actual. Can the same thing happen again this year on the \$33,560? Can we expect the same underestimated amount and going up again.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I don't know that.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You don't know it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Possibly overestimating.

Item 2 agreed

### **ITEM 3**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, maybe you could rule on this. Can I ask a question on student services relating to student loans or does that come up later? From the suggestion made by the chairman yesterday I don't want to miss it. If it has to come up now I'll bring it up now; if it comes up later I'll bring it up later.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — This one, student services. Again seeing that you've gone up on your figure here on one staff member, and your total increase is \$72,000, \$6,000 in the other expenses, here are a couple of things that come to my mind in looking at these. It seems that under other personal services there are a number of employees tucked away in here. I don't know why these figures aren't given in the columns, you know, if they are temporary or whatever you're bringing in. It would expedite the discussions. There's \$40,000 difference in the personal services and \$26,000 in the other personal services — both increases. Now I understand . . . we won't have to go through the six per cent; we'll accept the fact that there's a six per cent negotiated increase. I'll accept that. But could you explain . . . when you went up one person from 13 to 14 in personal services you went up \$40,000. Was that one job and what was the salary of it and what does the person do?

**MR. ROLFES:** — That position, of course, is vacant. It is for the coming year. You understand that it's for the coming year and so the estimated salary for that particular position is \$24,220. It's an educational consultant in guidance counselling . . . Guidance \$24,220. O.K.?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — In what are would this guidance person be working; in what institution or in what area of continuing ed?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Co-ordinating services to provide services to the institutes and

community colleges throughout Saskatchewan.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Once again I'll go back to the same question I've had all along and I'd like the answer for that, the top salary paid in that department. Secondly, rather than breaking it down and maybe you don't have these figures at hand, then you'd have to give me the individual, the first one. But could you give us an indication of the actual permanent positions for 1978-79 versus the estimated of 224,910. Do you have the actual? Can you not hear me?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I didn't understand the question. Say that again.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — O.K. You've indicated, subvote 2 for example, an increase of \$2,600 over the estimated to the actual, O.K.? Do you have a figure there with you, the actual cost of permanent positions for '78-'79 versus the 224,000 estimated?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think the member must understand that we are not at the end of the fiscal year; therefore we haven't got an audited statement. We still have to go until the end of March before we know what the actual for this year is going to be. I can't give you that. I just don't have it.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If you can answer, why how could you give me the figure of \$31,368.84 for subvote 2 in that one position?

**MR. ROLFES:** — My staff worked late last night because of the questions that were asked yesterday in a management series; they worked those out last night; they projected them and worked them out. Obviously, they didn't work them out for all of the staff. That's why we can give them to you for the management series.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — All right, I accept that. I know that some of these questions are premature, perhaps, at this point. Can we assume that this is a trend, that this increase over estimate is actually the trend throughout your department? Yes or no on that.

**MR. ROLFES:** — The answer to that is no because if you took note of the statement that I made before . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, no, throughout. I said comparison in year to year changes of salary levels in the estimates may be affected by several other factors in addition to the annual salary increases, such as changes in the number of positions, annual increment, reclassifications, promotions and appointments at various steps in the salary changes and that we can pick many of these up through recruitment and may get a lower salary. Through vacancies that exist during the year, we expect to pick those up. So, the answer to your question is no, I do not think that it is an underestimate of our salaries, our total salaries.

Our experience in the past has been that most departments can absorb the extra cost that there will be. That has been our experience.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I realize that it's not the end of the fiscal year yet so it's difficult. I accept that. To get back to my original question, will you give us the top salary on that one please?

**MR. ROLFES:** — \$32,428.80.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — And the projection for next year?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Which one?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — O.K. the estimate, the actual and the '79-'80 estimate?

**MR. ROLFES:** — O.K. The estimated for last year was — \$30,630 and the approved for 1979-80 (or the estimated) — \$32,840.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — One question again. I would like some clarification from the minister regarding the positions and payments made under Vote 3 — student services as it relates to community colleges and why that isn't down under Vote 6? Are there any duplications of services? You have them listed under 3 — I realize that students can be in service either to universities or to community colleges, but why are they not listed under community colleges — Vote 6?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think it should be understood that this particular individual is not an employee of the community colleges or of the institute. He is there to facilitate and to assist these institutes and the community colleges and to provide them with services to their students and supplies in regards to career and post-secondary training resources throughout the entire province. That's his job in that particular subvote.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, you mentioned he was in the co-ordinating and guidance services and I understand that. Out of your 13 employees in student services how many, would you say, are in student guidance (not the co-ordinating but just the guidance)?

**MR. ROLFES:** — The one that we were just talking about — three.

Item 3 agreed.

#### ITEM 4

**MR. TAYLOR:** — On program development, I think the minister must realize from my introductory remarks yesterday that this program is certainly one of my main concerns and I see that there is a drastic cut. Of course, I must say that if these cuts are justifiable we certainly would be supporting them, but again, emphasizing the importance of program in any type of education venture. I would like you, Mr. Minister, to explain to me why there is such a drastic cut in program.

**MR. ROLFES:** — My understanding here is that last year the department gave a high priority in contractual arrangements with people from the university and, I believe, from the institutes, in making sure that modularized programs, in the various areas, were developed as they were required, and my understanding is that we gave that a high priority and spent a fair amount of money in that area. We have sort of caught up — we think we have caught up in that area and we don't need to contract as many projects this year as we did last year. That is a reduction of \$75,000 in that particular area, so it is not the program that has been reduced. It is the contracting of services, of expertised services for the development of those kinds of programs.

Secondly, also in educational supplies, there has been a reduction of \$25,000. Those were the two main areas.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, contractual programs, if I understand you correctly, you paid out moneys to have these programs developed. These programs were developed



last year; they are being offered this year. Could you tell me how many of these programs were developed, and what these programs were? Were there three or were there 15, and what was the cost, and the names of them?

**MR. ROLFES:** — There are about 23. If the member would like, I can make the page available to him. Some are marked with asterisk; those will not be ready until . . . they're not quite finished yet. The others have all been developed and should be ready to go. But I can give you this and save us some time, O.K.?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Yes. I'll accept the page.

