

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 23, 1981

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 50 grade 12 students from Foam Lake Composite High School. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Mr. Ian Cooper, and Mr. Popowych and their bus drivers, Mr. Stobbe and Mr. Andrusiak, and, I believe, Mr. Labas from the Department of Co-ops.

I am particularly delighted to introduce this group from Foam Lake to this Assembly. I served for many years as a member of the staff of the Foam Lake Composite School. I draw to the attention of members of the Assembly that three of the members of the Saskatchewan ladies' curling championship team, who recently represented Saskatchewan in the national Lassie curling classic at St. John's, Newfoundland, are graduates of the Foam Lake composite school.

I am pleased to introduce this group of students to this Assembly and I hope that their visit will enhance their interest in our system of parliamentary democracy. I will be meeting with the students some time after the question period and I hope that all members will join with me in welcoming this group from Foam Lake to the Assembly today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: — Mr. Speaker, it give me great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of grade 8 students from Weyburn Junior High School, some 71 in number, accompanied by their teachers, Jim Nedelcov and J. Buzowetsky, and their bus drivers, Grant Hanning and Carl Borshowa. This is the 15th consecutive year Mr. Nedelcov has accompanied grade 8 students from Weyburn Junior High to this Assembly, so I think that's somewhat of a record.

I look forward to meeting with these students after question period and I know that all members join with me in welcoming this group of grade 8 students, their teachers and their drivers. It is our wish, I am sure, that their visit here may be informative and that they all have a very safe journey home. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MINER: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my good friend and colleague, Dennis Banda, the member of the Legislative Assembly for Redberry, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and to this House, representatives from the Hafford High School, 44 in number, from grades 10, 11 and 12, accompanied by Mr. Dennis Taylor and Ms. Linda Erlandson. It is indeed a pleasure for me to be able to fill in for Dennis Banda, who, for interest of the students, as I am sure you will know, is a hard-working member of this Legislative Assembly and respected by all of us. Unfortunately he is first vice-president

of the Churchill Development Board and was called away to Yorkton for an emergency meeting of that board, and therefore I am filling in on his behalf.

It is my pleasure to welcome you and to tell you that it is not from unfamiliar territory that you come. My farm is very close to Hafford. In fact I attended the school there myself, and know it to be a school of very high quality, as are the people — friendly and very good from the area of Hafford. I might add that this is not the first time Hafford School has been represented in this Assembly. It has been here numerous times before, as has a busload or more of senior citizens from Hafford. Let me welcome you to this Assembly. May your visit here be both informational and educational. I will be joining with you later for pictures and for some drinks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — On behalf of the member for Morse, I would like to introduce to the Assembly a group of 26 grades 8 and 10 students from the Cabri High School who are here visiting in Regina today and have a tour lined up. They will be spending part of an hour here with us today during question period; I'm sure they will be meeting at 3:15 with the member for Morse. I'm sure that all members will join with me in welcoming them here today and wishing them a safe return home.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Alberta Gas Reference Case

MR. ANDREW: — My question is to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Attorney General, on Friday the Alberta Court of Appeal in a unanimous decision ruled in favor of the Government of Alberta on the Alberta gas reference case to that court. Although the federal officials, in particular Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Chrétien, have declined comment as to a potential appeal on that, Saskatchewan's contribution to the federal cabinet has left no uncertain terms, and in fact the matter will be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. Given the significance of that particular decision on the resource ownership of various provinces (and that particularly applies to the province of Saskatchewan), could the Attorney General advise the Assembly (if, in fact, that reference case goes to the Supreme Court of Canada) whether or not the province of Saskatchewan will be intervening on the side of the province of Alberta on that matter?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I fully suspect that if it does go to the Supreme Court of Canada, the province of Saskatchewan will be intervening on the side of Alberta. However, I would like to point out to the hon. member that in the Alberta case the court held unanimously that:

The tax on exported natural gas under the proposed federal legislation would, to the extent that it purports to the tax of natural gas described in this reference and exported from Canada for use outside Canada, be ultra vires the Parliament of Canada.

And the court also went on to note that:

The narrow question is raised as to whether or not certain natural gas owned,

produced, and to be exported by the Crown in the right of Alberta is subject to a levy which the Crown in the right of Canada proposes to impose.

This reference, Mr. Speaker, as can be seen by these quotations, raises a much narrower question than the questions which have a direct applicability to the province of Saskatchewan. It does not have as direct an impact on our province as might be the case at first blush, because the province in its own right does not own and produce gas for export from the province of Saskatchewan. However, the reasoning used by the court in reaching the decision is important in our legal case, and notwithstanding the fact that it has a more narrow applicability to the province of Saskatchewan than to Alberta, in all likelihood we'll be standing with Alberta on this case if it goes to the supreme court.

MR. ANDREW: — Supplementary question to the Attorney General. Given the fact as well, Mr. Attorney General, that the case did involve a question of export tax — in this case on natural gas — and given the fact that 60 per cent of the crude oil produced in Saskatchewan is for export to the United States, can the Attorney General advise the Assembly, given this particular decision, whether the province of Saskatchewan can now be looking at the possibility of added revenues from that export of heavy oil, particularly to the United States?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be improper and imprudent for me to make a comment on this today. The judgment only came down Thursday or Friday. I have only been back in Canada since Saturday. I've not had an opportunity to receive the advice of my legal officers to the extent of the detail I would want in order to make the opinion available to my colleague in the Department of Mineral Resources. All that I can say, as I did in the first question, is that the reasoning by the court of appeal is important — particularly the upholding and the applicability of section 125 of the British North America Act, which prohibits one order of government taxing another order of government. This has been the source of our complaints with respect to the PGRT (petroleum and gas revenue tax) and the other 30 cent per mcf tax proposed by the national energy plan, and all of these things may very well make it possible, as the member suggests. That will be announced in a very short while, either by me or my colleague, the Minister of Mineral Resources.

Report on Meeting in London, England

MR. LANE: — A question to the Deputy Premier. I understand that you will be making a statement later in question period, but as a result of your trip to London, England, subsequent news reports indicate that, basically, you ran into a thick brick wall. That was subsequently confirmed by CTV on Friday night, I believe, when it indicated that your efforts were in vain. Now, my first question is one that I directed to the Premier last week, and that is: will you table today the information that you received from your deputy minister when he went as the advance party some weeks ago, what specific recommendations he made to you, and what individuals he saw in regard to the constitutional position of the province of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, the two reports that the hon. member refers to (and there are only two), I think have to be qualified. First of all, the *Globe and Mail* report continually named unnamed sources. I, for my part, put little credence in reports which have unnamed sources. During the course of my statement, the hon. member will see that indeed I am more optimistic about the impact of the mission. No one can speak with certainty because, as the United Kingdom

parliamentarians themselves say, they will not make their decision until they are forced to make their decision, namely, once the resolution goes from Ottawa to London. Accordingly, the certainty aspect will be determined at that particular time.

More specifically, on the question of the trip by Mr. Leeson, I have no objection to tabling for the hon. member the agenda for Mr. Leeson's two-day visit to London, 10 days or so ago. Essentially, the recommendation of Mr. Leeson was that it was important that I attend as soon as could be conveniently arranged to meet with as many people, from the governing Conservative Party and the Labour Party, to communicate the legislature's unanimous opposition to what is taking place in the House of Commons. That was the sum and the substance of the recurring report by Mr. Leeson as a result of his preliminary, preparatory meetings a few weeks ago.

MR. LANE: — Well, the agenda, of course, is not adequate and that information is not sufficient. Now, I don't want unnamed sources either, so I am asking you to name people. And I would like you specifically to name for me the individuals whom Mr. Leeson saw in regard to Saskatchewan and to your attendance in England.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to do this. If the hon. member wants to take up question period time, I'm prepared to do it. I'm prepared to also table the itinerary. But on Monday, February 23, Mr. Leeson saw Gilles Loiselle, the Quebec agent general; he saw Mr. Denzil Davies, member of parliament, the Labour front-bench spokesman on foreign and commonwealth affairs; he met with Mr. Alex Hart, the British Columbia agent general; he met with Mr. Jim McKibben, the Alberta agent general, and he met with Jean Casselman Wadds, the Canadian high commissioner.

On Tuesday, February 24, he met with Sir Anthony Kershaw, chairman of the now famous Kershaw committee; he met with a member of parliament by the name of Joan Lester, a member of parliament by the name of George Foulkes, Mr. Martin Berthoud of the North American desk of the foreign affairs office, and one or two members of the British press.

It was the substance of those meetings, and from the advice tendered there, that the recommendation was made that I should attend. I want to say clearly, Mr. Speaker, that the importance of the meetings with the agents of the other provinces should not be underestimated. All of the agents, particularly of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Quebec, have been doing considerable lobbying on an ongoing basis, and their intelligence to Mr. Leeson, as it was to me, proved to be very invaluable indeed.

MR. ANDREW: — A new question to the Attorney General with regard to the same subject matter. It appears that the federal government will probably move, by a form of closure, to close the debate on the constitution in the Parliament of Canada. During your trip to London, Mr. Attorney General, was there any talk in London with regard to a three-line whip being put in by the government party and by the Labour Party. My question basically is this: when I was there the view seemed to be if the whips were put on, the package would go through and there would be perhaps three or four days debate on the issue. Does that still seem to be the prominent view in Westminster?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — This is an important question. Regrettably, again, I am not able to say yes or no in response, because it depends on whom you talk to. Some members of the British House will say that this is an issue where it is impossible to have a three-line whip. A three-line whip, as you will know, is the highest form of party discipline. A three-line whip for example, was placed on Margaret Thatcher's budget

debate a few days ago while I was there. As it so happened, for the first time in a long time in British history, eight government backbenchers broke the three-line whip.

When we deal with Canadian constitutional matters, something which is not essential or intrinsic to the very policy or the existence of the government, I am advised it is not the kind of thing in which a three-line whip is used. You do hear talk of guidance and there are at least two other levels of whips which are possible. I think the best answer that I can give is the one which I received over and over again, "The government proposes, parliament disposes." And that's particularly important in this matter.

Subsidies for Special-Care Homes

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, as you should well be aware of, the concern of people throughout the province with regard to the rising costs of residing in nursing homes is becoming very apparent. I wonder if you can give this House some assurance that the 30 per cent increase recently announced in the budget for allowances for certain special-care homes will be used in the form of subsidies to offset all rate increases announced by nursing homes and to protect our elderly citizens from the tyranny of inflation?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member for Moosomin that the 30 per cent increase in nursing home care announced in the budget will be used in terms of subsidies to the people in the homes. I would like to inform the member as well that we are looking at freezing the increases until the announcement is made in the near future of how that money is to be spent. I think we are well aware of the final implications of the rapidly escalating costs of nursing home care and to that end we hope to announce very quickly a freeze on increases until the date the 30 per cent increase can come into place.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the minister and ask the minister if he agrees. Given my calculations on a specific nursing home (and I think you will find the figures quite consistent throughout), even with the 30 per cent increase, as announced in your budget, applied to the nursing homes (in this case level 2 care) the difference is only \$50. The nursing home increases have amounted to about 37 per cent and your increase of 30 per cent really only makes a change of about \$50. In fact, the residents are having to pay in the neighbourhood of \$150 to \$200 more, even given your 30 per cent increase.

My second supplementary is: will you make changes to increase that 30 per cent where it is warranted to make sure that the residents of nursing homes in this province will not be faced with any further increases?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the member that we are reviewing the total area of continuing care in the province at the present and how the moneys will be allocated will be announced in due course.

