

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
February 28, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce to the Assembly Mr. Sabian, who is the Deputy High Commissioner from India stationed in Ottawa. Mr. Sabian is seated in the front row of the Speaker's gallery. I met with him for a few brief moments before question period, and I understand he will be meeting with other ministers sometime this afternoon.

I would ask members on both sides of the Assembly to join with me in wishing Mr. Sabian a pleasant stay and a welcome to Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. KLEIN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, approximately 75 young people most of whom are from the constituency of Regina North. They are filling up the Speaker's gallery, almost, this afternoon. They are grade 12 students from O'Neill High School. They are accompanied here today by their teachers, Mr. Berezny, Mr. Ripplinger, Mr. Hudson and Mr. Allan.

Hopefully they will find their visit to the legislature here informational and educational. I look forward to meeting with them a little bit later to determine how they enjoyed today's question period.

I ask all members to join me in welcoming them to this Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Proposed Sask Tel Rate Increase

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Premier, in light of today's news release regarding Sask Tel's application for a 19 per cent rate increase in general telephone services, could the Premier tell this House today if that increase is going to be the general policy of the government, that it is going to say that the corporations should now be making a profit rather than providing a service at cost, as the government across and the members opposite have been saying in the past?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have always said that a public utility like Sask Power or Sask Tel should be run as efficiently and as effectively as

possible to provide the service at break-even. Now you do the best you can to break even in your given forecast period, from a little bit of a deficit to a little bit of a surplus. But the intention is to run it as smooth as possible to get the job done, to provide the service to the public, and not accumulate large debts or deficits in the public utility, because the public has come back many times and said they want that to be run squarely and fairly as a normal, natural monopoly of public utilities.

MR. LUSNEY: — Supplementary to the Premier. Less than 12 months ago, when you became the government, surely were you were aware that there would be required some increase in the rates. However, you decided at that time to freeze the rates. Are you saying now that you have made a mistake, and that the rates cannot be frozen and you require a 19 per cent increase today?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — What we said, Mr. Speaker, is that we would do two things. Number one, we would freeze the rates until we could set up a public utilities review commission, so that the public could be involved, and in justifying those rate increases. Number two, we said we'd open the books and see what was going on inside, because many people across the province of Saskatchewan wanted to know what was going on inside. So as a result of that, there are commissions and reports and reorganization associated with departments and crowns because we have opened the books and sadly to say, the cupboard was bare. So we are doing two things, allowing the public to be involved in this decision-making by having a public utilities review commission, and so that we wouldn't do anything prior to the operation of that organization, we said we'd freeze the rates and until PURC could operate. And that's exactly what we're doing.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Premier, in light of the answers that you are giving, are you not prepared at this time to admit to the hypocrisy of that government opposite in saying that they require 19 per cent now, when less than a year ago they promised no increase whatsoever? Are you not prepared to admit that?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I said we would freeze the rates until we set up a public utilities review commission and they could decide whether the rate increases were justified. And that's the process that they endorsed and they endorsed it again on Monday. And as a result of that, we are going to let the public utilities review commission review these, study the stats and the information to make sure that it is justified, and then the people will know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Premier, are you saying then that you agree that a 19 per cent increase is required? Because if you didn't you have the last say. You said so a few days ago. You have the last say in what the rate increase is going to be. Do you really feel, at this point then, that 19 per cent is justifiable?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I said the last time I spoke about this that cabinet didn't tell the crown corporations what to apply for. That's a crown decision. The minister may be involved in those decisions in looking at and providing the guidelines and so forth, but the crown corporation decides on the application and brings it to the public utilities review commission. Now that's exactly what's going on. We can always say it's cabinet, if I understand the legislation right, and I believe that I have it here. We can say, "Would you please go back and review that decision? We think it's too high. It should be lower. But the public utilities review commission, by law as I understand it, can't make the increases any larger than the application, and number two, we could ask

them. We said that we have the final say. We could ask them, "Could you go back and review this because it may be too high"? But it's their decision and they will decide.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Premier, supplementary. In that answer that you just gave me, you are saying that cabinet does have the right to tell them to go back to it. It's unfortunate that the minister of Sask Tel is not here today, but in essence he is the one then who had a say as chairman of the board, who had a say in whether that rate increase would even go forward to PURC. In essence what he was saying then was that he agreed that a 19 per cent increase was required, and he approved of it, and allowed it to go forward to PURC as chairman of the board on behalf of the cabinet.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, the officials in any public utility who put together their information, because they are good professionals in the province of Saskatchewan bring together the information knowing that it will be made public to the public utilities review commission so that it can be reviewed. If the public utilities review commission decides that it isn't justified, they won't grant it. Under the previous system, the cabinet minister was the person, and cabinet, who decided. But the general public across Saskatchewan said, "No. We want to get in on this. We would like to be in the process of deciding, particularly when it gets closer or nearer elections as it has been for years and years and years, when the ministers could do some funny things with rates." Now the public utilities review commission, at arm's length from the cabinet, can make those decisions. They have endorsed that position and we are going to let it operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier. The Premier has, at least in my judgment, stated and stated clearly that it is the policy of Sask Telecommunications, the board of directors of Sask Telecommunications, headed by your minister, your Attorney General, to ask for a 19 per cent rate increase in Sask Tel rates. My question to the Premier is this: do you support that policy position of your minister?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, what I support is that the application goes to a public utilities review commission — whether it's 6.7 per cent out of SGI, or whether it's 17 per cent coming out of Sask Tel, or wherever it may — that it goes to the public utilities review commission and they look at it and decide if it's justified. That's what I support — that mechanism.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as the Premier will know, obviously the public utilities review commission cannot deal with an application which is not made, and the application has been made by your minister. What I am asking you is: do you agree and support the policy contained in the application made by your minister, a request for a 19 per cent rate increase?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I support the crown corporation gathering its information and making applications to PURC for the final decision. I support that mechanism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Do you then believe that your minister should exercise any judgment over what applications are made to PURC, or do you assume that that is a matter only for the officials?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, the public utilities review commission will make its decision, and obviously that decision will be based on its information and justification. Then, at that time, we can send it back if we think that it is unfair. They may even bring it in somewhat less. By law they can't bring it in higher. So the mechanism is set up with its checks and balances. So I don't understand the concern. The concern obviously is that the previous administration had only one mechanism. That was cabinet. Now we have a new mechanism which involves the public, which is much fairer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A short final supplementary. Is the Premier saying that a request for a 19 per cent rate increase for Sask Tel rates is fair?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — What I am saying is that the public utilities review commission, as a system or as a mechanism, is much fairer than the previous mechanism, because that utilities review commission can justify the rates and look at them and call for information when it makes its recommendation. That's fair.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I ask a new question of the Premier. In view of the fact that the system which he decries never, never, in the history of the corporation, so far as I'm aware, ever led to a 19 per cent rate increase at one time, does he continue to believe that his new system is fairer, when the ratepayers the subscribers, are asked to pay much more by his government?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I don't think I can agree with the premise of the question — that the previous administration never had rate increases anywhere close to that. I think SGI had some that might have been 28 per cent, some others . . . (inaudible) . . . So, I would want to make sure that you weren't misleading the House in giving us false information. I'd take notice on all other rate applications before I would make any comparison.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Surely the Premier can understand the unfairness of controlling workers' wages and not controlling their costs. I remind you that you have it within your power to control their costs in this area at least by instructing Sask Tel not to apply for more than 6.5 per cent. Surely, that's only fair. Why didn't you so instruct Sask Tel? Surely, it's only fair to control workers' costs of living when you control their wages. Wouldn't it have been only fair to control the costs of living where you can by instructing Sask Tel not to apply for a higher percentage increase than what you were giving workers?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Are you saying that we should have large debts or deficits in crown corporations? If that's what you're saying then I'd have difficulty defending that on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan because you have to put the corporation in a difficult situation. Secondly, much more of your tax dollar would have to go to pay interest to pay for that debt. So, I'm not sure that's what you want. If it is, I don't know if I'd agree with you.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — At least, Mr. Speaker, the federal government controls the costs where they can by instructing the crown corporations not to increase their prices by

more than the amount of the . . . Surely, that's only fair. Why don't do you do that where you can, such as in Sask Tel — control their costs as you're controlling their wages?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I think it's becoming a little more clear now — the position that all of you are coming from. You would like to see us go into a situation where we're looking at massive increases in deficits like they are at the federal level to pay for some inadequacies or inefficiencies or whatever else. Is that what you're looking at? We are not about to get caught like they are at the national level where they haven't taken their guidelines on crown corporations and dealt with them efficiently or effectively, so they are looking at — what is it? — a \$28 billion or \$20 billion deficit. Do you want us to increase the deficit based on the size . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You just answered your question.

