

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 11, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES
Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Time Act

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As chairman of the standing committee on non-controversial bills, I wish to present the second report of the said committee, which is as follows:

As chairman of the non-controversial bills committee, I wish to report Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Time Act, as being non-controversial.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 43 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As chairman of the non-controversial bills committee, I wish to report Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act, as being non-controversial.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole on the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 44 — An Act to repeal The Tax Sharing (Pipe Lines) Act

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the non-controversial bills committee, I wish to report Bill No. 44, An Act to repeal The Tax Sharing (Pipe Lines) Act, as being non-controversial.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration of committee of the whole of the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move the said bill be now read third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Sharing (Potash) Act

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the non-controversial bills committee, I wish to report Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Sharing (Potash) Act, as being non-controversial.

Mr. Speaker: — When shall this bill be read a second time?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that second reading and consideration in committee of the whole of the said bill be waived.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the said bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agree to and bill read a third time.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure I introduce to you and to the Assembly some nine residents of Ranch Ehrlo Society, outside of the city of Regina near Pilot Butte. They are accompanied by Mr. Ian Grant and Carol Bell. I would ask that they would stand up and be recognized. I will have the opportunity to meet with them shortly after question period and after His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is in to give Royal Assent. I hope that our guests enjoy the afternoon and have a very interesting and informative tour, and an interesting and informative afternoon. I look forward to meeting with them after question period.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Bacon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to join with the Assembly in welcoming the delegation from the Ranch Ehrlo Society. My husband was in the employ of the Ranch Ehrlo Society from 1977 to 1979. We worked there with, I think there was 12 boys, at Chitek Lake. You're doing a fine job. We really enjoyed our times; we have many warm feelings. Continue the good work.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you and to all members of the legislature, a group of 17 grade 11 and 12 students from the community of Pierceland in my constituency. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Richard Frey; by the chaperones, Colleen Niedermaier, Charlotte Unrau; their bus driver, Dennis Hetlinger.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, as I have said on other rare occasions when people come from the Meadow Lake constituency this far with school groups, and it is a major undertaking — the organization of such a trip for people coming from that distance. This particular group has come from more than 400 miles from Regina, and I think it's an indication of the dedication of that community and of the school in that community that they take an interest in the public affairs of the province. I would ask all members to join with me in welcoming them here today, and wish them an enjoyable and an informative time in the legislature. I will inform them that I'll meet with you sometime this afternoon, just after the question period, for some questions and some pictures and so on. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Domotor: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, a group of grade 12 students from Winston High School at Watrous. They're 28 in number, accompanied by their teacher, Don Sangster. I trust their visit will be informative and enjoyable, and I'll be meeting with them at 2:45 for pictures and refreshments. I wish to ask the Assembly to welcome them here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Crow Rate

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Last week when Mr. Pepin released his press release stating he was going to change the Crow rate, you said, 'Let's wait and see. It mightn't be that bad.' I pleaded with you, 'Don't endorse the legislation by your silence.' You refused. Will you now get off the fence and tell the people of Saskatchewan where you stand on this proposed legislation that will destroy the Crow rate?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any doubt in the minds of the people of Saskatchewan where we stand on the question of the Crow rate. I would point out to members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation was tabled in the house of Commons yesterday at 3 o'clock p.m. I think that works out to about 5 o'clock local time in Regina. It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that my officials now have a copy of the legislation in their possession. They're currently analysing it. I'll be meeting with my officials this evening after which, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than pleased to detail our position relative to that proposal to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Well, it's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that your officials will read and detail it. We've had copies of the proposed legislation on our desk this morning. We've had copies on our desk this morning. Yesterday, by phone, we knew that the variable rates can be introduced at a competitive points. The railway simply has to file 30 days in advance that they're going to change the rate. Are you in agreement, personally, with changing the legislation so that the CPR and CNR can introduce variable rates with 30 days notice?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of pillow talk goes on between them and their incestuous relationship that goes on with their counterparts in Ottawa. I don't have the same kind of relationship, unfortunately, with the federal cabinet, and consequently I don't get the free kind of access that they obviously do to what may be coming out of Ottawa. As it relates to the question of variable rates — and it's been asked many, many times in this House before and answered many, many times before . . .

An Hon. Member: — Never.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Oh. If you'd take a look at your *Hansard*, or pay attention when the question's been answered you might understand it.

Our position, Mr. Speaker, has always been that we would reject any proposal that would allow the railroads, with their monopoly powers, to redesign rural Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — New question, Mr. Speaker. If the minister would have been in contact with his colleagues, like we were with ours, you could have brought down the Liberal government. You did not want to. There were 34 members, Mr. Speaker. There were 34 Conservative members out of the House and 24 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. If the member does have a question would you get directly to it.

Mr. Engel: — New question, Mr. Speaker. And he raised the issue of my contact with my colleagues in Ottawa. I'm saying if you would have had contact with your colleagues in Ottawa, you could have brought down the House yesterday. The vote was 34 Tories missing and only 24 Liberals. And you could have defeated them on that vote if you would have wanted to take action on this piece of legislation. And if you'd be serious about variable rates, because you knew variable rates were . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'll take the next question.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the first stage of the Crow bill was defeated in the House by a margin of 24, when 36 Progressive Conservative MPs were absent, would you advise this House what you did to encourage the Conservative MPs to be on hand to vote to defeat that bill? For if they had been there it would have been defeated.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another Erik that is the Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa, and I have confidence in his ability to influence the members of that particular caucus. And I'm sure that he did and I'm sure that some members like the member for Kindersley-Lloyd was on the farm and was unable to get back in time for the vote. And they don't have the private jets at their disposal as some other members might.

But I want to talk a little bit about bringing down government because we have some experience in that — we did it last April 26th. But, more importantly, Mr. Speaker, this question wouldn't be being dealt with in Ottawa today had it not been for your colleagues joining forces with the Liberals in Ottawa to bring down another government, Mr. Speaker, to bring down another government that was in fact committed to the preservation of western Canada and agriculture in western Canada.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I don't often agree with press reports, but I find it convenient to agree with the one that I read last night, when it said that it was the Liberals that held up the vote, Mr. Speaker, because they didn't have enough members to beat the combined opposition.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In view of the fact that it was perfectly clear on Monday that there was going to be a vote on Tuesday, can you explain what steps you took to encourage at least Saskatchewan MPs to be in Ottawa to vote against the Crow legislation? Can you tell us what you did to see that there was some voice for Saskatchewan in the House of Commons?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the member for Yorkton was also absent for the vote, and if you will tell me what you did to get him there. I will tell you what I did to get ours there. Quite frankly, and I don't want to be facetious, Mr. Speaker, but I did phone a couple of them and offer to buy them a plane ticket. And they allowed as to how they could afford it without any help, and they were going to go down if they could possibly get there in time. The original vote, I believe, was scheduled for 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and they were targeting for that. In fact the vote took place, I believe, at 1 or 1:30 in the afternoon, and caught some of them en route.

An Hon. Member: — Where's the member from Yorkton from? Which party?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I don't know which party the member from Yorkton's from, but . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. You've asked the minister a question. Give him an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In your platform that you circulated last April during the campaign, under Crown rate, you say, 'The Crow rate must remain.' Are you still standing by that, or have you some phoney excuses?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I remember well in the last campaign there were three parties that had the same position on the Crow rate. One of them was your

party. When this Gilson talks first began and later evolved into the Pepin proposal, we were I believe wise enough to not keep our heads in the sand and fight for the best possible deal we could get for western Canadians. We advanced a nine-point proposal in this House that was supported by the members opposite and was supported by this side of the House. It was identical to the resolution that your colleagues in Manitoba passed.

If I were king tomorrow and had absolute rule, I would say that the Crow must not be changed and that any additional cost for transportation should be borne by the federal government. As agricultural exports benefit all Canadians all Canadians should bear the cost of additional capacity in transportation. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we're putting up the best fight we can to protect western Canadians. We've brought forth a nine-point resolution that was supported by you, was supported by your colleagues in Manitoba, and thus, Mr. Speaker, makes your question quite redundant.

Mr. Engel: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. As far as redundant is concerned, when you say the Crow rate must remain, the position that Pepin put forward in his bill yesterday was worse — was worse — for Saskatchewan than his original proposal. And that's because you sat on the fence. My question is: are you in agreement with the inflation factor? Are you in agreement with the variable rates? Are you in agreement that the farmers should pay all that is over 6 per cent by 1986? Are you in agreement with those three points that's in the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we're breaking new ground in redundancy every time he stands up. Those questions, Mr. Speaker, were asked last Friday. They were dealt with last Friday. Of course we accept the principle of a safety net, as we argued, and argued on every occasion that we could argue it. We don't accept the safety net if it comes in at something like 15 or 20 or 50 per cent of the commodity price. WE argued for the principle of the safety net, and we endorsed the principle of the safety net. As it relates to additional commodities, we endorse the principle of additional commodities, but clearly, Mr. Speaker, if the additional commodity happens to be pumpkins we won't endorse it. We endorse the principle, Mr. Speaker, of removal of the 31.1 ceiling. I've already answered the question as it relates to variable rates. I've already answered the question as it relates to method of payment. And, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think for me to act in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan, I should be afforded the opportunity for me and my officials to review the legislation in detail. And I'll be prepared to bring our position in detail to this House after that's done.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, in your last response you indicated that you are looking for a safety net. Obviously if you have put forward a position that you want a safety net provided, I ask you to outline to the Saskatchewan what in fact you mean by a safety net. You have indicated on numerous occasions that the farmers of Saskatchewan are prepared to pay more. But I'm asking you, what are you talking about when you reply, 'safety net'? Define the perimeters of the safety net.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about is some recognition of ability to pay. And I'm sure that even the member opposite understands that we do compete in an international, a very competitive international market. And if we have inclining freight rates, declining commodity prices, then clearly we are at a disadvantage in that competitive market and thus are likely to be taken out of the market to the detriment of all Canadians.