Transfer of Level 4 Patients from Department of Health Jurisdiction

MR. LANE: — I would like to direct a question to the minister. Is it not true that effective June 1, level 4 is being moved from the jurisdiction of the Department of Health to the Department of Social Services? Would the minister confirm that fact? What hearings have you had with operators and the public, who are very much concerned about the

proposed changes by the government?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, it is not true that changes effective June 1 will move level 4 from the Department of Health to the Department of Social Services. I am not sure where the member gets that information.

I would like to inform him as well that negotiations are going on right now with SHA (Saskatchewan Hospital Association) and with SASH (Saskatchewan Association of Special-Care Homes. The negotiations are going very well and we hope an announcement will be ready for July 1.

Conduct of Judge King

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. In last fall's session I raised a matter with you concerning comments made by one Judge King about a drug ring operating in my constituency, specifically in the towns of Caron, Mortlach and Parkbeg. At that time, in response to the question, you indicated that the matter was being investigated, that you were checking with the RCMP drug squad and that your department would be making a full and complete investigation. Mr. Attorney General, as a result of a report by letter which I received early this year, it would appear that none of Judge King's comments have been substantiated or validated. In other words, the term which I referred to him as, on that day, would appear to be accurate. I note that Judge King is still on the bench in Moose Jaw; in light of the fact that he has been proven, at the very least, to be grossly, grossly inaccurate, may I ask when the individual will be removed from the bench?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that under our system of government, judges, be they appointed provincially or federally, enjoy independence and autonomy. This is especially true in the Saskatchewan context, since some few years ago it was my pleasure to introduce legislation establishing the appointment of a chief judge of the provincial court.

What has transpired is that this matter has been referred to the attention (I believe I am accurate in this) of the chief judge of the provincial court for attention. My recollection of the incident, while I do not have the papers in front of me, is that it was the conclusion of everybody that Judge King was trying to state in a dramatic way the importance and the dangers or difficulties of dealing (or fooling around with, putting it in those words) in drugs for the accused in front of him and generally, for the community at large. It seems that there may have been some words or phrases used which have prompted the hon. member's questions. The phrases have been investigated by the RCMP Police and have proven to be not as indicated by Judge King.

On balance I choose to follow here, and have no choice but to follow, the judgment of the chief judge of the court and rest by the decisions that he has taken in this regard, namely, that the matter seems to be a closed issue.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question to the Attorney General. Would the Attorney General agree that probably the epitome of law enforcement would have to be the magistrate who is making these decisions? Would the Attorney General tell me, so that I may convey to the people in my constituency who have to face this judge, how a judge who has been called a liar and confirmed as one by the investigation of your department — how those people can respect that individual and the institution of law

and order, when this man is confirmed that way by your own department and the RCM Police?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I must strongly take objection to the hon. member's categorization of or description of the words of Judge King as being tantamount to a lie, or to his being a liar. Statements are made, both in this House, on the bench, and elsewhere, in day-to-day efforts which do not intend to mislead and are not deliberately stated with a view to misleading people. I believe that is the category in which Judge King's comments can be placed. These were statements made by a judge who showed concern about the drug situation as he perceived it, not with the deliberate intention of misleading either the accused or any other members of the community, including the community which the hon. member seeks to represent. Accordingly, it's a tremendous quantum leap to characterize those kinds of statements to being tantamount to a lie.

I believe Judge King has done a good job for the provincial bench. He has been on the bench now for quite some number of years. I think he has served the people of Moose Jaw and district well. On this occasion he would appear to have made a statement which is not fully backed by the RCM Police reports, but surely that cannot be carried so far as to call for the removal of this person for use of these words or phrases.

MR. THATCHER: — Final supplementary to the Attorney General. Mr. Attorney General, when a judge on the bench, as in the case of Judge King, has made statements which are untrue, and has lied in his own handwriting in correspondence to the communities involved, why would the Attorney General of this province continue to stand up for such an individual? My question to you, Mr. Attorney General, is twofold. Would you give a blessing to the constituents of Thunder Creek and perhaps transfer him to Saskatoon where your constituents can have a run at a man like this? Is the reason why you are defending Judge King because you know very well you made a bad appointment, and that basically we have an NDP activist on the bench and you are afraid of him?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I really regret very much the personal attack on Judge King mounted by the hon. member for Thunder Creek in a forum where the judge is unable to defend himself. May I say also, Mr. Speaker, that I particularly draw to the attention of the people of Saskatchewan the philosophy of the official Conservative opposition with respect to judicial appointments, as indicated by the question asked just a minute ago. This philosophy is that if the Attorney General of the day disagrees with the statements made by any particular judge, he shall unceremoniously and without any due care to compensation or other factors, move him to another area of the province in order to penalize him. Mr. Speaker, I say that is tantamount to the highest form of interference with the principle of judicial independence which no democracy can tolerate under any circumstance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — And Mr. Speaker, may I also say that I find it particularly unfortunate that the lawyer-members of the Conservative caucus endorse this member's vision of the independence of the judiciary in our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Mailing of Welfare Cheques

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, I have in my hand a cheque sealed in one of your envelopes, Saskatchewan Department of Social Services, made out to an individual in Saskatoon for \$479.50 (I can see it through the envelope); it is a welfare cheque to an individual who did not use his own address. Now, my first question is: is it your normal practice to just mail out welfare cheques to anyone at any time they ask? Secondly, do you not do any kind of investigation to find out the residence of the individual to whom you are paying welfare payments?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is the policy of the department to check out people to whom cheques are paid. Some of them are done centrally through a computer in Regina, and others are done through the region. If they are to a long-term Saskatchewan Assistance Plan person, who is being paid on a regular basis, it is done through the central office in Regina. On the other hand, if it is on a short-term basis, it is done through the regional office. I am not sure about the cheque. I don't have it to look at. The member should table it so we can check into it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, if I table the cheque I am afraid the recipient will never get it, so I will give it to the minister himself later.

Mr. Minister, attached with the cheque was a letter from the firm who received it at their address. The individual had applied for rent of a premises, but had never received it. But when he went to your office to ask for social assistance, without any check by your department, he used the address of the real estate firm, and your office then submitted the cheque to that address without knowing whether the individual had this residence — knowing nothing about it. You just automatically . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — If the member has a supplementary, I will allow it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Will you, Mr. Minister, investigate the matter and investigate the total system so that no further abuse of this system will take place?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — I'm not sure what abuse took place. Also, I would question the member's facts in light of the recent questions asked about a firing where many misrepresentations were made. But I will look into it. I'd like to know where the member got the envelope. If he would give it to me, we will look into it.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. About five years ago the same situation happened in the Department of Social Services. It led to fraud charges and conviction of an employee. I can rehash the case. The Attorney General and the former minister know full well of what I speak. One of the scams in that was the use of phony or false addresses and then the departmental employee picked up the cheques. It looks like your procedures have not changed at all. Would you now be prepared to advise this Assembly, when you advise the member, whether you have corrected your procedures which led to a scam five years ago, or whether exactly the same procedures are being used which cost the taxpayers some \$40,000 or \$50,000?

HON. MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that the member for Qu'Appelle is again jumping in to pick up where someone else couldn't handle it. It's a normal procedure. I would like to say, as I mentioned to the member for Regina South, that we would look into the incident if he provides us with the envelope.

Tabling of Reports re Circle 4 Feeders

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On May 14, 1980, I questioned you in the Crown corporations committee concerning Circle 4 Feeders at Dundurn, Saskatchewan. To refresh your memory, Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) loaned Circle 4 Feeders approximately \$1 million. They went broke and moved the steers out in the middle of the night. Mr. Minister, why haven't you tabled this complete report to me? You promised no less than six times that if we would leave the Department of Industry and Commerce and move on, you would table within 48 hours a complete statement regarding Circle 4 Feeders. When are you going to make this information available?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the same question was posed to us in the Crown corporations committee last year. I'm quite positive that the member received all the information in detail from the Crown corporations committee. If I stand to be corrected, then it's yet to be received. But that should have gone forward to the hon. member.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I absolutely did not receive this information. Also, a new question to the minister. We also questioned you as to whether or not Sedco was involved as an owner in Circle 4 Feeders. With Mr. Speaker's permission, I'd like to make one quote. This was your answer when I asked you this question:

The information we have is that our people think there was some involvement with Sedco.

If that is the case, Mr. Minister, would you inform this Assembly as to what you will do with thousands of dollars of outstanding bills which are owed in the Dundurn community by Circle 4 Feeders? Would you inform this Assembly, if Sedco was a part-owner, that you will pay the local bills in Dundurn plus interest to this date?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I think those questions were asked last year, again, in the Crown corporations committee. I'm not ready at this point in time to give the hon. member any commitment of any kind. If I do, it will come through the Crown corporations committee. I'm sure that he has already received that information, if we were involved.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Attorney General's Trip to London re Canadian Constitution

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to make a statement which might be a little longer than normal, although it won't be, I hope, too much of an abuse of the practice of this legislature with respect to ministerial statements.

I rise to report on my discussion last week in London, England, respecting the Canadian constitution.

It was a very full week, indeed, with a very heavy schedule of meetings. Among others, I met with Nicholas Ridley, Minister of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Sir Anthony Kershaw, chairman, and other members of the House of Commons select

committee on foreign affairs; the parliamentary all party group on the constitution, co-chaired by MPs Jonathan Aitkin and George Foulkes; Denis Healy, the Deputy Leader of the Labour Party; the parliamentary Labour Party's foreign affairs committee; several other members, both Labour and Conservative, of the House of Commons and the House of Lords; the agents general of the opposing provinces; the Canadian High Commissioner Mrs. Jean Casselman Wadds; and the Commonwealth Secretary General Mr. Ramphal. No one, who was asked to see us, refused to see us.

In the course of my meetings I explained the nature and impact of the proposed federal resolution, the position taken by the Saskatchewan government and our Saskatchewan legislature and by the other opposing provinces, and the responsibility, as I see it, of the United Kingdom government and parliament.

I put particular emphasis on the following points: (1) that the federal proposal, particularly as a result of the amending formula under the charter of rights, would significantly reduce provincial powers and upset the balance of Canada's federal system; (2) that the proposal does not reflect the wishes of Canada "as a federally structured whole" to adopt the language employed by the Kershaw report. It is opposed by 8 of the 10 provinces, by the official opposition in the Canadian House of Commons, by all major political parties in Quebec, Alberta and Saskatchewan and, according to the latest opinion polls, by 64 per cent of the Canadian people; (3) that by virtue of section 7(1) of the Statute of Westminster, the United Kingdom parliament accepted the role of trustee or guardian of Canadian federalism, and that it has an obligation to satisfy itself that any amendment request from the federal government is proper — that it has the necessary level and distribution of support within Canada; (4) that the present situation is unprecedented in terms of both the impact of the requested amendment on the structure of Canadian federalism and the extent of provincial opposition; and (5) that in these circumstances the U.K. parliament should reject the request, if and when such a measure is put before it.

In addition, I pointed out that the constitutionality of the procedure has been challenged in Canadian courts, and that it would be improper for the Canadian government to transmit the request, or for the United Kingdom to act upon it, until the Supreme Court of Canada has rendered judgment.

I also made clear our hope that some combination of circumstances, including the prospect of vigorous opposition in Britain, might force Prime Minister Trudeau to return to the bargaining table so that a revised package might ultimately go to Britain with the support of at least the majority of the provincial governments.