MR. LUSNEY: — A question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, only about a year ago, when we proposed a much smaller increase than what you have proposed now, you (it wasn't you, it was your party at that time) said that that was real rip-off on the public of Saskatchewan.

Do you consider a 19 per cent increase a rip-off, or not?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — It seemed to me, if I recall (we can go back and check it), that you had rate freezes prior to the election.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Briefly.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, it was brief because you lost.

I don't know what you would have done after April 26 if you had won — whether you would have taken the freeze off or not — but you had it frozen going into that election. So you can't say that you didn't freeze them, or that you didn't have some sort of influence over them toward an election.

MR. LUSNEY: — Supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier indicate to this House when his party is now going to provide the free telephones for senior citizens, as they have promised?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — No. I can't advise the House. I take notice as to the question, but I can't give you an answer today.

MR. LUSNEY: — Could I rephrase that question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Premier, have you been looking at the possibility of doing that, or have you even considered implementing that election promise that you made, to provide free telephones for senior citizens?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, I'm not in a position to answer: the minister could talk much more about it. It has been discussed, from my recollection of talking to the minister who deals with the particular crown corporation, and they have addressed it. It's like several other things that we said that we were going to do. We're going to get them done. We couldn't do them all in the first eight or nine months, but we're getting there.

MR. LUSNEY: — A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Going back to a statement that you made earlier in question period, Mr. Premier, that the public is going to have the

opportunity to have input into this rate increase: if the public says that we reject the 19 per cent increase and that we want the government to go back and apply the inflation minus one increase, as they are on everything else, are you prepared at that time to accept that decision of the public and tell Sask Tel that they cannot increase their rates any higher than inflation minus one?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, it's difficult to know how you're defining it. In my view, the mechanism that we've set up was one requested by the public. It's called a public utilities review commission. People involved from the public can come in here, gather the information, look at it, talk to the officials, and see if it's justified. If it isn't justified, then they can't go home to their communities and talk about it, that is, as being a justified rate increase. If it is justified, they will defend it and say the crown corporation needs to get its act together so it can have a long-run balance and we'd better do it now, or whatever they're going to come up with as a justification. That's the role for this new mechanism, and it's one that's been endorsed all across the province, and we're going to let it operate.

Deficit of Upcoming Budget

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier. In view of the Premier's expressed opposition to deficits by government organizations, would he give this House an assurance that the upcoming budget will have at least a deficit somewhat reduced from the massive deficit brought in by the Minister of Finance last November?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — . . . (inaudible) . . . to the hon. member. I just wouldn't want to scoop the Minister of Finance. So . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you're right, it is an exciting time and I think we'd like to give him full stage. I'll just hold back any comments about the precise size of the budget till he . . . (inaudible) . . .

Transfer of Sharon Young

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, question to the minister in charge of government services. Last week, on February 24, I had asked the minister a number of questions relating to the Sharon Young transfer. She informed me that she was going to check and see whether or not (on one issue in particular) Sharon Young had seniority over other people in the same office. Can she clarify that point for me today?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes I can, Mr. Speaker. I can give a response to all the questions I took notice of last Friday. Whether or not she arrived on the 14th (I think I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition I would take notice): she did arrive in Regina and reported to work on Monday, February 14. She was sick on February 15, absent on the afternoon of the 17th, and called in sick on February 22.

As to the seniority, there are two clerk-typist 2 positions in public works in Prince Albert. The senior person is Shirley Bentile, who started work November of 1972. Miss Young started in July of 1979.

How long was she given to report to work in Regina? She was informed verbally and by letter on February 8. As to a grievance, no grievance has been filed as of yet.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. The minister informs me that she was notified on February 8 to be in Regina on what day?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — February 14.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can inform the Assembly and the workers for the province of Saskatchewan if in fact this is the new policy of the government: that employees are now given less than 10 days notice of a transfer from the time they are notified to the time they have to arrive in their new working place.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I can just say, Mr. Speaker, that obviously it must have been acceptable to Miss Young as she reported on the 14th and her time for filing grievance has lapsed. So obviously she was not opposed to the transfer.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can inform the Assembly what her position would have been if this employee had not complied with the request to report for work in a short eight days.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — That's a hypothetical question. I refuse to answer it.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I imagine the minister would refuse to answer it, because I don't think the employee had any choice at all.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The member is making statements. Does the member have a question?

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Yes. I'll preface my question by a one-sentence statement. What I would like to know of the Minister of Government Services is whether or not the resignation of one Mr. Wallis Cousineau is related to the Sharon Young affair.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I would say no, it isn't.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Can the minister inform us whether it was woman's intuition that this came about at the time that it did during the turmoil that was surrounding the transfer of Sharon Young? Did it have anything to do with the fact that the deputy minister had a conversation with Miss Young in regard to political activities?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No.

Resignation of Wallis Cousineau

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. During estimates on government services the minister informed the Assembly, gave a great long explanation about why Mr. Dennis Foley had been replaced by Mr. Wallis Cousineau from Ontario, and said what a great job he was doing. Can she now inform us when Mr. Cousineau informed her that he would be leaving that position?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Perhaps the member is not aware that there are plans for reorganization within government, in particular the Department of Government Services and the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. Mr. Cousineau's resignation is a result of the reorganization which has proceeded.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a new question. I asked the minister if she could inform us when she knew that Mr. Cousineau would be leaving his position. Can she tell us that?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — He tendered his resignation on Friday afternoon, the 25th.

Public Service Guidelines

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. I think it becomes more and more clear as time goes on that the lack of guidelines for the civil service is responsible for a great deal of turmoil which is going on in the public service at the present time. My question to the Premier is whether or not the guidelines that were laid down for Sharon Young by the acting deputy minister — that is, that politics should not be involved while she was working for the government — were given to your brother-in-law, Rene Archambault, when he took his position in Gravelbourg?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, I don't know what the acting deputy said to some of his employees. So it's very difficult for me to comment on it. With respect to the guidelines, I think the minister responsible for the public service commission has advised the House that there are investigations or applications at the national level with respect to guidelines. Many cases involve legal matters, so we respect what's going on in the province of Ontario, I believe it is. We'll move on it subsequent to that proceeding.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier was: does he know whether or not the guidelines that were laid down by the acting deputy of government services were given to his brother-in-law when he was hired by the government; that is, that politics should not be involved while he was on the job?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I just have no idea what Mr. Cousineau said to an employee, so it's impossible for me to comment on.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. We understood from comments made by the Minister of Government Services that one of the employees of the Department of Government Services was advised not to engage in political discussions, or alternatively not to engage in political discussions in the office, and that this was the same sort of treatment that was given to all employees. Our question to the Minister of Education is: was that sort of information tendered to your employee, Mr. Archambault, when he was engaged by your department?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I don't know the answer to that; I don't know whether it was or it wasn't, quite frankly. That's about as honest as I can be in answering that question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed a preamble. I have every confidence in the minister's honesty. I therefore ask him whether he will investigate that — the conversations with Mr. Clayton or whoever else — and report to this House on whether or not such information and guidelines were given to Mr. Archambault.

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, am I supposed to reply to that?

In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, as I recall — and this is from the top of my head — I had the opportunity of visiting with — of interviewing, I should say, that's the proper word — of interviewing Mr. Archambault. And, you know, from the impression that he

made upon me with regard to his qualifications, with regard to the competence that he brought with him for that particular job that we wanted done, with regard to the personality traits that I read about him (and you know I'm not Confucius; I could be in error), but keeping all those things I mind, quite frankly I wanted that particular person for that particular job. And whether he was the brother-in-law of the Premier (whom I have a great and a high regard for), or if he had been the brother-in-law of the Leader of the Opposition, or for that matter if he had been Joe Stalin's nephew, I would have hired the guy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I have a motion that I believe has been given to the Leader of the Opposition. I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

Arthur Joseph Thibault died on February 22, 1983. He was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Kinistino from 1959 to 1978. He was born at Bonne Madone, Saskatchewan in 1914. He was educated at Kaminka schools. He farmed at Tarnopol, was a member of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union and served as a school trustee for 12 years. He was a reeve for the rural municipality of Invergordon from 1952 to 1959.

As a member of the legislature, he developed a strong interest in the area of highway and traffic safety, and served as chairman of the special committee on highway traffic and safety, 1973 to 1975.

He worked with a variety of community organizations, including the St. Louis Alcoholism Rehabilitation Centre and the Prince Albert Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, before retiring at Wakaw in 1981.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with members of the bereaved family.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the formal language of this motion. Art Thibault was a person who, as the motion indicates, served in this House for a period of close to 20 years. He was known very well to a number of us. I served with Art from 1960 until 1978 — 18 years. He was a person who was well-loved as well as appreciated because of his particular traits of personality. I think this was illustrated by the fact that the funeral, which was held on Saturday and which was attended by the Deputy Premier, Mr. Berntson, as well as a good number of Art's former caucus colleagues, was exceedingly well-attended. I would have thought there were probably 500 people filling the main floor, the balcony and the basement of the Roman Catholic church at Wakaw.

