

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Domotor: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, a group of grade 6 to 8 students, numbering 29 in total. They're located in the Speaker's gallery. They're accompanied by their teachers, Bill Steckly, and Dennis Huebert, and will be meeting with them at 3 o'clock for pictures in the rotunda area.

I hope they have an enjoyable trip and find the proceedings this afternoon informative. I'd also like to point out that the Hon. Minister of Social Services, Gordon Dirks, used to be the principal at Guernsey school one time, and I'm sure that they're going to . . . (inaudible) . . . and enjoy the afternoon.

Again, I would like to ask the members of the Assembly to welcome them here this afternoon. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Muller: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to this legislature, a group of students from Christopher Lake, Saskatchewan. This is quite a famous tourist area in northern Saskatchewan or north-central Saskatchewan. It's not quite as windy as some other areas in this province.

I met with the students and had drinks with them just prior to coming in at 2 o'clock. I certainly wish them an enjoyable stay in Regina. I hope they've enjoyed their visit to the legislature, and I hope it's very educational for them. I understand they're going to spend another day in this fine city before they get back into that good country again, and I would ask all members of the legislature to greet them. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to, as well, introduce some guests to the legislative Assembly — 41 grade 12 students from Lumsden High School in Lumsden. They are accompanied by their teachers, Ken Langford and Gordon Bonokoski, and I would like them to stand and be recognized.

And the hon. member, cheap-shot artist, as he's known to most people throughout the province of Saskatchewan, was talking from his seat again. It's unfortunate, Mr. Chairman.

However, we don't let that take away from the welcome that I know all hon. members wish to extend to the students. I hope that your tour was enjoyable, that you find the afternoon interesting as we proceed with the estimates, which is the detailed budgetary expenditures review of, in this case, Executive Council. I hope you find it informative and interesting, and I look forward to meeting with you after about 2:30. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Young: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of my seat-mate, the member for Turtleford, I'd like to introduce 28 students accompanied by their teacher, Bill Kresowaty, from the Turtleford School. I'd like to advise them that Mr. Maxwell will be meeting with them at 2 o'clock for drinks, and I'd ask all members to join in welcoming them.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my word of welcome to that of the Minister of Rural Affairs to those students and teachers from Guernsey — I certainly enjoyed my years there — and also to those students and teachers from Lumsden High School. I had the opportunity of being an administrator of that high school for two years as well. And should my political career ever come to an end, and I expect that that will be some years down the road, I anticipate, perhaps, that, when my hair is greying, I may have the opportunity to return to either Lumsden or Guernsey.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10

Item 1 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Premier, just as we were dealing with matters at 12 o'clock, I had asked the Premier whether he would give a short statement of his policy with respect to development in northern Saskatchewan generally, employment in northern Saskatchewan, and other issues surrounding that.

And I postulated his policy, I stated what I thought he had stated in earlier occasions, that the policy was to treat northern Saskatchewan the same as southern Saskatchewan. And I asked him whether he thought the level of services in northern Saskatchewan was approaching that in southern Saskatchewan with respect to roads, schools, hospitals, and the like, and I'd be interested in his response.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, there are two or three important things to note with respect to development in northern Saskatchewan. One: there are about 25,000, I believe, considered to be in northern Saskatchewan, out of a population of a little over a million in the entire province. What we have attempted to do in the last couple of years is knit those 25,000 people in isolated communities into the mainstream of Saskatchewan. We have designated programs that will go right across the province, as opposed to having just a separate form of government, as was the case in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, just for north Saskatchewan.

And I will mention, for example, our whole tourism thrust. Most of that increase in expenditures in tourism is now being spent — or certainly a very large part of it — towards northern Saskatchewan, towards the lakes and the fishing and the recreation and so forth, and the jobs that come with that. Certainly the Northern (Saskatchewan) Outfitters' Association, which has been encouraging Americans to come into northern Saskatchewan, would be indicative of the kinds of things that we would see for northern Saskatchewan.

Similarly, with respect to mining, we see both in terms of the announcements of the new gold mines in Saskatchewan and northern Saskatchewan — with the activities of the uranium mining. That is part and parcel of mining across Saskatchewan, not only in the South but indeed in northern Saskatchewan.

Similarly, with respect to forestry, Mr. Chairman, our forestry policy and the development of pulp, paper, and timber has, in most areas, and with respect to most people, tied to northern Saskatchewan. And we are obviously focusing on the strength that we see in the North; that is, the tourism ability, the water, the recreation, the mining, the agriculture, and the forestry.

Now there's another area where we have spent money quite specifically, and I would refer to things that we've done with respect to job creation and training. We have a program, for example, the employment opportunities program. The description is called job creation and training, particularly targeted at native or northern individuals, and the budget for any of the disadvantaged and/or women is something like \$370,000. This is to be transferred from Advanced Education and Manpower to Social Services.

The forestry program is vocational, and it's in training, and particularly designed for the residents of northern Saskatchewan, with a budget of \$181,250.

The native career development program — to describe that, it would be, more or less, training to assist employers to recruit native people, particularly in northern Saskatchewan. It's targeted, I might say, Mr. Chairman, at unemployed and underemployed native adults, and obviously that would apply to a large part to northern Saskatchewan, which is, as I mentioned, something in the neighbourhood of 25,000 people. And the budget for that particular program is \$403,000.

Then there's a northern training program. To describe that would be course costs and training allowances for individuals to be upgraded. It's for Northerners that may be ineligible for other training assistance. So it's to target people that may be left out of various training programs. That budget alone is \$2.3 million, Mr. Chairman. Approximately 67 per cent of that will be recovered, we hope, from the federal government.

There's a Special ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act) program. We can describe that as: to encourage natives to identify and develop economic opportunities. And certainly we're targeting rural individuals of Indian ancestry, which includes a great number of the people in northern Saskatchewan. And that would be something like \$500,000.

There's also the Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program — technical institutes that will credit off-campus activities. And we've targeted groups that are geographically in positions of remote areas, so that would apply, I would suspect — and the Leader of the Opposition would recognize that — as a disadvantaged group, or those in northern Saskatchewan that are removed a long ways from the central flow of economic activities in their isolated communities. The budget there is \$4.96 million. So, in terms of our tourism, our mining, our agriculture, our forestry programs, and general economic opportunities that were linking the North with the South in the entire province, I've outlined several million dollars worth of specific programs for education and training in northern Saskatchewan.

And I would add, finally, that we have no intention, as the hon. members have said that they would do, to just holus-bolus close all the mines in northern Saskatchewan at a time when there's very high unemployment. And I don't believe that would be a responsible position, and I don't know how the Leader of the Opposition can think it would be responsible, but certainly to put an additional 10,000 people out of work in the northern half of Saskatchewan would indeed be unfair.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, first, with respect to the Premier's statement of the policies of our party, they are as defective as the statements he makes about what is happening in the province that I was illustrating this morning, but we are not debating that. We are talking now about his policies. He has been Premier for two years. Does he say that more people are gainfully employed in northern Saskatchewan now than two years ago?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I would suspect that unemployment in northern Saskatchewan would reflect national conditions with respect to relative terms; that is, unemployment in all of Canada is up compared to two years ago. Unemployment in northern Canada is up as well, and in the province of Saskatchewan we'll find that it is similar to the province of Alberta, the province of Manitoba, and other places.

Yes, unemployment is up across Canada. Unemployment is up in Saskatchewan, and unemployment may be up in northern Saskatchewan as it is in northern parts of the rest of the continent. So it would reflect, I would suspect, the normal changes across Canada that have occurred over the last two years.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, thank you for at least that admission that unemployment is up in northern Saskatchewan, and it's up massively, as you will know. You will also know that the number of welfare recipients is up, and up massively.

I'm going to ask him just a relatively simply question, and this has to do with the need to provide employment for people in northern Saskatchewan. I think we would all readily admit that our first preference would be to provide employment by having private sector jobs that would be available to Northerners. Let's concede that out of hand. But if they're not there, which they are not, is it better, in the Premier's opinion, to follow the policy he is following of having massive increases in welfare recipients, or would it not be better, let us say, to construct roads in northern Saskatchewan which will, I predict, be needed for future mineral development, by using those same Northerners to work at gainful employment of constructing, in my instance, roads, but many other public facilities.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, in my view the best long-run solution for residents of northern Saskatchewan, and particularly people who don't have the opportunities for employment, the best solution is education and training. That's why we have identified several million dollars worth of economic activity targeted to training and education, including a brand new technical school in Prince Albert, which is one of our most northern cities, to train people in northern communities to take advantage of tourism and resource development and economic activities.

Now if you have roads built, and people are unable to take advantage of economic activity because they're not trained, then they will remain and sustain position of high unemployment.

So if you can get people through public school and through high school and through technical school and through other forms of education or on-the-job training, it seems to me that the money spent today on training and education, not only for northern Saskatchewan, but particularly for northern Saskatchewan, that it will reap benefits in the future far above us now saying we're going to just spend money on the creation of a short-term public project.

Now a road may be some time. But a road going into northern Saskatchewan should allow people in northern Saskatchewan to participate in the economic activity associated with that road. It would seem to me this should be a balance, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, with respect to educational and training development as we provide these opportunities as I've mentioned in mining and tourism and so forth, which involves roads and waterways and resort facilities and so forth.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, it's rather clear that he doesn't feel his government could run a training program and road-building program at the same time, because he feels, they're alternatives. I have no quarrel with his training programs. They've been going on for a good number of years, and we hope they continue to go on.

The question, the rather narrow question I asked, is this: why do you think it is better to have a large number, and an increasingly large number, of people on welfare, and a much smaller number of people building public projects like roads, instead of the reverse? Instead of taking some of those people who are now on welfare and have them do things like road construction, street construction — all the other construction which is necessary in northern Saskatchewan to bring services to those communities up to some level approaching what we have in the South.

Why isn't it better to have those people working at improving their communities rather than simply getting welfare?

Mr. Chairman: — Why is the member standing?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, can I have leave of the Assembly to introduce some guests, please?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask you and the members of the Assembly to direct their attention to the Speaker's gallery, where it is my pleasure to introduce to you His Excellency Wolfgang Behrends, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, who is visiting with us today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — As I look at the biography I've been handed, Mr. Behrends certainly has had an interesting career. His studies have taken him to Germany, and England, France, the U.S.A. He is fluent in three languages, French, English, as well as German. His professional career — he has spent time in Hong Kong, Paris, Bonn, New Delhi, Vienna, Egypt. Of course, now he is visiting with us here in Saskatchewan. I know he has met with a number of our ministers, and will be meeting with the Premier, and it will be my pleasure to meet with him later this afternoon.

Accompanying His Excellency is Mr. Erwin Boll, the Consul-General of Germany, centred in Edmonton, and I would ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in making them welcome to Regina and Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10

Item 1 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, everyone agrees that it is much better to have people working than it is to have them unemployed. There's no question about that. And that's why we have been working hard to make sure that we have the lowest unemployment in Canada, in all the programs that we've had. And we've spent a great deal of money in public projects. I want to make that very clear.

We've got new nursing homes; we've got expansions to hospitals; we've got power projects; we've got natural gas distribution projects; we've got road construction; we've got handicapped centres. We have hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of public funds, of public funds that are going into economic activities and the creation of jobs.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that at the same time we can find that individuals that are untrained, and uneducated, and untrained, can get trapped, get a perpetual system of welfare.

And everybody across Canada knows that. And you can spend hundreds, and hundreds of millions of dollars, and you could target that in a community, and you still might not resolve some of the welfare people, welfare problems associated with people who have got trapped in that at an early age.

And I take my own community in the riding that I represent. There is at least \$100 million has been targeted into the Estevan community by the energy people — economic activity. And there's all kinds of employment. You can't find a house. There's businesses that are doing very well. The town is bustling. The community is bustling. And there still are untrained, uneducated people on welfare.