On the whole, I can tell hon. members that I was very encouraged by my week in London. I was encouraged to find a growing level of awareness of this issue on the part of British parliamentarians. I was encouraged, too, by the clear indications that the British want to do what is right for Canada. They have no wish to interfere in our affairs, but they have an appreciation of their obligations under the Statute of Westminster.

It is clear to me that the British are unhappy about the suggestion that they should simply "hold their noses" and act automatically to implement any federal request. In the face of such vigorous provincial opposition they will not be merely the rubber stamps that Prime Minister Trudeau expects them to be.

Let me emphasize one point. There is a clear difference between the Government of the United Kingdom and what it will do, and what the Parliament of the United Kingdom will

ultimately decide to do. I referred to it in the question period today — the government proposes; parliament disposes.

There have been press reports about my meeting with Nicholas Ridley. (Only one, I am happy to report that was alluded to in question period, in the *Globe and Mail*.) While I am bound by our agreement with Nicholas Ridley not to say any details publicly about our meeting, let me indicate that it confirmed what we already knew; the U.K. government feels obliged to lay this matter before parliament and it will urge its adoption. How strongly it will do so, and how long it will continue in the face of any vigorous opposition was not so clear. That is why it was important, and is important, that we speak to individual parliamentarians; that we continue to do so; and that other provinces increase their efforts in this direction as well. I was, Mr. Speaker, the first minister over on this kind of mission by the opposing provinces.

I shall be meeting tomorrow with ministers from other opposing provinces in Winnipeg. I will take the opportunity to share with them my observations on the situation in London. I will also be giving a full report to my cabinet colleagues at the earliest opportunity. I expect that we will be shortly in a position to indicate what further measures will be undertaken in an attempt to block the unilateral federal action proposed by the federal government.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I will table a copy of my itinerary in London last week, copies of the two press releases which I issued there, and copies of some of the materials which I distributed to the British parliamentarians and the press in the course of my visit there.

MR. LANE: — Reading the information submitted to me a few moments ago by the Attorney General puts the lie to the position which the government opposite has taken. I ask all members to read the one position paper attached, in regard to the effect of legal action in Canada. We, on this side of the House, have been urging the Government of Saskatchewan to join with the other provinces in challenging the unilateral patriation by the Government of Canada. We have asked for that, and all through, the Government of Saskatchewan has said it would basically have no effect. They won't join; they have refused to join. Yet, in a paper presented to parliament by the Attorney General, he uses the very fact that six provinces have gone to court as a justification for the Government of Great Britain not proceeding with the matter. On page 2 of that document, the Attorney General now says:

It is especially unfortunate that Mr. Trudeau's government has chosen to press ahead with its unilateral action at a time when the matter is sub judice in the Canadian courts. That action adds the issue of legal uncertainty to the propriety of such unilateral action by one order of government in a federation.

So, all through this whole debate he has refused to take legal action, and now that six other provinces are taking the action which he opposes, he turns around and says, "They are taking it; now Trudeau shouldn't proceed." So he is against the court actions but he is now for it as an argument to stop Trudeau from proceeding.

If the Government of Saskatchewan, as we have said from the beginning, had taken court action, had shown a common western front . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I would just like to say something about ministerial statements

and responses in this House. It has been a long established practice of this legislature for ministerial statements to be made upon orders of the day. It is traditional that cabinet ministers should, as a courtesy to the House if the House is in session, make any policy statement or announcement in the House prior to announcing the same outside the House. Such statements should be brief, factual and specific.

It has been further established by the House to allow, by courtesy, a brief, strictly relevant comment to be made thereon by the Leader of the Opposition or some other senior member. But it must be understood that a debate cannot take place, no motion being before the House.

I realize this is a difficult statement to deal with, but I have to hold the member for Qu'Appelle to the rules which say that a debate cannot take place since there is no motion before the House. I would interpret some of his remarks as clearly being debate. You may proceed.

MR. LANE: — The papers presented by the Attorney General as part of his statement, Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness are part of that statement. I was replying to a very strange position for the Attorney General of Saskatchewan to have taken.

It is interesting to note that in the position papers, again tabled by the Attorney General, there was no explanation to the people of Great Britain and their parliamentarians as to why Saskatchewan did not take a constitutional position and why the province of Saskatchewan, for some considerable period of time, was prepared to leave the impression that it would accept unilateral patriation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh yes, the Saskatchewan position, Mr. Speaker, was one of no position for some considerable period of time, which was basically an enticement for the Prime Minister of Canada to proceed.

In reply, the Attorney General also very pointedly admits that the one hope that the people of Canada have to stop the actions of Pierre Trudeau is the attempt by the Conservative opposition in Ottawa to stall and delay the matter to give the opportunity to the Supreme Court of Canada to rule on the legality or the illegality.

I would hope that the Attorney General's actions in going to London are not the only actions to be taken. The Attorney General today, Mr. Speaker, indicated that he is prepared to join in the reference to the supreme court on the oil and gas with Alberta. I would have hoped that today he would have announced that he is prepared to join the other provinces in their court challenge and, in fact, negate with the Premier has been saying.

Unfortunately and with regret, the press statements that came from your trip to London, I believe, fairly stated the situation in London, England, and that the matter is going through, and Pierre Trudeau has that assurance. I say that with regret. The only problem we have (and again, it won't be debated) is that we won't know that until the actual action takes place. But I would hope that the people of Saskatchewan will judge the government opposite, and its constitutional posturing, by the actions it has taken in going to London, England. If the British parliament rapidly pushes the Trudeau package through, we will know, in no uncertain terms, that the government opposite failed, and that the government opposite took the wrong approach and made a tragically wrong decision in not opposing unilateral patriation from the time of its proposal by the Government of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. What is the purpose of . . .

MR. ANDREW: — I wonder if the Attorney General would permit a question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — We are under an area of ministerial statements. It's an opportunity for a minister to make a statement and for a member to respond on the other side of the House. Given the serious nature of the matter that's raised by the minister, I'll put myself in the hands of the House. If the House wishes to allow a question, I will proceed.

MR. ANDREW: — My question to the Attorney General is basically this. Mr. Attorney General (and I simply want to extend upon my question in question period today), given the fact that it would appear that closure is now going to be moved in the House of Parliament, and given the standard position of the parliament in Great Britain — Westminster — has been that we are not going to sort of kick the package back, if you like, and that probably the best that could be expected from the provinces of Canada would be the slow-shuffle that is practised by the British members of parliament, does the matter then carry on further until we are adjourned, or their House adjourns sometime next fall? Can the Attorney General advise the Assembly if the message was delivered to him while he was in Great Britain that in fact the slow-shuffle could be practised, and give us his assessment as to whether or not the matter will be delayed till fall? Or whether, given the fact that closure could be brought in the next two or three weeks, the package could be in Great Britain and the matter could be addressed probably before July 1 which is the target date of Mr. Trudeau?

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, it is my conclusion that the majority of the parliamentarians who I saw concluded that they have two choices before them — either acceptance or rejection of that which comes forward to them from Ottawa. The question of amendment of that which comes before them from Ottawa to London, or if you will, delay, which I think is a variation of amendment, seems to get very, very little currency. One must appreciate, as I'm sure the hon. member for Kindersley does, that in the United Kingdom parliamentary scene, a debate of 48 hours or 72 hours (4 days) is indeed a very long debate.

One must also appreciate that in the United Kingdom situation, like all countries of the world, they have their own public agenda. They have budget problems; they have economic problems; they have inflation problems, petrol problems, northern Irish and Scottish problems.

When the resolution comes, and how it's dealt with, in my estimation will depend upon where it can work its way into the public agenda of the U.K. parliament, and all of the other confluences and forces which may bear some imprint on that. It is simply not possible for me or anyone to say with any degree of certainty that there will be a slow-shuffle or anything of that nature. I simply think U.K. parliamentarians will say: "We're either going to accept it or we're going to reject." Whether and how it gets dealt with will be dependent upon more their internal domestic timetable than any other objective.

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to make a statement with respect to ministerial statements?

MR. SPEAKER: — Traditional practice in this House is that the minister makes a

statement and the opposition responds. Any recognized political parties may also have an opportunity to respond. The way the situation is at this time is that I do not recognize that the member is a member of a recognized party for the sake of this Assembly and, as a result, response would not be allowed. As with the previous subject, I would put myself in the hands of the House. I'm not prepared to abridge the rule, but the House may at any time if it so sees fit, and then the member may speak. Is it agreed?

MR. HAM: — Mr. Speaker, I think, as you stated earlier, this is probably the most serious matter this country has faced in its recorded history. In many ways I have to agree with the member for Qu'Appelle with respect to the role that the Prime Minister of Canada is taking in regard to patriation of our constitution. I think there is little doubt that no matter what efforts the Government of Saskatchewan, and the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan take, no matter what efforts the eight other opposition governments in Canada take, unfortunately it will be futile, resulting in the fact that our constitution . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. There seems to be some cross-the-floor interference here. I'm having trouble hearing the member for Swift Current. Now that we've unanimously agreed to hear the member for Swift Current, I think we should unanimously listen to him.

MR. HAM: — I'll start again. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, unfortunately, no matter what efforts are taken by the governments opposing patriation, and most especially the Government of Saskatchewan, we will see our patriation of the constitution come back to Canada in its present form. There is little doubt Mr. Trudeau intends to take his place in history by bringing home the constitution. It's very unfortunate for the people of western Canada in particular that these steps are being taken under present conditions.

I commend the Attorney General for making an effort to lobby with British parliamentarians and officials in Britain. Again, Mr. Speaker, they will be futile attempts. Attempts should be made and I encourage attempts by all governments and by all members of all governments. We will regret, I am certain, that over a long period of time, especially in western Canada, we will remain forever the hewers of wood and drawers of water, as Mr. Trudeau will make certain the power in this country will remain in central Canada forever.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 45 — An act to amend The Registered Nurses Act, 1978

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Dinner

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day, I would like to draw to the attention of the members the fact that the 12th Annual Report of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has been laid on their desks. In conjunction with that, I would like to remind the members of the annual dinner and meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, scheduled for Wednesday, April 8, at the Centre of the Arts. Be sure to mark your calendars accordingly, as we would like to have as full an attendance as

possible at that meeting. I may say that at this point in time we have 22 associate members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. This is partly due to the fact that the MLAs' reunion was held last year. A number of those parliamentarians were encouraged by the fact that the reunion was held and wish to keep in touch with our association.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 44 — An Act to amend The Consumer Products Warranties Act

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, this bill is intended to clarify one section of The Consumer Products Warranties Act, which deals with what must be included in the additional written warranties. This act, which was passed in 1977, is unique in Canada. Accordingly, a good deal of response to the present act has been received regarding its effect on long-established selling and buying and warranty rights and responsibilities.

The proposed amendment is of a housekeeping nature to facilitate more effective administration of the act and to respond to an important concern about the act. The proposed amendment is viewed by the Canadian Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Association as necessary for clear interpretation of the act by business and, in the case of litigation, by the courts. By way of example, a motor vehicle has a statutory warranty under the act which continues for a reasonable period of time. The Canadian Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Association feels that a manufacturers' additional written warranty could, as the act is presently worded, be considered to begin after, or consecutive to, the period of the statutory warranty. This would be contrary to the intention of the act, and accordingly the necessary clarification is contained in this amendment.

The principle of The Consumer Products Warranties Act is to provide a basic minimum warranty for all consumer transactions in the province. Any risk or loss for defective product is shifted from the consumer to the seller or manufacturer responsible for the defect. The act has proved helpful to consumers and been well accepted by the business community, particularly in terms of clarifying contractual relationships with respect to warranties. The proposed amendment will further clarify the responsibility of retail sellers and of manufacturers. No part of this amendment limits the civil rights of Saskatchewan citizens, no licences or permits are required and no additional administration is entailed.