Mr. Chairman, a standard question again. Would you, just to save the time on the questions, I suppose we could get them all on subvotes, the salary of the top position in each subvote; I'd like to have that, estimated, actual and '79-'80 estimate.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Estimated for '79-'80, \$31,110; actually paid \$29,362. We estimated \$35,930. There was a change in personnel there. In '78-'79, estimated \$35,930, but it must be remembered there was a change in personnel, O.K.?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Looking over your sheet of programs that you had contractually developed, I see there are 23 as you say, and they seem to be, a lot of them seem to be farm oriented, which I'm glad to see. Would I be safe in assuming that they cost approximately \$5,000 each and were there 23 people that developed these or how many people were involved in developing these contractual programs? I want to know did two men or five men, or just give me an idea on that please?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I think that we would have to give you a complete answer, as I indicted before. Some of these were people from the outside who had the expertise; others were people from the universities; others were people from the institute. We haven't got those figures right here. We would have to research that and give you a written answer. We just don't have that here. Some of that it must also be remembered, was also volunteer work so that would take some time to work out.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — That's fine, Mr. Minister. When you have this, I'd just like to know that. I'll accept a written answer, you know, within reasonable time.

There's one thing I want to bring up and I don't know if it should be under program development. It's actually under program. I think it's a valid question. I'd like to ask it at this time, if it would be O.K., Mr. Chairman. It has to do with enrolments and I believe that your people will have to take some time to figure these out. It would be in your institutes and universities. Now, I'm not going to pin you down on every subject and every class and so on. If this is the correct place to ask it, I will ask it now, if not, I just want to make sure I get it in under one of these correct sub headings.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Could you ask those under the institutes under those sub headings as they pertain to the institutes and the universities? We would have the figures under those subvotes, as they pertain to the institutes and the universities. We would have those figures under those subvotes.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I would be quite willing to do that. I was wanting to know what your smallest classes are, your average classes and so on. But if you prefer for me to do it as we go through the institutes, I would be glad to do it then.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I would appreciate you just giving us warning and then the officials can get the answers when we get there.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Then so that you have some guideline as to what I am looking at: It would be for your institutes and for the universities and their average enrolment. I am most interested in your smallest enrolment, say classes that are under 10 or something of that nature. The number of those. That will give your officials some guideline to go on and it will probably speed up our procedure. Item 4 agreed.

## **ITEM 5**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Repeat the same question again, the estimated top salary for permanent positions, 1978-79 estimate, the actual and the 1979-80 estimate please?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Direct or, actual '78-79, \$41,066; estimate, \$38,500; estimate, '79-80, \$44,390.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I may be ruled out of order. I will ask the question because I don't know whether I can or not; however I will, at the risk of having the Attorney General losing his cool as well.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I asked you how your department handled the leasing of the 40 automobiles. You were going to give us the answer to that today and you did not. May I ask that question?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Did the minister make a commitment to that effect?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I can't recall whether I did, but if I did we'll provide the answer.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Certainly the question would be out of order under this subvote, but if the minister has made a commitment and he wants to . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, we'll provide the answer very shortly. Would the member accept a package of 14 pages, as an explanation. If you are not satisfied with the 14 pages, I have to read it because of the difference in how each one is handled.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I will gladly accept the 14 pages. I will gladly accept all of the records you have in your office.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Just the 14 pages, O.K.?

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — Hold it, hold it. Let's just look at it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — O.K.

**MR. SWAN:** — Under subvote 5, you have 16 people last year; you still have 16 people. The difference there shows about a 15 per cent increase for everybody. Is that what we can expect? Are those the facts?

**MR. ROLFES:** — . . . the same answer as I indicated to the member before — the salary increases from last year, plus the 6 per cent anticipated, plus increments.

**MR. SWAN:** — That does amount to 15 per cent, and it is a one-year figure that we are

looking at — the same number of people.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Two-year.

**MR. SWAN:** — Well, the difference between the two should only be one year.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I indicated before that it was underestimated last year because of the settlement that was made last year. We told you that in subvote 2. Therefore, we had to make up the difference of last year's settlement and what we anticipate this year — the 6 per cent that is included for this year plus the increment. That is the difference.

**MR. SWAN:** — When you were asked if this was going to be a factor that would be appearing in each subvote, you said, no. Now you are saying, yes.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I indicated to the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau), that the answer could be yes or no. I don't know whether it will be underestimated by a certain amount or overestimated by a slight amount. I am hoping that we would be right on. It may be that in many of the subvotes we will have underestimated, but I'm hoping that we haven't. In some instances you will find that we did underestimate because of the agreements that were signed.

**MR. SWAN:** — I think that we are going to need to identify the subvotes that were underestimated so that we can get at what actual increases occurred. That is what we are trying to establish — what type of an increase was actually given — and we are not getting a clear answer.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Well, I think I indicated to the members before that we have not reached the end of the fiscal year. We haven't got those figures. If you want to find out what they were in the previous year, then we've got to go to public accounts. We can find out there. We can't find out for this fiscal year, but you could find out for the previous year by going to public accounts. We don't have the actual. We have not reached the end of the fiscal year. What we worked out for you is the management series (the officials worked that out last night because we anticipated you would be continuing to ask those questions in the management series, but certainly we can't expect them to work through all the others). So I can't give you that answer.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the minister is probably aware of what we're trying to establish, but just to follow up a bit on the member for Rosetown-Elrose's (Mr. Swan) question. Could you from here — I realize I can't go back on subvotes 1, 2, 3, 4 — but from here on in could you indicate to us the number of managerial positions in each subvote, their top salary — the first position's salary, as I have asked — and the (there was one other question I was going to ask) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, I'll try for that for now and I'll think of the other one I had in mind.

**MR. ROLFES:** — We'll supply it to you on each subvote.

Item 5 agreed.