Farmers, I think, are a responsible breed of cat and they're prepared, Mr. Speaker, to

accept their share of the responsibility. But they want the protection of — and I think this is broadly endorsed through the vast majority of farm organizations in western Canada — they want the protection, Mr. Speaker, that at no time will freight rates exceed a fixed percentage of the world price of the commodity that they're dealing in. And I think that's a fair safety net, Mr. Speaker, a reasonable request from us to Ottawa, and one that we've advanced arguments for to Ottawa to accept that principle. If I can believe the members opposite and if I can believe Ottawa, there's some indication from Ottawa that they have accepted the principle. I don't know at what level they would effect the principle but if the principle is accepted, I suppose we can get to the table and argue for some level.

Salary Increases for Senior Public Servants

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. It has to do with the fact that his government has increased salaries of his highest paid civil servants by up to \$250 per month, \$3,000 per year, and at the same time your government has preached the virtues of restraint to those on minimum wage and to those who work for school boards and hospital boards and the like. My question is this: in the interest of justice, in the interest of fairness, will you today announce that you propose to roll back the April 1st increases for your very highest paid staff at least until you have increased the minimum wage for the very lowest paid people in this province?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that any increases that we want to make, or any administration makes, in salary that correlate directly with productivity are clearly not linked to inflation, and anybody that happens to be from time to time on minimum wage does not have to be confined to minimum wage, because through training and through skills and through several other things they can improve their picture. For out-of-scope people the only way that we can reward productivity, and large degree of hours and work, is through changes in salary.

Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition. I have had the opportunity to check the information given to me during my fiscal estimates. I have determined that in my absence the general salary increases of 6 per cent to out-of-scope employees was dealt with. I first realized the formal decision had been made yesterday, Tuesday, in question period. With regard to Mr. Dutton's salary, I was provided with the previous salary and not the increased salary. I assume the information was accurate and up to date.

Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to the Assembly, and I want to apologize to the Leader of the Opposition, for both having received and provided inaccurate information. I had no intention of misleading this Assembly, and I sincerely apologize for my error. Mr. Speaker, senior officials have offered their resignations, and I am considering an appropriate course of action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. With respect to the senior officials, are you satisfied with the performance of officials who knew the facts, did not advise you, and sat, respectively, beside you on your left, beside you on your right and behind you — every one of whom knew the facts, and every one of whom withheld those facts, apparently from you, but certainly from this House?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, as I've just pointed out, I apologize to the House for

having received inaccurate information, and having providing the House information, inaccurate information. I have received the offers of resignations of several of my officials, and I am giving them very serious consideration right now in terms of the appropriate action. I don't believe that I can add any more than that. I am giving it serious consideration, and I did receive their offers of resignation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If you do not accept their resignations will you at least reassess, will you at least reassess whether or not they are entitled to increases of \$3,000 a year for exceptional productivity?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. You've asked a question, now give the minister the opportunity to answer it. The Premier, please.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I have just acknowledged, and I've said several times, I respect ministerial responsibility for officials. I have had the opportunity to review the information, and I've had an opportunity to talk to the officials. And officials have offered their letters of resignation. They have provided information in error. They were errors of omission, not commission, and I will be dealing with them accordingly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I deal with the matter of the Dutton salary, which you advise that you were given erroneous information, that either the numbers were wrong, or in any case you were not aware of the appropriate figure. Will you concede that the increase which Mr. Dutton received was pursuant to a recommendation for an order in council signed by you, both in your capacity as responsible minister and your capacity as Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I concede that I signed the form. I looked at the information provided me and it was my assumption that the information on the list with all the rest of them was current. And I assumed that it was current, and I assumed that it was accurate. And I could have gone back and checked every one to see if they were current, whether it's 31, 32, 31, 33, or whatever it may be. I assumed they were current because the information was given to me was supposed to be current.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, I've apologized to this House and to the Leader of the Opposition for having received and having given inaccurate information. And I have received letters of resignation from my officials, and I can't offer anything else.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, one further question to the Premier on the matter of Dutton, Mr. Premier, you were aware that the Dutton figure on your list was the figure on your list you provided me two or three weeks ago. The list you provided me, and from which your staff read, was the same list that you provided me two or three weeks ago. A day or two before I asked you that question, and well after you provided me with that list, you signed a recommendation for an increase in Mr. Dutton's salary knowing that it was different from the list you had provided me a couple weeks ago. Why do you ask us to believe that you felt that the number on the list, which was the same as the one two or three weeks ago, reflected the increase provided for in the recommendation which you had signed?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. It's impossible for the House to operate with

this amount of commotion. I would ask for the Assembly to return to some semblance of order.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I looked at the lists of information that were given me. It was a long list of information on several employees and their salaries. I looked at that list, and I assumed that it was accurate, and that it was up to date. And there were several people on the list. And I assumed that that was up to date on all out-of-scope people. I made that assumption because the officials were providing me with that information. Mr. Speaker, I apologize that I made the wrong assumption.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, order. Give the Premier a chance to complete his answer. The Premier.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I've apologized to the Assembly. I've apologized to the Leader of the Opposition. I have received offers of resignation from my officials. I would point out, I believe that the hon. member opposite and the NDP opposite will recall where a deputy minister in their administration never even informed the cabinet of PCBs in Regina water and it went on and on and on — a serious problem in Regina — for a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just apologized for the fact that the information that I received during my estimates may have been hours out in terms of being inaccurate. And I apologize for that. My officials gave me the wrong information, and I provided that information, and I've apologized. I've received offers of resignation. I don't know what more that I can do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Education Act (No. 2)

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials.

Mr. Currie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce Peter Dyck, who is the executive director of regional services, to my left. And to my right is Bill Wells, who is the school administration consultant.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 26 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 27 as amended agreed to.

Clauses 28 to 37 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Education Act (No. 2)

Hon. Mr. Currie: — With leave, Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that Bill No. 36 be now read the third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 2:47 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave royal assent to the following bills:

Bill No. 31 — An Act to establish the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat

Bill No. 23 — An Act to amend The Human Tissue Gift Act

Bill No. 24 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act

Bill No. 25 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act

Bill No. 26 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend An Act to provide a Superannuation Allowance to a Certain Former Member of the Legislative Assembly

Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979

Bill No. 35 — An Act to amend The Rural Municipal Secretary Treasurers Act

Bill No. 37 — An Act to amend The Credit Union Act

Bill No. 39 — An Act to repeal The Mining Associations Act

Bill No. 40 — An Act to repeal The Artificial Insemination (Animals) Act

Bill No. 41 — An Act respecting the Department of Education

Bill No. 42 — An Act to amend The Time Act

Bill No. 43 — An Act to amend The Municipal Employees' Superannuation Act

Bill No. 44 — An Act to repeal The Tax Sharing (Pipe Lines) Act

Bill No. 45 — An Act to amend The Municipal Tax Sharing (Potash) Act

Bill No. 36 — An Act to amend The Education Act (No. 2).

His Honour then retired from the Chamber at 2:49 p.m.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 47 — An Act respecting the Administration of the Finances of Saskatchewan and to repeal Certain Obsolete Statutes related to Financial Matters

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the act that we're talking about I assume is the act respecting The Department of Revenue and Financial Services Act. I would move Bill 33, if I could, first.

Okay, it doesn't matter; I'll go with 47, An Act respecting the Administration of the Finances of Saskatchewan and to repeal Certain Obsolete Statutes related to Financial Matters. This new act has been created for three main reasons. First the existing Department of Finance Act, except for some minor amendments, has gone largely untouched for more than a decade. Because of this, the act has many archaic references that do not correspond to ways that the actual financial management of government is, or should be, carried out. The new act more explicitly describes the operation of the treasury board and the Department of Finance. As well, it streamlines the borrowing process of government and, in so doing, incorporates the provisions of Saskatchewan Loans Act within this act.

Secondly, the existing Department of Finance Act includes provisions for the operation of the Provincial Auditor. The new act separates these powers from the existing Department of Finance Act and creates a new Provincial Auditor's act. This move not only reflects the importance and the independence of the Provincial Auditor's task, but will increase the Provincial Auditor's independence and improve the way that he does business.

Third, the recent organization of government has resulted in the comptroller's office being transferred from the Department of Finance to the new Department of Revenue and Financial Services. Legislative change is therefore required to allow this transfer to occur while still maintaining the necessary working links between the comptroller's office and the treasury board.

I would like to turn to the highlights of the new act. Let me say at the beginning and very carefully that all the changes have been designed to improve the financial management of government. Nothing has been done, or will be done, to weaken in any way the financial responsibility and accountability of the government to this legislature. Parts II and III of the act deal with the organization of the Department of Finance. These parts more explicitly outline the duties of the minister, the treasury board, and the department, in the way of modernized language and makes it coincide with the desired practices.