Mr. Speaker, this is an essential amendment to a significant piece of consumer legislation. I recommend the bill for approval by all members of the House. I move, Mr. Speaker, second reading of An Act to amend The Consumer Products Warranties Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. McArthur that Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend The Community Colleges Act** be now read

a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski that Bill No. 25 — **An Act to amend The Heritage Fund (Saskatchewan) Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Koskie that Bill No. 31 — **An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act** be now read a second time.

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, the amendments introduced should have received the full support of the opposition because these amendments basically increase the protection to the people of Saskatchewan. They increase the public liability from \$35,000 to \$100,000. This provides the same basic protection to the residents of Saskatchewan from non-resident motorists as from Saskatchewan motorists.

I was surprised when the member for Thunder Creek, the other day in debate, rather than supporting this, took off on a tirade against Saskatchewan Government Insurance. I want to say that he launched this attack on the basis of, first, an attack upon the dedicated employees and managers of SGI. This is consistent Tory policy. I want to say also that he attacked it on the basis that we constructed a new SGI head office. The opposition's position on this is very confused. On the one hand it says that SPC is making too much profit; on the other hand it's saying that SGI is not being run efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the whole philosophy behind the debate that was entered into by the member for Thunder Creek, one realizes he is speaking the Tory philosophy. I recall exactly the same type of attack back in 1964. At that time the attack was that we should not have built the SPC building which had been erected in downtown Regina. Today they're saying we should not have built the SGI building. The same attack took place on management. Today they're attacking John Green who has pioneered SGI and government insurance across Canada. In 1964 they attacked David Cass-Beggs who had brought power to all of the farms throughout Saskatchewan.

I want to say that this is a consistent Tory philosophy. We saw their stand on Petro-Can in the last election and two elections ago when the Tory party was elected. And what did the federal party say about Crown corporations? They said, "If we are elected, we'll get rid of the Crown corporations and Petro-Can will head the list." And this is consistent. The same attack upon the Crown corporations in Saskatchewan is happening today. That's what Joe Clark and the federal Tories would have done to the Crown corporations in the federal sector. In fact, the Tory party came to office dedicated to get rid of Petro-Can. Recently the leader of the Tory party had a change of heart. He said that if he had to do it again, what he would do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. What's the point of order?

MR. KATZMAN: — Can you tell me what this has to do with The Credit Union Act we're

discussing? He's off on a tangent again.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, this is The Saskatchewan Insurance Act, not the The Credit Union Act. I'm glad that the member for Rosthern raised this point because he has highlighted a difficult situation in this House.

When a member speaks on a bill and refuses to stay within the rules with regard to the content of that bill and the principle of the bill, then it makes it difficult for the Speaker, or whoever is in the Chair at that time, to make other speakers from that point onward adhere to the principle of the bill. Because some members don't adhere to the principle of the bill, then obviously all members should be given the same latitude and should not have to adhere to the principle of the bill before us.

The minister, I take it, is responding to some remarks which were made previously in this debate. It's unfortunate; if those remarks were out of order and the House refused to keep their remarks in order, then the problem falls back in the lap of the House.

HON. MR. KOSKIE: — Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, I want to stay within the rules of the House, and obviously I was setting the record straight as to the position that the hon. member for Thunder Creek so viciously put before the House.

I want to say, for the record, this government is very proud that we have a new modern office for SGI. I want to say that we are very proud that all of the money accruing through SGI throughout the years has remained in Saskatchewan. I want to say that we are very proud that through SGI we have been able to establish a large number of agents throughout the province providing service to the public at a level unequalled by any private sector. I want to say that we are proud, Mr. Speaker, of the expertise that we have developed in the insurance field by Saskatchewan people themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment to The Saskatchewan Insurance Act is in the right direction and I so move.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Romanow that Bill No. 3 — **An Act to amend The Trustee Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Koskie that Bill No. 36 — **An Act to amend The Land Titles Act** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan Act.

Sections 1 to 12 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act

Sections 1 and 2 agreed.

Section 3

MR. TAYLOR: — In section 3(b), it defines "minister":

the member of the Executive Council to whom for the time being the administration of this act is assigned.

Is it not, in your view, Mr. Minister, advantageous that the ministry of continuing education and the ministry of education be encompassed in the same personage? I wonder why you would want to have another cabinet minister who perhaps doesn't have the total picture. I see a need in our modern society to streamline our education system to best suit the needs of the people who are going to be entering the job market. Modern society is very fluid in its changes. It would seem logical to me that there may be changes that are required in the field of continuing education or in education (it might be better put that way) that would have profound implications for necessary or corresponding changes in the field of continuing education. Would you not agree that there is merit in having those two ministries put together? I notice that many of the cabinet ministers opposite carry more than one portfolio; I think you, Mr. Minister, are a good example of that. Therefore I don't think we can argue that the two portfolios are too much of a burden for one person. So therefore it would seem a bit logical that the same person would carry both of these, so that he would have a global view of education, from kindergarten right through to the post-graduate level. He would have a global view of education for special needs, right through; this person would have a global or an overall view of native education; he would have a global view of how the school system is fitting in to the continuing education system. It just seems logical to me that it is best handled when one person accepts that responsibility for that total package.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I think the question that the hon. member raises is certainly an interesting one. I'm not sure whether I understood him fully, whether he was suggesting that we should amalgamate the departments, or whether he was suggesting only that the minister should be the same minister for both departments. If it is with respect to the amalgamation of departments, I spent a very considerable amount of time with my counterpart from Ontario, who had undertaken just such a development, and her advice was that she did not think that it was really all that advisable to do the departmental amalgamation. I don't mean to be blaming her, but I found her advice was very helpful and useful in this, where Ontario had actually tried to do this. I think that one of the difficulties in departmental amalgamation is that you generate so much energy in terms of organization that you sometimes lose some of your energy for doing what you want to do.

However, if we had two departments, which I think the hon. member is indicating he is prepared to accept, then it is certainly not traditional, and I think would not be standard provision in legislation, to suggest that the legislation should dictate who the

Premier selects to be ministers of the departments. It is standard procedure that the minister is a minister over a department, and where you have separate departments, it is within the power of the Premier to assign those departments to the minister he chooses. If he chooses to do as he has done, and has the same minister responsible (which I think has many, many attractive features), that deals with some of the problems the hon. member raises. But I don't think legislation traditionally is designed in such a way, where you have separate departments, as to try to enforce upon the Premier a selection of certain ministers for those departments. So I don't think that that would be possible in the legislative way, but rather would have to be dealt with by the Premier.

MR. TAYLOR: — I think, Mr. Minister, you realize I wasn't thinking of amalgamating departments. I think that wouldn't be the type of move we'd be suggesting.

In your visits with other ministers of education, is it generally the trend that there are two departments and that those two departments are administered by the same person?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — I don't think you could say there's a general trend. I would say, from my understanding, in the first half of the past decade of the 1970s it was a trend to have separate departments and, in most cases, separate ministers. I think in the last two or three years there has tended to be more of a move back to maintaining separate departments and to have the same minister responsible for those departments. But that is not true exclusively. I know it is certainly not true in British Columbia; it is not true in Alberta. I believe it is true now in Manitoba and Ontario. So I guess you can say it has come down to kind of half and half.

MR. TAYLOR: — I think we could move on then. I perhaps agree with you to a certain extent, that maybe one wouldn't want to legislate and tie a premier's hands in whom he has to choose for these various ones, but I would hope in practice that this could probably be continued because I do think that it is very good to have a co-ordinating individual between the two departments.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed.

Section 5

MR. TAYLOR: — Is that where number 10 comes under — here in section 5? Well, Mr. Minister, I'm not going to go through the whole debate, and all the reasons that I and my colleague for Meadow Lake feel this is perhaps asking quite a bit. I think we on second reading put forth our case quite strongly in which we thought the fact that you have the power to make grants and "annual or other payments on any terms or conditions that may be prescribed in the regulations, to any person, agency, organization or institution" is a rather far-reaching power. I know on the explanatory notes you pointed out something about the handicapped, and I think we on this side would certainly support that. But the terms of any person under any conditions is certainly giving the Minister of Continuing Education a tremendous amount of power — making payments to almost whoever he would consider deserves a payment. And I think that kind of power vested in the hands of the minister is probably not in the best interests of continuing education. I think that as it previously was (that it would go before the Executive Council) gave a little bit of a check on an individual. I would wonder if there would be any possibility that you would consider taking a look at that particular clause?

Maybe you could justify or try to justify why you feel you need that power, or the ministry needs that power, and how that will further or better the cause of continuing education?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, the problem the hon. member is partly raising has to do with terminology and drafting of legislation. I would say to the hon. member one might very conveniently be able to suggest that when the act says "to any person for any functions" it sounds very open. But I would invite the hon. member to suggest how he would propose to write a restrictive section of the act which would restrict who may receive grants. Do you want to say that the Frontier College receives grants under this section? Should or should not? Do you want that to be in the legislation or would you rather have us deal with Frontier College as it relates to the educational needs of remote communities when they come and make application? I think that just gives you an example of the difficulty. The Lester B. Pearson College of the Pacific, the Canadian Bureau for International Education, organizations that receive grants — you simply can't draft legislation to say which of those should and should not get grants. Clearly they must be related to the functions of the department, they must be active in the field of continuing education.

This section prescribes that it shall be subject to the regulations, which is a further check, and it must be done by minister's order and, therefore, it must be a grant which is authorized and approved by treasury board through the budgetary review. It must be provided out of money provided through the estimates review here and approved in the appropriations; so there are many checks which take place. What this section essentially says is that for grants of less than \$10,000, having gone through those various stages of checks and balances, the minister then may authorize the payments through minister's order. If it is in excess of that, it must take place through an order of cabinet. I don't believe that opens up a great deal of difficulty. It simply simplifies the administration of these grants. There is certainly no suggestion here that any minister has the ability to just throw money around without constraints on the use of the money or on the amount of money. It must go through all of those stages of review and approval.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I noticed in your explanation to me that you chose organizations. You didn't use individuals as the example, but in here it says, "to any person." There are persons as well as agencies. I can see that it might streamline grants somewhat, but I don't know if steamlining grants and making it very, very easy to hand out money here and there to individuals without approval, check or surveillance, or without the few questions asked by other colleagues, is really in the best interest. I wonder what was wrong with the section as it read:

subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and to such conditions as he may prescribe, the minister may make regulations respecting the paying of grants for the purpose of furthering any activities related to any aspect of education that is under the control of the department.

Now, that gives it just that little extra check and balance. It is not going to prohibit any of these organizations, or any of these individuals from getting grants, but it is going to

require the minister to bring it before his colleagues, the rest of the cabinet. I think, personally, that is probably better legislation than this, which seems to give all power to the minister to make annual or other payments (they can be semi-annual, monthly, or daily) on any terms (that means that nobody else has to have a look at it) or conditions that may be prescribed in the regulations to any person, agency, organization, or institution. I would like you to take another run at this. I may agree with you on streamlining, but I don't know if streamlining is altogether the goal that we are looking at. Is it departmental efficiency we want, or is it money spent to help people who deserve continuing education? That is what I want to see. I want to see the money spent where it is going to help those people. I just wonder what is so wrong with having your other colleagues as a little check and balance, instead of one minister having the power to give money on any terms or any conditions to anyone he wants. I would like you to illustrate to me how, other than streamlining, this is going to help.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the point of dispute is here. I am having a little trouble. If the point of dispute is the change in the wording to allow provision for grants being paid to persons, as well as to agencies, organizations, and institutions (which is one of the points the hon. member raises), I would point out to the hon. member that we recently have been developing a native career development program. That program will have, as an important component, provision for training on the job or job-related training. As part of that, it would be necessary to make payments to employers which may be, in certain cases, corporations — but under the definition of The Interpretation Act, persons are corporations or individuals. It simply would not be possible for us to proceed with that program, or with a similar program with respect to people with disabilities, because we could not make those kinds of payments under the old wording. We need this change in wording to allow those kinds of payments to be made. In addition to that, under the native career development program, the individual trainees will receive certain payments to cover their costs, living allowances, and so on. We need this kind of amendment to make that possible. So if you are dealing with the question of why we are including persons in here now, in addition to agencies and organizations, the reason is that we are getting into programs, specifically the native career development program, that require that kind of wording in order to function.