So what do we say? We say, money alone isn't sufficient. You can't just buy your way out of this. You can spend hundreds of millions of dollars and target it on the community, and it won't resolve the welfare situation. What you have to have is training and education targeted at those individuals that are unskilled, to provide them with the wherewithal to take advantage of the opportunities that are there.

That's why we have opted for a great deal of money, extra millions of dollars, for training, education and their facilities, as opposed to — and we've already spent a great deal of public money, hundreds of millions publicly: power projects, roads, hospitals, nursing homes, and so forth — all public. But as opposed to just spending more money chasing the same untrained people, we say let's start training more of them, particularly at an early age so they can take advantage of opportunities when the economy turns around, and when they, in fact, turn their own resource capacities around as individuals.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I was asking about northern Saskatchewan. I'm not surprised with your record at northern Saskatchewan that you want to talk about the constituency of Estevan, which, I think, is the farthest constituency from northern Saskatchewan. At least it abuts on the U.S. border. Will you answer the question with respect to northern Saskatchewan? We all can see that training is a great idea. You apparently think that training can only take place in an institution, that nobody can learn to build a highway by building a highway, that nobody can learn to do by doing. Well, I tell you, sir, that dozens, indeed hundreds of people learn to handle heavy equipment by building highways in the North by the simple process of being there, watching somebody doing it, and being instructed on the job. And that can happen. And I invite you, sir — I won't belabour this — but I invite you, sir, to stop your idea of doing no road construction in northern Saskatchewan and to commence once again to train people on the job, as well as in institutions.

No one is quarrelling about technical institutes. But your supposition that you can only learn to build a house in a technical institute and you can't learn to build a house by building one, is, I think, an unsound supposition. And I think you should look at the prospect of training some of these people by the very fact of building roads and streets and the rest in northern Saskatchewan. And instead of having massively increased welfare loads, as you have in your last two years, and a massive decrease, which you have in road construction, street construction and the like — and that's what you've done. You've cut back sharply on road construction, street construction and the like, and your welfare rolls have gone up markedly.

And again, let's not hear about training; we agree with it. Let's not hear about private-sector employment; we obviously agree with it. And I say to you that your welfare rolls are going up massively. Your expenditure on public projects where people can learn and can work and can get a salary is going down, and in that you are serving the people of northern Saskatchewan badly, and ultimately serving all Saskatchewan badly. There are many more people on the welfare treadmill, the welfare cycle, now, than there was two years ago, and any simple look at those welfare rolls will tell you that. And we obviously have to break that cycle, and we can break some of it by training. Good. We can break some of it by finding jobs in the private sector. Good.

But I suggest to you that, rather than simply saying that's the end, there is another avenue, and that is to proceed with public projects in order to bring services in northern Saskatchewan up to approaching the level that we have them in southern Saskatchewan, which you say is your ultimate objective. If that is your objective, why do you not pursue that objective by providing employment for people now on welfare? Surely you agree it's better to pay people to work than to pay them not to work.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, let's make some assumptions. Let's assume that the Leader of the Opposition and I agree that it's better to work than it is not to work. But it's a question of priorities: how do we get from A to B? And the Leader of the Opposition would do two things; quite clearly, he would do two things. He'd build more roads, and he'd close the mines.

Now if his argument is right that you train people on the job, why would he want to close the mines? I mean, let's talk about it. We maintain those jobs. We are building economic opportunities for tens of thousands of people, training on the job — training on the job.

And what would you do? Build roads to nowhere? If you close all the mines in northern Saskatchewan, there'd be nothing to go there to do, particular . . . unless you look at some tourism.

I agree. We want people to be gainfully employed. I agree, training is important. I believe now the balance is on training and education, as opposed to more roads.

We are also spending money publicly. We spend it on hospitals and nursing homes and on power projects and gas distribution programs into the billions — public money.

But the North doesn't just need public roads. People in northern Saskatchewan need to develop their own talents so they can take advantage of opportunities, not only in mines, but in all kinds of other things.

So if it's a question of disagreeing on what comes first — education, or more roads now — all right, I choose education and training as opposed to a multiple increase in expenditures on roads, particularly when we have economic opportunities tied to tourism and forestry and mining and the whole complex of things you can do in northern Saskatchewan.

And, as well, we spend untold millions on public projects. So I go back and say, all the public projects of the past clearly didn't train these people well enough, because now they're untrained, and the children are untrained, and the parents are untrained.

The key is in the long run, so five years and 10 years from now they can take advantage of the North, is to be trained and have a skill so that they can take advantage of roads that we build in t here, and not just build into nothing with no training.

So if we have to agree to disagree, I believe the training and education are extremely important now, more so than an increase in public road construction to some community that already has a road.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask leave to introduce guests, please.

Mr. Chairman: — The minister has asked for leave to introduce guests. Is that agreed?

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the members of the opposition for granting me leave.

It's my pleasure to introduce to you, sir, and to the other members of the Assembly today, a group of students — they're in the west gallery up here — from the school of Turtleford in the constituency of Turtleford, the constituency which I'm proud to represent, the jewel of the North. They are accompanied today by teachers, Bill Kresowaty and Rick Webb. I hope you're going to have a pleasant stay in Regina and here in the Assembly today. And I'll be meeting with them in approximately 10 minutes in the rotunda. Thank you. Would you welcome with me, please.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 10

Item 1 (continued)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I think we've heard the Premier's answer. He feels that the YES (youth employment services) projects which he kept mentioning, of which there are none in the North, and other projects are likely to provide employment.

I hope that gold mines go ahead as he suggests. And if they do, virtually everyone who works there who is a Northerner will be someone who was trained on road construction or similar construction, and who learned his skills in handling equipment there, as has been the case with respect to other projects in northern Saskatchewan.

But we've heard the Premier's pronouncement. I asked him very, very clearly and very distinctly: didn't he think that it was better to go ahead with public projects — not only roads, but public projects — rather than welfare. And he said: I won't answer that question; I want to talk about training.

And that is all too indicative of this government. They simply will not face the fact that there are massive welfare rolls there and that they ought to be reduced and they ought to be reduced by training if possible, obviously, but if not, then by proceedings with public projects. That has been clearly rejected by the government, and I think the people of the North know that.

I want now to pursue this question that I asked him before as to whether or not he has had approaches with respect to the purchase of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. He gave a guarded answer to that. I think he said "some approaches, but not many," and he wouldn't go further than that.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — That's accurate.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, would you indicate whether or not you've had one . . . you had a proposal from a financial organization known as Burns Fry Ltd., and you received written proposals from Mr. Latham Burns, the president of Burns Fry Ltd. To proposing some arrangements with respect to SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) — I think he's chairman of Burns Fry — and what your reaction and response was to the proposal set out by Mr. Latham Burns, the chairman of Burns Fry?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I said clearly that there were some people that may be interested. I also said that I wasn't going to jeopardize people being interested in the province of Saskatchewan, either in new developments or joint ventures or any other combination thereof, by talking about who it was, and how much, and where they live, and so forth — because they obviously inquire into the province of Saskatchewan in confidence. And the Leader of the Opposition, having sat in this chair, understands that.

So I'm not going to get into specifics. I don't think it'd be in the best interests of the province of Saskatchewan or in economic development. And yes, there are some people who are interested. Yes, economic developments, hopefully, will continue to take place. But I won't jeopardize that by giving names and addresses of people who may come to inquire about Saskatchewan on a confidential basis.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, Mr. Premier, would you make any statement as to the policy of the government with respect to disposing of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation or any of the major assets of that corporation?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, our policy to date in the province of Saskatchewan is one of allowing more and more of the public to participate on a first-hand basis, that is, to begin to buy their own shares in resource development in the province of Saskatchewan. We are starting with power bonds and then energy bonds, and there may be more bonds in the future, because people do see a difference between individual ownership and government ownership. And government doesn't necessarily represent the folks. The people themselves want to be able to participate themselves, in their own right, as opposed to the government.

So the policy, the policy is very clearly that we are managing the corporations that we have inherited. We'll manage them to the best of our ability. We've put them on a profit and a dividend oriented philosophy to pay as much money as they can to the people of Saskatchewan. If we can allow the people of Saskatchewan to participate by buying bonds, like in the case of Sask Power bonds or energy bonds, and they like that, then they will be allowed to do it. And that's the basic philosophy.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, thank you for that statement. I don't know how wide-ranging you wish it to apply to. It seemed to me you were saying that the Crown corporations — and I'm going to ask you to clarify this — are being operated so as to generate substantial dividends.

Now, I want to know whether you agree with the statement of the hon. member for Bengough-Milestone, the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources (whatever his portfolio now is; I believe that's right) when he talked about, in this House on March 26th, when he talked about hidden deficits of the previous government — that was the crutch he hung it on — and then he said:

How are these deficits hidden? How, Mr. Speaker? They bled their crown corporation to give artificial transfusions to the government financial operations. Funds that rightly belong to the crowns, hundreds of millions of dollars, were siphoned off . . .

Now, I want to know whether you believe that payments by Crown corporations to the Government of Saskatchewan amount to bleeding off funds, siphoning off funds, that belong to the Crowns? Or do you believe that those are proper payments to the owner of the Crown corporations? What is the policy?

I note that the member for Bengough-Milestone uses colourful language dealing with what he calls:

They bled their crown corporation to give artificial transfusions to the government financial operations. Funds that rightfully belong to the crowns, hundreds of millions . . . were siphoned off . . .

That is an odd phrase, but I ask you whether or not . . . that is, whether he was speaking for the government in suggesting that no money should be siphoned off from the Crowns to the government.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition raises a very interesting point with respect to Crown corporations. We've had some of this discussion before — last year's estimates with respect to dividends. I think it's fair to point out at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that there are obviously two kinds of basic Crowns, one in the resource business, one in the utility business, or those in the resource business, those in the utility business.

And there are two points to be . . . that were brought up. As you mentioned, the member from Bengough brought up two points. One was the question of balancing the books and balancing the budget, and the other was with respect to Crown corporations being robbed of their dividends. So we've got balancing the budget on one hand through the Crown corporations, and the other is with respect to whether they should be paying dividends or not.

Now let me just . . . The last point first. Should Crown corporations be paying dividends? Obviously resource corporations, if they weren't tied up to pay dividends, goodness knows what they were set up for. They should be paying dividends to the province of Saskatchewan as fast as they can, and as well managed as they can, and so forth.

And we are working as hard as we can to make sure that is the case. The Crown corporations are not there just for some social or political reason, but an economic reason — to provide money for the people of Saskatchewan to use that money to build roads and hospitals and education and so forth. That's the resource Crowns.

Now with respect to the whole question of utilities, the question is: do we use a utility as a form of taxation to build roads and highways and so forth? All right. Now, the former administration did that. You taxed Sask Power, for example. You would say, please send me a dividend this year and I will stick it into general revenue and I will go and build and do things.

So you use the power corporation as a means of taxation to build. So you look at the power corporation, and since, well, from 1968 to 1982 a little in excess of \$104 million was taken out of the power corporation, taken out of the power corporation and used in general revenue. And some years it was as high as \$20 million, taken out of Sask Power to balance the books in general revenue, or it certainly contributed towards it, even at a time when Sask Power couldn't afford it.

And, in fact, if we go back and look at the Crown investments corporation, the Crown Management Board, saying . . . and the Auditor General . . . I believe 1984 . . . This is the compendium of management letters issued. He talks about a disclosed deficit of \$50 million incurred by Crown Investments Corporation. And in a discussion of the public accounts, and I'll just read this out so that we know where the money's going, and this is the chairman of the CIC saying:

I think that the motivation of the Provincial Auditor's concern was a situation where the Crown investments corporation found itself in a negative retained earnings position, and was making dividend payments.

Dividend payments even though it was in a negative retained earnings.