Specifically, the minister is responsible for: the management and control of revenues

and expenditures of the Government of Saskatchewan; the management of the Consolidated Fund, the heritage fund, and the public debt; the presentation of estimates to the Legislative Assembly; and the presentation of public accounts.

Similarly, section 12 of the act brings the duties of the treasury board up to date. Treasury board is responsible for: the finances including revenue and expenditure and assets of the Government of Saskatchewan; the evaluation of programs of government; the administrative policies and management practices and systems; the government's accounting policies and practices; the organization of all or any part of the Government of Saskatchewan. These ministerial and treasury board responsibilities are the core feature to an efficient, effective and accountable public sector.

Other features of parts II and III of the act should improve the day-to-day operation of government. Sections 9 and 10, for example, enable the government to establish authority for grants or financial assistance programs. It would be our intention to use this authority mainly in emergency situations. Previously this had been done through the appropriation act, which not only provided the funds for the particular expenditure but also provided the legislative authority. This was a practice that was seen undesirable by both the Provincial Auditor and the government. We are therefore taking the necessary legislative steps in this new act to strengthen the legality of such expenditures.

Even though the comptroller has been transferred to the Department of Revenue and Financial Services, section 14 of this act recognizes the importance of the comptroller's function as it relates to the overall responsibility of treasury boards. This is important to establish since it makes it clear that the comptroller is responsible for ensuring compliance with financial regulations established by the treasury board.

Part IV of the act deals with investments of the Government of Saskatchewan. The investments board is continued in section 18. Changes to this part in the act will allow for better management of public sector pension funds. A previous amendment to The Department of Finance Act established the consolidated superannuation plan investment fund. Provisions in section 20 of the new act will now allow for the creation of more than one pooled public sector pension fund. More than one pooled fund is necessary to accommodate the differing kinds of public sector pension plans in the province, while the contributions to and the benefits from each of these plans remain separate to each plan. The act allows for the pooling of these assets for investment purposes. The consolidation will allow smaller funds to take advantage of the same investment opportunities available for larger funds, and contribute to a higher investment return.

Parts V and VI deal with revenues and the appropriation and expenditure of public moneys. Section 25 continues the Consolidated Fund. This provision is fundamental principle of the parliamentary accountability and control. All public revenues will be deposited in the Consolidated Fund unless otherwise directed by the Assembly.

Part VI of the act specifies that the minister prepares the estimates and presents them to the Legislative Assembly. The act continues the normal practice of appropriations. Virements which move funds between subvotes within a specific vote will be allowed, but it should be emphasized that the net effect of virement changes will be shown in the *Public Accounts*.

The practice of issuing special warrants will also be continued, and the period within

which they can be issued prior to the sitting of the legislature will be changed from 14 to seven days. This will allow for greater administrative flexibility without weakening the accountability and control.

Part VII of the act, dealing with the government borrowing and liabilities, has been substantially streamlined and improved. This modernization will generally allow the government to be more responsive to changing financial market conditions in a way that reduces the paperwork within government.

With respect to the authority to borrow, The Saskatchewan Loans Act allows the government to borrow for its own purposes only when there is — this is for a capital project. The repeal of The Saskatchewan Loans Act and the modernization of its provisions within this act will allow the government to borrow for the general purposes of the Consolidated Fund. This change will make our legislation coincide with practices that have been in reality for at least the last decade, and will avoid the archaic language required from the previous act.

As well, the government is currently authorized to borrow on behalf of specific Crown corporations. The new act allows the government to borrow for Crown corporations generally as specified in that corporation's own act, without specifying the exact Crown or purpose for which the borrowing is being made. This strengthens the authority to borrow, will allow more immediate responsiveness to the financial market conditions, and allow the government to borrow in advance of requirements of a specific corporation.

With respect to the mechanics of borrowing, further improvements have been made. Under a blanket order in council, Lieutenant-Governor in Council can authorize the minister and his senior officials to borrow up to a certain specified amount. Section 42(5)(a) and (b) details this provision. Within the amount identified in the blanket order in council, various borrowings can be undertaken within the identified limits. This will allow the minister to take advantage of market conditions on an hourly basis in a more streamlined way.

Under previous legislation, if the government wished to undertake a bond issue in, for example, New York, members of Executive Council had to be on stand-by to authorize the order in council at a specific time. This process proved to be very cumbersome. The changes, except for the overall authority to borrow, will eliminate the need for extensive Executive Council time on short notice and often unforeseen time base.

At the same time, the streamlining of paperwork will not weaken the accountability of our borrowing activities. A specific order in council will still be required before a deal is closed. In addition, when borrowing funds are advanced to the Crowns, the order in council will of course disclose all of the relevant details, including where the money is being advanced and for what purpose.

Similarly, improvements have been made in borrowing of short-term funds, treasury bill notes, etc. Previously, when an issue of a 90-day treasury bill had to be rolled over, a new order in council was needed to authorize the sale. The new act allows the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to authorize the amount of the treasury bills that can be outstanding. Within this general authority the minister can then authorize specific transactions. This will again streamline the process and negate the need for an ongoing Executive Council involvement.

With respect to remissions, there is a section of remissions in the revenue and financial services act pertaining to taxes collected by that minister. Beyond this, the act I am presenting today contains a blanket provision covering any form of tax, and therefore goes beyond the more specific concerns of the revenue and financial services act.

As well, the minister will now be able to make remissions of up to \$1,000 without further cabinet approval, again streamlining the paper flow going through cabinet. Of course, all remissions will continue to be reported in *Public Accounts*.

In conclusion, it is with great pride that I put this bill forward. I think it goes a long ways toward modernization of wording and streamlining the very practical way the financial administration of the government runs. I therefore move Bill No. 47, An Act respecting the Administration of the Finances of Saskatchewan and to repeal Certain Obsolete Statutes related to Financial Matters, be now read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to review the legislation fully. It is fairly detailed legislation. A couple of points did occur to me as I read the legislation and as I heard the minister. I will want to raise in committee the matter of remissions, and remissions by the minister of smaller amounts under \$1,000, and whether or not the legislation makes clear that any taxes or other debts due to the Crown which are remitted are forgiven by the minister, whether the details have to be set out in *Public Accounts*. I didn't pick up that this was required, but I may not have understood the provisions completely.

Another area of a good deal of interest is the relationship between the Department of Finance as set out in the act, and the Crown corporations, and the pension funds — more particularly the Crown corporations. There appears to be fairly rigorous guide-lines with respect to treasury approval for any borrowings by Crown corporations. This certainly has been the custom. I am not sure that the legislation has been framed in such clear, and accordingly restrictive terms. This is something that we can pursue in committee. I would like an opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to review the remarks of the Minister of Finance, and accordingly beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Bill No. 46 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of
The Department of Finance Act, 1983**

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the main purpose of this bill is to make reference changes in existing pieces of legislation because of the new Department of Finance Act, 1983. Beyond these simple housekeeping matters, there are four more substantial points that I would like to highlight.

Number one, section 18 of the act amends The Interpretation Act to allow those who are authorized to appoint public officers to fix their expenses in addition to their remuneration. Previously, the practice had been to fix both expenses and remuneration. The amendment will bring the legislative wording in line with the practice.

Two, section 32 of the act adds a provision to The Provincial Secretary's Act authorizing the Provincial Secretary to provide office space and staff for the operation of the office of Lieutenant-Governor. For a number of years, money for this was contained in the Provincial Secretary's budget; however, his act was silent on the matter. The addition to this act should therefore strengthen the expenditure authority of the Lieutenant-

Governor's office.

Section 34 of the act repeals provisions in The Public Service Act which declared that the Provincial Auditor and his employees are public servants. This is being done on the wishes of the Provincial-Auditor to highlight his independence and be consistent with the new Provincial Auditor Act.

Section 51 of this bill amends The Trust and Loan Corporations Act. The alteration provisions allow the Minister of Finance to require trust and loan corporations that are provincially incorporated and licensed to effect insurance on their deposits with the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation. Further, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize the Minister of Finance to indemnify the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation for any losses it sustains from the previous mentioned insured deposit.

I move Bill No. 46, An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Finance Act, 1983, now be read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we will be proceeding with the previous bill, or Bill 47, I have no comments on Bill 46, other than to raise two or three matters which can perhaps best be raised in committee. And, accordingly, I will be supporting the bill.

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

Bill No. 33 — An Act respecting the Department of Revenue and Financial Services

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — An Act respecting the Department of Revenue and Financial Services — the new Department of Revenue and Financial Services has been formed by combining the comptroller's office in the Department of Finance with the revenue division of revenue, supply and services and the addition of the public employees benefit agency. The mandate of the Department of Revenue and Financial Services will provide administrative and program support related to government financial matters, including supervising the receipt and distribution of public money, the administration and collecting of provincial consumption tax, and other miscellaneous revenues, or refund programs, and administering designated public employee benefit plans. The amalgamation of the various financial administration function into a single department will allow for what we believe to be a more improved department. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 33, An Act respecting the Department of Revenue and Financial Services, be now read a second time. I might say that this is one of the final bills dealing with the reorganization of government.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I do want to address a couple of comments with respect to this bill. With respect to including an agency to operate the public employee benefit plans under the Department of Revenue and Financial Services, this appears to be a reasonable arrangement. I will be inquiring as to just how this dovetails in with the Crown investments corporation and whether or not the Crown investments corporation will still perform some or all of these functions with respect to Crown corporations, or whether the public employee benefit agency will undertake the administration of all what of what might reasonably be called the public plans.