Secondly, the federal government (and it was true of the previous Conservative federal government as well as the current government) is talking about the federal-provincial agreements they have, making greater provision for industry based training, including training on the job. In order to participate in those programs, which are now developing, we need this amendment so that we can make payments. This is because the payments come through the province and are then paid to the employers and the individuals being trained. We simply can't participate in those programs.

So, I certainly wouldn't suspect the hon. member is suggesting that we should leave the old act in place so as to hamstring our ability to undertake those important programs.

With regard to the second question, which is a different question, as to whether the cutoff should be zero, or \$5,000, or \$10,000, before requiring cabinet approval. I will point out to the hon. member that it is our considered view that a cutoff of \$10,000, with the kind of approvals we now have for grants, does streamline the process — that a minister's order, given the regulations giving the treasury board authorization, given the necessity for appropriation, is adequate to cover the final check on these. At over \$10,000 you're starting to deal with a more substantial amount of money and it's good to have a further cabinet check on the payments. I agree, it's judgmental. I can't defend \$10,000 as opposed to \$15,000, or \$5,000, by any particular argument, other than to

suggest to you that when you look at the structure of grants, \$10,000 seems to be not a bad breaking point. The ones below that figure tend to be the smaller grants and to be more numerous (for instance, making payments to individuals who participate in training programs). Surely, there's no point in asking cabinet to review all of those because they are under the regulations and there is no way cabinet can relate to those individual payments.

Section 5 agreed.

Section 6 agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Student Assistance and Student Aid Fund Act

Section 1

MR. TAYLOR: — I think we have debated this one quite thoroughly, too. I would like just a few comments from you, Mr. Minister. I think you know my concern about the eligibility for loans. We've made that case pretty plain. I know that some of this is tied up with federal legislation. Would you give this House your assurance that you will try to negotiate, at the federal level, a loosening up of this so that these students, whose parents have assets (as I've pointed out) but probably don't have a lot of cash flow (and that may be the case again this fall) would be eligible for those types of loans?

The other thing that concerns me is that the students in some cases are going out of the province to take the type of training they want. Can these students become eligible for loans? I know that if the courses are not offered in Saskatchewan, then I think they are, but there are quite a few cases of students who are not receiving loans. Those kinds of assurances are what we are most concerned with regarding the student loans.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, first of all I will reiterate what I said earlier. I certainly appreciate the support of the hon. member in the efforts that I have undertaken to try to see that we open up the terms of eligibility, because I do believe, as I've indicated to the hon. member, that some of the terms in the national program are too restrictive. I believe that, in particular, there are people in the lower-middle income groups to whom we should be providing a greater degree of access to this assistance. Even though they receive assistance, I think there is justification for looking at providing a better level of assistance.

I would point out to the hon. member, as I pointed out earlier, that a little over a year and a half ago I was successful in convincing my colleagues from the other provinces and the federal minister to put together a task force to review this whole subject. If the hon. member would use what I know is his significant influence with a number of other Conservative ministers of continuing and advanced education, who are responsible for the administration of the programs in their provinces, in order to convince them to support my efforts to bring about a change in the national criteria, I would very much appreciate his support.

I think it would be better utilized in that quarter, given the resistance that I have sensed in certain quarters to these kinds of changes, than directed at me. I am already a convert. In fact, I believe I was a convert before the hon. member was a convert. So I would ask him to use his considerable influence in that direction and I am sure we will

then bring about some very significant changes in the national program — changes which are needed. The other question the hon. member asked was with respect to eligibility for loans by those students who study outside the province. Certainly, there is eligibility now for loans by students who study outside the province and we will continue to provide them.

MR. TAYLOR: — Just on the comment of my using my influence, I think probably the easiest way I could do that is if we changed the government. You and I could trade places and that would be the way I could use my influence best.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Oil Well Income Tax Act

Section 1

MR. ANDREW: — I have a couple of questions, Mr. Minister, with regard to not so much the legislation as the situation as it relates to the oil and gas income tax act. Perhaps you would permit a couple of questions and then we can simply run through the rest of the legislation and get it off the paper, okay?

The question I have is not addressed in the legislation itself but it is the issue that is presently of some concern to the oil producers in the province. Given the superimposition of the national energy program on the present rules, both in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, and the impact of that national energy program because of the manner in which it is deducted prior to other deductions taking place, we find the producers in Saskatchewan, in particular of marginal wells and in heavy oil, after all the smoke has cleared, are in a negative or minus position with regard to production. I believe the statements that you have made have been to the effect that you don't perceive or don't see any substantial changes in the royalty positions. Now that would tend to beg the question by the word "substantial." Are you anticipating some amendment or some changes to bring those producers to at least a plus position as opposed to the minus 10 or 15 cents a barrel levels they have now?

HON. MR. COWLEY: — No, I think that at present we have no plans of making that kind of adjustment. What I meant by "substantial" is that if at any time the industry or some other group approached us and said a particular part of this tax was applying in a way that wasn't intended, etc., obviously we are open to it. In terms of making some general changes in the tax, which is what you are talking about, we don't at this time have any changes. Our position is that we had this royalty structure in place last year; things were reasonably good in the Saskatchewan oil patch. It's in place this year; the problem is the national energy program. Any changes we might make of a substantial nature would have to be made in the context of some change in the national energy program as it might apply to Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

MR. ANDREW: — Arising out of that comment, Mr. Minister, the point I would wish to raise with you is this. You are correct in your assessment that your system was in place and there was a fair amount of activity in the province prior to the implementation of the national energy program. In, let's say the Lloydminster area, many of the companies (or at least some of the companies) are not servicing their wells presently in production

because of the negative situation. They are proceeding to produce where they are producing. Now, it seems to me in that given area that the Government of Saskatchewan is in fact probably in a better stead than it was prior to the national energy program, given the fact that now you are receiving a certain amount of the export tax on heavy oil. Given this fact, I would suggest that the revenues of the province are in fact increasing as a result of the national energy program, taken as a whole in that regard.

Many people in the industry (and I think your department, like everyone else, is waiting for the decision of Husky as one of the major players in the Lloydminster field) and various publications speculate that 600 wells could be shut down once they have addressed their well-to-well assessment, or as many as 50,000 barrels could be shut down in production in the Lloydminster field. This is going to have a very serious impact on provincial royalties and the provincial budget, where we are seeing a \$600 million revenue coming in this year.

My question, Mr. Minister, is basically this: given the fact that the national energy program was not all negative factors to the provincial government, is there any thought of perhaps modifying the royalty taken by the province in the heavy oil area so that we don't have to face the very serious question of substantial shutdowns in the Lloydminster area? This could have serious implications, I suggest, both for provincial revenues and perhaps for the upgrader that is proposed to be built.

HON. MR. COWLEY: — I don't have any quarrel with the member's comments with respect to the impact on provincial revenues. Obviously, if wells shut in, we, as a provincial government, lose the royalties we would have otherwise received. My arguments have never been that we are better off financially to not make adjustments. I think that the position of the federal government is the one which the member is putting, that is, that we do derive, at least temporarily, some benefits from the national energy program and, consequently, we should reduce our royalties to make way for the PGRT (petroleum and gas resource tax).

I think the member should look at two or three things there. The PGRT is now at 8 per cent, which works out to about 24 per cent in terms of cash flow. The federal government was careful to say in its budget that this is not fixed for all time and so it could indeed be 12 or 16 per cent at some point in the future, near or far, depending on what you think of the federal government's need for cash.

So I think any action on our part to reduce our royalties to take account of the federal government's PGRT has two effects: (1) it just encourages the federal government to follow through; (2) it puts our neighbour to the west in a somewhat awkward position by Lalonde's next comment which would be, "See, Saskatchewan has reduced its royalties; why don't you do the same?" I'm not sure that I want to put either them or us in that position.

Secondly, with respect to the sharing of the export tax which we now have with the federal government — at least, we believe we have — we have yet to receive any of the money . . . Has the legislation entered parliament? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It hasn't even entered parliament in Ottawa yet. Furthermore, there is no guarantee as to how long we'll receive any money from that. Half of the export tax on oil going out of Saskatchewan could be a significant amount of money, but if there was no oil exported, there wouldn't be any. Half of nothing is nothing.

We saw in January the impact of an increase in the federal government export tax in the near shutdown of our exports to the U.S. Given what is occurring in Alberta with the Alberta government's cutbacks in production, there is the possibility that all of our oil may be diverted to eastern Canada, in which case there will not be any export tax for us to share 50 per cent of. So, to use the numbers, it's difficult to know, in both the short run and the medium term, what there will be for Saskatchewan in terms of revenue from the export tax. As I said before, both publicly and privately to the industry and to others, it seems to me that the federal government's national energy program is designed to force provinces to reduce their shares of the revenues. It seems to me not to be a wise thing for us to do because it simply invites further increases by the federal government with respect to the national energy program.

MR. ANDREW: — I have two comments with regard to that, Mr. Minister. I think the Premier has indicated several times in the Assembly that the provinces are anticipating substantial revenues from that anticipated rebate of that export tax. I appreciate your comments, as well, with regard to the impact that your actions might have on the province of Alberta. I would simply say that in the past it hasn't seemed to me that the province of Saskatchewan has ever been very concerned about the impact that its policy might have on the province of Alberta, whether it was in the field of oil and gas or whether it was in the field of the constitution or anything else.

My question, Mr. Minister, and the point I wish to make is simply this. Although I appreciate your caution (and I think everyone shares that caution equally), the one fact is that the province of Saskatchewan's take from the oil industry (for various reasons — maybe it's a smaller factor in our provincial budget or whatever it might be) is still substantially higher than the province of Alberta's. We are still looking at the situation where the producers on the Alberta side of the border are showing a profit on their production of heavy oil, and the producers on the Saskatchewan side are not showing a profit, although they have been carrying on for some period of time and some of them, in particular Husky, as a good corporate citizen, are addressing the question and may bite the bullet and hang on for a while. But we cannot expect even Husky to hang on for a long period of time. It would appear that what the minister is saying is that he will remain intransigent even if that period runs for a year to two years, and that we will face the shutdown rather than make that particular move.

The second point which I see being made by the minister, and, I think, by the Premier, is that we are, in the words of the Premier, not really players in the national energy debate right now. "That's primarily an issue between Ottawa and Alberta. Saskatchewan can do very little except ride along with it." So, when you give those two factors, I wonder whether or not the points which are being made by you are bona fide, Mr. Minister. I wonder whether we are going to see a shutdown as the whole national energy program and debate drones on for another two years before we see any material change in it.