## ITEM 6

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, the question I would like to direct under this vote is: what, basically, is the function of these 20

positions that you have listed under Vote 6?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think if I just read to you the titles of the individuals, they are self-explanatory. There is a director of the particular program, a community college program, an assistant director. We have one co-ordinator. He spends a fair amount of time in the grade equivalent exams, and I think the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) or the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) will be able to explain those. We have 12 field representatives — there's one in each college. There's a personnel administrator who does the accounting, an adult education consultant I who is an assistant in the labor relations field, a clerk steno III and a clerk steno II. Those are the people.

**MR. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Chairman, further to the positions, could the minister tell me where they are located? Now you say there are 12 field representatives, are those 12 out in the 12 community college zones? That's the first question. Secondly, where are the other employees located?

**MR. ROLFES:** — In Regina. The field representatives are all in their respective community colleges, except the Indian community college. The others are all in Regina in the central office.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, further to community colleges, can the minister tell me if they are planning any new programs that have not been announced yet? Might I suggest one in the field of oral communication? In our traditional education systems we teach basically reading, writing and arithmetic but what we don't do is teach our young people, whether it be through the institutional system or whether it be through the community college, to orally communicate thoughts of people. Sure, Mr. Minister, that's what we have to do here as legislators and it is what we do most in our lives. I am wondering, do you have any plans, Mr. Minister, under community colleges, to introduce such a program throughout the various community college areas in the province?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think the member has a slight misconception of how community colleges work. We don't direct from central office as to what kind of program they are going to have or not have. We will assist them. If they find a need, let's say in Meadow Lake, if we find that there is a need out there (and the community college, by the way, find that there is a need out there) we will assist them in developing that program. We'll give them whatever help we can from central office. But establishing the need in each particular area will be determined by the people in that area and by the board of the community college. They will decide and that's why you will find that there is a wide variance in the programs throughout this province. That's the way it should be. That's the way we wanted it and so I can't answer that question for you. If they think that there will be a real need and if the member, for example, feels there is a need in the particular area that he represents, I would suggest that he go to the community college board and make them aware of it. If there are sufficient people I'm sure they'll put on such a program. We'll assist them to develop the program and in the delivery of the program in whatever way we can.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Then, Mr. Minister, am I to assume from your remarks that you are prepared to accept any program that the community college board suggests that they want to put in place, in any of the community college zones?

**MR. ROLFES:** — If you read The Community College Act, you will find that is their legislative responsibility.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, then, you have no control whatsoever as to the kinds of programs that they institute? None whatsoever?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Direct control, no; influence, yes, certainly. There are various ways; we can do it through counselling, by consultations, certainly through our funding mechanisms. There are ways of doing it, but let me say that I, as the minister responsible, would be very reluctant to tell adults in a particular community that they don't have the right to determine the kinds of programs that they think are beneficial to themselves. Now, certainly, I think there would be some that maybe would be unacceptable to anyone. I don't know what they might be, but I just don't think that we would like to tell adults in a particular community the kinds of programs that they should have for themselves. Having said that, that doesn't mean that there wouldn't be a time, if I find a program so unacceptable, that I wouldn't try to use my influence to convince them otherwise. I have not found that necessary so far.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the minister's concern for the local boards and their decisions and his respect of those decisions. It's rather ironic that we find that evident from time to time, but not very consistently from your side of the House. What I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the minister if he would not mind using his influence, possibly, in a few instances at least. I might suggest that oral communication should maybe take precedence over belly dancing and the likes of this. Now, that's my suggestion. Surely, there must be some priorities that you have as the head of continuing education. You can say that you want to respect those local boards and that you don't want to interfere with the decisions that they make. I suggest to you that there are times when you have to exercise your responsibilities as a minister.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I think if we are going to continue this line of questioning, then we're going to get into some differences of opinion as to how much you're going to respect local autonomy and the decisions of people out there. I don't know what's wrong with belly dancing. I haven't participated in it, but maybe some people find it offensive. I don't know. Let me say this. Maybe if the member for Moosomin finds belly dancing offensive . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, O.K., I'm just saying if you did and it was offered in the community college in which you are the MLA, I would hope that you would use your influence there with the people and say hey, I'm the elected member of the provincial legislature. I find that program unacceptable and I would like to advise the board of that and do it in writing. If I find the same thing as a minister, I can assure you that I will take whatever means I have at my disposal to make it known to the people that I don't find those programs acceptable. I am not so sure whether belly dancing is offensive, or basket weaving, or whatever it may be. I would rather place my confidence in the people at the local level until they prove otherwise. I think it is a good concept and their responsibility as prescribed by The Community College Act should remain intact. I think the less interference by us here the better, unless we find that it is really a particular program that is unacceptable.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Last question, Mr. Chairman. Of course the minister had to attempt to misunderstand me. I did not say that I was opposed to belly dancing. Now that is what you are suggesting, that I might take offence to it. What I am saying, Mr. Minister, is that there are other worthy programs and that I would like you to use your influence if you so choose. But you have reneged on that, you said you're the MLA in that particular community college zone and that's your responsibility. So I accept the challenge, Mr.

Minister, I will take and be responsible for the kinds of programs. If I don't like a program or want a program instituted, I will bring it to the community college's attention. I don't require an answer, Mr. Chairman. Those are my final remarks on it. His answer might precipitate another question.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Now, Mr. Chairman, I just don't want to leave those remarks unchallenged. I don't care whether it anticipates another 20 questions. I don't care, if you make some irresponsible statements like that. I simply will not accept them. I did not accuse you of being opposed to belly dancing. You're the one who brought it up. You brought them up as though it may be something in which the minister should intervene. You indicated that there should be a higher priority list. I simply say to you, you give me the higher priority list and I will do whatever I can to scrutinize it and if I agree with you I will try to put into effect. But, having said that, if you have a priority list I think it is incumbent upon you to make that known to the community college in your particular area. That's all I am saying.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I have a series of questions, I'll take them one at a time. Who is the director of community colleges?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Jake Kutarna.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — His salary? The three salaries, the estimate '78-79, the actual and the '79-80?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Estimated '78-79, \$35,500; actual \$35,418.98; (Hey that's not bad you guys, we're getting better) approved for '79-80, \$37,460.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Would you indicate also, Mr. Minister, the amount you pay to the field reps, just one? If they are all the same, give me one.