I want to refer to an aspect of this bill that has also been included in other bills which

has been somewhat disturbing to me. It authorizes the minister to pay money to consultants and to advisory committees, and if the consultant or the advisory committee is retained for less than a year, then there is no requirement that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be involved. I would not ordinarily be concerned about this, but there does not appear to be any opportunity for public review of the people who the minister appoints, or the amount that he pays them.

It will be recalled that in this House when we have moved orders for return asking who has been engaged by contract for the Department of Agriculture, that information was denied. Apparently, therefore, it is the policy of the government to, firstly, give itself the authority to appoint ministers — to appoint advisers, I should say, or advisory committees; to assign to them duties; to pay them money, but to refuse to disclose that money except buried in *Public Accounts* 18 months later. I think that that's an undesirable matter and I think we should pursue that in committee, because I think that is certainly not a desirable state of affairs.

I note also that the comptroller, who is a vital official of the Government of Saskatchewan, is provided for in this bill, but is provided that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint him. The previous legislation made it a requirement: shall appoint. I can't conceive of circumstances under which they would not appoint a comptroller, but I note the change in the language and it must have a reason.

I would have thought, at least without further explanation, that the comptroller was probably better cited in the Department of Finance than in the Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue is primarily a money gathering agency, and the Department of Finance has heretofore been the financial planning agency and the money spending agency, and the comptroller is probably as much or more concerned with the spending of public funds as in the gathering of public funds.

One further point, and that has to do with remissions, and I referred to that earlier. I think it advisable, if the minister is now going to have the power to forgive debts which are owed to the Crown by a member of the public, without any approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and accordingly without any public record, then to avoid any suggestion of potential impropriety that a minister may forgive debts and that there be no public record of it, that it ought to clearly state that any remissions so granted by a minister, up to \$1,000, would be required by law to be recorded in the *Public Accounts* so that this matter would in due course become a matter of public record and in due course then could be pursued.

I would prefer the former course of action which made it a matter of public record immediately after the remission, as is true when the process is done by order in council, but if that is thought to be an undue burden on the cabinet to process paper, and I'm aware of the nature of the paper flow, then at minimum, it seems to me, there ought to be a statutory requirement that the matter be disclosed in *Public Accounts* and I did not catch that in the legislation.

It will be seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that my objections, while of some substance, are essentially matters of detail. I do not object to the establishment of a Department of Revenue and Financial Service in the course of the government's reorganization, and I will accordingly be supporting the bill but raising some issues in committee.

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

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE
CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE
ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased at this time to introduce my officials from the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. Sitting beside me is Gil Johnson, deputy minister of education, or advanced education. In front of me is Mr. Frank May, director of finance and Mr. Doug McGuigan, budget officer. Sitting behind me is Mr. Ed Evancio, assistant deputy minister. And at the rear is Mr. Lorne Sparling, executive director of institutional expansion; Mr. Alex Guy, special adviser, science and technology; Mr. Ian Wilson, provincial archivist; Mr. John McKendry is the director of university liaison; Mr. Ray McKay is the director of northern advanced education; and Mr. Glenn Belsey, the director of student services.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I have a few preliminary questions that I want to direct to you. And I must first of all commend you for the questions which I asked in the previous estimates. I want to indicate and thank you for supplying the information — and it has been beneficial and, I think, time-consuming.

I'll just go back to one item and that is the information that you provided on the hiring of a deputy minister. I note that the consulting firm of Thorne, Stevenson and Kellogg of Vancouver, British Columbia, was used at a cost of \$39,254.93, and the number of applicants received was 83.

I first of all want to ask whether that amount was paid solely for the work of hiring a single deputy — that is, for the department of continuing education — or was it a consulting firm which did work beyond, in other words, looking for a deputy for continuing education? I did see the advertisement at the time, and I know for a fact that they were soliciting for a deputy minister of continuing ed, and I just ask: what is the overall work that they did? Was it reduced to the single issue of the continuing education, because I take it was paid by continuing ed, or did it have a broader scope of reference?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member from the Quill Lakes, the arrangement was made through the Premier's office for the consulting firm. And it was done in an attempt to hire a person at this position as objectively as possible on the basis of competency. And so therefore this consulting firm was used to do a search in this province and throughout Canada. The limit, if I recall correctly and if I have the right information, the limit of the fee was to be \$20,000 plus whatever travel expenses would be incurred as needed for the interviews that were set up throughout the country.

Mr. Koskie: — I don't wish to pursue it a great deal. I think that the amount is very

substantial. And although they looked at a number of applicants, I guess one should be pleased that in fact no applicant was deemed to be as good as what you had locally, because with the recent appointment of your deputy minister, who in fact was known at that time to the province . . . But I can understand that wanting to get a general description and the potential for filling the position . . . I leave that as it is.

I want to go on in respect to the community colleges. You gave me a list of the terminated board members, and you don't have to provide this right away, but I wonder if in fact in respect to the community colleges if you could provide us with in fact the make-up of all the boards on the individual . . . For instance, Carlton Trail Community College, I'd like the complete list of all the individuals that form the board. And likewise, the other members. I presume you can provide that information.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will provide that information for the member.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I refer also to one other information that you provided to me, and that was the total number of people that were dismissed by the department of continuing education, as it was then. And I note that there were some seven that were dismissed, and you indicate that three of those were terminated for cause. What I ask you is: has there been a settlement reached in respect to those that were dismissed, or are there any impending legal actions?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — As far as I am aware, Mr. Chairman, a settlement was made with each one of the seven, except there was one person who was a probationary employee with one of the technical institutes, and an arbitration may be pending in that case.

Mr. Koskie: — The others . . . It has been finalized per se?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Right.

Mr. Koskie: — I refer also to a list of the contracts which you provided that were made with continuing education. And I want to ask in respect to one particular contract, and that's with a Sheila Carnegie, from May the 1st, '82 to April the 30th, '83. And it indicates here the purpose of consulting with that individual was to develop a plan re concept, size, and program offered at La Ronge training facility, expand training strategy for northern Saskatchewan.

First of all, I would like to ask whether that represents the amount paid to date, or whether in fact the contract has been completed.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, in the case of Sheila Carnegie, that contract has been completed, and she is presently the acting principal of the North East Community College and she will be until June the 1st, when the person who has been selected as the permanent principal starts his job.

Mr. Koskie: — The total amount paid for that particular study was \$35,616, and I would like to ask the minister whether he has had an opportunity to review that study, and would he like to comment on the plan concept that was developed by this individual? That is, the terms of reference or the purpose was to develop a plan re concept, size, and program offered at La Ronge training facility, expand training strategy for northern Saskatchewan. So, as a result of that study, I'd like to ask the minister what conclusions, if any, has he come in respect to the size and program to be offered at La Ronge?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, this lady worked at La Ronge, and worked with the staff in northern Saskatchewan, with the staff of the Department of Advanced Education for northern Saskatchewan, in developing concepts for programs, as a result of which we are pleased to announce the expansion of many programs at La Ronge and at Buffalo Narrows. I do have the details for these programs. I would be pleased to provide them at the present time, or to provide them as programs in the making for this coming year, hopefully to get them off the ground by September of this year. I could make these programs available immediately, or I could have the information relayed to the minister — or, I'm sorry — to the member.

Mr. Koskie: — You indicated, as a result of it, that there'd be expansion programs, I take it, at La Ronge and at Buffalo Narrows. Does the expansion of programs . . . Will it involve the expansion of facilities, as well, to accommodate the offering of these expanded number of programs?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Yes, it's anticipated that the expansion of programs in La Ronge will amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$500,000, and in Buffalo Narrows to approximately \$1 million.

Mr. Koskie: — And if I could just follow up on that, Mr. Minister, will it entail at La Ronge, for instance, any capital expenditure for the erecting of facilities, or expanding facilities? Where will these expanded programs be provided from? I guess that's what I'm asking.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, the renovations will take place in the upper Atco building . . .

An Hon. Member: — At La Ronge?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — . . . At La Ronge, in order to accommodate a number of programs. In addition to which, there's the plan to put the NORTEP (Northern Teacher Education Program), the training of native teachers for northern Saskatchewan, in the classroom, and the library resource centre and the training facility in the upper Atco building.

Mr. Koskie: — Could you indicate in respect to Buffalo Narrows, are there existing facilities which will accommodate what you are anticipating, of additional \$1 million in expansion of programs, or is there also additional expenditure for expansion of facilities? Out of where will it be offered?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — I think that the proper answer for that, Mr. Chairman, would be, both will take place. There is existing facility. Approximately half of what was — I guess it was the old DNS building — is being used, has been used up to this time. We're expanding into the other portion of the building, and we'll be spending money in both areas, from the point of view of expansion, and to some extent, a new program.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I would like to ask a few questions about the West Side Community College. Could you indicate what the budget is for the West Side Community College this year?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, the program budget for the West Side Community College is \$845,000 this year. The budget for the operating is \$415,990.

Mr. Thompson: — Could you give me the figures for 1982-83 for the West Side Community College programs, plus the operating?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, the figure for the program for 1982-83 was \$753,908; for the operating it was \$365,820.