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Well, obviously, one can interpret the discussions which are going on, the positioning of the various parties, the likely outcome, and the duration of it, in different ways and what is the best policy for the Government of Saskatchewan to follow in the short run and the long run is obviously open for debate. It is our position (the position we have taken) that since the problems are caused by the national energy program, the solutions should be forthcoming from that program, and that we should continue to hold our discussions with the federal government, which we are doing at the official level. I'm not optimistic about any particular outcome there. Alberta's minister, Mr. Leach, is meeting on April 13 with Mr. Lalonde. I don't know what the outcome of that will be. I presume that later we will have an opportunity to meet with Mr. Lalonde.

We are in reasonably close contact with Alberta and its position.

I think one can debate whether or not our position is right. I am simply giving you our position and the reasons for it. I recognize that there are other options which we could follow. For now and the foreseeable future, we don't propose to change our position. Obviously, 6, 12 or 18 months from now, we will be continually reviewing the situation. We may later decide that some other course of action is advisable, but for now, that is the course we are following.

MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Chairman, to expedite matters, I can advise the Chair that I will not be objecting to the lengthy legislative changes going through, and have no questions on them. I don't suspect that there are any other questions from the floor, and I'm now prepared to waive them through.

Sections 1 to 15 inclusive agreed.

Section 16

HON. MR. COWLEY: — Mr. Chairman, a brief comment on that. That amendment takes us back to January 1. This is part of the agreement we worked out with the industry. This bill was introduced last fall. If it had been passed then, we wouldn't have made it retroactive. There is no particular problem, but we've done it. It simplifies everyone's bookkeeping if it starts on January 1, rather than having two systems which change over in the middle of the year.

Section 16 as amended agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Sections 1 to 14 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 22 — An Act to amend The Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. minister I move that the bill now be read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Department of Continuing Education Act

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Student Assistance and Student Aid Fund Act

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Oil Well Income Tax Act

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — I now move the amendments be read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. ROMANOW: — By leave, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 27 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

HON. MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOWS

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce the officials, as you suggest. First of all, I would like to introduce Dr. Will Toombs, who is the deputy minister of continuing education, newly appointed January 1, 1980. In front of Dr. Toombs are: Mr. Lew Riederer, assistant deputy minister; Don Philippon, director of policy and program planning; behind me I have Doug McGuigan, budget officer; Mr. Frank May, who is director of administration; in addition to that, Mr. Matthes, Mr. Kutarna, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. McKendry.

Item 1

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I think the biggest concern facing the students of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan, in regard to continuing education, probably would be the question: are these students being given the training that they will need to take a part in what we view as the new Saskatchewan? I think we all realize in the decade of the '80s, and speculating upon what may come in the '90s, that the rate of change taking place makes one wonder if the existing programs and curricula, which are in place today in Saskatchewan, are what is needed to have these people fit in to share what we hope is a great future in this province.

I think that is the number one question that is running through the minds of many

people. I think people, as a whole, are quite willing to support education, be it at the school level or be it at the university level or the technical school level, if they feel that they're getting their dollar's worth and that their children are going to be equipped to take part in the mainstream of society. I think that is the one question the people who are involved in education today should be addressing. Are we attempting to meet those needs of what is going to be out there in 10 years or in 5 years?

I wonder if your department, as a department, is gearing up for this highly technical age that we seem to be entering — the age of the computer. We hear every day in the House that the computer may have erred, or the computer did this. We're into the age of the computer, but are we equipping people to really understand and to realize the effect that that computer is going to have upon their daily lives, and certainly upon the way in which they take their part in the job market and in the future of this province? I think those are the areas which continuing education has to be addressing and has to be making adjustments.

When you see programs and interviews at the universities in the province, where they're interviewing the graduates, you find that certain graduates in certain areas, even today, in 1981, are not being grabbed up in the job market and are not finding employment. In other areas, in the more technical type of area (let me cite engineering for an example), they are being offered 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 jobs, before they even graduate. Are we really looking at this in a whole comprehensive viewpoint? There is a danger, I suppose (being educated in the academics yourself, and having come through them as many of us have) that it probably is the only way to stardom and grandeur, and to understanding the world around us, and making our niche in society. This new society (I don't know what it will be like) has to look to see what type of people it will need to take part in it. I wonder if we are inclined to look at our own past track record, at what we studied and what we had to go through in our levels of continuing education, and make the false assumption that more of the same is going to satisfy the needs of the students today and in the future.

I just think of the possibilities in the Lloydminster area in the heavy oil and the spinoffs that will come in the way of jobs, if and when we ever get our energy problems in this country worked out — that area of the province and the estimated number of jobs it will take and will provide for people. I wonder if we are, at this point in time, training our youth in Saskatchewan and equipping them adequately for this. I know in your budget you announced some new training facilities in Prince Albert, some new geological training at the university. I think that is good. I commend you for that. What I am asking is: is that enough? Are we really tackling the whole thing of technical education in the province?

Then along with this new technology, this new Saskatchewan, and this new future that we can envisage to a certain extent, comes the thing of the new leisure of people. I don't know what the work week is now, but if I try to contact people on a Friday afternoon, many times I can't find them; they are out at the lake. That's fine and dandy. But the work week could even be compressed more. I wonder then, in the whole field, if people are not at their places of work, they will be taking part in leisure. When I think of leisure, I think of the journalism which we fought for in the campus (and I believe that school is operating now); I think of the radio arts, the television arts and the performing arts, these sorts of things.

When I was teaching school, if a student came to me and said, "Where can I go to take this type of training?" Basically, I had to say, "Well, you want to go down to Ryerson in

Toronto." Many didn't want to go that far away from home. Or there were some schools in Lethbridge, Alberta that offered some of these classes. I cite those as a couple of examples of the technology, the role of the blue-collared worker in this new technical type of society which we are entering into at a rapid rate. I also look at the whole field of communications, the performing arts and the type of people who will be taking part in providing some of the leisure entertainment for this new workforce. Then I look, as I say, at the recent stats on the graduates at the universities. I see that for many of the graduates there are not a great number of jobs available.

Now, I know it is hard to plan, because things change very rapidly. But, I think, as a Department of Continuing Education, it has to be of paramount consideration in your planning.

I'd like you to just comment a bit, Mr. Minister, on those things that I have laid out at this point.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member certainly raises a valid and important concern. There is no question that we are facing very, very rapidly changing circumstances with regard to the need and demand for trained, educated people in our society. I would say to the hon. member that I certainly agree that we must be doing some planning for the future. The hon. member mentions that while he agrees with providing for training facilities, such as the new provision for a technical institute in Prince Albert, and with the program of very major expansion of the engineering facilities at the University of Saskatchewan and now of the geological sciences and so on, such facilities are not the whole answer. I agree with the hon. member. I think we certainly must have the infrastructure or the facility to do what is necessary, but we recognize that facilities are not the whole of what's needed. I would indicate to the hon. member that, indeed, I think one has to start at some point to ask some basic questions about what the goals of education are and how one would relate education, not only to the academic skills and the basic skills — the three Rs and that sort of thing — but beyond that to the relationship of people who are coming out of our education system to the world of work.

I think that applies equally well at the elementary and at the high school level as well as at the technical and university level. There is no question that the world of work, the word of life in the community, the world of citizenship — all of those things — are important considerations in the way you organize your programs. I will say to the hon. member that we have been undertaking, first of all, as part of the recognition of that, a very major review and redevelopment of the curriculum, both in the school system and in the post-secondary system — at least as it affects us directly. With respect to what the hon. member has been talking about more specifically — technical and vocational education — we recognize that the world is changing very rapidly and that the skills people are trained for today may not necessarily be the specific skills they'll need five years from now. Therefore, we are undertaking to redevelop the basic curriculum as it applies to all of our technical and vocational programs so there will be a greater degree of flexibility in those programs, they will relate more clearly to the demands we can project into the future and they do in fact provide within that training some high degree of flexibility, so that young people who are trained today will not be caught in job ghettos tomorrow.

So, yes, I agree with you. I think the place to start, first and foremost, is with curriculum and we are doing a major amount of work with respect to that. Secondly, and related to that, is the whole question of scope of training — what kind of areas you cover. We have

been making and will continue to make major provision for a widely expanded scope of programs. Certainly the communications technologies, the computer technologies, the computational technologies and all those related fields are areas where we have been expanding our capacity to provide education very substantially in the technical and vocational sectors. In addition to that, we recognize that, because education is so important to young people — and adults as well — in terms of their future work and life in the community, the access that people have to these programs is very important. I have been concerned that, to a certain degree, the highly centralized institutional-based programs have not provided the full opportunities they should have to as many people as possible because of the circumstances of people that limit their ability to travel to the larger centres to take the kind of programs that are offered — their ties to the community and to family or other social circumstances that detract from the ability of rural people to fully take advantage of these programs. So we are also looking at providing for a much more decentralized basis of delivery of our vocational and technical credit programs. We have in the budget this year a major commitment to training, in terms of decentralized, rural-based, vocational and technical training.

The last thing I would mention to the hon. member in that respect is simply that we recognize the vast growth in demand for training and training spaces. We are providing that through major expansion in our programs — not just in our facilities but in the programs themselves.

I would say to the hon. member that he may be aware that about a year, or a year and a half ago, we had a report produced by the Department of Continuing Education (it is in libraries, and so on, around the province) called VOTECH 90, in which, in the vocational and technical area, we looked at all of these questions. We have been working from that report to develop a comprehensive, integrated planning framework to deal with all of these changes, which, I agree, are very much with us as we go into the 1980s.

The hon. member makes reference to university education. I don't fully agree with all of his comments. I recently received a report from the University of Saskatchewan that indicated that the last year or two, at least, compare as well with any other year in history, in terms of young people being able to take up job opportunities as a result of the university education they have obtained. That appears to apply very evenly across all faculties and all areas of training. I think that we are going to need, and it will be to the benefit of young people to take advantage of, vocational technical training. Likewise, it will be to their advantage to take the opportunities which fit their needs and interests and to take advantage of a university training.

I think that our universities are doing a good job. I believe there probably are areas, in terms of the basic curriculum (just as we're doing in the other two parts of the system), that they could be looking at. Of course, as the hon. member knows, the self-governing nature of institutions in the university sector requires that they do that themselves.

I have had some discussions with them. In fact, as recently as three weeks ago, I met with the senior deans, presidents and administrators of the two universities to discuss these and other related topics — about ways of planning our education system, integrating things and looking at certain questions of curriculum and the interrelationship between curriculums.

But I don't think that things are nearly as bad as the hon. member seems to imply, with respect to the opportunities that university grads have open to them.

MR. TAYLOR: — I was commenting on, and I think you probably saw the same television show, where there were interviews with the students at the campus. Obviously I'm not criticizing the social sciences (I'm a graduate of the social sciences myself), but the fact of the matter is that these people weren't getting jobs — whereas, in fields of engineering and technologies, there was a line-up for them. I think that we would agree that education is basically to broaden one's horizons, and one's understanding and to make one a more adaptable and understanding person — a person with a broader viewpoint. On the other hand, I think there is the utilitarian aspect of education. We have to take a serious look at that. In many people's minds, that is the priority. They will pay for the goods if they feel they are getting the goods.

When I am addressing this, I am looking at the whole picture of the needs that have to be met to satisfy what may be developing now. I wonder how you are going to address and co-ordinate the problem of overlap. I know the two university campuses are autonomous, but we have to have some type of co-ordination. I am pleased to hear that you have met with these people, because that is just the type of thing I've been talking about. We have to look with a vision to where we're going and what's out there. You mentioned that as, perhaps, being the goal — that could be. But we cannot afford to have needless overlap because of various jurisdictions. We cannot be selling areas short because maybe they are not as glamorous or they are not what we came through in the past. We have to be addressing this question: what are the needs out there? When we talk about this, we must have the money to do it. That is the next important thing. We have to put together a package that will provide these types of opportunities and programs that are going to be demanded.