**MR. ROLFES:** — There's a fairly wide variance between these. These are union-negotiated, as the member well understands. But I can give you one at \$23,310. That's maybe a little bit on the low side but about the middle.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I just received the information on the automobiles. I have a question on that if I may. I don't quite understand the system you're using here. First of all you have on the form subvote 1, 2, 3, 26, 27 but there is no subvote 27 in continuing education. Then, for example, under subvote 27, on the field cars you show a mileage of 15,000 miles per car at a rate of 16.8 cents and \$2,520 rental. Now I can't believe that each of those gentlemen drove 15,000 miles exactly, so what does that indicate? Does that indicate the mileage allowed or does it indicate that they pay over that or what's your answer?

**MR. ROLFES:** — These are estimated figures for next year. I am given to understand that they drive anywhere from 15,000 to 20,000 miles doing their job.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — These are all right. I should have read that ahead. It's '79-80 fiscal year estimates, so you're estimating 15,000 miles per car. Is there a mileage charge to the individuals for personal use?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I think the answer is on the third page of the materials that I gave you — personal use of a central agency vehicle.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You told me you were going to give me 14 pages but I only received six.

O.K., Mr. Chairman, on the personal use of the vehicle, you indicate here \$50.00 per month minimum charge for the use of a CVA vehicle to cover travel of up to 298 miles or 476 kilometres. Have you charged, in fact, any mileage to any of the 40 automobiles that are being used by your department? Has there been in 1978-79 any charges made to any civil servant or assistant deputy minister or whatever for excess mileage and usage and if so, what amount of money, total — I don't want a breakdown — just a total?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yeah, I think the member understands that we will not have that figure with us. We can get that for you. I'm pretty sure. We'll have to get it to you in writing. We haven't got that with us here.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — You don't know whether or not there's been any charge made?

**MR. ROLFES:** — We'll try and . . . not even try, we'll reply to you in writing. I just don't want to say yes and then be committed — Yeah, the minister said yes. We think the answer will probably be yes, that there were some but we want to make absolutely certain.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised you don't know that answer. However, I accept that. But I would like to know the amount of money that was charged out totally, not the breakdown, but the total amount that was charged for the personal use of automobiles last year.

Another question that I have here is how many in that subvote are management and again, I can't recall whether you've given this answer or not, but do they all qualify for the merit increase in that subvote?

**MR. ROLFES:** — There are two in the management series.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The second part of my question, do they both qualify for merit increases?

**MR. ROLFES:** — They are both eligible, but I can't tell you right now whether or not they . . .

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Eligible is good enough.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Okay.

Item 6 agreed.

## **ITEM 7**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I see in this subvote that your number of employees remain the same. I'm not quite sure on what your occupational training is. Are some of these contractual services or programs that you were talking about earlier? You could give me a little explanation, Mr. Minister. And secondly, I see quite an increase there — of \$40,000 — under your 'other personal services'. I'd like some clarification as to how many positions that may be or what would explain that \$40,000 increase.

**MR. ROLFES:** — First of all, you asked what this particular subvote is about. I can read it to the member very quickly. The occupational training division is responsible for the following:

1. Co-ordination of all training delivered under the Federal-Provincial Adult Occupational Training Agreement, including skill, adult basic education, apprenticeship, and industry-based training;
2. Co-ordination of all training delivered through the non-registered Indian and Metis program, including the payment of living allowances;
3. Co-ordination of the payment of course costs and living allowances associated with a vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons program;
4. Administration of the Trade Schools Registration Act;
5. Negotiations with the federal Department of Employment and Immigration for the provision of training under the Adult Occupational Training Agreement.

The increase to the \$44,000, I guess you said; there are two temporary positions added. Industrial field representatives at \$22,260 each. These funds are recoverable from the federal government under the Adult Occupational Training Agreement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — May I interrupt the proceedings of the House and beg leave to allow one of the members — I believe it's the member for Turtleford — to introduce a group of students, please.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. L.E. JOHNSON (Turtleford):** — Mr. Chairman, with leave of the Assembly, I would like to introduce to you and the other members a group of some 26 students from the upgrading class in Debden. They are attending the Debden Training Centre. They are seated in the west gallery with their teachers Shirley Merchak and Mary Gerow. I will be meeting with this group afterwards for some light refreshments, pictures and to answer their questions.

They left Debden I understand some time around 6 o'clock this morning and are leaving here after they have toured the sights in Regina. I hope that they will have a very good trip home and that they enjoy their stay here in Regina.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Committee of Finance — Continuing Education — Vote 5 Cont'd.**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The standard question, 1978-79 estimates, the actual and the 1979-80 estimates.

**MR. ROLFES:** — All right. Budgeted for 1978-79, \$30,120, actual \$32,935.56; estimated for 1979-80, \$35,210.

**MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** — My question is regarding the adult basic education



program. As I understand this, and you were saying that a great number of the chairs, as they call them in those classes, are purchased by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and by others, by industry and so on. Is there any provision in there for certain students to come into that adult basic education program directly from the regular school system?

**MR. ROLFES:** — You know, it could happen, but not very likely. Those who are federally sponsored have to be out of school for one complete year (I think you are well aware), and also have to be past the school leaving age by one complete year. I'm not sure that it is even worthwhile discussing those who would be eligible. Hardly anybody would be eligible. There could be a . . .

**MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** — I don't want to prolong this, Mr. Minister, but I do know, and I have known in the past, of cases like this. Now, what I am asking is, is there any provision, or could there ever be a provision for that? Because, as you will agree, there are students who, if you put them on the street for that year, that interim year in between, it would probably be a bad thing. That is basically what I am asking.

**MR. ROLFES:** — It is at the discretion of the college, and if the student is prepared to pay his own fees, or her own fees, but it is at the discretion of the college . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — That's right; that's correct.

Item 7 agreed.