Mr. Thompson: — I wasn't listening that close, but did you indicate that there was a million dollar increase for community colleges in northern Saskatchewan this year?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — I could give, Mr. Chairman, the B budget expansion figures which would be: operating costs, \$232,000; and capital costs, \$419,000; and the capital services, about \$1 million, as an estimate.

Mr. Thompson: — Could you also indicate what new programs the West Side Community College is going to be administering this year? I'd be interested to know whether you are going to take in the NORTEP (Northern Teacher Education Program) program, and also the labourers program that is being carried out by the West Side Community College.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, the Buffalo Narrows is going to run the general labourers program and the general labourers orientation program. The number of trainees committed would be 30 and in addition the program expansions would be for pre-employment industrial mechanics, industrial mechanics apprenticeship level 1, pre-employment heavy equipment operation, pre-employment carpentry, carpentry apprenticeship level 1. The total training places would be 31; the operating costs would be \$232,000; the capital costs, 419. I think I gave those figures previously.

Mr. Thompson: — Okay. The general labourers program you have taken into the West Side Community College. Is this right?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — This one that we're referring to is in co-operation with the Key Lake Mining company. It's not with the labourers training. It's with the Key Lake Mining Corporation.

Mr. Thompson: — But that is the same program that has been operating for the last 18 months in Buffalo Narrows. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, it's almost the same, but it is a different one because Key Lake had its own trade union, and so they will build certain components into the program that are a little different, such as counselling and life skills.

Mr. Thompson: — But it will be the same program for Key Lake and will be administered by the same group of individuals. They'll be using the same facilities to train the labourers — am I right? — and using the same facilities, the cooking facilities, the arena where they train; everything will be the same.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's correct.

Mr. Thompson: — And I see where there has been an increase of less than \$100,000 for the West Side Community College. And, taking into consideration the fact that you have taken over a program that has been operating for 18 months and put into there,

absolutely no way can you consider that that is a new program. When I take a look at that and what it's costing, the West Side Community College has not got an increase of \$90,000 but, once again, the second year in a row, will be getting a decrease in funding. And when you take a look at the situation that we have on the west side and in northern Saskatchewan as a whole — and we had discussed this in your estimates last year — where I feel that a priority has to be put on education and training programs through the community college, and when I take a look at this I see that you have once again taken money out of the West Side Community College. And that, Mr. Minister, is where I feel that you should be putting a lot more dollars into, because it's very important that we give these citizens in northern Saskatchewan an opportunity to train so that they can compete for these jobs.

I agree with the labourers program. That is a good program and has trained a lot of young men and women on the west side to take over the jobs at Key Lake. But by no means should we be holding the line on spending in community colleges. This is where we should be putting more emphasis on training. And I just ask you for your opinion on that. As far as I'm concerned, the West Side Community College has less money to operate this year than they had last year, taking into consideration the fact that they have taken over that labourers training course — general labourers training course — which has been operating for the last 18 months.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, perhaps I didn't explain myself properly when I first gave some of those figures, but the way it actually works out is that we will be spending \$845,000 in the '83-84 year as opposed to \$754,000 in the '82-83 year. So that represents what the hon. member mentioned as a \$100,000 increase. But in addition to that, there is new money being spent in the Buffalo Narrows depot to the extent of \$1 million for the renovations and equipment; and in addition to that, the \$232,000 operating costs and \$419,000 capital costs. So that is new money in addition to the \$100,000 difference.

Mr. Thompson: — The \$1 million in renovations to the community college building in Buffalo Narrows, could you indicate what renovations and if there is any new portions of that building that is being constructed?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — This money would be used largely to convert the existing cold storage space into instructional and into industrial space, to be used for training.

Mr. Thompson: — You're going to spend \$1 million to renovate a cold storage, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, I was giving the \$1 million as an estimated figure, and that is an estimate given by government services which would include some equipment, some industrial equipment.

Mr. Thompson: — I'm confused here now. You're going to spend \$100 million on an expansion . . .

An Hon. Member: — \$1 million

Mr. Thompson: — \$1 million, and you're talking about a cold storage that you're going to renovate, and you're also talking about equipment that you're going to put in that space once you take the cold storage equipment out. Could you indicate how many dollars will be spent on equipment to go into that space?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — That figure is \$419,000, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, that figure is \$419,000.

Mr. Thompson: — \$419,000 for equipment.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Right.

Mr. Thompson: — Could you give me the number of square feet in the cold storage that you are renovating?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — It's approximately 4,000 square feet.

Mr. Thompson: — 4,000 square feet of cold storage? Burns and Co. wouldn't have that kind of a cold storage in their slaughterhouse.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — The dimensions as we had them are 72 by 54 which works out to approximately 4,000 square feet.

Mr. Thompson: — And that is a cold storage, is it?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, that building was constructed a number of years ago. It was built originally by DNS, and was used not for cold storage of meat and dairy products, but for storage of things like lumber, and so that it has to be converted into a real use building.

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Minister, that makes more sense to me that it would be a large space in the depot where they are keeping lumber and that, but when we talk about a cold storage, to me I think that it's something that you would store meat in, because that's the terminology I would use on a cold storage.

And it's my understanding that you're spending over \$500,000 on renovating that space.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the ball-park figure that I had given was a million dollars, but government services has not come up with an exact figure. They've been taking a look at what has to be done in order to make it functional for the kinds of purposes for which we want to make use of it.

Mr. Thompson: — Well, Mr. Minister, you indicated that there was around \$400,000 worth of equipment, and I can only assume that there would be approximately \$600,000 in renovation costs for that cold storage that you referred to. Could you indicate to the legislature whether or not the renovations are being contracted out, or are they being done by local crews?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, that would be regular tendering through government services, and we really don't know anymore at this particular time. We could get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: — Also, could you indicate at what time you expect to have that space renovated and the equipment in there and classes started?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — We would be attempting to do everything we can to have it

operational in September, and particularly for as many programs as we could operate at that time. If not, certainly we feel that it's realistic to have it operational by January of 1984.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just in respect to the same topic, could I get a breakdown of . . . In respect to La Ronge, you're indicating a \$500,000 expenditure — renovations — and I ask you: how many additional students will this accommodate at La Ronge? What is your projection? And similarly, at Buffalo Narrows.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, in La Ronge, it would be 65 training places and 75 people — 75 bodies, as it were. In Buffalo Narrows, it would be 31 training places and 56 people or bodies.

Mr. Koskie: — One other piece of information, if you would provide me . . . Previously you provided me with a table in respect to the Saskatchewan community colleges funding formula calculation for 1981-82 college fiscal year, July 1, '81 to June 30, '82. I wonder if you could provide me with a similar table for all of the colleges. On this here previous form was, you know, the Carlton Trail and Coteau and Cumberland, Cypress and so on, and it dealt with the urban population, the rural population, the total population, square miles, and it had the various subheadings and came out with the total of current grant. And I was wondering if you could in fact provide me with a similar type of table, and you could provide that at your earliest convenience.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — We'd be pleased to provide that. We have some of that information here, but we'd have to send it to you.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to ask the minister whether during, oh, in December or January, did the department of continuing education change the rule in respect to obtaining a teacher's certificate at a university?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, just for my clarification, this would refer to the Department of Education, the Department of Education certificate as opposed to the institute instructors, if I'm not . . . Yes, effective — from memory now — effective in September those who are entering must have four years of training in order to gain a Professional A certificate. I could be out there on the date, but that decision has been made by the department in consultation with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the trustees association.

Mr. Koskie: — It's my information, Mr. Minister, that last fall, some time around December, the department of continuing education ruled that teaching certificates for secondary schools would be granted to education graduates only if they had a minor as well as a major in obtaining their degrees, and I understand that this ruling applied to all those who had not yet obtained their certificates. I want that clarified because I . . .

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, it really would have no relevance to the Department of Advanced Education, nor would it have had to the department of continuing education. That jurisdiction would lie completely within the area of the Department of Education, and that would be done through the universities, through the colleges of education.

Mr. Koskie: — It's my information, Mr. Minister, and as I say, it may be wrong, but the department of continuing education in fact ruled, you know, that a teaching certificate for secondary schools required both a major and a minor, in order to get their degree. The problem that has been brought to my attention, Mr. Minister, is that some students

at the University of Regina, who in fact expected to graduate this year, have encountered a problem because the university authorities did not, according to my information, take adequate steps to inform students of this change. And as a consequence, some of the students who were expecting to graduate, I am told, are now advised that there was a change by the department of continuing education requesting the major and the minor. And if my information is not correct, I stand to be corrected on this, but this is what I have been advised, and I'd like your clarification on it.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, no, the answer is that the department of continuing education did not give such a directive, or have anything to do with the establishing of such a directive. I might, for further clarification, in the case of this particular instance . . . I would have to check with the Department of Education because they would be the people who would make that final decision. I would have to check with them concerning any changes that have taken place, as far as teacher certification is concerned, in regard to majors and minors, and I would be pleased to do that, and to provide that information for the hon. member, if that's satisfactory.

Mr. Koskie: — That'll be fine. I'll take up the particular problem with you, and have you check it out, Mr. Minister.