And if you look at the management letter of the Provincial Auditor, you can see that it has been

true for the Crown investments corporation, 1978. And I'm quoting this as April 26, 1984, page 279; 1978, and again in 1979, and again in 1980. And since 1978 was in a positive, was in a retained earnings position of negative retained earning position, and in those early years, and in fact in 1982, were in a negative retained earnings position — negative - \$50 million negative.

So the question that is raised by the member from Bengough-Milestone is this: if you were putting the Crown investment corporation into a negative position and still demanding revenues to balance the books, then it doesn't really look like you had a balanced budget at all.

And I go back to Sask Power, and Sask Power has a pretty difficult debt/equity ratio as a result of some of this. But here are funds that go through to government: from 1968, 3 million; '69, 3.5 million; 1970, 8 million; 1971 (your first year of administration), 10.4 million; 1973, \$20 million; 1976, 3.6 million; 1977 (from Sask Power to the government), 10.2 million; '78, 8.2 million; '79, 10.3 million; 1980 (and this is again with a negative retained earnings in the Crown investments corporation) you asked for another 16.5 million from Sask Power due to the general revenue in the Government of Saskatchewan. In 1981 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well then, who did you give it to? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. And they're negative. In 1981 there was another \$10,275,000.

Mr. Chairman, that adds up to \$104,975,000 that was taken from Sask Power which is not a resource Crown. That's a public utility where you go out and you bill people. You bill people. And you didn't bill them to build power projects. You billed them to take dividends of over \$100 million and then put it into CIC. Then you draw the money out of CIC and you do whatever you like with it.

Now I don't believe that public utilities were set up as a source of taxation, and I've said that to you before. I agree that public utilities should be able to create enough dividends to help pay for their projects, and they should be self-liquidating, and they have to contribute towards the interest, and you agree with that. I mean, we have to find the interest money some place. But I don't believe they should be used as a source of taxation to go build hospitals, because the reason they are in the public sector is because they are a natural monopoly, and we don't want to use them to unduly tax people as a natural monopolist would.

That's precisely what the member from Bengough-Milestone was talking about. He said Sask Power is in a lot of trouble because you took over \$104 million out of that Crown corporation, put it in CIC, then took dividends out of CIC when it was broke, and then you spent it and said you balanced the books. Well the people of Saskatchewan were getting tired of paying power bills so you could balanced your books and then go build things.

And then we go back and look at the debt/equity ratio in Sask Power and it wasn't for power projects. And you can go back today and say, well the debt/equity ratio is higher. All right. It's higher today because we're building Nipawin. We're putting natural gas distribution systems all across the province, and you didn't do those things. I believe money should be spent in public utilities building public projects for the public good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And the problem with this is not mentioned by the member from Bengough-Milestone. The problem with this is that you used a utility, you used a utility to put money into CIC, and that's why you set up CIC, to take money out of CIC. And as the Auditor General said, even when you've got a \$50 million debt you still took money out of there as dividends to the province, and then you spent the money. And obviously you could balance your books, or do whatever you like with it. But you must admit it was a source of taxation on a public utility, and public utilities, to my mind, were not set up to do that.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, we have a very clear statement of

policy that public utilities should not be paying dividends, that public utilities should not pay dividends. If they make a profit it would be reinvested. That is what the Premier said. If he said anything else, I'm amazed. That's what he said.

Now I want to ask him whether or not that policy has been followed by his government with respect to Sask Tel and whether in each year that he's been in office he hasn't taken a dividend out of Sask Tel? Isn't that true?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We have three public utilities. We have utilities that are in a great deal of financial trouble because of what's going on in the past. All right? That's for sure. Here's \$104 million that wasn't linked to projects. All right? To date, we still have financial difficulties in the public utility sector. We're trying to resolve those difficulties in the public utility sector. And we're working very hard to resolve them and put the debt/equity ratios back on track. That's what we're trying to do.

In principle, this is not what a public utility was set up to do. Not at all. And the hon. member knows that. He may believe that you can use it as a source of taxation. We have got some significant problems today and we are working hard in the public utility sector to resolve those. And yes, Sask Tel has paid some dividends recently, only because we've got such significant problems in power as a result of it being robbed for years.

But as a matter of principle, those utilities should stand on their own two feet and should not be used as a source of taxing to build anything else that may be at the whim of government. And that's why they were put in the public sector. In theory, I'm sure the hon. member would agree, and in practice. But in practice it's got us into a lot of trouble in the past. And as a result of that we've got to work hard to resolve it.

There's no question about resource Crowns. They should be paying dividends. Public utilities should put . . . create enough to pay for their own projects, to protect against the interest rates they're going to have to carry, and so forth. But as a form of taxation this has to stop.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, that's an interesting comment, because prior to his election there was a general policy of paying half of the profits of power and half of the profits of telephones into CIC or the public purse — the recipient was varied. Since his election, there has been not one single change in that policy. One-half of the total accumulated profits of both of those have been paid over. There hasn't been a single shift in policy. There's only been a shift in rhetoric. He's taken just as much money as before — half the profits.

The fact that he didn't make any profits in power is hardly applicable to previous administrations. Because his administration, if he thinks the problem is debt/equity ratio, in every major utility we have — power, telephones, it's true of STC as well — the debt-equity ratio has got worse. It's got worse, worse since he came to office — worse in telephones, worse in power. And his theory that Nipawin is the first major capital project we've had is simple nonsense.

The facts are that he is pursuing precisely the same policies, and he has simply changed the rhetoric . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Indeed, indeed we had rhetoric. Indeed, we had a simple rationale. You can accept it or not as to why the corporations were asked to turn over half of their profits. We don't need to go into that. That was past. But we've given it many times.

The Premier says it was the wrong policy. It was the wrong policy, but we're going to follow it because we need the money. It was the wrong policy for telephones, but we followed it each year we've been in office. That's what he says — because we need the money. It was the wrong policy for power, and we're not following it because we're not making any profits. And that's true. We're not making any profits in power, and not because of any particular rate freezes, but because of the fact that less power and less gas is being sold . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh nonsense.

The Premier tries to tell us that the growth in load for power has been at the regular level in 1982 and '83 and '84. That's not true. The load growth, the load growth has been lower rather than higher. And a simple look at the potash mines that were closed down and the rest will indicate what . . . But if, in fact, I'm wrong, and if, in fact . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, of course. I am not suggesting that the consumption went down — I am talking about load growth. Didn't you hear those words? The load growth has gone down. The rate of growth has gone down.

If anyone believes that the economy of Saskatchewan is in such a disastrous state that power consumption is actually going down, not even I would allege that of this government. I'm just saying that it flattened out compared with previous years. The load growth reduced — that's what I said. And I said it as clearly as the English language permits it to be said. And I am saying that happened, and if these people are denying it, let them deny it, because their figures contradict what they say. And it went down, and because it went down, the profits of the power corporation went down. And that is what has happened.

The point I want to make is this: while the government opposite says that it's going to operate the utilities without taking dividends, when it has any profits to take, it has taken them. It has not taken one cent less, not one cent less than would have been taken out under the old policy. And if the Premier wishes to deny that, let him quantify, let him tell me how much less they have taken out than 50 per cent of the combined profits of power and telephones — not a penny less.

That's what they would have got under the old policy. That's what they got under this policy. They're saying that they've got a different justification for it. But when it came to grabbing the cash, he grabbed exactly the same amount. And that's all I wanted to underline. He took the same amount as under the old policy.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the Auditor General said the CIC is \$50 million in the hole. We inherited that situation - \$50 million in the hole. You talk about the Heritage Fund. I mean, why was CIC in the hole - \$50 million in the hole and in a lot of trouble, paying a lot of interest payments?

So we go back and we look at both the resource Crowns, Mr. Chairman, and the utility Crowns. And I don't mind seeing dividends to the extent of \$104 million over 10 years from a resource Crown. But why an individual or a government would jeopardize a corner-stone of the Saskatchewan economy, like Sask Power, and put it into that much debt — like the interest on \$104 million, even at 10 per cent, doubles. That's over \$200 million that we sacrificed in Sask Power. So Sask Power is in a great deal of financial trouble because you took money out of it even when it was in trouble.

Now we have to put the utilities in good shape. We have to put the utilities in good shape. We don't believe in using the utilities as a source of taxation when we've got resource Crowns that should be paying dividends and utilities, and if some of the debt/equity ratios are up today it's because of capital projects. And they should be for capital projects, and I don't think you'd disagree with that. If you're going to build a power project, if you're going to build something else, then you'd borrow the money to do it. If you'd have left the money in Sask Power, we wouldn't have to do it. You wouldn't have to do it.

We have to go into the market, for example, for a Nipawin power project for several hundred million dollars. But why wouldn't you allow power to remain strong? And it didn't. The debt/equity ratio increased and increased, and not because you were building things. Because you were taking money out to do something else with it not associated with power.

Now we have inherited a difficult situation in power. And we want to make sure that the utilities look after themselves. So in this situation where we have utilities, some utilities that can

contribute and help this other utility, we want to make sure that they're in good shape. And the resource sector should be paying all the dividends that we can muster.

But the whole principle of robbing a Crown corporation like a power corporation, which is the corner-stone of this province, or any other province, to take the money and to jeopardize its position internationally and financially, and put it into a Crown investment corporation and then have that \$50 million in the hole too, and year after year take money out of there just to balance the books, is not appreciated by the people of Saskatchewan, and that's why they were upset with it. That's why they wanted to see it stop.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — One simple question then, Mr. Chairman. Are you . . . Did you take a dividend out of Sask Tel? Do you deny that the answer is yes?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we took a dividend out of Sask Tel for one reason. One reason. One reason. And the reason is that Sask Power is in such financial difficulty that the other two utilities, without any doubt, are forced to contribute to the financial wherewithal of the utilities.

And there's no alternatives. \$104 million plus interest is over \$200 million that was taken out of Sask Power, put it in terrible position. And the demand for electricity is growing in Saskatchewan because the population is growing, and the consumption will be going up, and the forecasts are very large. And we have to be building power projects.

So we don't want to get caught in the situation where we use a utility to tax for nothing else. Think nothing else. Not for the project. Not for power. Not for a telephone system. But for whatever the government decided to do, as it did in the past.

So you could take this money, for example, out of Sask Power, and you could go and buy farmland with it. I don't believe in that. You could take Sask Power's money and you could go buy a uranium mine with it — now the ones that you want to close. For all I know, the \$104 million out of Sask Power went to buy uranium mines that now you want to close the whole works. We don't believe in that.

We have inherited a difficult situation, and we are going to resolve it to the best of our abilities, allowing those utilities to work together as best they can to resolve it. And the only reason that we would accept any money from Sask Tel, dividend, is to repair the damage in a sister utility that has absolutely been bankrupt by the previous administration taking over \$104 million plus interest out of it.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — I find that a remarkable statement, but I want you to tell me why you feel that Sask Power was in a difficult position on May 1, 1982. In what did its difficulty consist?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the difficulty is a very high debt/equity ratio, and paying a very high debt/equity ratio, having paid dividends of over \$104 million which it could not use. So any kind of a project that it wants to get into or build, it is out 104 million plus interest. And it had no idea where that money went.

And you agreed. In fact, you initiated research on a power project — the Nipawin power project. And yet you would take \$104 million plus interest out of that corporation, and then decide to put the corporation to build the power project. That's the reason it was in trouble — because it would have had more debt than equity that was necessary.

And compared to other public utilities, and other people involved in those kinds of industries, you take \$104 million . . . Even the principle is wrong, but the fact even financially that you'd do that, and not spend the money on a utility, is a serious mistake. And that's why the power corporation's in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I asked you fairly simply in what the difficulty consisted, not your story of how it came about, but what do you say was the trouble with the power corporation on May 1, 1982. Is it you're saying that the debt/equity ratio at that time was too high? Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I'm saying precisely this: the debt/equity ratio was \$104 million too high. You had taken over \$104 million plus interest out of that Crown corporation, and you spent it on whatever you liked to spend it on. But it wasn't on power, it wasn't on natural gas, and it wasn't on power projects. The debt/equity ratio, if you hadn't taken that out, would be something like 70:30, as opposed to 86:14, or 86 whatever the difference is.