For example, I don't know whether we have adequate training for day care workers. You announce that you will double the funds for day care. You must have the personnel. I see, as I go around the country, many people with two family incomes. I ran into a girl yesterday, who is a nanny, brought all the way from England. Do we train any domestics in this country? I don't see anyone coming out of our continuing education institutions who is trained as a domestic. Maybe there is a need. Maybe that's one of the needs and maybe we are coming to that situation. I don't know if we are today adequately training the day care workers.

I will put that question to you. Do you feel that there are programs in place to train the people needed to man the day care centres which are going to be developing with these new funds? Maybe the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland would like to answer, but I will address it to you, Mr. Minister.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I am glad to answer that question. If the hon. member will check back in the review of the estimates last year in the budget debate, I believe it was about a year ago that I announced the introduction of a new day care worker training program. That program is now being fully developed and we will be admitting students, hopefully, at the beginning of next September. That program has been provided for.

I agree with the hon. member that, certainly, we need to recognize the very important needs of day care centres for trained personnel. This program, I believe, will be the best that's available in Canada. It will provide for a one-year and a two-year program leading to certificates and diplomas. The program which is developing, the curriculum that is coming into place and the staff we have will certainly make it a program that is to be

envied. I appreciate the hon. member's support. I was a year ahead of him on that one, but I still appreciate his support. I am looking forward to that program playing a very important role in meeting our day care needs.

MR. ANDREW: — My question follows up on the questions by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley. Mr. Minister, the statement that you have made is that you are moving away from what we might call the standard form of education, which we see in our high school system, into a more job-oriented system of curriculum. Is that what we are basically talking about — much in the direction, let's say, that takes place in England or in West Germany or even in some of the oriental countries where they are starting to address the question of technology, the question of being able to produce the manpower that we are going to need as we go into the next decade with regard to the whole field of high technology, electronics, energy and related areas?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, perhaps I should clarify that — I think the hon. member made reference to the high school system. One of the things that our review of the high school curriculum will be looking at to find is to recognize that many, many students do not pursue basically academic programs after high school. I think it is only about 30 per cent who pursue academic programs and 70 per cent who do not. What that tells me is that there is a need to recognize that there is another aspect of the world of work besides the academic kinds of pursuits that will impinge upon the needs of those students. But we are not suggesting that, at the high school level, students should become vocationally skilled for particular trades or occupations. I think that is perhaps a bit too early; there can be emphasis within the high school options which are provided such that students can become more familiar with the kind of knowledge and the kinds of skills which might relate to the general areas which they might be pursuing. My opinion at the present time is that it would not be wise to set up the school system as a prevocational training program, that is, in the sense of preparing young people to move directly into occupations with specialized training which is required for those occupations.

Essentially what we are doing is recognizing that occupations require, as you mentioned, basic skills and understanding in the areas of technology and administration, and a lot of other areas, and that we should be trying to recognize the need to provide for literacy skills in those areas — an understanding of those areas and some grasp of how one can gain a better understanding and the basic knowledge which goes with those areas. It will provide an opportunity for those students to more readily move directly into the more specialized vocation preparation that comes at the post-secondary level through technical and vocational programs. So, we're looking at an integration without streaming students into particular vocations at the high school level.

MR. ANDREW: — My question, Mr. Minister, basically is this: I think you would agree that certainly some of the European countries that have been successful in this area have, in fact, moved much earlier than the post-secondary school system to address the question of job needs. I think your statistics indicate that 70 percent of the students coming out of the high school system do not, in fact, go on to further forms of education — either to university or to the technical schools. It seems to me that the problem we're going to face in this part of the country over the next 10 or 15 years is a serious shortage of trained technical people in various areas of the technologies — because that's the area we will probably be able to address, and that's to our advantage in this part of the country. Maybe other parts of the country are not as fortunate and do not have the resources, etc., to be able to address that question. I think it's important we

seize on that in this region of the country, because I think we can make a contribution to this country and to the world in that given area.

It seems to me that one of the great problems we're going to be facing over the next decade is that in the past many of the trained people we were able to attract in given areas came from the European countries. It now appears, from the writings in the field, that those people (whether they come from England or from other areas of western Europe) are not interested in coming to Canada now because the standard of living is no longer the bright, shining thing, high above their own. In fact, they have comparable standards of living and they want to stay home in their own countries. Therefore, we face what I think is a massive problem in obtaining trained people. For example, if we were to commence the nuclear refinery in Saskatchewan, or address the question of the oil upgrader, or address the question of the tertiary recovery of oil, or if we were to proceed with the petro-chemical industry, with the tar sands, with coal development, etc., western Canada would have a very serious need for skilled workers and a very difficult time finding them. I think most people will agree that we're going to have to produce our own trained people.

Given that situation, and given the situation of a fair amount of turn-around time before we have those people in place, it seems to me that we're not, in fact, addressing that question quickly enough. We are going to have to sit down and look very seriously at more job-creating or job-oriented educational systems, not only in our post-secondary schools, but also in our high schools. Nobody seems to want to make that extra step as they have done in some of the other countries that have shot ahead of Canada and the United States, as it relates to productivity and as it relates to being able to seize upon the high technologies. And given that, Mr. Minister, would you not agree with me that, in fact, we have to do much more than we are doing now? I don't say that you are doing less than another province, but we have to do much more to address this question if we're going to survive in the '80s and on to the '90s.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree that we have to recognize this need and deal with it, and that we're working under fairly constrained time frames, although it's not that we're starting from nowhere. We've had a very good system of technical-vocational training but the demands, I agree with the hon. member, are pressing on that system. I don't think, first of all, it's true to say that the European experience has been one of utilizing the secondary school system for specialized pre-vocational training, that is to say, training that leads people directly into specialized jobs in the workplace. The European system is converging much more to the direction to which we're converging, or making efforts toward converging, and that is providing our students who come out of the high school system with a good sophisticated level of basic literacy in the high technology and technology related fields. The post-secondary system and the employers themselves need to pick up people from that point and provide a further level of more sophisticated specialized training for specialized and particular work. But I agree with the hon. member. We certainly are moving very substantially in that direction with our curriculum programs that are under way now with respect to the school system.

With respect to the post-school technical-vocation training, I would point out to the hon. member that a major area of emphasis in this year's budget deals with the whole question of providing exactly that kind of resource-related and technology-related post-secondary education in the technical and vocational fields. We have a major expansion of the STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute) taking place. We have a major new institute developing in Prince Albert. We have a very large amount of additional

resources devoted toward, in addition to that, providing decentralized training so that the training can take place at the North Battlefords and the Melforts and the Kindersleys or Lloydminsters or wherever.

It is appropriate to take training to people who are going to be working in areas of employment that relate to the regional needs of those areas, and relate to the interests of the students from those areas. So this budget makes a very, very major commitment to that very kind of investment in those kinds of needs. I think we have to keep pushing forward. We simply have to recognize, as the hon. member said, how quickly things are changing and that for reasons of availability of people from outside the province, as well as for reasons of wanting to provide the opportunities for our own people (which I think is important), we should emphasize this area of education very strongly. And that we are doing.

MR. ANDREW: — I suppose it's not fair to raise these points in the estimates of continuing education, which stresses the higher level of education, but I think it's very important. It's difficult to look at the two in isolation. It seems to me one of the big problems that is being faced at least in rural schools, in the high school system, is quite frankly that the education system seems to be addressing itself to the average student. In fairness, I think perhaps the city schools address it much more because they have far more resources; they have far more students.

But the problem that I see in the rural Saskatchewan schools is basically this: we address our whole program to the average student. There is very little in it for the over-achiever or the exceptional student. Probably equally as well, there's not that much for the under-achiever, the person who could be diverted into the technical fields at an earlier age and clearly has the problem with the standard forms of curriculum in the high school grades, particularly the last three or four grades of high school. If that person were able to gear himself, or channel his education more into the technical fields of the welding, the pipe fitting and the machinists, he is going to be very much in demand certainly in this decade. That's number one. Number two is that the question of the high achiever, to my way of thinking, is not being addressed by our school system. Those are the people who can go on further into advanced education and deal with questions of high technology, deal with questions of administration, etc. I think we have, by and large, as a country, a very well-educated group of citizens. But that is the area we must seize upon, it seems to me, if we are going to go into the future and make it count as an economic contribution to this nation.

So, all I'm saying, Mr. Minister, is that it seems to me we have to go back and tie continuing education to the whole area of education. I'm far from being any kind of an expert in the field of education, but it seems to me that those are two areas which are not being addressed, clearly in our rural schools, and I think they are areas that should be addressed.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I think I have some disagreement with the terminology that the hon. member is using, and I will make reference to that. To be fair, I appreciate that you are not trying to argue a highly detailed point, but I would point out that we just recently, from the Department of Education, released a discussion paper on rural education which I think you have had an opportunity to review.

In an important way, that paper addresses the questions you're talking about — recognizing that we do have certain kinds of interests and certain kinds of skills and

requirements that we perhaps have not been meeting as well as we should have, particularly in the rural schools. We also discovered, in that report, that even though the opportunities seem to be there in the urban schools, we don't seem to be meeting the students' needs as well as we should in that area.

I do want to take just a little bit of exception to your terminology, not to be argumentative, but to clarify a point. I wouldn't categorize these in terms of over-achievers and average-achievers and under-achievers. I think what we really are talking about is different aptitudes, different skills and different interests. I think you are probably referring basically to the academic versus the more vocationally-related areas of emphasis within the curriculum, if you like.

I would say to the hon. member that I think, generally speaking, our schools (and certainly that study would confirm this) in Saskatchewan do an excellent job in terms of providing an educational standard for the academic orientation. I think in terms of the question of, say, the gifted student within that, there is a need for additional program support in our schools to meet those needs. But, I think, generally, in terms of the academic student, we do an excellent preparation job with those who are going to pursue academic studies.

I do agree with the hon. member that we do have some very important questions which we need to address, particularly in the rural schools, in terms of those students who do not pursue an academic program beyond school, who go directly into the world of work, or who go into technical or vocational training programs. I think, as that paper points out, that there are some things we have to explore. It's not easy to do in the small schools, and it is a real challenge to try to put it together. But I think it can be put together, and I agree with the hon. member that if we do that we are going to meet the interests and needs of a whole group of students whose needs we are perhaps not meeting as well as we should at the moment.

MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, a comment to the minister. My colleague was mentioning the programs in the schools. I want to keep this on continuing education, but this relates to the discussion we had earlier this afternoon on the ministries. Really, the Department of Continuing Education in this province dictates to the students in the schools what subjects they will take. That's where you will have to have overall planning because basically the students in the schools of Saskatchewan take the "straight eight," as we call it. And although we've expanded in the fields of technical and vocational education, if you want to go on in continuing education in this province, you have to go back to straight academics, Mr. Chairman. I can't see that as being the type of planning we need to satisfy these new technological needs. I can't see why a student who comes through a motor mechanics course and then wants to get into a technical field at STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute) or Kelsey Institute, has to have, for example, history. He has to have some history to be a well-rounded individual. But they are a technical kind of people. I say that we have to look at this whole situation. I know it's not an easy one to answer. Demands are made on many of our technical people, or so-called technical students to have social sciences, sciences, maths and English. I agree that you need a basic core there, but on the other hand, I don't think that these other things, which kind of dovetail into that, should be penalized. That's the situation.