I want to turn to another area in respect to the estimates, and before I do that, I just want your confirmation of whether or not, since the information was provided to me on March 1, '83, I guess, have you added to any of your personal staff? I note before you had a Judith P. Bergen, assistant secretary to the minister, and a William Ross (Bill) Barry, as special assistant to the minister. And what I'm asking is: with your added duties, have you added any additional supporting staff?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, no, I have not added any.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to turn now, Mr. Minister, to the area of, I think, primary concern, in respect to the estimates in Advanced Education and Manpower, and I guess what I want to start off with is to ask you a simple question: whether or not you have in fact reviewed the amount of the operating grants that you will be providing to the universities. And, since the budget has been down for a month and a half, or two months perhaps, I'm wondering whether you have had an opportunity to monitor the grants structure for the university, that is, the operating grants, and whether in fact you have modified the grants which you will be providing the universities over and above what has been indicated in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, just as a general answer to that question, we have had consultation between our officials and the university officials with regard to the monitoring of the projected enrolments. And they've indicated that they are going to have some difficulty in accommodating students and programs, so that we are continuing to study the situation with the two universities and that discussion is ongoing at the present time.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, certainly I don't think that I have to remind the minister of the great amount of concern in the university community in respect to the amount of the operating grants that are being offered by your department, Advanced Education and Manpower. And I want to say, Mr. Minister, that in your position as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower that your reputation with young people is well known throughout the province, and I think one which is respected for what you have in fact worked with, with the young people in this province both as an educator and of

course in the field of sports. I think that your record is very enviable. And many of those young people, I want to say, did indeed work with you, and when you went on to the mini Grey Cups, many of those young people carried out your coaching instructions and scored the touchdowns for you.

And I want to say, today, Mr. Minister, that the young people of this province are looking to you to score a touchdown for them in education. And what has really happened is that there has been a big disappointment, that indeed that one of the essential educational communities of the university is so drastically being cut — cut to the extent that there will indeed be perhaps a curtailment of programs, and certainly a curtailment of the number of students that can enrol in some of the classes. I want to say, in discussing the seriousness of the situation, that I do so with no personal attack on your intentions or your record. I do say though that in assuming an office as Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower that the young people do look for your direction to see that the universities receive sufficient funding.

I realize that you work within the framework of an Executive Council and a caucus of a party, and restraint has been the name of this government since it assumed office. I know that many of the linemen that you have while you're trying to score this touchdown for the young people of this province by getting proper funding, that there will be less than good blocking on your behalf.

Certainly, Mr. Minister, there can be no doubt that before you abandoned the university commission they submitted a budget to the department of continuing education and indicated that there would be serious cuts, even with 7 or 8 per cent. Their recommendation for the amount of operating funds was set at somewhere in the neighbourhood of between 11 and 12 per cent. We gave ample warning to you. As you know, in the previous budget there was a 17.5 per cent increase in the operating funding. We early gave you the indication that education grants for the operating of the universities would have to be substantially increased.

I think if you look at the reaction to the budget it's very clear. The U of R wants extra government money to deal with swelling enrolment. The next article that I draw to your attention is, 'the University begins Paring.'

I draw to your attention, Mr. Minister, an article which indicates, 'U of S may turn down students unless funds hiked.' The U of S increased funding from government.' The president of the University of Saskatchewan went before the senate:

The 80-member University of Saskatchewan Senate is calling upon the provincial government to review its funding provisions for the university. The motion, one of several put forth at the senate's spring meeting Saturday, responded to the concerns about enrolment pressures noted by the president, describing the university as stretched to its limits in its physical facilities and finances.

We could go on with additional headlines: 'U of R is Unhappy with Grant.' And I take here:

The Budget Leaves University Considering Program Cuts. The University of Saskatchewan will have to reduce staff, cut programs to get by on a 7 per cent increase in grants budgeted by the province, president of the University

of Saskatchewan said.

To maintain its present level of service, the university needed an increase of more than 11 per cent (an 11 per cent they didn't get, Mr. Minister).

'The U of S Needs Money.' Another article: 'University in Financial Bind.' Another one from the editorial page from the *Star-Phoenix*:

U of S Quotas Disturbing. If the University of Saskatchewan is forced to turn away prospective students because of physical limitations imposed by inadequate funding, a most disturbing precedent will have been set. The university has warned that unless the provincial government is able to provide increased financial support, enrolment quotas may for the first time (enrolment quotas may for the first time) be imposed on colleges which traditionally have been able to accept all qualified applicants.

And I could go on. And I want to turn, and the members opposite are so readily available in comparisons, and I have an article covering the situation at the university in Manitoba. Do you know what it says?

Universities to Get More Money. Manitoba's three universities and St. Boniface College are getting \$146.3 million from the provincial government this year. Hemphill told the legislature the grants are 10.3 per cent more than universities received the previous year.

10.3 per cent. And certainly I say to you, Mr. Minister, that to sit back and to say that the government . . . the most that your cabinet colleagues, the most that the Premier of this province will do, will allow you to do, is merely to monitor, I think is less than satisfactory.

I find in this province one of the most disturbing situations that is developing. I see that this government is refusing to adequately finance higher education in universities. And even more disturbing, coupled with that, is the job opportunities which I will come to, because you have something to do with that.

As was indicated the other day, between the ages of 15 and 25, we have the highest number of young people unemployed, in Canada. So the young people are not facing a very realistic or a very bright future. Indeed, I want to say, Mr. Minister, there are less than enough jobs. One out of five of our young students are finding jobs. Tuition fees are intending to be increased. And there's going to be quotas put on the number of students because of the miserable amount of revenue that you will provide to the universities.

I think that the editorial which I read sets in place what is happening in this province. And I want to read, just for the benefit of all members, what in fact has been said:

The university has warned that unless the provincial government is able to provide increased financial support, enrolment quotas may for the first time be imposed on colleges which traditionally have been able to accept all qualified applicants.

And I say, certainly education in this day and age is of utmost importance. And so I

would like to ask the minister: can he give us some assurance that in his discussions with the universities, that he, in fact, will take a stand on behalf of those young people who respect him? Will you, in fact, demand from your government sufficient funding, or do the honourable thing of resigning?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, I'm going to have extreme difficulty in replying to the hon. member from the Quill Lakes, mainly because I don't think there's a sufficient amount of time in order to cover all the areas that he touched upon. I would have preferred if he had asked me a question and I would have been pleased to try to give him the information that he was seeking.

However, first of all, at the outset, I do want to thank him sincerely for the generous things that he said about me personally. I don't know that I feel that I have so much to offer to anyone in particular — in education or any place. But I do know this: that I do have a feeling about what is really in the best interests of young people of this province. And I would try to, try to answer and respond to the hon. member by referring to some of the things that we had in mind. At the outset, in taking over this portfolio of Advanced Education, which really refers to that area excluding K to 12, it became very apparent to me that there were many different facets of education, each one seeming to go its own little way. There was the community college, there was the technical institutes, there was the university, there was the distance education, there were extension programs, there were the correspondence courses. And then you had, added to that, the various kinds of programs offered by the K to 12.

And so, the hon. member made some reference to me and part of my coaching career, and how I should be attempting to rally the troops, so to speak, so that we could score a touchdown or two. And quite frankly, I appreciate his attitude with regard to that. And that's precisely what we were trying to zero in on, because we see each one of these facets of education, or components of education, as being very, very significant and very important parts of education, and each one of them involving a large number of young people, all of whom are very important.

So that I couldn't honestly take a look at the university sector per se, and say, 'Hey, we should spend X number of dollars there,' if it had some bearing on what we were able to do in another area such as community colleges, in another area such as technical institutes, and so forth. I saw that each one of these were members of the total team. And if I was going to do a half-decent job, as a coach is supposed to do — and I think that maybe I would enlist the support of the hon. member there as an assistant coach, because he does have a few good ideas — then I think it would be my responsibility to do that which was in the best interests of all of the different facets in education. And that is precisely what we have done.

And I would say this: that I would stand on record as being very, very proud of the Minister of Finance and of my cabinet colleagues, because when I did represent the cause of education and in regard to budget I found that my pleas were very, very well received by comparison with what was needed in Highways and Health and Social Services, and so forth. And quite frankly, if the members would just recognize one fact that is a real fact, because it's got dollars and cents attached to it, and it is this — and I think that they should listen very, very carefully — that the increase in post-secondary education, the increase given in this whole area of Advanced Education and Manpower, was 12.2 per cent over the last budget year — 12.2 per cent, not 7 per cent.

Now, what you're complaining about is, 'How come you distributed it incorrectly.'

That's what you're talking about. And I say: well, maybe that's right; maybe that's right; maybe we made some bad judgements. I would accept that. But we did it deliberately, because we felt that there was great need in this place and this place as opposed to that place. And so, quite frankly, as far as the university sector is concerned, I don't think we treated them badly at all, and particularly compared to the way that they had been treated for the last 10 years. And every time I turned around talking to the university sector, they reminded me over and over again: look, you say 17 per cent which we retained in the budget last year, and you say that's great, but that doesn't make up for the underfunding that has been going on for the last 10 years. And that's what they were telling me.

Now those were the facts the way that I perceived them. Now if you really wanted to perhaps get into some of the facts as far as the university spending is concerned. I would say this: that what we did was to try to address ourselves to some responsible spending. We said that the university should be given an operating grant in accordance with the guide-line. And we said the same thing with the K to 12 education. We said, on the contrary, that there is a greater need for expansion in skill training in this province because we were tied with New Brunswick for last place as far as total number of training spots was concerned. And we didn't like last place, we thought we'd get a little bit closer to the top where we belong.