This indicates the sort of man he was. He had deep roots in the community, having been a reeve, a school trustee and an MLA for that period of time. He had fine qualities as an MLA and a particular ability to establish rapport with people from all walks of life. He spoke English, of course. He spoke French. When he was reeve of the R.M. of

Invergordon he taught himself sufficient Ukrainian so that he could deal with a good number of his constituents who were more comfortable in that language. And accordingly, he was able, I suppose, in not a literary, but none the less three languages in a workable nature.

Here in this House he established a number of characteristics which I remember him for, and I suspect others remember him for.

One was certainly his concern for young people, particularly for school children. I know of no MLA who promoted more school visits, who was more assiduous in meeting the students and, by the way, of buying them the appropriate glass of milk or Coca-Cola or whatever was called for, and providing pictures — generally talking to them about the legislature. He was also fairly assiduous in caucus in pointing out to us in caucus that we ought to mend our ways and be a little more orderly in this House so that we would present a proper example for school children. I regret to say that Art is not now here, and not now able to deliver the same lesson, because I think it is equally needed, Mr. Speaker.

He had another characteristic which endeared him to his caucus colleagues, and that was his belief that public issues had a natural flow, and that one should not move on an issue decisively until the public had an opportunity to consider it and appreciate it so that he as an MLA would be able to go out and talk with his constituents about the need for a particular change, they having had at least some opportunity to apprise themselves of the issue. It is, I suppose, always the case that the MLAs will be ahead of the public in the consideration of issues, but it was his view that we should not be too far ahead, otherwise the system which we operate would not operate effectively.

As was indicated, he had a couple of other strong interests, in some cases almost passions. These included traffic safety, the problem of alcoholism as it related to driving, and the problems of alcohol consumption as it related to driving. He was a strong member of a series of traffic safety committees we have had, advocating measures which have subsequently become accepted, and which were certainly not popular when first introduced — one thinks of seat belts and other restraints, child restraints, which were hotly opposed by a good number of the public, but now have been more or less generally accepted by the public and, I think, by all the statistics, certainly by the press releases issued by the present Minister of Highways, the thrust of which I agree with, that this has indicated that many lives had been saved.

Perhaps his greatest single interest was in the problems associated with driving under the influence of alcohol. He made himself a very considerable authority on that. He studied the programs which were in operation throughout the world. He was able to discuss with a great depth of knowledge what was going on in Minnesota, where he had visited their programs. He visited Australia and spent some time discussing with the officials in the state of Victoria the programs they operate. Out of all of this, he had distilled a particular theory, a particular approach, to that pressing social problem.

He continued to advocate it. When I received the news of his death, I had on my desk an answer which I had prepared to the last bit of correspondence I had from Art on the issues of highway safety and what we ought to be advocating in this House. It was a commentary on the white paper put out by the government on traffic safety.

Art's view — and I won't recount them all here — was that state punitive measures would be unsuccessful; on the other hand, remedial measures offered to people who did

not feel any sense of crisis would be unsuccessful. Accordingly, what we needed to do was to bring about a sense of crisis in the mind of the offender. Then, when he is in that state of mind, we would offer remedial measures in institutions such as the ones in Victoria, the ones in Minnesota, and the one at St. Louis which has had a successful record here in this province for a couple of years.

Art's contribution is not to be thought of as confined to any one of the items I have mentioned. In fact, he had a lively interest in the whole field of government and made an outstanding contribution to this legislature and, I know, to the community in which he lived. He was known throughout the entire constituency of Kinistino in a way which few of us will ever be known in our own constituencies, and was known in a wider area less well since he had an opportunity to represent the now city of Melfort and an area around there for a period following the 1971 election.

Art Thibault was the sort of MLA whose service in this House makes this House a better House. His life was one of service to his constituency and to the community in which he lived. He was a member of a large family and a close family, as was clear from the funeral. His wife, Doris, and he had children who have continued to make their contributions. It is a better province because of people like Art Thibault and the Thibaults.

I know that I would like to join with the Premier in offering my condolences to Mrs. Thibault and to other members of the family on the loss of their husband and father.

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to pay a tribute to the former member for Kinistino. I got to know Mr. Thibault in the early '70s, and I was impressed by the character of the man, his dedication to the performance of his duty as a public figure. I think all of us will have gained by the example that Art Thibault presented to this legislature.

He served his constituents well. There was no problem too small for Art Thibault to attend to. I want to say that I served with him also from '75, when I was elected, until Mr. Thibault retired in '78.

I want to say that besides those concerns that he had in respect to highway safety, throughout my association with him he always presented wisdom and guidance to younger MLAs in conducting the business of the House.

He was a unique individual, as has been mentioned, in his method of communicating with constituents and the people of the province. He was not really tied to the formal method of communication that many of us followed: newsletters, publications and papers. His was a method of direct contact, and certainly with young people, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, he had a great, close association.

I had the privilege of attending the Mass at Wakaw, and I want to repeat that the funeral, I think, indicated the respect that this man garnered in his community. I was told by many who were there that it was the largest funeral that Wakaw has had, and I think that perhaps the eulogy which was given by Father Boutin best summarizes to a large extent how Art Thibault was to be judged. Father Boutin indicated that Art Thibault was unselfish and that his efforts went beyond serving self-interest to serving his fellow man. His counsel was always wise and thoughtful, and certainly I think that Art leaves behind a legacy of example in public life that all of us can gain from.

And so I would like to extend to the Thibault family, Mrs. Thibault and the children, our condolences.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, as one of those on the government side who sat with Art from '75 until the '78 election, and as a rookie in the House, and as his neighbouring MLA — he had the area directly next to me — Art and I got to know each other, as did the people across the floor. I must say of Art, as the former premier mentioned, that to watch him with his students when they came to visit the Assembly was to marvel at the painstaking patience he spent in explaining to them what had happened in the House and why it had happened. And as he used to herd them through — for lack of a better word — the line to have their dinner, or their milk, or whatever he was going to treat them to, he always seemed to have time to sit and chat with them longer than most MLAs, and he was concerned.

Mr. Blakeney spoke about Art's belief in seat belt legislation. I suppose more than any other member in this House at that time he believed in it — more than anybody — and fought harder for the betterment of it, and did a lot of research and study, as he was the Leg Secretary to the Minister of Highways in those days.

I can remember a group of elected officials from Quebec that toured Saskatchewan, and I happened to have the privilege of being their tour guide that day. Art had arranged a function out at a small community, French-speaking, in his riding, and the hospitality and the warmth shown by Art and his people made us proud to say that we were fellow MLAs.

You know, in the throne speech or the budget speech Art would get to his feet and give his speech. As the former premier said, he would chastise for our misbehaving and occasionally would chastise us out in the hall because we had got a little rowdy in the House. But he believed in the system of parliament, and he gave many years of his life to it. And I don't think there is a more fitting tribute you can give to somebody who gives his life for the betterment of his friends than to say that this province, this country, and the citizens of same are better because he was here and did his part. I join in condolences to the family on the loss of its father and husband. Thank you.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to add to the members who have already spoken my condolences to the Thibault family, and especially to Doris. When I first got elected, I think I could have called Art my political godfather — someone who was generous with giving sound advice in how to deal with a constituency and constituency problems. He came along with many of the groups and delegations that met with me and sat in on meetings, and I really appreciated the effort he put out as far as a rookie member was concerned.

I can remember well the day that the safety council presented Art with a little red automobile that he so proudly wore on his lapel and that signified his concern with highway traffic safety. And the committee work he did, I think, was second to none, as far as members are concerned in this House in the work we do on committees.

I think a point that hasn't been mentioned yet, Mr. Speaker, is Art's graphic use of the English language.

Several stories when the name Art Thibault is mentioned — two stories always come to my mind and I think I should mention both of them. He always used this illustration, many times he used this illustration — I am sure if he were involved in the crow debate

today he'd say, "Don't chop the dog's tail off a little piece at a time." He was very strong on that one. Another one he used to tell was about giving directions: "If you want to get there, you can't start from here."