And that is a significant difference. And people have a right to know: what are we doing with our power bills? And you said, well, we are paying dividends with your power bills and we're going to buy farms with them. Or we're going to go off buying something else. And people said, that isn't what a utility was set up for. And they don't like that. And I'll admit they don't like it. And we're not going to do it by robbing utilities, just on a whim. That money that's coming in from utilities is going to be based and working on utilities to get them in good sound financial shape, because when we received them, they weren't.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, you did not tell me in what the difficulty consisted, other than you said that the debt/equity ratio was higher than it would have been, had the dividends not been taken out. That is self-evident. That is self-evident.

But let me tell you this, sir. The policy you are now stating is totally inconsistent with what your colleagues stated when they were in opposition. They consistently stated that there should not be a profit in the power corporation. They said that over and over and over again.

Now, obviously you cannot reinvest profits if there are no profits. The old policy was to reinvest half the profits. The people like the member for Indian Head-Wolseley said over and over again, there should be no profits. Therefore, the debt/equity ratio should be 100 per cent debt, and no equity. That was their position, and that is the position which now the Premier is decrying. How they change when they cross the floor!

They took a position that there ought not to be profits. They now say, yes, there should be profits, but there shouldn't be dividends. A very, very different position.

Now you, sir, are saying that the debt/equity ratio in April or May of 1982 was too high. I ask you: what target are you aiming at, and what progress have you made towards your target?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we certainly believe that public utilities can generate income. The income should be used in the public utility to pay its debts, to build projects, to contribute towards interest — all those things. The principle is simply this: not to use the public utility as a source of taxation to go do other things, because people don't like to pay their power bill, to think that the money's going to go off on something that has nothing to do with power. And any place you go in the world, the reason you set up a public utility is to make sure people don't do that.

And, for heaven's sakes, we must admit that, let's say, a reasonable NDP-CCF, left-wing government would believe in that as a public good. Why would you exploit the people on low income who pay their power bill, and take that money and go play with it? That money should be used to provide power cheaper, not more expensive. And that's the point.

Now, you say, what is our objective? Our objective is to put those utilities in a healthy debt/equity ratio position and not rob them so that they are in a very vulnerable financial position which may result in higher, higher utility rates, to be spent on something that people don't believe in and certainly isn't associated with the utility.

Now the debt/equity ratio was high when we got it. We have some power projects to build. So we have to go blow the money, because you didn't leave any money in it. What would you have us do? Not build the power project and rely on somebody else that could rob us of millions and millions of dollars?

We decided to build the power project, as you did, but the problem was Sask Power didn't have the wherewithal to do it inside and internally. And there's nothing wrong with a utility making money, spending it on itself — paying debt, paying for projects, paying interest rates — but not on other things, because that isn't what it was set up to do.

And that's clearly the difference between you and me. You would use that utility to tax people, to go buy whatever you liked. The money coming into utilities in Saskatchewan today is going to be used for utilities only.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that's what the man says but that's not what the man does. He's just stripped off dividends from Telephones two successive years, and not for telephone expenditure, and he's made that abundantly clear.

So what I ask you again, sir: what debt/equity ratio are you aiming at? You say that it was too high in May. Whether or not you admit it, it's gone up since then, now down. Now what are you aiming at as a desirable debt/equity ratio at the end of your four-year term?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, it is our intention to reduce the debt/equity ratio. Clearly. And there's a couple of ways to do that. You can do it through management and to run it as efficiently and effectively as possible. And you can do it by not robbing the corporations of dividends to use on other projects. Those two things are very significant and those two things are exactly what we're going to do.

The money that is being used in utilities today is to resolve the situation that we inherited. And the debt/equity of Sask Power will be up if we build a power project, because you didn't leave any money in it. So you can't go trucking around the province saying, "Well, the debt/equity ratio is higher than we got it," if we're building projects. I wish this had been spent on projects, but it wasn't. We could have had a quarter of a billion dollars worth of projects. You talk about roads in northern Saskatchewan. You could have developed projects for northern Saskatchewan, had them paid for. But we don't know what you did with this money.

You obviously balanced the books. Every year you said, "Well, it's balanced; it's balanced," and you balanced the budgets. I mean, this tells me that you're taking from a public utility to balance the books in the province of Saskatchewan. You've led people astray for years. They thought that it was balanced by itself. But you set up the Crown corporations and you duck in for \$20 million, \$16 million, \$10 million here or there. That's a lot of money. Plus the interest.

All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we are not going to jeopardize the role or the health of these Crown corporations, these utilities, by robbing them to do other things. They will be put on a sound management footing. We're going to have to continue to build public projects. If that means we have some debt, then we're going to have to incur that debt because that's the way we inherited it.

If those utilities now, one or two are in a healthy position, that money will be used — and you

can mark my words that money will be used — for the strength of those utilities, for those utilities, because one particularly is in very serious financial trouble because of, as I quote, “Hundreds of millions of dollars that you took from it and we don’t know what you did with it.”

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I take it you will not state what you’re aiming at for a debt/equity ratio.

I will make a little wager here that at the time of the next election the debt/equity ratio for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will be worse than the day you were sworn in. And I will just issue a little challenge to see whether you can improve on that, and my bet is that when four years is gone by with all of the rhetoric — with all of the rhetoric — the debt/equity ratio will be worse than it was the day you were sworn in.

You will say it’s because you’re building a power project as if Coronach were not built, as if other power projects were not built in the past. Of course they were; of course they were. And debt/equity ratio was thoroughly manageable. There’s nothing very bad about an 80:20 debt/equity ratio in a power corporation, nothing very bad about that. But my bet is you won’t get to 80:20. My bet is that it will be far worse than that.

And one of the reasons, of course, will be because you will not be following the dictates of the recommendations of the Public Utilities Review Commission which says that you should improve the debt/equity ratio by putting equity in the power corporation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Whoever took it out, it’s your Public Utilities Review Commission which says . . .

The Public Utilities Review Commission says that you should pony up some money because you are asking the power corporation to do things which are not profitable, and you are refusing so to do — you are refusing so to do. And you obviously are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that’s right — refusing so to do. And we’re all going to have higher power rates and higher gas rates as a result of that. So that’s an interesting comment on just whether you’re concerned about debt/equity ratios — an interesting comment.

So you, sir, are taking the position that you will not disclose this committee what debt/equity ratio you are aiming at for either power or telephones in your four-year term. Is that your position?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I made it very clear that our intention is to improve the financial state of the power corporation. We inherited a situation that was a public utility that had been robbed of over \$104 million in 10 years, plus the interest. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member says that we have the Sask Power doing things that are not profitable. I mean, I don’t know where this individual, the hon. member gets his . . . where he forgot his roots.

What was the whole reason for Sask Power to start with? We bought . . . I mean, for heaven’s sakes, the former premier of Saskatchewan, Tommy Douglas brought power to all of rural Saskatchewan. Did he do it because it was profitable? Is that what he did? Did he go from town to town and say, well by gosh, we’re gonna make sure that this power corporation is profitable and that’s why we’re bringin’ power to Lake Valley, Saskatchewan. No, we didn’t do that. He said the people of Saskatchewan need power. And the people of Saskatchewan today need natural gas on their farms, and that’s what a public utility should do, is provide natural gas to people all across this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And if there isn’t money in power today to provide Sask Power, and power to places all across Saskatchewan, including the North, for natural gas, it’s because the previous administration — and I don’t even think that the hon. Tommy Douglas would have done this — the previous administration robbed Sask Power of \$104 million plus interest. And

now you talk about we can't provide projects at a profit to the people.

You've used Sask Power to tax them and tax them and tax them of at least 104 million plus interest, and you didn't give them a thing. You didn't give them natural gas. Why didn't you want to give them a natural gas distribution program till the dying hours of the campaign? Why? Why? Because you knew you'd taken \$104 million plus interest which would have darn near paid for the whole program. We're spending \$350 million over 10 years. Here's 200 . . . well doubled, it would be \$208 million that you used and they didn't know what for.

And you ask me about the debt/equity ratio. Well you can go from town to town and house to house in the province of Saskatchewan from now until doomsday, talking about the debt/equity ratio of Sask Power. We will provide natural gas to the people of this province. We will provide electrical power to the people of this province. And if we inherited a problem, we will fix the problem. And they will not be fooled or confounded by a debt/equity ratio that they say, you'll say, aha, there's a project that isn't profitable. People today want power and gas on their farms, and they don't really care whether the former leader and premier of this province thinks that Sask Power is profitable or not. We'll run it as well as it can be run. Mark my words, we will not rob it to spend on other things. And the money coming from utilities today will be used to put utilities in good shape.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, mark my words, you've already robbed Sask Power . . . Sask Tel, by your definition. You have done exactly what was done in the past by Sask Tel by taking the dividends out. And you have taken them out of Sask Tel, and you haven't had any chance to rob Sask Power because they haven't made a dime since you came to office — not a dime.

And I'm interested in the comments from a member opposite because, you know, when we were pursuing this very issue in the power . . . in the Crown Corporations Committee, it was very clear that the position of the Progressive Conservative Party was totally inconsistent.

The Premier says that that money should have been left in the power corporation. That's what he says. If that had been done, the profits of the power corporation would have been larger each year than they were. I take it that that will be conceded; it's self-evident.

Each year the Progressive Conservative members of this legislature complained that the profits were already too large. The Premier is now saying you should have taken action which would have made them larger. He is saying what was totally wrong and totally inconsistent with what his colleagues said in the legislature when they were here. And this is such an example of the Conservatives wanting to have it both ways, of wanting to say in opposition, there should be no profits; when in government, there should be profits of the power corporation, and reinvested.

Whether or not — whatever the Premier's position of saying that the debt/equity ratio should be lowered by retained earnings (that's his position) is totally inconsistent with the previous position of saying that the corporation should be run at a break-even figure, as his colleagues said, year in and year out.

Whether, if we had followed, if anyone had followed the advice of his colleagues, there would have been no issue about dividends, there would have been no profits. That was the policy consistently urged and stated. If anyone doubts it, let them look at the record.

So I think the Premier, as I say, has redefined the policy of the Progressive Conservative party. I'm interested in the redefinition that there's nothing wrong with profits so long as they're retained. That's basically his new definition — and that he is going to run these corporations at a substantial profit in order to lower the debt/equity ratio. That's what he told us. That's what he's

told us.

Fair enough. We understand the policy. I am amazed to hear that, coming from a party which has consistently enunciated quite a different policy — a policy which said that they should be operated at a break-even figure.

But just one question to the Premier. He talked about a deficit in the CIC which, for the sake of the committee, is a very different corporation than power and telephones. Let me make that clear. It is an umbrella corporation.

And he said that there was a deficit, a deficit when he came to office. I want to ask him whether that deficit has increased or decreased in the two years in which he's been in office. Will he not admit that the deficit complained of, and that he said was the author of his difficulties, is now much higher than it was before?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to profits and public utilities, my position hasn't changed from last year, and the hon. member and I went through this before. There's one distinct, clear difference between our position and your position, and that hasn't changed among my colleagues. My colleagues, when they're talking about power making profits and contributing to other things that are going on to the province, is not what a utility is set up for.

Let me say very clear: a utility, in our view, should be profitable in that it shouldn't be a loser, and if it can pay for its own projects, and if it can pay for the interest on those projects and maintain a healthy, credible reputation, that's what the utility should do.

Now the opposition says you should take dividends from that utility and do something else with the money, not tie it to that utility. We don't believe that. So that's where the distinction is, and that's fair enough.

With respect to the deficit in CIC, I think that, as I quoted, the Crown investments corporation found itself in a negative retained earnings position, and yet it provided dividends. In '78, in '79, in '80, and '81 was the first time that it was positive and it had \$233,000; and in '82 again, it was in a negative retained earnings position.