## ITEM 8

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I imagine there is a very simple explanation to this, but you have a vocational centre there and you show no expenses for personnel. Are the personnel who are working there shown in another subvote? That is my question.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Maybe it is best if I simply read a brief explanation here. This subvote incorporates funds formerly allocated to the Prince Albert vocational centre and now disbursed for comparable programs operated by the Natonum Community College. Programs facilities are rented from the Prince Albert Public School Board, and all personnel services are provided under a contractual arrangement with the board. That is why they do not appear here.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — If this is correct, then why is this not shown under community colleges if it is community colleges expenditure?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Sorry it took us so long. I'm still not sure that I understand the explanation. But my understanding of this particular program is that it's a specific program for adults which is almost totally paid for by the federal government. In other words, moneys will be allocated as programs are offered, and if, for example, we didn't expend all the money because programs weren't implemented or delivered, then the moneys that we would recover from the federal government would correspondingly drop. So it's a different kind of program than any of the others in the community college.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, I've been quite pleased with your answers up to this point. But in this one, when you say you're recovering the money from the federal

government, you're budgeting for \$875,000. I don't see any personnel. You tell me it's under the community college. I ask you why you haven't shown it there. You have to take another run at it to get through to me on this one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're going to have to, that's for sure. You've been good so far but this time . . .

**MR. ROLFES:** — The Prince Albert Vocational Centre was in existence before the community colleges were established and because they had a fairly extensive program, the arrangements that were made at that time were to keep that as an entity unto itself, rather than amalgamating it with the community college as we have done with all of the others. We have left it by itself and have set up a contractual arrangement with the community college and the — which board is it — Prince Albert Public School Board and we have left it as a subvote by itself. You might say, why the subvote? We have to expend the money first and then have to recover it from the federal government. So, we have to have money in there so we can expend it and then we recover it from the feds after we expend the money. So if we expend — what have we got in it? — \$875,000 we simply then bill the federal government for it. If we only expend \$600,000, that's what we bill the federal government for. But we have to put it in there to give us the authority to expend the money and then we simply recover it.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — O.K. on that point. You've explained that, thank you. But I still don't understand the expenditure on other expenses and no expenditure on personnel. Explain the personnel aspect to me and I think we'll have it? How many? What were they? I don't see any people that are teaching there.

**MR. ROLFES:** — These people are employees of the Prince Albert School Board who are contracted by the community college to deliver the programs. That's why they're not in here.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Chairman, I take it then — a yes or no answer — I take it then that those employees you contract with the Prince Albert School Board are included in the \$875,430; then answer this question. If you have \$875,430 expenditure budgeted for and you say you'll get it back from the federal government, why is it in here at all?

**MR. ROLFES:** — We wouldn't have the authority to spend it. How would we expend it; we would have no authority to expend the budget. This is not uncommon, by the way. I have quite a few of those in the Department of Social Services. You have to have some way of expending the money and then you simply recover it again from the federal government. It may take a year or two years before you get it back from the federal government.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — One final question. Where does the money come from into the consolidated fund?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Is there any indication anywhere in your department which shows how much moneys, (I know it isn't in the estimates of expenditure,) come into the consolidated fund from the federal government for programs that are cost shared?

**MR. ROLFES:** — It's in the blue book, under consolidated funds summary of estimated budgetary cash flow 1979-80; it's the fourth page. In the estimates on the middle of page 8, under receipts from other governments it says, manpower agreements \$11,655,600 and the \$875,000 is included in that \$11 million.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I notice that you have a reduction in staff here in permanent positions

of three people — a reduction of \$46,000. Does this indicate that your cutback in staff is also a cutback in program? What three individuals or three positions, which is what I'm more interested in, are not filled? Would you explain the reduction from nine to six please?

**MR. ROLFES:** — You wanted to know the three positions? O.K. Number one is the instructor technical institute counsellor. The reason as I understand it is because student numbers declined by mid May of last year and it was felt that a nine month labor service position could cover the counselling load. This labor service position has been offered to the same individual. All three I think are the same thing. The next one, technical institute for motor vehicle mechanical repair; the third one is for carpentry and pre-employment.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Does this indicate — now what I'm asking is, did you have two people in some of these fields or no, or does this indicate that the Meadow Lake Vocational Centre is also having a program reduction? When you lost one of these individuals, did that program of, say, carpentry have to be discarded? Explain the three programs that these people were in?

**MR. ROLFES:** — As I indicated to the member, all three positions have been offered to the same people again but it is a nine-month service position and we felt that that was sufficient. So the positions were permanent and we have now offered them back to the same people again on a nine-month basis and that's when the students are there.

**MR. McLEOD:** — In this subvote of the other expenses of \$79,890, will the minister tell me how much of that, the expenses in there, is for supplies or equipment to be purchased for anything in the food services area?

**MR. ROLFES:** — None.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Could you give us a breakdown? You know, I don't want to prolong this too much but I would like a breakdown for the cost of supplies for construction, for the building construction and also for the mechanical area?

**MR. ROLFES:** — For apprenticeship carpentry it's \$4,500 . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. McLEOD:** — The reason I'm getting into this a little bit, I find I'm very familiar with this place and I just can't see the expense under 'other expenses' once you get away from salaries of \$79,000. I would like to ask you, and you may want to get that in writing or something easier or send a page over, whatever, of the breakdown of those expenses, that \$79,000.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I can give you some of those estimates; repairs to equipment, \$4,000; travel and sustenance, \$3,950; CVA (Central Vehicle Agency), \$3,200; miscellaneous contractual, \$4,450; educational supplies, \$27,510; educational equipment, \$17,040. There is another one for \$19,740 but they tell me that's a long list of small items.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Can you give us some example categories so we know what that \$19,740 might be?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Telephones, taxes, freight, cartage, express — all those things.

**March 22, 1979**

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, a standard question. The 1978/79 estimate, the 1978/79 actual, and the 1979/80 estimates would be what?

**MR. ROLFES:** — 1978/79, \$25,386; actual \$28,044.48. There's a slight problem here. The estimate for 1979/80 is \$27,910. You guys are going to have a reduction.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — It does slightly disagree with the minister. It's an increase of \$2,600 over budget. Just to add to that you're contradicting the statement you made earlier. If the merit increases account for the increase from the budget of \$28,044 over that, your merit increase will bring it up over the \$27,910. I don't know why you're concerned about it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Oh I'm not concerned.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — I can believe it.