I think he was just a tremendous fellow. He had more concerns for his fellow man than he did for his own time and his personal interests. I feel that the amount of effort he put into being an MLA and the hard work he did even was detrimental to his own health. That kind of service is really highly regarded by all the people of Saskatchewan. I would like to add my condolences to his passing at this time.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, perhaps seconded by the member for Shaunavon:

That the resolution just passed, together with the transcripts of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased, be communicated to the family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

CROWN INVESTMENTS CORPORATION OF SASKATCHEWAN

Vote 65

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would you introduce your officials please?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, on my right is Mr. Don Gracey, special adviser for the CIC.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just have a few questions, Mr. Minister, in respect to the crown investment corporation. I want some preliminary information. I would like you to give me a list of all persons that were fired or whose employment was terminated since May 8, 1982 by the present government. Is that clear enough?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, obviously the member is not familiar with the procedure on this particular subvote. This is a statutory vote, nothing to do with the review of the crown corporation, and the question he is asking would be better asked in crown corporations review. At that time I'd be happy to answer his questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The question pertains to crown investments corporation so the question is in order.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I won't question your ruling. However, I'd like to advise the Assembly that I'm unprepared to answer questions today relating to the operation of crown investment corporation. I'm prepared to answer questions on the vote under which we are here — not the vote but the statutory advance. My

understanding is certainly and I believe there are precedents . . . As I say, I am not questioning your ruling. You've made the ruling. However, we had, as I recall when we were in the opposition, the problem of questioning Sedco in this Assembly. We couldn't do it. However, as I say, I am not prepared, sir, to answer questions since I don't have my officials with me to answer the kinds of questions that have already been asked, nor did I come prepared for it. That was not the understanding that I had of the questions to be asked. Those questions are better asked in crown corporations.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I respect your decision, and that of course was my understanding in my preparation in asking questions relating to the crown investments corporation. We have an item to vote on and I wanted to delve into some of the areas.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, in light of the obvious problem that we're having, I would move that we pull this estimate today and have it at a later date. I'll come prepared, whatever is required of me at that time. My understanding was this was strictly a statutory or simple matter, and I move then that we pull this vote today and have it at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Agreed? Agreed.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could find out from the minister . . . On Friday, while questioning on estimates for Industry and Commerce, I had some questions relating to the loaning policy of Sedco. I wonder if he could prepared himself for that area as well, under that vote on Sedco, because I will be following that up at a later date when we come back onto this issue.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a debate on this issue, but really, it would be the first time (that is, in my tenure in this Assembly) that we have moved crown corporations hearings — debates — into the Legislative Assembly. We have a vehicle by which we can do that.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, my point of order is this. There was a ruling made by the Chair not five minutes ago that this kind of debate would be allowed on CIC, and I assumed that it would mean on Sedco as well on another vote. I can't quite see what the minister is debating. I think a decision has been made, agreed to by the Assembly. When we come back in another day when it's called, I'm just alerting him that we will be questioning him on the lending policy of Sedco. I don't see the need for a long debate.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Chairman, I don't see the basic need for a debate. When the hon. member wishes to ask questions to the minister, it will be determined at that time whether or not the question is in order or not in order. I think it is senseless to proceed at this point.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

FINANCE

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 11

Item 1

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is just obtaining his

information, etc., and if we could just bear with it for a minute or two, we could then proceed at that point.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — We're just waiting for the critic in the area of finance. The Leader of the Opposition, but maybe we could start out and carry on for a bit. They are pretty standard questions, and if the minister wants to introduce his staff who he has with him, that would be fine, and we'll go from there.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The deputy minister of finance is presently in London, England, with regard to some borrowing activities. In his stead will be Mike Costello, associate deputy minister of finance, Don Rowlatt, tax and fiscal policy, Morley Meiklejohn, Lawrie McFarlane and Keith Mackrill.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Could the minister give me a list of his staff, the upper management in the department as well as their salaries? I'm sure that he can get that to me in writing. It's probably just as easy as listing it out here.

A question to the minister: I wonder if he could inform the Assembly of the number of employees in the department who have a CVA vehicle assigned to them? This wouldn't mean in the car pool, but individual employees who would have an automobile assigned to them, if any.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — With regard to the upper management, they are basically the same as was there before. There have been no salary increases for those particular employees since my coming to office. In my own personal office, the minister's office, I have two secretaries and one executive assistant.

With regard to CVA automobiles, I believe the number of CVA automobiles is one less than it was when I took over the ministry. I believe Mr. Meiklejohn lost his car because he didn't drive . . . Never had a car.

The deputy has a car, and there is one in a car pool for the investments branch to track back and forth to the bank and that type of thing. There are two cars, plus one for the minister, which has 100,979 kilometres on it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I have a fairly long series of questions that I would like to ask. They are really going to amount to things which the minister may or may not have on hand that I would like him to see whether he could provide me with. A couple of them may have been asked by my colleagues.

Has there been a request for the names, positions and salaries of members of the minister's staff?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — There are three in number, two secretaries and one EA. I could get you the exact salaries of those three particular people.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I would like to ask the minister for the names of all employees being paid at a rate exceeding \$2,000 a month who have been taken on staff by the department since May 1, 1982. I invite the minister to say if \$2,000 is an inconvenient figure. If it should be \$2,200 or something to exclude stenographic and clerical, by and large, then I would accept his suggestion along that line.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What I'll undertake to provide for you is the list of all people that we have taken on since we've taken office, if that would be satisfactory. Other than perhaps some in the comptroller's office that I wouldn't know exactly the salary of, and I'm sure you would care less about it either, I can send all the ones in the immediate finance staff and in the minister's office staff that have been employed since April 26 and the salary that they have to you. I believe that they're all OC appointments.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Would the minister also include people in other branches of the department where the salary exceeds \$30,000 a year? Could the minister also provide me with the names of all persons having contracts of personal service entered into with the Department of Finance after, say, May 1 or May 8, 1983, under which payments at a rate exceeding \$2,000 a month had been made, or are to be made? What are the names of your executive assistants?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I have one executive assistant. Her name is Jane Dempsey.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Do you have any administrative assistants or people bearing similar titles?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — If you want to call them an administrative assistant; I call them my secretaries. I have two of them. As by way of not misleading, I did start out with three AAs and two of them moved on to different jobs as one tries to adjust to the office to find out just what type of staff components you need. So I did have two. I believe one moved early in December and the other one moved maybe in February.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I wonder if you could give us now a list of all borrowings by the Department of Finance where the term exceeds, say, three years and the principal sum borrowed exceeds \$5 million, giving the amount, term, rate of interest, and any major special features — if they're retractables or something of that nature?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Do you wish me to send that information over to you now? I think we have it. We can take, if you like, the borrowings for the entire year — we've pretty much completed the borrowing requirements. Just with the last, I think the last deal was a Canadian deal at 10.75. yes, a Euro-deal at 10.75 was the last one, and I think it ranges up from there up to . . . I forget the highest amount, but I certainly can send that information across to you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I would appreciate that. I'm not interested in the treasury bills. I don't know, you may have some bank borrowings for up to three years. I'm not asking for that. I'm essentially asking for what might traditionally be called a bond issue.

I would like to ask a number of questions on revenue. I will be looking at page 8 of the estimates and asking some questions on budgetary revenue. Starting at the top, with respect to corporation capital, I wonder if the minister would, for the record, tell me what the rates are.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — My understanding of the rates: it's 0.3 per cent for the general tax rate; the tax rate for banks is 0.8 per cent; the tax rate for trust companies and loan companies is 0.8 per cent, and the exemption level is \$10 million.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — What is the estimated corporate capital available for taxation in each of the categories of general and banks and trust companies? What figures were used in arriving at the computation of \$21.1 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We'll have to provide that information. It's not something that we have there, but we will undertake to provide that for you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Okay. What is the position of Sask Power? Is it a taxable corporation?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, in more ways than one, unfortunately.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Sask Tel? Yes. Could you give me the position of co-ops? Has there been a change in that area? Has there been any position with respect to CIS, with the Co-operative Insurance Services, or The Co-operators.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I think in the budget, with the increase in the insurance premium tax that applied to the co-ops, but there was a corresponding decrease in the corporate capital tax — no, insurance company tax.

Apparently the co-op insurance company was not taxed before. Now with the taking off of that tax, none of the insurance companies are taxable, so it's now equal between the co-ops and the other insurance companies.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I understand the minister to say that none of the insurance companies are now paying the corporation capital tax. Just for the record, the minister says yes to that.

Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, then you are not able to give me the calculation as to how you got the 21.1 million, then? I'll be asking this right down the list, so . . .