Now the negative retained earnings position is partly because of the fact that CIC had been asked to contribute to the government, to general accounts, when it didn't have the money in there, so we accumulated about \$50 million worth of negative earnings. Now if CIC is in trouble today, it's the same way as Sask Power — because of that.

And the second reason — or international commodity prices like potash that don't provide the revenue. As the hon. member said, they got \$168 million at the peak of one year. Well that's fairly fortunate. You know, I would like to be in the same position. So, Mr. Chairman, I will just point out that there is a difference in philosophy with respect to utilities, and we'll agree to disagree.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I asked the Premier whether or not he wouldn't concede that the retained earnings position of CIC was a good deal worse now than it was when he took office, and he says there's a difference of philosophy. That, I think, acknowledges that, in fact, he has run those corporations at a massive deficit since he has come to office, and that the deficit continues to rise, notwithstanding his rhetoric about how he is going to run them in a business-like way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier, I want to ask about the policy of the government with respect to liquor advertising, and whether you have had any cause to review the decision you made with respect to permitting liquor advertising?

I won't go into all of the arguments against liquor advertising. They were done very capably by my colleague, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, in discussing the budget with the member for Meadow Lake, the minister in charge of the liquor board, and the liquor licensing commission. My question to you is this: have you had any occasion to review your decision to permit electronic advertising of liquor, of beer and wine on radio and television in the light of the very large lobby of people who have expressed their opposition to it?

The latest one is: "The United Church urges end to liquor advertising." A month or so ago it was the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation urging an end to liquor advertising, they seeing the effect it was having on school children and young people; the United Church taking the view that it is having a deleterious affect on the community. Are you giving consideration to reviewing your decision, and rescinding the order in council which permitted the electronic advertising of beer, wine, and spirits - or—beer and wine?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we monitor our programs on an ongoing basis. And as the hon. member knows, and I won't pursue it in any great detail that we have had some representation from people in the community asking us why we have changed the law with respect to Saskatchewan people advertising Saskatchewan products, like beer.

And we explained to them why we've done that. And we very briefly say, Mr. Chairman, Saskatchewan produces a great deal of malting barley. Saskatchewan people do that, and it's quite legal. Saskatchewan produces beer, and there are breweries in Saskatchewan, and that's legal to do that, to produce beer. And it means a great many jobs.

Saskatchewan also, all through the NDP administration, received beer ads from the United States into this province from Alberta and British Columbia, or pardon me, from Manitoba, because they could come in here from satellite. But our barley producers and our breweries, which were making and producing legal products — grain is legal, and beer made in the province of Saskatchewan — couldn't advertise their products. So they're saying Americans can advertise, drink Miller in Saskatchewan, and we are producing and competing but Saskatchewan people can't.

So we said: is it fair that Americans can advertise their agricultural and food products in our province, and we go ahead and produce them — and you allowed them to do it.

I believe now that there's over 70 communities licensed to receive those ads through international airways, which you didn't stop — licensed to advertise all over Saskatchewan. And you say . . . and we said: well, we thought Saskatchewan producers and Saskatchewan businessmen and people in the business of producing malt and barley, people in the business of producing beer which is legal in the province of Saskatchewan, is sold all across Canada, should at least be able to compete with Yankees — at least.

Now if we could stop all advertising so Americans couldn't advertise their product, that's a different story. But it's extremely difficult, as the hon. member knows, to stop the satellites. I mean, it's extremely difficult to do that. We've got more satellites up there, and people are advertising international things all the time. We live in an international world.

So was it fair? And when we respond to people, they agree. Was it fair for Saskatchewan to put the blinkers on and say there aren't beer advertising in Saskatchewan. No, because they're here. They're already here, and they're all over the province, and it's all American, and all Alberta, and all Manitoba, but not Saskatchewan products — only foreign products. So was it fair to us to say: well, we can't advertise Saskatchewan stuff because it isn't here. No, it was here.

And, in fact, in more and more communities, it's licensed. So as a result of that we said Saskatchewan people should have the opportunity to compete in the production of their grains,

in the production of their food products and beverage products, the same as Americans can.

Secondly, the provincial government, the provincial government . . . I believe the former administration had put thousands and thousands of dollars into the industry — the Biggar malt plant; think the Biggar malt plant. In fact, the government had subsidized it, yet the Government of Saskatchewan wouldn't allow Saskatchewan producers to compete in that market.

Third, we thought it would be time that we had more responsible, aware advertising on television because there wasn't any to speak of. So we said, using this excuse, we would allow Saskatchewan people to participate in that market if you make sure that you advertise an aware program, and we'll tighten the laws — and the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Health have done that. Awareness is way up, accidents are down, charges are way down, and so forth. So it's the combination, Mr. Speaker.

It was time we woke up to what was happening internationally because we couldn't deny the fact that it was here already, and, for the reasons I mentioned, we pursued it. We monitored closely. We look at the traffic accidents. We look at all the other things with respect to health, and you can have my word we will continue to monitor it very closely.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Premier. I don't think I could have put my case any better than you have put it. You have apparently relied upon the fact that some ads were coming in here for American brands on cable, cable that is received by a small minority of the people — minority at least — of the people of Saskatchewan. And secondly, the brand is not, in fact, being sold here, unlikely to encourage a great deal of selling if you're advertising Coors, or whatever, but I'll leave that.

You have stated your position, and I will also leave your last comments, and there are enough people around Saskatchewan to recall the old Aware program and the Feelin' Good program and to compare it with what you are doing. And if you think that there wasn't an Aware program before you came to office or a Feelin' Good program before you came to office, and now there is one — fair enough. That is your position.

But there are a lot of people around Saskatchewan who know better and will judge you for that sort of a comment, which is flatly false, and the Premier . . . Well, he may not know it's false; I shall not say it's false. His statement is flatly false, and it may arise out of error or otherwise.

I want to turn now to the Expo '86 beer hall, on hold pending liquor law review. Do we propose to . . . Is our project at Vancouver on hold because we're unclear as to whether or not we can serve alcoholic beverages in the Saskatchewan pavilion?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, I'll have to take notice. I'm not familiar with the . . . (inaudible) . . .

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — One final, small point. In our discussions yesterday, we — or perhaps an earlier day — we were talking about the staff. And I understood the Premier to say that he would let us have a list of his staff in approximately the same form as provided last year. And I don't want it now. I just wanted to be clear that that was our understanding.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes, you'll have it.

Mr. Sveinson: — I have a few questions of the Premier, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Premier. In listening to the rhetoric of the last few days, I can understand how the public in Saskatchewan is somewhat confused about certainly the activities of the government and, no less, the activities of the former . . . opposition. Fortunately, we have another alternative in the wings, and that is the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

And I think that we'll all agree that the polls do demonstrate, and the premier said earlier in this

debate, that the alternative in Saskatchewan has got to be the Conservative Party. I say the Conservative influence in this province has been felt, and I believe that in the next federal election we're going to find the alternative in this province will be changed. It'll be changed from the NDP and we'll find a presence, a federal presence, a federal Liberal presence, in this province.

Unfortunately, I didn't have an opportunity to rebut the Premier's statement, but he certainly did indicate that the polls do reflect on political movements, whether they be in Saskatchewan or whether they be in Canada, or wherever they may be, indicating that the plight of the NDP was not a pleasant plight. They are down drastically in the polls. But I would say to the Premier that the plight, even of the provincial Conservatives, is not an easy plight to deal with. We'll get back to that later in the debate.

I hope that my intervention will not delay the committee. I have a few questions of the staff of the premier, and I believe that I would like to start out by suggesting the Premier does have one of the largest staffs in Canada to, in fact, bring together the information required — at least perceived to be required — to deal with people like myself, of course, and the rest of the province. He has approximately 100 people on his staff.

Last year at this time, I would just like to say, that Mr. Leddy, no longer with us, recently fired by the Premier, was sitting in the seat of Mr. Smith-Windsor who is now presently the acting deputy minister. I would ask the Premier: how long do you expect that Mr. Smith-Windsor will be your acting deputy minister?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — As long as I see fit.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I can understand that. When you, in fact, decide that you will appoint a deputy minister, will you in fact . . . Will you advertise the job? Will you call for . . .

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I may or may not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sveinson: — Very interesting, Mr. Premier. As Mr. Smith-Windsor is the acting head of your staff I would ask you: does Mr. Dave Tkachuk report to Mr. Smith-Windsor?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The assistant deputy minister of my office is in charge of virtually everything that goes on in the Executive Council, and people do report through him, which includes intergovernmental affairs, and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, people are aware of the fact that in this administration, governmental affairs moved into Executive Council, and the previous administration it was in various other places. That is largely responsible for some increase in Executive Council. And in fact, the size of both of them has declined. So if we look at the size of the administration, obviously 3,000 people smaller than the previous administration, but even in terms of Executive Council, it's smaller because we now include governmental affairs.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I don't think the debate was the size of your staff or the size of the government staff. I think the people of Saskatchewan can see that the effect of government under the administration of the Progressive Conservatives hasn't really dropped. The number of departments, I don't believe, has been reduced, just the employment in those departments has been pared so that people within the departments, working for the departments, have to work a little harder.

I would like to clarify the point just asked. You mentioned that Mr. Tkachuk reports to Mr. Smith-Windsor. I would ask you at this time: is there any part time activity on behalf of Mr. Tkachuk with respect to personnel? Is he paid a fee for attracting personnel into the Progressive Conservative fold?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — No.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, you've certainly had other part time employees on your staff, Mr. Premier. As I mentioned earlier, recently fired Mr. Leddy. Moving along to another member of your staff sitting just to your left and over your shoulder, Mrs. Crosthwaite, who in fact is the present executive clerk to the Executive Council. I would just ask the Premier what basically Mrs. Crosthwaite has with respect to qualifications to hold that position.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, she is obviously a very talented woman. She has a B.A., an M.A. She has international experience. She's got experience in research, and she's very bright, and I might add, Mr. Chairman, she's loyal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — I think the primary reason for her position is her loyalty, no doubt, Mr. Premier. You brought her in at great expense to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan from Argentina, along with her husband, who I believe as a couple, probably qualify as the highest paid married couple within your Executive Council and likely within the public service of Saskatchewan. Would that be fair to say, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we in this administration are extremely proud of the women that we have working with us in this administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And it is beyond me why any member, independent or otherwise, would pick on well-qualified, talented, young Canadian women working in the public service, when in fact it is our desire and most Canadians' desire, to have more women working in the public service.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And it is clearly a reflection of the misguided direction of the member that's asking the question. I mean, the most popular thing that you can do in Canada today with respect to government employment service is to have professional women employed, and the member opposite is picking on t hem. And he knows that she is very well-qualified, both provincially, federally, internationally, and in education, and has a great deal of professional integrity. And that's precisely what we want in the public service, and that's precisely what we have here in the province of Saskatchewan from the cabinet minister down . . . or the cabinet down.

So I am only too glad to see her come home to Saskatchewan to be employed in the provincial government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — I don't think I intended, at any point in this debate, to in fact criticize the hiring of women within the public service.

What was the cost to the public in Saskatchewan to bring Mrs. Crosthwaite from Argentina, or the cost to bring her husband or both of them back to Saskatchewan after two years of political experience within your government, prior to her returning after the provincial election to be appointed to your political staff?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, it didn't cost the provincial government anything. It was virtually zero to bring them back. We didn't pay any transportation bills. We didn't pay any moving bills at all.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I can appreciate, I can appreciate your answer. What does virtually no expense mean, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, that means the federal government paid for it.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, compliments to the federal government. How is it that the federal government paid for the return of Mrs. Crosthwaite and her husband to Saskatchewan to serve the employ of Mr. Premier and his Executive Council?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, as I understand the federal policy, Regina was their permanent place of residence in their international movements, and they brought them back to their permanent place of residence, and they paid for it. So we were happy to acknowledge that, and it cost us, as a result, virtually nothing.