As far as participation is concerned for young people, participation level rates very good compared to other province as far as the university sector is concerned. When you get into the skill training area, we rate last, tied with New Brunswick. And so we said, there is a need. We will put more emphasis in the distribution of the money that we have available in that area than at the university sector. And I would think that that makes pretty good sense as far as responsible spending is concerned.

When we get to taking a look at what the needs are for people, I think one of the things that we have to take a good look at is that there are 177,000 people in this province who have grade 10 or less education today. When you put alongside the fact that of the people who are on social assistance today, 74 per cent of them have grade 10 or less education, I think that there is an area where we have to get to work. And I'm talking about people from the ages of 15 to 54, I'm not talking about kindergarten people now, so that there is an area where we have to place a greater emphasis in the proper distribution of the money that's available in education is concerned.

Now, to come to grips with some of the things that you were throwing out, and the headlines that you were showing in regard to the university sector, all that I can say to you is that we did say that we would do something that we felt was pretty responsible. We'd give the 7 per cent guide-line, but we would, in addition, we would monitor this situation as far as enrolment is concerned and we would make decisions on the basis of need, and that need would be something that we would establish in consultation with the administration of the university. And so that, as I said to you previously, is going on at the present time.

As far as comparison is concerned, you know, you used Manitoba as an example with their 10.3, but don't forget this — that they were locked into a two-year teacher contract, and when you consider that 70 to 80 per cent of your operating costs go into teacher, professors' salaries, that it goes without saying that they were forced into giving that rate of increase as compared to what they had the year previous, which was not a 17 per cent increase. And then when you get into Ontario, they gave an operating increase of 7 per cent; Quebec, 1.5 per cent; Newfoundland, 2.5 per cent; Alberta, 5.1

per cent. You see? So I don't think that we're doing that badly, and I'm not saying that the university doesn't have to do something in order to address itself to the whole concept of doing whatever they can on their items of restraint. I think that they do, along with everyone else, and so as far as I'm concerned that's just fair ball.

When you get into the area of spending money on capital construction, yes, I think what we have done has made a lot of sense. I would see that there would be greater need to spend money on operating than on capital when there is time of restraint. And one of the things that we have done — and we've been criticized for not providing more and more space here at the University of Regina — one of the things that we have done in order to accommodate space at the University of Regina has been to consult with the people who operate archives. We are moving the archives to another location which will give them more adequate and better space for the archives, as a location, and so this frees up the whole fifth floor of the library building at the University of Regina, which in effect give them the value of somewhere around \$3 million in construction.

Quite frankly I think that's a responsible way of addressing ourselves to what is needed and what is not needed. And that is what we had in mind and that is what we will continue to have in mind. I think that if you ask me, as you did before you sat down, whether I was truly going to become involved with doing and planning what is best for the young people of this province, the answer is yes — yes — truly as fairly and distributed as fairly and as honestly as we can possibly do it through our department.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I am rather disappointed that you indicate that it was a deliberate decision in order to in fact starve the universities, and in fact to bring upon the university a, as has been indicated in the articles that I have put forward and has been voiced by the presidents of the two universities, that students in fact will be turned away. I am disappointed that that was a deliberate decision. I would have thought that you might have said that in view of the poor economic performance during the year of government that you did your best. But you have said that you have deliberately, deliberately set a level and you are satisfied with that level.

What amazes me is that you in fact indicate that you are going to continue to monitor enrolment — monitor enrolment. I ask you: have you not in fact contacted the university commission, which you are abolishing, to determine whether they had any figures in respect to the projection of enrolment, whether in fact it would be going up and expected to go up this year? I understand from the press releases, and talking to university people, there is an expectation that there will be increases. Many young people can't find jobs, and as the president of the University of Saskatchewan indicated, this is a time for them to take the opportunity, an opportunity to get a degree, a training for their future, because some day we hope that the economic climate in this country will turn around, and young people will indeed have an opportunity to have a meaningful role in society, in a profession that they may wish to choose.

So what I'm asking you then, what are your projections in respect to whether or not tuition fees, and whether you have any knowledge whether tuition fees are to be increased at the University of Saskatchewan and at the University of Regina.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, the tuition fees — a decision that is made by the board of governors of the universities — have increased, or are to increase, 7.5 per cent at the University of Regina, 7 per cent at the University of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Koskie: — That is the projection of the coming year: that the University of Regina, 7.5, and University of Saskatchewan, by 7 per cent. Is that correct, Mr. Minister?

Well, in view of that information, I ask you: how do you expect the universities to accommodate an expected increase in enrolment of that magnitude with a 7 per cent increase in operating grants?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, I would say, Mr. Chairman, in about the same way as they've had to do for the last 10 or 12 years because, as I've pointed out to the member, universities have been underfunded for the last 10 years, according to what the faculty associations tell me, so that, you know, they would have to go ahead and adapt and do things, and show a degree of flexibility, just like everyone else does when he has to practise a little bit of restraint.

In addition to that, I think that the hon. member is forgetting, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that we are providing — we are going to be providing somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1,200 new training spots for skills training at the technical institute level which, we feel, should have some impact upon the enrolments at the universities. To what extent, we're not quite sure, but it should have some impact, and what the projection is down the road four or five years — two, three, four or five years from now — very, very few people really know.

It seems to me that for the past five years the previous government was projecting declining enrolments something to the tune of 40 per cent decline by 1983-84.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I want to . . . I think I did ask, Mr. Minister, whether you have any communication with the universities and whether there is any good news for the students that the tuition fees are going to be increased. And can you in fact tell us, if you have that good news to spread to the students, what the amount of the tuition fees are projected to be increased by the universities?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, mentioned that the tuition fees are going to be increased at the University of Regina by 7.5 per cent, and at the University of Saskatchewan by 7 per cent. And I also mentioned that this is a decision that is not made by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. It is a decision that is made by the board of governors of the universities. And, as far as tuition fees are concerned, if you want to compare it to tuition fees in previous years, if you go back to 1977 — this is just from my memory — and go all the way through some five or six years, you'll find that there was only one year where the tuition fees were lower than that.

Mr. Koskie: — I have a few statistics. And the statistics that I have shown that the tuition fees declined steadily as a percentage of the total university expenditure from 1975 to 1976 through to 1982-83, from 11.69 per cent in '75-76 to 10.57 in '82-83. So I ask you: can you assure us that this trend will continue in '83-84, and that the universities will not have to . . . Well, they have already in fact had to increase it. But what I'm asking you: in respect to the percentage of the total university expenditure, will in fact the percentage that is made up of tuition fee, will it continue to decline? As I said, from 11.69 per cent in '75-76 to 10.57 in '82-83, so the amount of the total expenditure during those years had been declining. And I'd like to know whether you can assure us that with your 7 per cent operating grant whether the total part of the cost will in fact, in respect to tuition fees, will in fact continue to decrease.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the question correctly, the member wants to know if the percentage of tuition as an expenditure for paying for university, as a percentage of the total expenditure, will continue to decline. Well, it has declined as a percentage from the 1960s, from somewhere around 26 per cent to 10.1 per cent which it was in '81-82. I'm not sure just what the figure would be but I would think they would be comparable to that figure of 10.1, if it was figured out. But we don't have the statistics on that at the present time. Now as far as the future is concerned, I think that's perhaps a bit of philosophic question in that I think you and I, as people who live in our society, have to determine what percentage should the consumer pay as far as education is concerned — you know, just how much should we expect him to pay, it is gone down, as I said, all the way in the 1960s from 26 per cent down to 10 per cent, and as far as I would know, to the best of my knowledge, it would be about 10 per cent at the present time.

Mr. Koskie: — I am very concerned with your comment that you really are philosophically looking at how much the consumer should pay. And you know what the consequences of a user . . . That's your concept because I didn't put it through. And I have been indicating that during our period of administration that the percentage of the total expenditure was consistently going down, and that therefore the consumer was paying less. So there was no intention, nor did I raise that the consumer should pay more.

And I am very much opposed, very much opposed, of any type of philosophical approach to university training that only the rich have access. And one of the things that we provided, through the institution of bursaries, was in fact to make it available to the poor as well as to the rich. And I hope there will not be a departure from it because there's certainly evidence, indeed in the health care field, where the user fees are being put on by one Tory government after the other.

I want to ask a further question in respect to funding. I have a statistical sheet here indicating that from 1974-75 to 1981-82, there was a 96 per cent increasing grants for the full-time equivalent students, or an average annual increase of 13.7 per cent. I want to ask you: in view of saying that there's going to be a 7 per cent increase in enrolment, will you indicate whether you believe that your increase of 7 per cent in operating grants will indeed provide funding — an increase in grants per the FTE or substantially more than 7 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, I think I would just like to point out a few of the things that we had been doing. For one thing, we gave an operating grant in accordance with the guide-line of 7 per cent. For another thing, we decided that we would review and inform the universities that we would review the impact of enrolment, which we had been doing, and which we will continue to do until we have made that decision. In addition, we have increased the amount of assistance given to students to the loan and bursary for students. In addition to that, we've established Opportunities '83 and have more than doubled the amount that was given under the old YES (youth employment services) program.

But in spite of what the hon. member says, as far as the operating grants and the percentage of operating grants is concerned, I think it's important for me to point out a very important statistic and it is this: that considering the combined operating and the capital funds — considering both of those — that these showed a substantial decrease as a percentage of the total provincial budget, and I think that's a very telling statistic. The decline goes something like this: from 1970 it was 8.3 per cent of the total

provincial budget; in 1982 it had declined to 4.84 per cent, a decline over those years, over those eight or nine years, of 3.46 per cent.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to indicate, Mr. Minister, that you have totally not addressed the statistics which I gave you, and for this obvious reason: that you could not in fact compete with the record during the period that I indicated.