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We have some of the, but other ones we don't have, and we'll undertake to get them to you, but the exact calculation — that we don't have.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I now turn to corporation income tax, \$106,789,000. Am I right in believing that this tax is collected by the federal government?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That is correct.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Of the \$106,789,000 provided for, for what period was that collected by the federal government? How would I phrase that? For what federal government tax year is that payable?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The component of that 106 million is as follows: the estimated federal tax between April '82 and March '83, 110,225,000, less \$10 million for Saskatchewan royalty tax rebate, plus \$6,000,564 for adjustment for underpayment by the federal government for prior taxation years.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The amount of 110 million, then, is an estimate of what the federal government will collect on our behalf between April '82 and March '83, this current fiscal year.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's for that taxation year, and they run a couple of months

behind as you are aware; it's for that period — of money earned during that period.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Less approximately \$6 million in respect of oil royalty, plus approximately . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: — 10 million for oil.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Plus 10 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . less 10 for oil royalties, plus 6 for previous underpayments.

Are we able to say with ease how much of that derives from corporations operating all or primarily within Saskatchewan, and how much comes from corporations operating all across Canada?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Of that amount, and I can only give you this in ball-park figures, if that's acceptable, approximately 30 per cent is from small businesses primarily operating in Saskatchewan and 70 per cent from larger corporations that operate across the country.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to gasoline taxes of 15.7 million, how much of that is collections in respect of amounts sold prior to May 8, and how much is collected in respect of amounts sold after May 8? In effect, how much is it old tax at the . . .

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Of that 15,000,700, 10 million is gasoline and diesel fuel sold prior to May 8; 4,000,800 is railway locomotive diesel fuel that still has a tax on it; and 900,000 is aviation fuel.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Do CP Rail and CN Rail pay the tax?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — You've got it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Air Canada, PWA and CP?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Norcanair?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — No.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Why does Norcanair not pay?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Because it flies primarily in the province of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Do I take it that that same rule would apply to Athabaska Airways and other similar charter carriers and to private aircraft?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That's correct.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Would the minister speculate as to whether or not the payment of this tax is one reason why CP Air pulled out of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, I think CP Air is probably a small carrier relative to Air Canada, and the whole tax collected in the entire year was \$900,000, and if that's the

reason they left then they've got pretty tough looking books.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Frontier Airlines, yes or no?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, they do pay it, and I understand that both Frontier and Pacific Western would like to expand further into Saskatchewan, and I tend to think that maybe they have their finger on the pulse of the province better than perhaps the CPR does.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The CPR doesn't keep its finger on the pulse. It's difficult when you've got the hand in the pocket.

CP Express — do they pay, and their trucks?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I don't believe there are any trucking firms that pay that tax. It's too difficult to differentiate in that particular situation.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — And Greyhound Bus Lines?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — No. One of the reasons, of course, for that is that the railways and the airlines are taxed in a different way, as you are aware, compared to what you would refer to as an E&H tax, sales tax or road tax, whatever you want.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — So that the situation is that if a CNR train is driving along a track parallel to a road, the train that goes along the track will be paying the gasoline tax, sometimes called the road tax, but the truck which is carrying similar freight to a similar destination beside it doesn't pay the tax.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The first correction is that I don't think many trains use gasoline. On the second point, you are correct. And I'm sure you're not making a case for CPR and CNR. I wouldn't understand that to be your case. The other one, as you know, would be somewhat tricky to administer, and we have opted not to do so.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — If I said gasoline, I was obviously not stating what I meant. Both the train and the truck will almost certainly be fuelled by diesel. The one will bear a tax, and the one will not bear a tax. The one on the rails will bear the tax, and the one on the road will not bear the tax. What is the rate to the present payers of the tax?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 2.9 cents per litre.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Turning now to individual income tax, \$612 million — that tax, I take it, is collected by the federal government. What are the existing rates? It seems to be a simple question, but I know it isn't.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 51 per cent.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — What is the surcharge payable for . . .

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 12 per cent.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — That is 12 per cent of what?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That is provincial tax payable over \$4,000.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Could you give us the credits applicable, or some of the major credits applicable, let's put it that way?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — There's a low-income tax reduction equal to \$160 plus \$50 per dependent child, and a special \$50 tax deduction for senior citizens. Then there is the mortgage tax reduction thing we did away with, but there is still some application to phase it out.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — For what period was this \$612 million collected by the federal government?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — If I can go through it the same as I did before, from April 1982 to March 1983: instalment payments, \$602,694,000. The adjustments are as follows: plus Saskatchewan surtax of \$5,500,000, less Saskatchewan tax reduction of \$22 million, less 1981 Saskatchewan mortgage interest tax credit of \$8,500,000, less 1981 capital gains tax rebate of \$2 million, plus the adjustments for underpayments by the federal government in previous years, \$36,400,000.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — \$602 million plus \$5.5 million Sask surtax, minus \$22 million, minus \$8.5 million approximately. What was that for? . . .

Minus \$2 million capital gains rebate, plus \$36.4 previous underpayment. Does the minister have any reason to believe that as at the end of this year, we will be in an underpayment position or overpayment position with respect to the federal government? Is there any way to calculate that?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — In response to that, I can't give you a definitive answer other than to say that traditionally they have underpaid. The only comment that we would say is that we wouldn't anticipate it in this year to be a large number.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Would the minister be able to tell us whether this 36 on individual and 6 on corporate — that's 42 million underpayment — in respect to previous underpayments (that's in this year's budget), was a large figure — significantly larger figure — than normal?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's a lower amount than normal for corporate and about average for individual.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn now to the insurance tax. Can the minister advise us what the rates of insurance tax are?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That was 2. It was increased to 3 in the November budget. I think there were certain ones exempted down to the 2 that weren't increased: sickness, accident, that type of thing, was not increased.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — What insurance companies pay this if Co-ops don't and if Pioneer doesn't? And I'd like a little comment on . . . I'm not clear in my mind what the life companies pay, and what the sickness and accident pay, and what the fire and casualty pay.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — In the budget, what we increased was all insurance companies,

other than sickness and accident and life insurance companies; they remained at 2 per cent. If you recall, that brought us in line with many other jurisdictions, particularly Ontario, who were at 3 per cent as well and where the bulk premiums would be established with regards to that. So we felt we should have our fair share of it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — So no change was made in life insurance or sickness and accident, but he fire and casualty were raised to 3. What were the estimated premiums in each class to arrive at the 11.5 million calculation?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We don't have that broken down here. We can provide that information for you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Thank you. I would like that provided. I turn now to the acreage tax, \$3,750,000. Is this straight acreage tax or does it include any of these producing tract tax?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — No, it does not include.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — What is the rate per acre?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's 50 cents.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Fifty cents an acre is the acreage tax. So I take it then that this is collected on 7.5 million acres, or approximately.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That's your numbers. It would be 50 cents divided into the given number of acres.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn now to sales tax \$329.8 million. What estimate of retail sales for 1982-83 is included in that estimate, and a breakdown of the non-taxable and taxable.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We can try to get that particular question answered for you. Other than the retail sales, the retail trade in 1982 is forecast for 8.7 per cent as the basis by which the projected tax is arrived at. But for more details, they are not here yet.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — So that the calculation of \$329.8 million is arrived at by assuming an 8.7 per cent growth in the sale of taxable goods?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's approximately half-and-half. Retail trade provides approximately half of it and the other half is provided by the non-retail trade, the building materials, sale of machinery, equipment, that type of thing provides approximately the other half. The total details of that we don't have available to us.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm not quite sure of the distinction here between retail and non-retail.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What we would be talking about is the tax on buildings, the tax on utilities, the tax on farm machinery that would not normally be purchased at the traditional store or retail outlet that you would see.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Let me ask that question again. With respect to what you arrived at the \$329 million, did you take the figure for the previous fiscal year '81-82

and increase it by 8.7 per cent, or did you arrive at it by some other method?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Apparently the way that number is actually arrived at is the Department of Revenue and Supply have a mechanism by which they can calculate in the specifics of each specific item, and project the growth of that particular item and then pass that information on to us. We don't have that information available at this point in time but we can undertake to get it and deliver it to you at some future date.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Very well, I would ask that the minister provide me with a calculation of the sales tax figure, if you would.