Mr. Sveinson: — So that both Mr. And Mrs. Crosthwaite came back to serve the Executive Council of this government at the cost of the federal treasury which, of course, is the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, as well as others. Did you request that they come back to serve you? And I can understand that the reason her loyalty was so assured is that she did serve as a political adviser to your caucus for two years prior to returning to Saskatchewan.

Is there any other couple within the service, within the public service that are paid as highly as this couple, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know why the hon. member wants to pick on couples, married folks, or women professionals. I mean it doesn't . . . I don't think the people of Saskatchewan have ever been anti-families, or anti-married folks, whether they worked at the Co-op or whether they worked in government or wherever they worked. I mean it's just . . . I'm not quite sure where the hon. member is coming from in terms of picking on women — picking on women.

There are people, there are married couples working in the Saskatchewan Government, in the Alberta Government, in the Manitoba . . . as far as I know, in all governments. And there are couples as high as the deputy minister level. I believe Mr. Ken Fyke, the deputy minister of health, and his wife both work for the Government of Saskatchewan, and they have been here for some time. I would venture to say at one time I worked for Mrs. Beryl Plumptre in Ottawa, and I'm not so sure her husband didn't work for the federal government at the same time. I may be mistaken there, but certainly there have been couples that worked at the same time all across Canada.

And what's wrong with men and women working in government, and it happens to be a couple, if one is the deputy minister of that and one works for Executive Council? Why would the Liberal representative or the Liberal Party or Liberal anything, or anybody else for that matter, want to pick on women? I don't understand that, Mr. Chairman. It just doesn't make any sense.

We are proud of women in cabinet. We are proud of women working in Executive Council. We are proud of wives working in the province of Saskatchewan. We are proud of couples working. We are proud of our children. We don't like to pick on anybody. And a particular member of the legislature that would go to the trouble of picking on women — young, professional women — is beyond my comprehension, and I just frankly don't understand it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I can understand, Mr. Premier, you don't know the direction that I am undertaking. I don't think you know the direction that I am undertaking. I don't think you know the direction of most of your government, and certainly it would do you well if you'd get to know a few of them and find out what the direction of your

government should be. I have never, ever qualified or, in fact, criticized your government or any other government for hiring women staff members. Never, ever, ever! I didn't criticize it. I simply asked a question. Was she hired as a political assistant? And at what salary was she hired? And on what conditions was she moved into Saskatchewan? That is not criticizing; that is not, Mr. Premier, criticizing the hiring of women!

In fact, if you go back in history, you'll find that the Liberal government in Ottawa has members of cabinet long before you did. If you go further back, you'll find that the Conservative government in this province go back to 1930 and served one term. And with an attitude you have for individuals like myself and other individuals all the way across this province, you'll find that the next term of this government will only be one term.

But getting back to Mrs. Crosthwaite's salary. How much does she earn, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, getting back to the issue of women working in government. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Order! Order! The members from Regina North West asked a question. Allow the Premier to answer it . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order! The Premier has the floor. Mr. Premier.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we're very proud of the tradition that we have in our political party with respect to women. The hon. member raises it. I believe the first woman in the history of Canada to be a member of . . . to be in the cabinet, nationally, was under John Diefenbaker. I believe that's the case. And that's a tremendously valuable historic fact, that women have, in our political party, always ranked with men equally when it comes to the political and democratic process.

And it's exactly the same in the province of Saskatchewan. The first women in the history of our province to be in cabinet came in April of 1982 — the first women ever to be elected and in cabinet in the province of Saskatchewan. Now that's both a record federally and it's a record provincially. Progressive Conservative nationally, Progressive Conservative provincially, and that's exactly what we're going to do in the future. And we're very proud of it.

Now, with respect to public employees, we're very proud of women that are also public employees, and there will be more. And we certainly have more women in our caucus than you do in yours.

Mr. Chairman, the salary of Mrs. Crosthwaite is \$4,800 a month.

Mr. Sveinson: — I realize her husband doesn't work in your department, sir, but would you have the information on his salary?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that. But obviously it will be in *Public Accounts*, and we'll get it. But let me just respond. My response is this. What is the hon. member trying to do with a female employee in the administration? Why is an individual of the legislature picking on a female employee in the Government of Saskatchewan? And the opposition is joining in. Why are they picking on a female member of the public service in the province of Saskatchewan?

You know what they do? They say, ah, but let's find out the salary of her husband, as if that's going to cast an aspersion on this individual . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, that's exactly what you've asked for. The individual asked for the salary of the husband . . . He didn't even give the position. He just said the husband of the female employee. Do you want to know the salaries of every one of the wives . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's exactly the question. Right? Why do you want to pick on women?

And, Mr. Chairman, why does the opposition want to pick on . . . Why do they join together to pick on a female employee? Quit picking on employees. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it's pretty darned low when a member of the legislature picks on a female employee to publicly embarrass her, when we are trying to provide more opportunities for women, and then to ask, to publicly ask what her husband's salary is just to embarrass a female employee. I think that's one of the lowest questions I've heard in this legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I'm not certainly criticizing a married couple or I'm not questioning the gender of the individuals involved. She works for Executive Council in a very highly paid position. All I was asking was her salary. I would also like to know whether she drives a luxury automobile on behalf of the government. I would also like to know the details of the expense account of this particular individual, and whether or not she has credit cards. And I'm not using her as any . . .with respect to gender, I could really care less.

But I would like to say that recently a cabinet minister was definitely fingered by Southam News as having abused some of the privileges of the Executive Council and the cabinet. While he paid the moneys back, it was outlined that he had abused that privilege.

I would like to establish, not only with respect to this individual but possibly with respect to all individuals in your Executive Council, exactly what their salaries are, whether they drive company cars, or whether they drive Executive Council cars, or whether they drive government cars, and just how lavish their expense accounts are. And how many credit cards do they have, to, in fact, entertain the whims of the members of Executive Council and cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I will respond to the individual member with respect to the specific questions, but let me add: I think it is one of the lowest form of questions I have heard to pick on a female employee, to pick on a female employee. If the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wants to stay here for the next two days or three days picking on women that will be his choice.

But let me say, Mr. Chairman, we are extremely proud of the women that are working. We believe that women should have opportunities in the work-force, even if the hon. member as he's always said, and he's said for years and I know it well and everybody else does, that he thinks the women's place is in the home and that's it. Even if he believes that. And it will be reflected in the kinds of questions that he will ask here, and maybe he'll ask for the next three days.

But I want to say that we firmly believe that women should be in cabinet. We firmly believe women should be in Executive Council. We firmly believe that women should have full opportunities right across the entire work-force, whether he does or not. And we will stand fastly, protect that, and develop that and work at that.

With respect to allowances, Mrs. Crosthwaite has the same expenses and expense account as all other civil servants get in her position whether they're men or women. She is treated exactly the same. She doesn't have a car. She has some car allowance. With respect to civil servants' expense accounts, she has the same thing as other civil servants get whether they're male or female. She doesn't have credit cards, but in her position, if she has to entertain individuals that come in from Intergovernmental Affairs or the Chinese delegation or others, she is entitled to expenses the same as any other employee in the Government of Saskatchewan. She is treated no better, no worse, but she is a woman, and she's given equal treatment and equal opportunity and we're proud of it.

Mr. Sveinson: — Just for the record, I somewhat question the judgement of the Premier with respect to my line of questioning. I certainly am as proud as you are about any women working

in our work-force who have the ability and certainly the drive and enthusiasm to attain the position that Mrs. Crosthwaite has. That wasn't the line of question that I endeavoured. I have no doubt that women all over this country have a deserving place in government and in industry and everywhere else, and I think you've somewhat misquoted me, Mr. Premier, by suggesting that I would say anywhere, anytime that women's place is in the home and nowhere else. I think I should, in fact, on a point of order demand that you retract that statement because I certainly do not support it. I'll let it go. I'll get it go because it's on the record. It's on the record that I don't support it.

I just feel that the judgement of the premier on the integrity of my line of questioning is somewhat questionable, and it upsets me that he would direct and use a woman on his staff who is very capable, to come back at a member, to come back at a member of the Liberal Party and accuse him of attacking that individual. I requested, and all I requested, was information. I did not ask for a personal condemnation of what I think of women on your staff or women elsewhere in Canada working for government staff. I qualified that early. I said that I agree women have a rightful place in government and a rightful place in industry, and they are suddenly attaining that rightful place. Most other premiers in this country, in fact, employ women as part of a secretariat within their own staff to draw on ideas from other women. I'm not so certain that Mr. Devine shouldn't have somebody in that position on his own staff.

Basically, I think you've answered the questions that I asked relative to salary and relevant to other pertinent information. I know that the government thinks this is one big joke. I see Embury back there . . . I'm sorry to name him so explicitly, but I see him back there. It's the first time I've noticed in this Assembly in the last few days that the man's even been awake. So, you know, I've certainly improved the index of interest in the Assembly, if nothing else. I had absolutely, absolutely no intention to draw on the comparison that the Premier just voiced, and that is, my opinion of women.

Going back to Mr. Smith-Windsor for a moment, I would just ask the Premier: what does Mr. Smith-Windsor run?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I will offer the independent member the same courtesy as the Leader of the Opposition. I will send him the whole list of people that are employed and their salaries, the same as I did last year. If he wants to go through them one to one, I'll just say I'll send them to him. In this case I'll respond: 6,024 per month.

Mr. Sveinson: — Just moving along. Mr. Premier, you have two executive assistants. One is Mr. Craig Dutton; the other is Mr. John McKenzie. I would just ask you now what the salary that Mr. Craig Dutton earns and what the salary of Mr. John McKenzie is.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I said to the hon. member I'll send him the whole works, everything, the same as I send the Leader of the Opposition, which is the same as I did last year. It seems to me a little bit of a waste of time to go through every single, solitary member of either Executive Council or other departments. So we will send them over. You can have them all and you can have them at your disposal. You can publish them if you like.

Mr. Sveinson: — I would prefer, Mr. Premier, that you give me these figures in the House.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I think they're on three sheets here. We'll Xerox it immediately and we'll just give the whole works to the hon. member.

Mr. Sveinson: — What are the responsibilities of your executive assistant, Mr. Craig Dutton?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dutton primarily is an assistant to me with respect to two things: one, keeping track of social and economic conditions that are going on in the province and in particularly, the south-east part of the province, because that's where my riding

is. As you know, I have a few more responsibilities than the average MLA, so Mr. Dutton helps identify things that I should be aware of there on a daily basis and helps me deal with it.

Mr. Sveinson: — And what are the responsibilities of Mr. John McKenzie?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — My office receives a great deal of requests — a large number of requests — particularly by telephone. And so many of the issues — and I would say that sometimes there are literally hundreds a day, the telephone calls on specific things — Mr. McKenzie deals with those on an ongoing basis. And he will deflect them or direct them to departments. He will take those to me that he thinks that I need to handle. He will take them to the ministers that he thinks they need to handle. Mr. McKenzie also accompanies me when I go various places around the province. If I need this or I need that, he's there. He will also assist me when we're driving to Weyburn to a function and back again.

So he's generally on the communications side — incoming requests. He deals with them on the telephone. He'll allocate them out and then he, again, is assisting me wherever I go. And if I need somebody to get me information, make some calls, and so forth, he's my sidekick.

Mr. Sveinson: — Do these two gentlemen earn the same salary?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Evidently they don't. I will send it to you in a matter of minutes.

Mr. Sveinson: — So, in fact, Mr. McKenzie, would he earn more than Mr. Dutton, or would Mr. Dutton earn more than Mr. McKenzie?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I'll send them over to the hon. member and I'll send one to the Leader of the Opposition. It's the same thing, and then he can look at them himself.