That's why I say that continuing education has, in the past, kind of been focused toward the university and the academics. I'm not knocking the academics in any way, shape or form. As long as we're going to be a culture in a civilized society, we're certainly going to have to have the academics, too. But we have to be looking at this

other type of avenue. I think that's what my colleague was looking at and discussing. If you want to respond to that, I'll be glad to hear your views.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — If I might just briefly comment, this discussion almost scares me because I don't know whether I'm slipping the way of the old Tories or the old Tories are slipping the way of the new socialists. I really can't disagree with the basic assumption which you talk about there.

Since becoming minister, I have had a lot of discussions, both with my officials in the Department of Continuing Education and with the universities. We have some major redevelopment work going on in our curriculum in this direction. It suggests, basically, that the very strict, rigid, academically oriented entrance requirements, with respect to certain parts of our post-secondary system (and even, perhaps, the strictness which applies to the university system), are something which we should be looking at. We can very well slip into restricting access for students who have abilities, skills and aptitudes which suit the kind of program we have there, but who, because of those entrance requirements, are denied access.

So, I am very strongly in support of the view that we must be assessing that and providing more flexible aspects of entrance so that the students going back to school can pursue programs within the school system which have a broader base and are better geared to their aptitudes and interests. I agree with the hon. member entirely that we must not lead people to conclude from that that we want to discard the basic, liberal arts skills — reading, writing, and basic literary skills. We want that to be an integral part of the programs which those young people take. I agree with you that they should be able to broaden out that basic program to suit their needs and aptitudes without feeling that their access to technical schools or vocational institutes will be restricted as a result.

MR. TAYLOR: — Just in reply to the minister, reading from the people I talked to out there, we're gaining and you're slipping, but we'll leave that. The other thing is, if we want to get these estimates over, please do not brand my seatmate here as a socialist or we may be here for quite some time.

We've probably discussed the philosophical natures of this. I hope I've laid out to you my concerns, and I hope that you take those seriously and act upon them. They're offered to you with the sincere hope that we may try and improve the system.

Let us get down to some of the more practical things, then, some of the actual implementation. I remember last year, Mr. Minister, you spoke in your address on the budget, I believe it was, about the decentralizing and going out into the rural areas with a module type of approach through the community colleges. I have been waiting with bated breath to see where this develops. I don't know if you mean the new school up in Prince Albert, if that is your idea of one or not. But that still is rather a large urban area. I am thinking of those people out in the areas of say, Maryfield and Wilkie and these outlying extremities. How are you going to be getting this type of module program? What progress has been made? How are you coming along with its implementation?

It sounded exciting at the time, and I may have missed something. I think I have addressed this to you before. It fits right into native education. In my constituency I have five native reserves for this type of training. It is very imperative that we get it going quickly if we want to draw these people into the whole work force in this opportunity for the future which we have been discussing. What have you done to date, and what are

you planning to do?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — First, we are not talking, in terms of this outreach or decentralized delivery, about the development of, say, a new institute at Prince Albert, other than that will support the carrying of additional and new programs onto an outreach basis into communities as well.

We have appointed a co-ordinator in the department to work on the further development of this overall program. We have been experimenting with some pilot projects over the past year and utilizing primarily the vocational high schools around the province, because they have the facilities to which we can adapt most quickly if we want to move with some experiments and pilot projects. We have started, during this past year, with some pilot projects around the province. This year's budget makes a major commitment to 150,000 training days under that program. We will be moving ahead with some vigour, based on the experience we have developed with that program, concentrating primarily at this stage (it is not to say that that will be exclusively, or that that will be the case as we move down the road two or three years) on utilizing those facilities we have in those vocational high schools around the province in Yorkton, North Battleford, Swift Current, Estevan, Weyburn, and Melfort to provide training that is identified, through the community colleges and those communities, as being required for the needs of those communities and the students who are interested in pursuing those programs.

MR. TAYLOR: — Will you give me an example? You said you had some pilot projects going on. Where was the pilot, and what type of programs were offered?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I think to get the 1980-81 figures in detail, I would have to give those to you later. But I can indicate that we were able, during the past year, to organize approximately 35,000 training days on that basis. We're going to move that up to 40,000, hopefully, in this coming year as a result of expansion of these projects already under way.

The concentration, roughly, would be distributed among the Yorkton area, the Lloydminster area, and the Prince Albert area, where up to this time we have not had an institute. The Prince Albert area has received a major amount of attention in this direction. Those are basically the areas where we have been concentrating our projects to date.

MR. TAYLOR: — Within your project, what type of programs have you been offering? I would like just an example of some.

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, primarily in the traditional trades-related fields at this time — truck driver training, carpentry, some basic welding, and steel fabrication. We have, in the newer areas, the emergency medical technician program as well. I don't have the details in each program, but most of them have been in the basic trades-related areas, and particularly in the areas I mentioned.

MR. TAYLOR: — Last year we raised some concerns about the psychology department at the University of Regina. You pointed out that you did not care to interfere in any way, shape or form. In fact, you pointed out that you wouldn't take much action on it. There were some reports that came down. They were not public reports. There was some discussion of people being let go. I just wonder if you feel that the situation has improved in that department? Did you make any representation at any time, and if so,

what type of representation, and what is the situation at this time in the psychology department of the Regina campus?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, without trying to evade the question, I do think that would be a question better addressed to the chairman of the board of governors or to the president of the university. Let me try to answer with the limited knowledge I have of the situation, but the member must recognize that decisions with respect to the program, staffing, and academic standards within the university are matters that the university itself maintains vigilance, control and direction over. On receiving the representation from the students last year, I did pass on the fact of the representation to, I believe, the president of the University of Regina. As well, I have on occasion discussed with the president of the University of Regina the progress, if you like, they have made, in terms of dealing with some of the difficulties they had there, without my being able to define exactly what the nature of the difficulties were, or what specific solutions were required.

I do know that the University of Regina did take steps to deal with some of the problems it has been able to identify there, partly through the review of the reports the hon. member mentions. I should point out that those reports were not in my possession; they were not my property. They were not advanced to me by the university; they were the property of the university. But, on the basis of those reports, and its own internal reviews (which were very extensive), it did take some steps to deal with some of the difficulties that had arisen.

They appointed an acting department head to deal with that situation. That acting department head, it has been reported to me, did a very good job. Since that time there has been a department head appointed. I understand, from reports I have had, that the situation is now very good.

MR. TAYLOR: — What about funding for secondary education? Am I right that Francis Fox made an announcement that the established funding program between the federal and provincial governments was due to lapse on April 1 next year. Now looking at the situation as it exists within this country at this time, and seeing the announcement of the federal Minister of Health the other day that if you don't eliminate extra billing they will cut off the funding, do you as minister see any movement on behalf of the federal government to perhaps pull back or restrict the amount of funding that they are presently putting into post-secondary education in this province?

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, as a bit of background, the federal government starting, I believe, in 1977 or 1978, redeveloped its program of fiscal transfers and support of social programs away from the earlier cost-sharing arrangements into what has become known as the EPF (established program of financing). Under that program they agreed through a formula to transfer to the provinces unconditional money to utilize in support of their social programming. There was no distinction in that agreement between health and education and aspects of other programs related to that, but rather it was unconditional and open to the provinces to use as they saw fit, according to their own priorities. The federal government did that in order, as they put it, to put some cap on the costs so that they could separate the provincial spending decisions from their own financial expenditures.

Recently the federal government, including Mr. Fox, at a meeting that I attended, indicated that it is now seriously considering restricting those fiscal transfers to the health field only, as a result very substantially reducing the amount of money that will be transferred directly to the provinces. What they are saying in their statements — which they have not announced, I agree, as formal policy, but certainly have given very strong indications to the universities and governments about — is that they, therefore, expect that the impact of those very serious cutbacks (and they are talking about cutting back \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion in terms of transfers to the provinces) should fall upon the post-secondary education system.

The logical result, if that should happen, is that the universities and the technical institutes — but particularly the universities — would need to very substantially increase the money that they can draw from other sources, particularly from students through tuition fees. It is a movement in a very serious way, if the federal prescription were followed, toward a user-pay system beyond anything that we've ever imagined for our university education in Canada up until the present time. It seems that what they are talking about is providing some, although not nearly all, of the money that will be cut back to students through the issuance of vouchers, or certificates of that sort, through which the students can then go and purchase spaces in these much more costly programs that will be offered at the universities. Apparently the federal government feels in this way that they can get more direct control over the priorities within the universities, and at the same time, slot people into educational programs in accordance with some sort of national manpower plan. The result of that, I fear, will be very serious indeed.

I have indicated my very strong objection to that. I object to it on a number of grounds, including the impact it will have on provinces, and particularly on have-not provinces, and that it will have on the universities. That would involve a very radical transformation of the way our universities function within Canada today. I think it amounts to a direct attack upon the very foundations of the public education system at the post-secondary level that we have in Canada today. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the federal government is intent upon moving in this direction. I believe that it's imperative that we all take a stand against this kind of move, because it will have a serious impact in terms of the kind of educated citizenry we have in Canada, because the simple fact of the matter is that a lot of students who now go to university, if this all comes about, will not be able to afford to go to university in the future.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Minister, to sit here and listen to what you're saying, and I'm sure you're informed on this, is just shocking. You have attended a meeting, but I think there should be strong action taken, as Minister of Continuing Education. This kind of meddling by the federal government into part of the jurisdiction under the BNA Act which is exclusively a prerogative of the provinces should be fought with every weapon available to us.

Mr. Minister, I think it's incumbent upon you to make this known to the people of Saskatchewan. I don't think there are many guys out there who even have an idea what an educational voucher is. I share with you the belief that educational vouchers or the voucher system would be a backward step in trying to achieve what we want to achieve in the education of the people of this province. I think we should join forces. And I ask you: would you join with me in sending a telegram to Francis Fox or Pierre Trudeau, or whoever is this master planner in Ottawa, to tell him that you're not going to do that to the educational systems in Saskatchewan? And you should come out and make these

things public so that the people realize the danger of the voucher system to the universities and the technical institutes which we have in this province.

I don't think it's good enough to just go to meetings. Maybe you just found out about this, but I think we should be hitting them and hitting them hard because it is something we, in western Canada, don't want. We don't want some joker in Ottawa giving my son a voucher to go to take some kind of training which he thinks my son should take. I oppose that and so do you; so does everyone on this side of the House. I would like you to canvass the silent majority over there and see what their viewpoints are on this voucher system. I think we should fight it right now, tooth and nail, with every weapon available to us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the hon. member's support for the stand which I have adopted on this matter. I would indicate to the hon. member that during Education Week I was able to take advantage of an opportunity to speak to a major conference in Toronto on this question. He may have read the reports in the *Leader-Post* and other Saskatchewan papers. I took a very strong stand on this point, as a starting point. This conference was attended by university administrators, teachers and other people associated with universities, as well as by federal government officials and provincial government officials. I made my stand very, very clear on this point, as a starting point; I had just then become informed of what was happening in this regard.

In addition to that, my deputy minister, the chairman of the universities commission, and the presidents of the two universities, have formed a working group to put together a fight back, if you like, approach to this whole thing, because I think I'm speaking for both of the universities as well as the universities commission when I say that they equally share a concern about this. I would certainly look forward to an opportunity whereby this legislature or you and I could jointly make representation as well on this subject, so that we can better make known our position, as well as better educate the people of Saskatchewan about how dangerous this whole proposition is.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.