I turn now to tobacco tax and ask for the rates for cigarettes, cigars, pipe tobacco and cigarette tobacco.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — For cigarettes, a package of 25, 42 cents; for tobacco, per 25 grams, 17 cents; and for cigars, anywhere from 4 cents to 22 cents, depending on how expensive you want to go — 4 cents for White Owls and 22 cents for the better kind.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to that calculation of 36.4 million, I wonder if he can give me the calculations; what the projected sales are of dollars or units as the case may be, and apply the rate and give me the calculation.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We don't have the brand and number on that and I think you will appreciate as well that it increased in November, so there is that calculation as well. We can undertake to get that for you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the calculation of "other, 5.9 million," could the minister tell us what are the main headings under this heading of "other"?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — There's a series of them, as you appreciate. If I could give you the largest ones of those, the pari-mutuel tax is \$2 million; motor vehicle insurance premium tax, \$2 million; fire prevention tax, \$1.4 million. Then there's a whole host of other taxes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The fire prevention tax is in effect the tax on fire insurance premiums. Am I right? And the motor vehicle insurance tax is also a tax on insurance premiums? Why aren't they up under the heading of insurance? I'm just asking that out of curiosity.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I'm not sure we're going to accept it, but that's a separate tax, the other one, and this one is sort of at a different rate and different type of calculation. So it was just simply blended in as always to the catchall at the bottom.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the pari-mutuel tax, approximately how much is that, shown in the . . . From the point of view of the government, is that a gross figure or a net figure? Is that what we get after we allow rebates to the tracks, or is it before we allow rebates to the tracks?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That would be the gross revenue, and then what we give back would come off of that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Can the minister indicate in what department of government the rebates would be? In the Department of Agriculture, or not?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Paid out of agriculture.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Could the minister indicate on a net basis how much we would get, approximately, of that 2 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Virtually zero net.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn now to the heritage fund. I'll come back to that, and skip it for a moment. The liquor board, 90 million. Approximately how much do we assume that will represent profits of the liquor board, and approximately how much will be a drawdown on an existing surplus?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The profit is about 93.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — For the year ended March '83, it is expected the profit will be about \$93 million.

With respect to the receipts from government enterprises and other funds, \$6,800,000, what are the main components of that item?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The two largest ones there I can give you is the land titles insurance fund, 1.1 — that's a surplus; revenue and supply systems centre, and CVA advance accounts, 1.1.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the revenue and supply systems centre advance account, 1.1 million, is that a profit on operations as one might say or is it a repayment of a previous advance?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Apparently it's most likely a profit. It's not a return of an advance, because it wouldn't other wise show there.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Turning to the motor vehicles at 46,200,000, can the minister advise of the approximate number of vehicles that this covers?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We don't know. We will try to get that for you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, can the minister advise how much of the increase over the actual for the previous year is accounted for by an increase in vehicles, and how much by an increase in the rate which was effective, as I recall it, a couple of months ago?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 70 per cent of it would be rates; 30 per cent of it would be vehicles.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, for my curiosity, does the minister have at hand an explanation of why the actual for '81-'82 was significantly lower than the budgeted 47?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I am advised that the estimate you are talking about at 47, the actuals come in at 41 and I guess the only thing we could say is that the estimate was too high. Why it was too high, because I wasn't there at that time, I wouldn't know.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I move down, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, to the item under other own source revenue, other revenue, 21 million. Can the minister give us the main components of the 21 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — There are a great number of these. The two largest ones are \$14 million from the public service superannuation board — employees' contributions, superannuation; that's from the old plan. The only other one of major size would be agriculture refund from previous years expenditures. I'm not sure any more than that, that's the only information I have.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Moving down, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, to the Canada Assistance Plan, 114 million. Are the payments by the federal government substantially current in the sense that is that the amount which will be earned during the period 1982-83, or is there a lag?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I understand they're very current.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Can the minister indicate the reason for this large increase in the refund under the Canada Assistance Plan?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — SAP expenditures.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Am I then to understand that because this figure has gone up by approximately \$28 million the increases under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan have gone up by \$56 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It is roughly in that proportion, although I think you will appreciate it's not in complete correlation and some payments come from the assistance plan that apply to something else other than SAP and that type of thing. That it's a rough correlation would be a fair statement.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — In view of the very large increases in SAP payments, in Saskatchewan Assistance Plan payments, under public assistance, has the Department of Finance or any other department of government got under way plans to provide significantly more employment so that there would be significantly less payments under SAP? \$56 million in one year is a huge increase.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, clearly in the November budget, we earmarked \$15 million, all of that being up-front money. The federal program, of course, I think contributed something like \$11 million, of which a substantial smaller portion would be spent in this fiscal period. Any other plans that we have afoot I think will be announced in due course, and I'm sure the hon. member will wait to see what those are.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the hon. member will not be the only one who is waiting. A good number of people have been waiting for quite awhile, and when we think of an extra in welfare payments of \$56 million, that is indeed a pretty impressive figure, and one which none of us should be very proud of.

I turn now to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the DREE money of \$8 million. I won't ask whether we think that that will tail off from DREE. I don't know what DREE is called these days, but whatever that department is, is that in a sense a residual amount of money which is likely to be significantly less in the next budget? Or are there

ongoing agreements, western Northlands, or whatever, which will continue to produce funds?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — If I could respond to the two questions, or the one question and the one comment: we are in the process of several new agreements and I suppose we are waiting as much as everyone else to see what direction the federal government will be taking.

With regard to the question of social assistance payments going up, I'm sure everyone is concerned about that, and I think everyone is concerned probably across the free world with regard to unemployment.

I can say that our record to date has been a good one relative to other provinces and certain other jurisdictions in the United States. Having said that, that doesn't mean it's good enough. I think though, by the same token, the hon. member has to recognize and to justify that our system of social assistance was put in place for the very types of situations we find ourselves in in a cyclical economy that always happens to exist. That is, when the less fortunate are without a job, or the less fortunate are without a family or a source of income, we have to have a system, a safety net if you like, to catch those people, to provide them with the bare necessities of life. I think that's basically the system that we live in in this country. Granted, it's perhaps not the best time for that type of a system; bear in mind that that's what it is for, and bear in mind that we are clearly in an economic downturn here and every place else.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm not always sure all your colleagues are fully aware of that, judging from their public pronouncements, but I'll not say more on that. It's not my purpose now to debate that.

With respect to the DREE agreements (I don't want to go into the details of them, but I just try to refresh my memory on which ones are left), are we in receipt of money (to make it perfectly proper) under that heading, under any Special ARDA agreements, western Northlands agreements, Qu'Appelle implementation agreements, and any other big ones?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We are in receipt under those that you have mentioned. I don't think there are any large ones other than those. Northlands and Qu'Appelle are the two large ones.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Again, just for routing. With respect to western Northlands, most of the arrangements are made for that agreement by DNS or now DTRR, I suppose? And most of the ones for Qu'Appelle implementation by the Department of Environment?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, you're correct with regard to DNS and highways, I believe, and the Qu'Appelle by urban affairs and environment.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — And with respect to Special ARDA, who has that in your administration now?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Economic development. Industry and commerce, economic development.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The next item, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, is equalization

payment minus 29 million. Is it anticipated that . . . Shall I phrase it this way: is this part of a pattern of payment back that we can anticipate in that we still have some to make up, or was it a one-year correction?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I believe if you go back to the budget statement of November, what was said is the overpayment was \$100 million. The federal government has agreed to take it over an extended period of time, \$29 million this year and 22 each of the next four years.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to EPF, established program financing, has there been any change in the year that we're discussing, '82-83, in the method of calculating our EPF payments?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — There hasn't, no.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Could the minister give a brief outline of the headings under which we receive money under EPF? What I am trying to establish is that those are block-funding payments and do not include any tax points in that figure. But I am not recalling the method of calculation of the block funding now.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's the cash portion. Any of the points with regard to income tax would show up in income tax. The primary headings are post-secondary education, medicare and hospitalization, and compensation for loss of revenue guarantee in the formula. And then don't try to have him explain the formula for you, please.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I will just waste the committee's time for two minutes by saying that I think that that is a proper statement of what we're getting from the federal government. And when I hear the federal ministers going about saying, "Look what we're contributing for hospitalization and medicare and post-secondary education," and they get a figure very much higher than that by working out their so-called backoff on tax points. And when I recall the origin of this, they are saying that they were fed up with collecting money that we spent and therefore we should raise our own money. They would give us the tax room and we would raise it, and we would take the political heat for it (when I say we, I mean the province of Saskatchewan). And when, after having taken the political heat for raising it, then to hear the Hon. Mr. Argue or someone else say, "Of course, this is money we gave you," then it seems to me that that is a slight distortion of the history. And I am sure all hon. members will agree with me that I am merely making that point because I've heard it in the last few months once again.

The end of that extraneous comment.

With respect to other federal-provincial programs, could you give me the main headings under that figure?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — You have to appreciate there's a whole host of these here. Legal aid, \$1.08 million; education, bilingualism (that's the best I've got there), 1.85 million; energy and mines, renewable resources, for \$1 million; heavy oil, fossil fuel agreement for \$1 million; health, VRDPs, vocational training of some kind under health, and urban transit assistance for 2.5 million. That takes care of . . .

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Could I ask the minister to provide me at a later time the list of those figures? Thank you, Mr. Minister.