Mr. Sveinson: — What are the qualifications of these gentlemen: Mr. McKenzie, first and Mr. Dutton, second?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Dutton has a B.A. in political science and economics. He has three years administrative experience in business and management consulting. And he's obviously involved in his own family operation in the energy business.

Mr. McKenzie has 14 years experience in family and corporate business, and a considerable amount of skill in public relations, as he was involved in the entertainment business and so forth.

Mr. Sveinson: — Where did Mr. McKenzie attain his degree?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. McKenzie didn't get a degree. If you're asking about where Mr. Dutton got his degree, the one I just mentioned, in economics and political science, I believe it was in . . . Well, maybe I'm mistaken, I think it was Brandon.

Mr. Sveinson: — I see that Mr. McKenzie earns more than Mr. Dutton. Is there any reason for this inequity?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. McKenzie has a few years experience on Mr. Dutton, and experience, as we know, for normal situations does provide for a certain degree of education and, as a result, it's worth something. So, with 14 years of experience in business and public relations, and so forth, given the age difference and so forth, it's a very natural difference.

Mr. Sveinson: — Very natural progression. Where was Mr. McKenzie prior to his employ with the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Just prior to the election he was working for me as leader of the

opposition, or Leader of the Progressive Conservative party, and prior to that, he was in business.

Mr. Sveinson: — I see that he earns approximately 3,300 a month. Does that also include a car and an expense account?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, it does not include a car. It would include the normal expense account, expenses that he would receive working with me if we have to pay for expenses, and he is normally the one that pays for it for me. I will use my credit card; he will normally use it to pay hotels, and so forth, but he doesn't have a credit card himself, or a government card. He helps me handle my travelling and expense account. So he would have the same normal expense accounts as any other public employee.

Mr. Sveinson: — Do either of these gentlemen have any previous experience in government?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure, but I don't believe that they do.

Mr. Sveinson: — Moving along to Mr. Greg Fyffe, assistant principal secretary to the Premier. I have his salary, Mr. Premier. Could you please outline his daily activities as far as a member in your employ?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Greg Fyffe, Mr. Chairman, because of his experience, and I would just point, has a B.A. and M.A. in politics and 11 years experience in legislative programming, is correspondingly responsible for . . . Well, he's secretary of the legislative review committee. He monitors the Legislative Assembly on House procedures. He will attend things like constitutional conferences on House procedure. He supervises the correspondence unit in Executive Council, and he provides me with personal advice on the operations of the House, on regulations, on the design of legislation, and the review of legislative possibilities.

Mr. Sveinson: — I see his salary is \$5,222 a month. I realize his responsibilities are heavy. Could you please tell me where he was employed prior to coming to Regina?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — In the House of Commons, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sveinson: — But he relocated to Regina. Was there relocation expenses involved with Mr. Fyffe's move, or was he moved here by the national government as well?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — He was relocated at the provincial government's expense.

Mr. Sveinson: — What would the cost of a relocation like that be approximately, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Approximately \$7,700.

Mr. Sveinson: — Does Mr. Fyffe have an assistant?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — He has a secretary, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sveinson: — So he doesn't have an executive assistant per se that works in his office or works for him? He only has a secretary? Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — That's right.

Mr. Sveinson: — Last year, when you were out of the country, Mr. Premier, Mr. Fyffe raised his salary, along with several others, of course, in Executive Council. Did he do that with your knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, let me make one thing very clear, nobody raises their own

salary. So I don't think it's fair for the member to be suggesting that to the public, or to the Assembly, that public employees just holus-bolus raise their own salary. In the case of Executive Council, the salary would be increased if we passed an order in council. If an order in council was passed with respect to salaries, I'd be aware of it and we are checking to find out what it might have been in terms of a level, if there was one, when I wasn't here in the legislature.

Mr. Sveinson: — I'll just move along to Ms. Marge Haddad. Is she a member of your staff, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes.

Mr. Sveinson: — What are her responsibilities?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Itinerary co-ordinator, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sveinson: — I don't see her listed on — I see that her salary is \$27,085. What would her responsibilities include as itinerary co-ordinator?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Receiving and co-ordinating invitations that are delivered to me personally. Then it's reviewed by committee. Recommendations are then suggested. Ms. Haddad brings them to me. I decide which ones I'm going to pick up on and do, given the recommendations of the tour committee, and she goes back and puts it all into place, and keeps my calendar from being overlapped or double booked, or whatever. Co-ordination of itinerary.

Mr. Sveinson: — And what are Ms. Haddad's qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have her educational experience before me, but prior to April of '82, she was working in the private sector. Prior to that she had been a secretary working in the Legislative Building, and prior to that I'm just not sure.

Mr. Sveinson: — Would that be a secretary's salary that she earns, or is that a special qualification? Is that a secretarial salary that she earns?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — No, that isn't a secretarial salary, it's a ministerial assistant's salary, because she does much more than the normal secretary. She has to actually manage, make some decisions with respect to the Premier's time. So it's a ministerial assistant's salary, as opposed to a secretary's salary.

Mr. Sveinson: — I can certainly take that as an answer. I suppose that the allocation to a single, independent member is something like \$28 a day. And she certainly looks after my itinerary. She certainly looks after my time. I don't have any other staff. She also does all my research. I just compare that to \$2,735 a month and say that, you know, I think that whether she's qualified or whether she isn't, I realize she has political connections with the Conservative Party. I would say that unless she has other pressing staff needs, that possibly she should be reallocated to the secretarial pool and possibly \$2,700 a month is a little less than most secretaries would earn for the same kind of involvement.

I would like to move to Miss Bonnie Holbird, who, as well, is a ministerial assistant, earning \$3,435 a month. I would ask what her responsibilities are, and whether she has a government car, and also whether she has an expense account.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, let's make one thing very clear, Mr. Chairman, so the hon. member can stand up and talk about it across the province. Earlier, I said he was picking on a female employee in the province of Saskatchewan, in the public service. And just now he says — he starts on another one — Mrs. Haddad. And he says, here's a public employee that is doing the job of co-ordinating the Premier's itinerary, and he said her salary should be reduced; she should

be confined to a secretary's salary.

Women all across this province, and all across Canada, want equal opportunities and equal pay for equal work. What does this independent member from Lord knows where say: that the salary should be reduced and confined to that of a secretary? She is in a management position, and again he's picking on women. And then he goes on to pick on Miss Bonnie Holbird, and he'll probably say the same thing — the same thing. He'll say, "Why can't we pay women less?" Or, if a woman's husband is employed in government, why should that be the case?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will defend the women in government employees service all across this province — in my office, in other offices, in the private sector — no matter where they are. And I think that the hon. member might know that the Premier of the province might get more requests for public speaking than the member opposite, who says that his secretary might be able to handle his. He may not need one at all, given the requests that he has to speak — maybe not any.

Let me just make it clear, Mr. Chairman. Let's make it very, very clear what the hon. member is doing. He said in this House that a public employee of the Government of Saskatchewan, who is a woman, should have her salary reduced to that of a secretary, because she's a woman. And that will go on record all across this province and, indeed, all across the country, and I'm sure the hon. member's leader is very proud of it.

With respect to Miss Holbird, she organizes and co-ordinates over 400 pieces of mail that come in . . . How often? Every month, and she co-ordinates the correspondence to that. And she has the same sort of expense allowance as other public employees, be they male or female, and no, she should not have her salary reduced to that of a secretary because she is a ministerial assistant and is in a management position.

Mr. Sveinson: Well I can appreciate again the Premier's insolence with respect to a reasonable question. I think, initially, I compared a secretarial staff that he's allocated with an independent Liberal member, which doesn't quite reach 500 a month, with somebody working in his own office for eight hours a day, who presently, whether she's female or male — and I don't really care which, Mr. Premier, whether you're paying a salary, you're paying for a service delivered, and you're paying her \$3,500 a month.

And maybe your position dictates that yes, your personal secretary who looks after one small part of your daily business — your itinerary — maybe your personal secretary should earn \$3,000 a month more than mine. I say that maybe she shouldn't, and maybe that you should upgrade the services that you allocate an independent member in this House to at least allow them, to at least allow them to function — to function reasonably, to function reasonably, and I did not implicate at any time that I was attacking women again.

I think your judgement is somewhat in error, and I think that on many matters, in fact, in estimates over the last three days, it's been well demonstrated your judgement is in error, not only with respect to the bill that the public has to pay for 100 employees who work in your Executive Council, but also on many other matters . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's a good thing I've driven Blakeney right out of the House.

Miss Holbird is earning \$3,435, and I'm not saying she's not earning that. I'm not saying she's not earning it and I'm not saying she doesn't deserve it. All I asked you, Mr. Premier, is: what are her qualifications to serve in that position?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Miss Holbird has nine years of non-government experience as an executive secretary and office manager. So with the kind of experience that she has, she's more than well qualified for it.

Just to help put the hon. member's questions in perspective. With respect to his attitude about people and about women, and a man that is evidently seeking the leadership of the Liberal Party says this, and this is the kind of attitude, this is the kind of attitude, and I'm quote *The Globe and Mail*, May 30th. This must be where you're coming from. Mr. Whelan says:

A man should always wear a hat. No easier way to catch a cold in winter than to go bareheaded. And in summer, the sun'll roast your brains if you don't wear a hat. (Yes, this is Mr. Whelan.) And that's one reason they have low IQs in Africa.

Mr. Chairman, that's indicative of the kind of attitude the member has about not only women in the public service, not only women in the private sector, but any individual. He has no more respect for individual rights or individual integrity, human worth. And this is an individual in that party that's seeking the leadership of the nation. This is going to be the leader for all of Canada, and he says, "... that's one reason they have low IQs in Africa. They don't wear hats."

Well, Mr. Chairman, if that's a reflection of the attitude of the hon. Member's questions about women that we have employed, about women that I have employed in Executive Council, or women employed all across this province, then it's a sad day for the Liberal Party of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinsson: — There's an old saying that any fool can criticize, condemn . . . And I think that most do, and I think, Mr. Premier, you've certainly qualified very, very effectively with the last statement. I don't have any idea what the IQs are in Africa, and I don't know where you're quoting from. You mention *The Globe and Mail*, but I don't know what it has to do with the qualifications of one Bonnie Holbird with respect to the salary she draws down as your employee. I'm not criticizing women. I'm just questioning the qualifications.

I see Mr. Craig Dutton as well qualified as an executive assistant, and that's what he is. Mrs. Bonnie Holbird is also a ministerial assistant. She earns \$300 more than Mr. Craig Dutton, who has a well-qualified university degree and also other qualified experience. I just ask, for the record, what her qualifications are. I think that's very simple. I know that she worked with the Conservative Party over many years, and I don't doubt that she served the Conservative Party very well. I just asked: what is her background, and what are her qualifications? And I think education and service, not only to the Progressive Conservative Party, but outside the party, I think they're important as well. And when you're paying somebody \$3,435 out of the public purse, I think an explanation is only just.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I again, have to say that I resent the hon. member saying that people without a university degree can't be productive and can't hold managerial positions. I resent that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — We have women employed in the public service in Saskatchewan, all across this province in the private sector, and in Executive Council that do not have a university degree. And that doesn't mean, as the hon. member suggests, that they should be confined to being janitors or even secretaries or anything else. They can go to the very top, the very top of this government or our political party and, obviously, they do — they're in cabinet. And they don't necessarily have to have a degree in anything. And for the hon. member to say that individuals should not be working in the Executive Council with managerial capacity, because they don't have a university degree, is a shame and a sham.

And the reason that I read this from *The Globe and Mail* as an indication and reflection of how you and your colleagues feel about human dignity. You don't know what it means. And you've asked me questions now for over an hour that have been nothing but to disgrace women from

one end of this province to the other, saying they don't have enough education for a job; they're paid too much in managerial positions, and all you want is more money for yourself. That's all you want.