I am concerned that certainly the direction that we are taking will not depart from the past. That is, if an individual wants to go to university, I think that a province . . . One of the best investments that you can make is indeed to allow individuals the choice if they want to go to a technical school, but surely, if they have the talents and the abilities to go to university, just because of economic factors they should not be denied that right.

But I am concerned and the reason I am concerned is that . . . The committee says cut-backs in education are necessary, and I want to read what a staunch supporter of your party and an organization that donates handsomely to you, Ian Sinclair, head of the government's 6 and 5 restraint advisory committee said, and all of you will know who Ian Sinclair is. He's the head of the CPR, and he goes on to say:

When you come to education, I'm sorry, but some people are going to have to, when they go to school, pay a little more, and that means at the bottom end some won't be able to go. And that's a tough thing and they may have to postpone their education.

You know, that is the philosophy of the rich, the philosophy of the rich and the powerful, saying that the opportunities will not be provided for every Saskatchewan Canadian to attend university if he has the desire and the capabilities of doing it.

And I want to say that Saskatchewan had indeed a fine record in its universities. But if you look at what is happening across Canada — university budgets squeezed. Here is what is happening in other Tory provinces:

Buildings decay (it says), ceilings are caving in. Roofs leak and seepage is damaging walls and the foundations of the University of Toronto. There is water running into the scientific equipment because the university can't pay for repairs.

And it goes on. I can go to every province which has a Tory government, and there are major cut-backs. And so what I am asking you, Mr. Minister: can you give us and the young people of this province a commitment that not only monitoring, but that you will, in fact, increase the operating grants to the universities in order that they will not have to cut back on the number of students, in order that the tuition fees will not rise to such an extent that many of the children from poorer families will be denied the opportunity of higher education? I ask you, Mr. Minister, can you give us some assurance that you will, indeed, modify this restraint policies of this Tory government that is essentially bankrupt — this province trying to pay out their election commitments? And now we are finding those election commitments are at the cost of the young people, the senior citizens and the working man in this province.

I would like for you to indicate as succinctly as possible, and as precisely, what in fact you are prepared to do in the review of the dilemma that is facing the universities of this province.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would give the hon. member my assurance. I would give him my assurance that I promise that I will apply common sense and good judgement, and we'll get our department to do the same thing in addressing ourselves to all the problems in connection with education. And that's what I said at the beginning. We're not going to isolate this against this, and have an inequitable distribution of funding in education. We're trying to remove ourselves from that plight. We're trying to distribute it so there is truly accessibility for people.

And, by people, I mean accessibility for all people. I mean accessibility for those people who have dropped out of school for one of many, many reasons. I mean accessibility for people who are over 24 years of age, over the traditional school-leaving age, and so forth. That's where I'll give my assurance for. You bet. To be responsible for addressing myself to doing the best that I can in giving as much as possible an equal opportunity to all of the people of this province, to get a substantial amount of education according to their interests, and according to their ability to absorb it.

And I would also want to assure you of this: that we do not, as far as the university funding is concerned — university students and technical institute students have a very good student assistance plan, one which we've added to. We added something in the neighbourhood of \$2 million to last year, additional to what they had the previous year. And we are going to continue to increase this student assistance plan in the province of Saskatchewan. So that I can assure you also, that no student who wants to attend university, and who's admitted to university, will be denied student assistance.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with what the minister has been indicating — emphasis in respect to technical training. I have a comment of supposedly an expert, and I would like to get his reaction to the general tenor of the comments that are made here:

'Governments like Saskatchewan are making a mistake throwing their resources into technical schools, training people for jobs that soon won't exist,' says an author, therapist, researcher, who was visiting Saskatoon. 'Anything technical, a machine can do better than man,' Professor Eugene Heimler said in an interview. 'It's services people will have to be trained for, but we don't see that yet.'

I'd like to ask you whether you would care to comment in respect to those portions of the comment of the university professor from the University of Calgary. And just for clarification, because he says, 'Anything technical,' he says, 'a machine can do better than man. It's services people will have to be trained for, but we don't see that yet.'

I ask you, in a recent study that has been done by the federal government, or commissioned by the federal government, has indicated that with the introduction of modern technology, that it's going to replace jobs so significantly that there will be in the neighbourhood of 15 per cent unemployment. So what I'm asking you: would you care to comment in respect to this so-called authority indicating that the machine, the second industrial revolution, is going to completely — not completely, but to a large extent — eliminate many of the jobs for which we are training today?

And as I said, the federal report indicated also that by the early 1990s, they're expecting in the neighbourhood of 15 per cent unemployment.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the first part of the question that was asked by the hon. member had some relevance to a philosophy of what a person should learn when he goes to school. And I would say to that, that he should learn as much of the basic skills as far as his communication skills and his number skills are concerned and his social skills concerned, as a core of information around which he builds those other things like aesthetic and physical and things like that. I think I've gone into this in the past, and I'll leave that alone at the present time. But that would be my philosophy as much as possible for all young people who go to school. I think that the best thing we can do for them is to give them the best, basic, solid core of information of training them to be capable of thinking human beings as much as possible. This enables them to be able to adapt to society's changes.

Now, when we get into what we're trying to do in placing emphasis upon technical education is concerned, all that I can reply is simply this: it's a fact of life that we are getting more than double the number of applications to take technical training and skill training in our technical institutes today than we can accommodate. And so therefore the need, the demand is there. Well, the reason is because we don't have enough training spots for them in this province — period. But that was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That was precisely what I was trying to make when I first started out — that when we started out, we took a look at the total training situation where Saskatchewan was concerned, and one of the places where there was the greatest need was insofar as technical training is concerned. And so therefore we decided that we would, over a period of the next three to four years, increase the training capacity of this province by 60 per cent.

Now, when we get into this, what we would believe in, if you get into the area of the philosophical, is that we believe that we should be teaching our young people to meet change, that we should be teaching them to use the technical advances and to be able to be the most adaptable in our society. And as far as that federal study was concerned that the hon. member made reference to, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, unless I read the newspaper incorrectly, that the same day that the federal study on technology was introduced, there were other experts who disputed the findings of that and who said that technology will, on the other hand, will create new and more jobs.

Mr. Koskie: — I have just one further and then maybe a couple of questions as we go through the individual items.

Recently the Premier announced that, Mr. Minister, that you would in fact be setting up in your department a women's division and what I ask you is: can you outline briefly what you anticipate to be the functions and the broad objectives of the women's division that is being set up in your department?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, to date we have set up a woman's services branch in the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. And to date we would see that this branch would establish a focal point for the gaining of equal opportunity for women and meeting the needs of women in this province. We would see that it would address itself to employment, to training, to awareness, to all those areas such as equal pay and equal rights before the law and sex stereotyping and wife-battering and all the things that women are pointing out are real concerns to them. And up to date, what we had done has been to take up these issues with the women who have been transferred from the Department of Labour into our department and to start to make a plan whereby we can meet with some of the women's groups that exist in this

province, particularly with the advisory council on the status of women.

Mr. Koskie: — Just one other question. In respect to your jobs opportunity '83, could you indicate to me the number of applications that have been approved?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, as of May the 11th the total number of applications received were 4,161, and the total number of requests for students worked out to roughly 9,000. The total number of applications approved was 3,192. The total number of students approved were 3,668. We still feel that we will be able to approve somewhere in the neighbourhood of between 150 and 200, perhaps even as high as 250, more students.

Mr. Koskie: — Well indeed the program is assisting the placing of a number of students and I think what is obvious is the large number of students that could be facilitated, because of the requests for students is way up in the area of 9,000. And certainly in some small way this has been of assistance in placing students.

The thing that concerned me most about the program is that the very short time period that was allowed for the application. The budget came down on March the 29th and by April the 22nd was the deadline for submitting applications. I think it was obvious that the department, in setting up this program, obviously set a quota as to how many they were going to service, how many students were going to get the benefit out of it. But certainly with such a short time limitation on making applications, from April the 1st (or wherever) to April the 22nd, clearly indicates that there was a large volume out there of students and employers who would want to participate in this.

And all I can say is, while it goes part of the way I think it goes less than the full extent of beating the basic problems. And I thank you for that information.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Item 6

Mr. Koskie: — Just on that item, I would like to ask the minister for an explanation of why the staff was cut in community colleges — administration from 26.8 to 21.6. At the same time indicate the positions that were cut.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Chairman, there were 5.2 positions abolished. Three of these were DNS positions that were abolished in the Athabasca region; 1.2 position was abolished — it was steno vacancies; and one position in management information services.

An Hon. Member: — Where was that one?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — That position was located in Regina in the department.

Item 6 agreed to.

Items 7 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Item 18

Mr. Koskie: — Would you give me a list of the projects to be provided for by the expenditure of 4,342,000? Just provide it to me — a future date is fine. Will you do that?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Yes, we will.

Item 18 agreed to.

Items 19 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

RESOURCES DIVISION

ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 5

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — I would like to thank the minister and his officials.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also would like to add my thanks to the officials for a good job done.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank the officials, and I thank the minister for his forthright answers in the dilemma that he faces.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:19 p.m.