**MR. McLEOD:** — This has to do with the kitchen and cafeteria facility at that vocational school. I would like to know the cost of the facility itself and the equipment that's in there now.

**MR. ROLFES:** — We will have to supply you that in writing. What you want to know is the cost of the facility and the cost of the equipment in the kitchen? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. You want to know what the original cost was, right?

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — That's right, and the equipment that is in there, as it sits right now.

**MR. ROLFES:** — O.K.

**MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Chairman, the reason I am asking this question (and we have talked about program development and so on in some of the other subvotes, and I know that). As you are aware, that facility is there and it is an excellent facility. There is no question about that. You have indicated that none of the expense that you are indicating there in the \$79,000 is for food services. I am asking you, why not?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I am not avoiding answering your question as to the original cost. We don't know. You are simply saying, why are we using it. I guess for two reasons. One is the high cost involved in providing the food, and secondly, a lack of students. Of course that second one is partially responsible, or most responsible for the first one.

**MR. McLEOD:** — You know what the question that follows from that of course, is (and certainly, Mr. Chairman, the facility is there). You say that the high cost of it, but certainly that should have been considered at the time to put in a facility like that, and not to be used. You will have to agree, Mr. Minister, it is quite a white elephant situation and I am sure you have been in there yourself and have seen it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I have been in there and I wish the member would convey that to DREE (Department of Regional Economic Expansion).

Items 8 and 9 agreed.

**ITEM 10**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I notice again that you have a reduction of seven people, from 165 to 158 permanent employees. My question is, what is the enrolment? Has the enrolment been going down? Are there any programs that have been dropped? Also, on your other expenses, a reduction of \$219,000 — just an indication of, why that reduction?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Would the member, again, be satisfied if we supplied him with information on the specific enrolments in the various institutes? We have the information here. I think it would save us a lot of time and I think it will provide you with the information that you want.

In regards to Wascana, I think that was answered in question period, yesterday, or maybe in yesterday's estimates, that it is really due to the . . .

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Minister, you are referring to the reduction of the Manitoba dental plan. Are your fellows working on the low enrolment classes? I would like that, Mr. Minister. Your average enrolment at Wascana. I would also like your low enrolment classes. I have this book, I could send it back. I'm capable of reading my own.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I didn't know you had that.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, I have it and I will have to look through it if that is the answer that I am getting, but maybe you can do a little work on these for me, please.

**MR. ROLFES:** — I am not sure if this is what you are asking for, but let me see if we are providing you with the right information.

In the apprenticeship programs the average is between 8 and 10; that is right across all the institutes. In technologies, the average size is about 25. In some of the other group instructions it could go as high as 100 students, as for example, in nursing. O.K.?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I asked you a question. Do you have any low ones, something where you have 5 or in that neighborhood — 5, 3.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Member, could you just elaborate what you mean by . . . we're finding it somewhat difficult because in some of our programs it's a one-to-one relationship instructor to student. For example, in the dentistry program, it's got to be a one-to-one and yet it's not a one-to-one when you take the number of instructors and the number of students. I'm not quite sure what you want.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I understand what you're meaning there and that's not what I'm driving at. I can understand that there's probably parts of courses and there's areas where you have to be one-to-one but what I'm saying are there . . . Let me put it this way, are there major courses?

**MR. ROLFES:** — In resource technology, for example, do we have a course like that where there are only five students in a class?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes. I mean for major courses where there are very low enrolments. I'd say under eight.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Could you go on to another question and another sub-heading. We can't seem to find any. We've come down to nine again but if we find some, can we provide the answer to you a little later so it won't hold up everything here?

**MR. TAYLOR:** — That's why I asked it before, Mr. Minister. I agree that it might be difficult and I'm quite willing to wait until our last . . . as long as I know if there are low enrolment classes and what ones they are. I think that's a fair question . . . inaudible . . . That's fine and dandy with me. However, I do have another question here and it's on subvote 10. Again, the high paid position at Wascana — I suppose it would be the director — and it's a question that my seat mate has been asking about the '78-'79 estimate, the actual '79-'80 estimate for salary, Mr. Minister?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes. The budgeted for '78-'79, \$37,180. The actual, \$35,495.32. The approved for '79-'80 or estimated, \$39,860.

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — I asked you a question yesterday, Mr. Minister, dealing with that staff reduction that appears and you told me that there were vacant positions involved in the 165. Could you tell us how many vacant positions, and if there were vacant positions in the 165 and you had budgeted \$3,151,000, how many dollars were left over because of the number of vacancies?

**MR. ROLFES:** — That's a rather difficult question to answer because of those positions that were vacant, for part of the year some weren't vacant and some weren't filled immediately. So at the end of March we had five positions that were vacant but that doesn't mean that they were vacant all year. The department, also, (because we were going through budget preparations and there was a clear indication that we would have to give up some positions) was, I suppose, wise enough not to fill those positions. If you want the actual man-months that were either put in or that were vacant, we would have to calculate that, you know, how much time one person spent and how much time another spent; we'd have to add those up. The other thing is we can't give you the actual figure because the fiscal year isn't over yet. That ends in another week or so.

**MR. SWAN:** — The reason I'm asking the question is because I'm concerned when you show an estimated number of posts and when I asked you the question yesterday in one particular subvote you said there were 10 positions not filled. Then you come across and show a fairly large increase in salary. You know, 10 positions not filled should have amounted to a couple of hundred thousand dollars and it doesn't show up and that's what I'm trying to get at.

**MR. ROLFES:** — There is a reduction in Wascana and again the member ignores the point that I made that some of these ten positions should be \$200,000. You are assuming that they were vacant all year. I just made the point that some were not vacant all year. They became vacant towards the end of the year. Because we were in budget finalization and the department knew they had to reduce staff, simply didn't fill those positions, and kept them vacant, so that as of March of this year, those positions are vacant. Rather than hiring people and having to let them go, we just didn't fill them. That's the explanation for it.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, with 158 permanent positions budgeted for, can you tell me out of the 158 how many are management and out-of-scope, please?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I can tell you there are two in the management series, that's the principal and vice-principal, but I can't tell you just how many are out-of-scope. We'll have to look that up.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, if the minister will get me the information, I would

appreciate it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Yes, we will do that.