I turn back to the figure of Saskatchewan Heritage Fund, 710 million. And I turn to page 118 of the estimates, and we have a figure, Mr. Minister, of \$10,171,000 for coal. I wonder if the minister can tell us what the royalty rate and the estimated tonnage would be that arrives at that figure?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The estimated tonnage would be 7,403,000 tonnes. The crown royalty would be 15 per cent of mine date value.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, has there been any change in the royalty rate during the year under review?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's exactly the same structure: no royalty rate increase or decrease.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn to natural gas and ask there the royalty rate. And I'm asking with respect to this particular calculation of 660,000 and what the anticipated volume is in Mcf of thousand cubic metres?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The rate was 2 cents per Mcf. As you are aware, that was changed effective February 1 to 10 cents per Mcf that will have very little impact on this revenue year. The total volume is 367 Bcf.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The total volume again, Mr. Minister, if I may?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 36.7 Bcf. 36.7 billion cubic feet. Right.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — And 36.7 billion cubic feet at 2 cents per 1,000 cubic feet — a royalty rate of \$660,000, is that right? It doesn't seem quite right but . . .

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's approximately right, only I think somewhat crown into freehold land varies, but 90 per cent of it is crown land.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to change in royalty rates, none other than the one that the minister has now advised? Turning now to oil, \$710 million; I will not ask all the components of that, but I would like to ask about the five or six largest items.

With respect to oil royalties, what sum of money is it anticipated will be collected of that \$710 million out of what are oil royalties proper?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Crown oil royalty will be 315.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — And road allowance?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I think that is reflected in . . . We don't have that part of it broken down.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Do you have a figure for bonus bids?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes. Our estimates were reflecting at the time of the preparation of the budget at about 30. We have been, I suppose, pleasantly surprised and that number is probably going to show some increase for us, although the exact number we won't know yet, but it should be stronger than 30.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to oil well income tax, what figure is anticipated there?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 123.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Pardon?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — 123.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to export tax flowback, what figure is anticipated under that heading?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Approximately 214.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — How much of that is in respect of the year under review, and how much of that is in respect of previous years?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I take it, you mean earned as opposed to where it is reflected? I think we've been in this debate before. The 104 would reflect this year and 109 from the previous allocations, which would then be offset with the equalization payments.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Turning, Mr. Speaker, now to potash, could the minister give me any breakdown as between royalty and base payment and graduated? Does the minister have any breakdown of the 60 million as between the potash royalty figure and the potash base payment figure, and the potash graduated payment figure? It doesn't much matter if you don't.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Of that 60, it would be 24 base payment, 25.8 graduated payment, and 10 crown royalty. If I might add, those were our numbers as of November. The Department of Energy has announced, perhaps a month ago, that those numbers were probably coming in less than that in the sense that anticipated revenues by the potash industry, when they paid their money out early in the year, did not come to fruition. The last quarter, they did not have to pay as much tax. Therefore, it's probably modified down, but . . . (inaudible) . . . could put some further pressure on it. The number used by the deputy minister of energy was down to 34 million from the 60 million, so we have a drop of approximately \$24 million.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I will turn now, Mr. Minister. Picking up on what you have now said, I would like to review the various estimates again, in effect. With respect to \$21.1 million from corporation capital, do you anticipate receiving substantially all or more than that?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — As I indicated on the potash, we show some weakening there. We have a bit of strength up on the oil from what we anticipated. We anticipate maybe a little more with regard to personal income tax than previous years, but most of it is, by and large, very close to where we are. In answer to the question, that specific one. I would tend to answer that, overall, as to where we are going, we look fairly close, other than the fact of potash being down further in that specific and with maybe a little more optimism in both oil and personal income tax. Otherwise the rest of them are pretty much according to the estimates we put in.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'll take them one by one,

simply for the record. So the corporation capital tax, you think, is about right? March 1, '83 estimate, or today's estimate for corporate income tax, at 106 million; about right? Gasoline tax at 15.7 million; approximately accurate? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minister says yes. Individual income tax at 612 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I think that I indicated on that that we are modestly optimistic that we could have a little better number there. The exact amount of that I would not know at this time and tend to hold back any projection further than what we have.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Thank you Mr. Minister. Insurance tax of 11.5 million. Is that approximately right? Mineral acreage tax at 3.7 million; approximately right? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The minister says yes. Sales tax at 329.8 million. What is your current estimate?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That one is a hard one to call. We think we're fairly close to it, give or take a little bit, though, on either side, and I hope you can appreciate that aspect.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Tobacco tax at 36.4 million. What is your current estimate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would the minister answer from his feet, please, so it's recorded?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I answered: pretty close.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — The "other" of 5.9 million. Is that approximately correct?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It's approximately correct.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, I'll come back to the heritage fund once again. The \$90 million from the liquor board: there is no reason to think you wouldn't be taking that amount?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Correct.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Are you anticipating taking any more from the liquor board than the 90 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — No.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the estimate of motor vehicles at 46.2 million: do you anticipate that to be approximately correct?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — That is reasonably correct.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to all of the other items under that heading, our own source revenue, is there any reason to believe that there will be a substantial variance from the 138,400,000?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — No.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the item, receipts from other governments, Canada assistance plan, is the estimate of 114,400,000 approximately correct?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, it will be at least that. There could be some variation on

that; those numbers aren't in yet.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, with respect to established program funding and equalization payments, I take it the figure is fixed by agreement?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The answer to that is yes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — To establish program funding, is the figure of 297,600,000 approximately accurate as far as you can judge it?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, apparently it is tied in to income tax. It could be down a slight amount, just to take cognizance of the fact that income tax could be up a little bit, but otherwise, it's pretty much right on.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, with respect to any other item in the total of 438,983,000 under the heading, receipts from other governments, do you anticipate any substantial variation?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — No.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I turn to the heritage fund, on page 118. With respect to coal, the 10,171,000 — what is your present estimate?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The estimates will be pretty much consistent, other than for three items. Gas, we indicated earlier, would probably show some increase because of the increased royalty effective February and March of this fiscal year. Oil will show some modification up. We are not exactly sure of that number yet. Potash we probably see coming down, perhaps 25 million.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Does the minister have any estimate of the amount likely to show upward under oil?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Perhaps a few million, but still it's a hard one to read out there, and I would hate to be tied to that figure. But we are optimistic that we could get a little bit more.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, with respect to potash, did I understand you to say that you anticipated a possible drop of 25 million or thereabouts?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, I believe the statement made earlier was that the number we had in them was at 60, and we are projecting, or the Department of Energy was projecting, 34 approximately a month ago. I'm not sure that it has varied much from there. That's the number we're tending to be looking at now.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to the total figure of \$811,757,000, total non-renewable resource revenue for the heritage fund, subject to the comments already made with respect to natural gas's modest increase, oil's possible increase and potash's possible decrease of perhaps 25 million, is the figure thought to be approximately correct?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I would say in answer to that question: pretty much the way we see it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I turn now, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, to the investment revenue under the heritage fund — dividend from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, \$50 million, and interest revenue of \$26,070,000. Are each of those expected to be approximately those figures?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, we have before us supplementary estimates of approximately \$52 million. That may be partially offset by miscellaneous underexpenditures which are perhaps not fully identified yet. Could the minister advise whether or not it is reasonable to add the \$52 million supplementary expenses to his deficit of 220 to get a budgetary deficit, likely of \$270 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — It would not be correct. We anticipate corresponding offsets in expenditures to cover the supplementary number that you talked about.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do you now think that the miscellaneous under expenditures, which always occur, will be as much as \$52 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Very close.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to revenue, we have indicated some places where revenue will be up and revenue will be down. The biggest, I think, single figure which looks fairly firm is a drop of 25 million in the potash side of the heritage fund. If that should occur, my understanding is that it would not then be possible to transfer the full \$710 million to the consolidated fund. Is that the government's view?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — As I understand, the legal opinion on this question is the estimates are the numbers that relate to the transfers as opposed to the actuals.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — You are advising now that if the actual revenue is less than the amount projected then the provision in the statute limiting the amount of the transfer would not cut in because of a failure of actual, but would be governed by the estimates.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, what the act says is 80 per cent of the estimated revenue. So I suppose one would ask for a legal opinion on that. Reading that, we would interpret that as meaning what the estimated value was as opposed to having to readjust it on actuals.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — In summary then, with respect to the deficit estimated in November at \$220 million, is the minister advising that he believes that the actual deficit for the year ended March 31 next, one month from now, will be that figure, give or take \$10 million?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I would say yes to that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Turning, Mr. Minister, to the administration branch. There has obviously been a very, very large increase in the expenditures under the administration branch. Would the minister indicate what increased positions were provided for? I think a look at the estimates will indicate that the previous years had 11.4 person-years. The anticipated increase was perhaps two people to 13.3. We now have 19.3 which is an

increase of six people — eight people really — eight people in the administration branch. Would the minister outline what people were on staff last year and what are on staff now?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I think the largest item in that is the funding of the Wolff commission on the crown corporations. It's under the Department of Finance; that's approximately \$600,000.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I'll start at the top line first, the personal services: 11.4 person-years and 19.3 person-years — eight more people. Could the minister advise what people were on staff when he took office and what people are now on staff?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — In the blue book, would reflect the five or six positions with regard to government organization, government reorganization. That particular operation is now being wound down, but that would be the largest component, those five or six positions there.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — We in the opposition have wondered with some fascination where all of these transition team people were . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Pardon? Well, can you give me the names of the people who were . . . We knew who the transition people were, we just didn't know where they were getting their cheques from. Can you tell me the names of the people who were on staff and the people who are now on staff?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Okay, this was government organization advisers. What you would commonly refer to as the transition team would not be seen there. The person involved in that was a Mr. Gil Johnson, who is now deputy minister of continuing education. He came into the government and worked various reorganizations that we were doing. Along with him was a Mr. Ed Evancio, and a Mr. Murray, and two or three secretaries in that group. I think they were dealing primarily . . . One of the main areas was northern Saskatchewan, but also would be overall reorganization of government, which is an ongoing operation and not what you would normally refer to as transition.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I wonder if I might persist and ask whether the minister can just run through the names of the people who were on staff and who are covered by this 19.3 in the year under review. Who were the 11.4 and who were the 19.3, to the extent that they were permanent people, or contract people? Full-time people is perhaps what I'm saying.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Okay, the positions are as follows, to add up to 19. Two executive assistants that were in place in November that I indicated that were no longer there. A minister's secretary, assistant secretary to the minister — that's in the minister's office staff. That component was four. It is now three. The deputy minister's office is the deputy minister, the assistant deputy minister, the assistant to the deputy minister, the deputy minister's secretary, clerk-steno 3. Administration services — the director of administration, assistant to the director of administration, communications officer, clerk-typist 3. And then the Gil Johnson group that I referred to earlier of the five people. And that adds up to the 19.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, could you give me the names of the people? I know a number of them and I will be able to relate better if I have the names.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Okay. The executive assistants who were on were Jack Upshall, who is now in highway traffic working there; Dawn Dobni, who was a lawyer working in my office, is now working with Sask Housing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Dobni. Diane Tremblay, who was the secretary there before; the new secretary is Dianne Mooney. The deputy minister is Rob Douglas; assistant deputy minister, Mike Costello; assistant to the deputy minister is Mr. McKenzie who is now on education leave; assistant to the deputy minister, Ron Davis; the deputy minister's secretary is Margaret Allan; the clerk-typist 3, I don't know who it is and I'm sure you don't care. Director of administration, Keith Mackrill; assistant to the director of administration, Ehman; and communications officer is Jane Dempsey who is now the EA in my office.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — In respect to David, Mackrill, Ehman and Dempsey, when did they come on staff?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mackrill was there when I came. Ron David transferred September 1, 1982, from BMI over to that particular position. Jane Dempsey was hired on June 16, 1982.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And Ehman?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Three years.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Turning now, Mr. Minister, to the other expenses, \$940,470, could you give me a breakdown of all items of \$50,000 or more?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The printing, binding and engraving is \$50,000. The other miscellaneous expense was \$750,000. The largest component of that was the Wolfgang Wolff commission and report with regard to crown corporations, handled out of our office. The other two were two people. One was called Robinson, from Sask Power Corporation, who was doing an internal study with regard to the workings of the Department of Finance, and one was Garnet Garven, who was formerly with the city of Regina. They came over here. They were contracted to Executive Council. We pay for their cost because they're looking at the Department of Finance.

Those are the three that exceed \$50,000. If you want me to get into some of the smaller stuff — that's pretty well got it. It's X number of dollars for telephone and office paper and this type of thing.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — You have partly answered the next question: that is, what contractual employees are covered by that vote?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Just the two I referred to.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Paul Robinson and Garvin. What was the approximate total cost of the Wolfgang Wolff commission?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We had 600,000. It's estimated to come in around 425, substantially less than 6.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would the minister give the view of the government as to the value to the government in future policy-making of the Wolfgang Wolff commission report?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Would I? No, because I believe that matter has not been adequately dealt with at cabinet yet. I think it would be improper of me to comment until such time as it was. I think the statement will be coming forth on particular moves that we might have to address to crown corporations by way of organization and how we might do that. That's going to be announced in due course.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Would the minister outline somewhat more fully regarding Mr. Paul Robinson and Mr. Garven and what their commission was when they were taken on contract?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I think they were looking at the workings of the Department of Finance. Many of the places, virtually all of the people that were there before were left in place. I think it was an idea to ensure that we check with other jurisdictions independently to determine whether it was operating the right way or whether it should be working in different ways. That, by and large, was what they were doing and the advice that we sought from them.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — What were Mr. Robinson's qualifications to review the Department of Finance? What is his background and what qualifications would he have for that particular task?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I understand they both have masters degrees or equivalents in public administration. Garven was an employee of the city of Regina in a senior administration position, and Robinson was in a senior position with Sask Power.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, have they reported to the minister in a formal way?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — They have made some recommendations, but not a full final report. Any full, final report, as you can appreciate, is an internal management document. I suppose we would look to see if there's going to be any reorganization or doing of things differently within the Department of Finance. I think that will become clear as time goes on.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do I understand the minister to be taking the position that they are hired on contract to do an examination of the operations of the Department of Finance, that they will report to the minister and that that report will not be public or made available to anyone but the internal government persons?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Generally, I think what will happen is that they would be advising. We would tend to review and look at, and act on where we saw proper to and not act on where we didn't see proper to.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm directing my attention to whether or not the report prepared by the outside consultants — in the case of Mr. Garven, not in any sense a government employee, and Mr. Robinson, an employee, I take it, of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation — notwithstanding the fact that they have been engaged as outside consultants and paid for pursuant to a contract, whether their findings will in no sense be available to anyone but the minister.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, I don't think that they're going to be findings in the sense

of a formal report like the Wolfgang commission report was, with a specific targeted deal. I think what they're looking at tends to be able to advise the minister as well as tending to look at the overall way of doing things. And it's not so much an internal report, as I suppose an internal report for the government. But there is not the formalization of the report, if I can, like the Wolfgang commission.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'd be interested if the minister would outline what sort of things he was contemplating with respect to the Department of Finance. Is it assumed it will take on much larger responsibilities or much smaller responsibilities? Is it assumed that parts of the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services will be decanted back to finance?

The Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services indicated — I don't think she asserted it, but indicated — that there might well be an amalgamation of the Department of Government Services and the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. As I recall it, the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services was made up partly of functions taken over from the old Department of Public Works and functions taken over from the old Department of Finance. And I'm curious to know whether or not it is proposed that the Department of Finance will be assuming substantially larger functions if there is an amalgamation of departments.

I'd be interested in knowing just what avenues these people were looking at. I'm sure anyone can look at the Department of Finance. But these two particular people have no . . . They wouldn't have much to say about treasury and debt management or whatever, that function, and they wouldn't have a great deal to say about the comptroller's office, or perhaps they would, although I don't know where their expertise would come from. They might, if they were looking at an overall review of the organization of government — they each come from relatively large organizations who are organized somewhat differently than the Government of Saskatchewan — they obviously might have something to contribute. I'd be interested if the minister would state a little more fully what was sought to be achieved by bringing in these people and asking them to review the Department of Finance.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, I suppose what we would look at trying to achieve is: see what other jurisdictions, how other jurisdictions handle the budgeting process; see whether all the departments of the department fit, or whether some others could be transferred to other departments or amended or varied. I suppose that the other thing that we sought is maybe a way to prepare a budget that would tend to be such that it was more receptive to the people or more in tune with what people were saying. And was the system in fact right for that? Were there some amendments to that?

I take it the hon. member would probably harken back to the last budget that his government advanced and I suppose would ask oneself. "Did we do everything the right way and were there changes that could be implemented to make it better, to make it more address the needs?" And I suppose we sought those types of things. And some of that being structural; some of it being other than structural. And where the problems were.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I have no doubt in the world that some things should have been done differently, but I'm not sure I would have looked to the Department of Finance as the first place. I don't think there was anything wrong with the way the numbers were put together. It was perhaps the numbers that were put together that might have been done differently, and I can hardly lay that at the

door of the Department of Finance.

Perhaps I can phrase the question this way: with respect to the other expenses item, it has multiplied by a very large figure — 141 to 940; 800,000 increase. Six hundred thousand of that is accounted for by the budget for the Wolfgang Wolff commission report, which I take it will not be an ongoing expense. The other 200,000 is accounted for partly by the Robinson and Garven study. I'm wondering whether there are any other items in this 940,000 which are likely to be ongoing, and therefore likely to be an expense which will continue into future years.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We would anticipate that most of that would drop back off next year.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.