Item 10 agreed.

#### **ITEM 11**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Again, on the permanent positions, I see a reduction of 11. I know you'll be working out the enrolments for me into those classes, so I'll expect this later, but what positions were deleted from Kelsey?

**MR. ROLFES:** — One position terminated and that was an instructor in renewable resources. These others were all vacant positions: renewable resources, two in recreational technology, three in the nursing assistant program, four in diploma nursing, one in secretarial services, and one medical lab technologist, I guess it is. Those were the positions.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'm very interested in the first one in renewable resources. You said there was a position terminated. Now, I'm not sure if that means you let someone go, or if you deleted that position. In my experience with the graduates from the high schools who have wanted to get into renewable resources there's been a tremendous waiting list. It's one of the most popular courses, I believe, in your institute, and why would you be cutting back?

**MR. ROLFES:** — It is a very popular program. I remember my days as a high school counsellor and it was a very popular program. At that time, seven, eight years ago there were lots of jobs available. There simply aren't jobs for the graduates, and we don't have sufficient jobs for the number of graduates that come out of the school. That is why it has been decreased from 96 to 72.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Your waiting list of students wanting to get in is going down too. This has been transmitted to students, has it?

**MR. ROLFES:** — It's been transmitted to students but as I indicated, it's still a very popular program.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Perhaps we should have a word or two with the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Matsalla) to create a bit of employment in this field.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — The same question, the '78-79 estimates, the actual '79-80 estimate, and also the number of management or principals in that one, an out-of-scope which you'll have to get me later.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Two in the management series. The highest salary there budgeted for '78-79, \$37,120. The actual for '78-79, \$39,352.08, and the estimated for '79-80, \$41,570.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Regarding the nursing, you mentioned three positions in nursing and I think one in diploma nursing. It seems strange to me that we'd be cutting back in nursing programs. I understand that Wascana is being expanded and the southern part of the province is taking their training in Wascana, but I would think there's quite a demand for nurses. Would you explain why the nursing program has been cut back?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Again, it's the same thing. We do have a surplus of nurses in this province, and we have cut back in the number of positions available at the institute. While I'm up on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I think I can provide the member with the low enrolment classes. We can't come down to five but surveying, I'm told, is eight, painting and decorating, eight, information retrieval program, I hope that's what it says, eight. That's at STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute). In Wascana, operating room nursing, nine, health record technology, 15 and survey, 87. In Kelsey, chemical technician 14, plumbing and gas fitting 14. Sorry we couldn't get down to five.

Item 11 agreed.

## ITEM 12

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I see there is just a reduction of four, which in proportion to Kelsey seems to be fairly well in line. Again, Mr. Minister, what four positions have been deleted at STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute)?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Clerk II, general services, an instructor in machine shop, an instructor in educational staff development, and an instructor in welding.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I am not very clear on what the educational staff development officer is. Could we have a little clarification? It seems strange to me.

**MR. ROLFES:** — It is in-service training. Very often, as my people tell me, we recruit fairly heavily from industry itself, but these people have never taught before. They are experts in their particular field.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, standing question — 1978-79 estimates, the actual, and 1979-80 estimates?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Budgeted '78-79, \$33,184; actual for 1978-79, \$35,107; '79-80, estimated \$39,852.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, has a decision been made on a merit increase on that one already?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Can I provide you with a breakdown on that and the answer to your question is no. But I would like to give you a breakdown on that one. We do have some effective figures on one that one. But the answer to your question is no.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Are you providing the breakdown today or tomorrow?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Tomorrow.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Fine, because it's certainly out of line. If you don't have the answer, then I want the answer for it.

**MR. ROLFES:** — We'll get you the answer.

Item 12 agreed.



# ITEM 13

**MR. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Yes, in this one I see drastic cuts and they may be very justifiable. Again, I would like a little explanation of just what this is and as you can see, from \$255,000 to \$60,000 is a drastic cut and there's nine people that have been let out. I'd just like a general explanation on all three topics here, Mr. Minister, please.

**MR. ROLFES:** — O.K. It's government efficiency. No, really, on this one, when the Science Policy Secretariat and the Science Council were established back in 1974-'75 — I think it was '74 and brought in in '75 . . . it had been the hope of government that we, the Science Council and the science secretariat would keep the government abreast of various science policies and science technologies and research that the government could take advantage of in the various areas and pertaining to each department in the government. We have found over the last three or four years that this really wasn't happening, and I'm not blaming anybody in this particular regard, but I think we found ourselves that it wasn't as valuable to government as we had hoped it would be. It may have been that rather than the science secretariat and the council, in keeping government abreast on various research and technology that the government should be aware of, they got themselves involved in rather in-depth research and we felt that there were other personnel and other departments in government that could give us that kind of research. So, we finally came to grips with it and said, let's maybe, start over and see if we can't come up with a secretariat and council that would keep this government abreast of research, not just in Saskatchewan but in North America and in the world, particularly with the economic development in uranium, potash, and heavy oil. What we have done is reduced the secretariat. We have also reduced the council and have taken measures to put people on the council who are experts in their particular area — in other words, scientists or economists who are experts in their area.

What we're going to be doing in this particular year and hopefully in the future, if it's effective, is to second staff from various departments who can be used by the assigned secretariat to help it accomplish its particular goal. I'm hoping it will be effective and if it is I'm sure we'll find some expansion in future years and further development in this particular area.

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — Thank you for your explanation of what can be classified as rather a faux pas government, I imagine. I understand that this was basically to keep you abreast of research. You admitted that it didn't do this. I compliment you on your efficiency. If it is not a functioning organ, then it should be dropped. When you set this up, did you not realize that this was part and parcel of the university's life and that there's good research going on there and perhaps we can use the university? Maybe you did consider that. I'm not saying you didn't.

I detect in your words a little bit of doubt about the future. You said 'if effective' and 'I have some doubt'. That's fine. I'd like to know who the two people — I'm not interested in their names, Mr. Minister — I want to know their fields of expertise. It appears you kept two people on at salaries of \$30,000. That would be the answer I would require. In what field of expertise are the two remaining?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I'm sorry. I should've introduced the gentlemen beside me, Dr. Leon Katz, a well-known physicist. He is certainly well respected, not only in Saskatchewan but in the world. He is the director who has been kept on, and a stenographer who will be assisting him.

**MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Chairman, there are two positions. For the top one again, will you give us the 1978/79 estimate, the actual, and the 1979/80 estimate please?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I should have mentioned probably, Dr. Katz's term comes to an end at the end of July, the 1st of August. He is on a contract basis with us. His approved salary last year was \$48,000. We have in the budget \$46,000. That's an estimate.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You mentioned that you were hoping to second people from other areas, would they be paid out of continuing education or would they be paid in the area from wherever you're planning to get them?

**MR. ROLFES:** — From wherever we are planning to get them.

Item 13 agreed.

### **ITEM 13(2)**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — There is a second part to Item 13.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I would like to ask a question. Where did this go? Has it been transferred to another department?

**MR. ROLFES:** — It went to the communications secretariat and I believe that comes under the Attorney General's department.

### **ITEM 14**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — One question here, Mr. Minister, I know you have a bill before the House to create a full time head of the University Commission. I see the increase here is \$56,000. My question is how much of this \$56,000 are you budgeting for this full time head of the University Commission's salary?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley and possibly to the House. I think I misled him the other day in question period. I discussed it with him and certainly it was not intentionally done. When I said it would cost us \$20,000 to \$30,000 this was a misrepresentation because we already have a full time University Commission chairman and his salary is whatever we have in the books here, \$50,000. What the bill that I'm bringing in does is to appoint the chairman for a period.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Well, then I'll go back. I'm glad you indicated that his salary is \$50,000, which is rather staggering, but are you planning with this full-time open-ended job that you are planning to create, is that salary going to be \$50,000?

**MR. ROLFES:** — No. My understanding is that the university commission determines the salary of the chairman, except on the original appointment that was \$50,000, which was an OC, the commission determines his salary.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'll accept that but if you're creating a new position now that's a different position than you have there. Then, on the initial appointment I'm sure that there'll be an initial salary. That's what I'm asking. What is this salary?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I'm sorry, but the member does not understand. The new legislation that is put in does not establish a new position. That position is there. It simply gives us

the authority to extend the chairmanship of the commission for longer than one year, so it is not a new position. The position is already there and when he was hired his salary was \$50,000. The commission now determines, or determines at that time, what the salary of the chairman will be, and it is not for us to determine here.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — You're saying that his position when he was hired was \$50,000. That doesn't mean that the position at this time is \$50,000.

**MR. ROLFES:** — He was hired July 1, '78 I believe so I would assume that his salary is \$50,000.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — On this we could maybe talk a little further. Is it your intention, in your new bill that you're drafting there, to extend it as we say open-ended to keep this same person in? It's just giving him an open-ended contract?

**MR. ROLFES:** — His appointment is subject to the lieutenant-governor in Council. Is it our intention to keep this particular gentleman in his position for the present? Yes, it certainly is. I think, again, he's a well respected individual. I have had the opportunity since I've been appointed as Minister of Continuing Education to meet with Dr. Bill Sibley, and I would hope that more members in this House would be able to meet him because he is, I think, a very respected educator in Canada. I'm very pleased that we have him as chairman of our commission.

Items 15, 16, 17, agreed.

## **ITEM 18**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Just a little explanation here — some of those, I understand, must be the institutes. Would you give me a little elaboration, Mr. Minister, on which these are?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Federated colleges. For example, Campion College and Luther College, St. Thomas Moore College in Saskatoon; the affiliated colleges and they would be Athol Murray College, Wilcox; the Canadian Theological College, the College of Emmanuel and St. Chad in Saskatoon; Lutheran Theological Seminary in Saskatoon; St. Joseph College, Yorkton; St. Andrews College, Saskatoon; St. Peters College in Munster and the Western Christian College in Weyburn.

**MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern):** — Mr. Minister, is this also where you grant to the schools — for example, in my own constituency we have many Mennonite high schools and so forth — is this the grant area or is that education?

**MR. ROLFES:** — That's education.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Fine.

Item 18, 19, 20, 21 agreed.

## **ITEM 22**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Just an explanation from the minister again, i.e., where are these traded out occupational training outside centres? What ones are you meaning there, Mr. Minister?

**MR. ROLFES:** — Those are almost exclusively community colleges — there are some in the institutes and some in private trade schools and some in the universities. But mostly they're in the community colleges, almost exclusively, community colleges.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Again as to your grants to community colleges. Does that mean that there are more moneys to community colleges than Item 17 shows?

**MR. ROLFES:** — These are contracts that we have with the community colleges, where they deliver the adult basic education programs, the skill upgrading programs and the NRIM (Non-Registered Indian Metis) program. That's under the Occupational Training Act. Okay?

Item 22 agreed.

### **ITEM 23**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — There's a slight reduction here. Where is this training taking place and why the slight reduction?

**MR. ROLFES:** — We have been very successful in this program over the last few years, and we're catching up. There have been fewer trainees in this particular area and it's levelling off. Last year, we had 625. We are anticipating about 585 this year.

Item 23 agreed.

### **ITEM 24**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — This is the one I had asked the minister about some time ago. I think he knows what's coming up and he promised me an answer. I'll refer you to page 10 of your document here — Student Aid Fund — and there are two items here that are a concern to me. The first one says loans written off \$5,935. I would like to know why these loans were written off; how many of these loans are written off?

**MR. ROLFES:** — I have again three pages here under the following heading, 'Accounts Receivable'. Accounts receivable includes Saskatchewan student loans, Saskatchewan student bursaries repayable by default, teacher training loans, emergency loans, interest on loans, accounts receivable March 31, 1978, and then summary of loans receivable March 31, 1978. I have three pages of explanation here. If that is satisfactory to the member, I'll simply turn it over to him.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I don't think we need three pages to explain why there are loans of \$5,000 written off.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order, please. We have supplementaries; we have heritage fund to cover yet under this. I think that it now being 5 o'clock, I'll leave the Chair until 7 o'clock.