You said well, why can't you get more money? Well, first of all the Board of Internal Economy for this entire legislature decides what you and your secretary gets. It isn't me, and you know that. But you just want more money for yourself, and you are willing to pick on any single, solitary, female and government employees all over the place. It's a shame, you should be sent home and apologize.

Mr. Sveinson: — The Premier seeks to get down into the mud on this issue, and I'm trying to keep it on a plane. I don't think that asking for qualifications relates anything to whether you've got a university degree or not. There are several employees, there are tens of employees working for your Executive Council where there is political appointees. And I'm not questioning whether or not they're women or whether they're men. I'm just saying, are they earning a fair salary.

You just criticized janitors and people at the bottom of the scale, and that's exactly where you are, Mr. Premier. You represent big business in this province. How can you, as a businessman, a Premier, who represents that part of the scale, even identify with them? You go out to a bowling banquet, and you're in your best tuxedo. You don't know where the people of this province are. You don't talk to them. You don't talk to the back-benchers in your caucus, and you criticize me.

You say that I don't have the integrity that I should have as a member of this House, and that I don't respect women in a fashion that I should respect them. And that is absolutely balderdash, because that wasn't the question. That didn't relate to the question, and I want an answer to the question.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I gave the qualifications of Miss Bonnie Holbird. I said she had nine years of . . . five at professional, secretarial and executive experience as a secretary. And all I wanted to reflect is that everybody knows in this legislature that the most right-wing individual in the entire legislature is sitting there as an independent member — the most right-wing. And he is an individual that would endorse this kind of thing, that would say, women shouldn't get paid the same amount. The place for the women is in the home, etc., etc., etc.

And he is the kind of individual who said that women now that are being paid X amount of money to be managers should have their salaries cut. Well clearly, Mr. Chairman, the government members on this side of the House, and the government members on all sides of the House, are in mainstream Saskatchewan. We have support from the middle, we have support from the left, we have support from the right, we have support from women all across this province, because we understand real families, real people, and the integrity and the dignity of individuals, including all of the women that are employed and will be employed in the province of Saskatchewan, including Bonnie Holbird, who happens to work in a managerial position, and she doesn't have a university degree, and we are proud as punch of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — I don't know what qualifies you, Mr. Premier, to suggest that I'm the most right-wing individual in this House. In my term as a Conservative, you only spoke to me twice, and that certainly wasn't on the basis of any philosophy. I can tell you that I had to . . . your personal secretary, not only was she very rude when I tried to make an appointment with you, but she turned me off on several occasions. And she's been rude to the public. I have been told that this lady has been rude to other people who have tried to get through to your office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Your office is not . . . the doors to your office aren't open, Mr. Premier.

And how would you know that I'm a right-winger, if I in fact am. I believe in small business. I

believe in Medicare. I believe in things that are small-L liberal, Mr. Premier. Now how can you quality that I am a right-wing individual of any philosophical nature?

I would like an answer to that, or I'd like you to withdraw it from the record.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, again I rest my case. What does he say? Women are rude. Right? Women in the public service are rude to this poor little MLA. Mr. Chairman, we respect and we are so proud of the women that we have working for us, and he wants to reduce their salaries. He wants to embarrass them. He now says that they are rude. I mean, how many quotes do we have to have? We can publish this all across Canada. This is his attitude towards women in the public service, or women in private life, and women generally.

Mr. Chairman, we know, we know that the most right-wing radical individual in the legislature is sitting as an independent. The whole province knows, and if anybody has been watching television, or reads *Hansard*, now they'll know why that individual and where he's coming from — why he sits so well with Mr. Whelan who is running, who criticizes the I.Q. of an entire continent.

Mr. Chairman, I just say that I will defend women in the province of Saskatchewan and across the country, and in the public service, whether they have degrees or no degrees. I don't condone saying that they are rude. I don't condone saying that they are not qualified. I don't condone lowering their salaries — in fact, the very opposite.

They are great in terms of hospitality. They reflect and represent this government well. Some of the best representation we have in cabinet are women, in the public service are women. And I know the hon. member doesn't believe that, and he doesn't believe in equal rights for women, but I do and we will stick with it as long as we're government, and we'll be here a long time, given that.

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Devine, your personal staff, your personal staff . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order, order. The member from Regina North West should refer to members of the legislature by their cabinet post, or by their constituency. The member for Regina North West.

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Premier, your personal staff that are, in fact, lined up at the back of the legislature today, are on record, are on record as having criticized the ambitions of women in this province and all over Canada, indicting that . . . there are studies indicating that their only aspirations are to watch soap movies. I see one of them in the back of the hall today, Mr. Dave Tkachuk. You responded to that very poorly in question period one day, Mr. Premier.

I have certainly not indicated today in any way, shape, or form, that I have anything but the most appreciative and absolutely the most respect for women of any member in this legislature, including yourself.

I have just raised some questions with respect to your personal staff. I don't think any staff of the Premier or of Executive Council should be covered because of their gender. I think the involvement of this staff should be open to the public. What we pay them and what they're qualified to do should be open to the public.

I suppose I can go back to Mr. Smith-Windsor, the gentleman to your right who is presently giving you information on, and you're going to come back at me. He's paid 80,000 a year. You've got other staff in here that are all over 60,000, I'm sure. There's eight or 10 of them.

One member rises and asks a couple of questions on the female staff of the Premier, also on the male staff of the Premier, and you come down on him only because he asks a question. And you

try to relate to it as being a very defamatory question relating to gender and not to specific responsibility.

Well, I say, Mr. Premier, it relates to specific responsibility. And I'm not trying to outline the women are any better or any worse than men. Okay. They're equal in my mind, and they're equal in everybody's mind, I'm sure, who is in a responsible position and has the opportunity to hire them. You hire them on the basis of their ability, not on the basis of their gender.

I would also suggest that there are other people on your staff who, in fact, I don't know their background and I certainly don't know their qualifications. One sits immediately to your left. Last year Mr. Leddy sat in that same position. Could you please outline what Mr. Leddy's background or what Mr. Leddy's experience was, to the House, Mr. Devine? Mr. Premier, I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, as I point out to the legislature, Mr. Leddy no longer works here. When he did work here he had a personal service contract, and his experience was in the private sector for a number of years.

Having answered that, I think it would be fair, Mr. Chairman, if I just elaborated a little bit for the hon. member, because he's so concerned about it, about some of the things that this administration has done for women.

An Hon. Member: — That's not what I asked, Mr. Premier.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, I answered it. And I'm just adding to it, and I can't help it if you weren't listening, but I've answered the question with respect to Mr. Leddy. Let me just take this opportunity because you are calling women rude. You were calling women over-paid, because you don't . . .

An Hon. Member: — I haven't called women rude.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — It's in the Legislative Assembly. It's on the record.

Mr. Sveinson: — On a point of order. I would request that the premier withdraw that remark. I have not called women, as he says, rude. Check the record.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Would the member from Regina North West state his point of order.

Mr. Sveinson: — My point of order is simply this, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Premier to withdraw the statements he's made with respect to my remarks about women in general. Okay? He reflects that I'm saying women in general are rude, and I say I have not said that in the record. I wish he would study the record. He has also made other defamatory remarks that I have made in this House that I have not made. I'd say that he is very, very far from the truth with respect to my remarks, and I demand that he remove those remarks from the record.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, the member opposite obviously has not yet, has not yet learned the rules of the House. This is debate. When a member is losing in debate that's no reason for a point of order.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. It is a point of debate. It is not a point of order, and debate continues.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I just wanted to add, because the hon. member brought up the question of the salaries of women, of the attitude of women, and how women were being treated in this

administration, and I want to point out just very briefly what we've done for women in the last few months.

One, established a Women's Secretariat. A program description is attached, and I can just go through it.

Activities to date include: a program with respect to violence against women, planning with other departments, retraining and employment programs for women, examine pension and provisions for inequitable treatment of women.

Pornography: identification on problems and solutions addressed with respect to pornography and women, presented briefs with respect to it.

A women's services branch, Mr. Chairman, Department of Advanced Education and Manpower: develop educational and training programs to improve the opportunities for women.

Saskatchewan skills development program: 50 per cent of the 2,400 training seats are expected to be filled by women, often in non-traditional areas where we even pay higher. Saskatchewan Employment Development Program — 1,500 jobs for single, unemployed, social assistant recipients, the majority of which are women.

Affirmative action unit: that's the third thing — improve the representation of women in senior and middle management and in technical trade areas within the Government of Saskatchewan, and it's increased in 1982.

Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: an increase from zero to 16 per cent — that is women being employed. Saskatchewan agricultural research fund, increase from 14 per cent to 20 per cent; Sask Tel employees, increase from 8 per cent to 27 per cent; new boards and commissions — the Public Utilities Review Commission — 42 per cent female employees; Saskatchewan economic development advisory committee — 20 per cent female employees.

Social Services, number four: in addition to training programs co-sponsored by Advanced Education and Manpower; Saskatchewan Income Plan — we have assistance to seniors of which, of course, the hon. member knows 60 per cent of the women over 65 are living below the poverty line, and most of the seniors are women.

Five grants to non-governmental agencies: sexual assault centres — obviously they're addressed to women; traditional house and transition houses; Sask Housing Corporation — obviously we're dealing with single women who are seniors.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to all the questions the member asked regarding women, whether they're underpaid or overpaid or . . . (inaudible) . . . As he mentioned, or whatever, I would just like to point out the record of this administration in employment of women, and the treatment of women, and the care of women, and the affection towards women is as high as it's ever been in this province.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I compliment you, if that's actually true, Mr. Premier. I compliment you on your approach to women's issues.

But that is not what's on the record with respect to your own personal advisers. That is not on the record. On the record is that women don't have any ambition, and women's only ambition is to sit around in slippers and watch soap movies. That is on the record.

And I appreciate that if you've heard that into the record, that at least you're moving in the right direction with respect to women. And I'm not questioning that. My questions were not relating to the integrity of women on your staff. Basically they were specific to salary and qualifications.

And you can read into that whatever you wish.

I don't believe it's the Premier's role to decide whether or not my integrity relating to women, on the basis of the line of questioning that I've made, is, in fact, where it is.

And I see, Mr. Premier, you're back in the mud again, even from your chair — even from your chair. You don't have the respect of your own caucus, let alone the women of this province. And I think that if you continue to destroy, or attempt to destroy, the integrity that I have, and the respect that I have for women, you're losing, Mr. Premier. You're losing badly.

Minister of Finance was just on his feet. He suggested I was losing badly in debate. Well, on whose . . . How do you place that, Mr. Minister of Finance?

The next person I would like to . . . Is Mr. Ron Larson on your staff, and what's Mr. Ron Larson's responsibility and qualifications, sir?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Larson is currently seconded to Executive Council, working on the co-ordination of interdepartmental programs, and his experience has been in the private sector for a large number of years.

Mr. Sveinson: — He is seconded. Is Executive Council still paying his salary, sir, and what is his salary?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Larson is paid by the Public Service Commission and is not paid by Executive Council.

Mr. Sveinson: — Is Mr. Jim Martin on your staff, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I am advised that he is on the Provincial Secretary's staff.

Mr. Sveinson: — What is Mr. Michael McCafferty's responsibility on your staff, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. McCafferty spends most of his time on research with respect to policy issues, current events, and so forth.

Mr. Sveinson: — What are Mr. McCafferty's qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. McCafferty has a B.A. and 10 years experience in government service and worked for one of the people that I most admired. He worked for the late John Diefenbaker, and was thought of very highly by Mr. Diefenbaker, and respected very much his loyalty.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — I was in his office only once, but he did have a large piece of real estate here in this building that was very lavishly furnished. I don't know if that's common to all the offices of your staff. He also had a 21-inch television. I just wondered: does that real estate and the lavish furnishings Mr. McCafferty had in his office — does that go with all offices in this building?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want the hon. member to leave the impression, or the wrong impression, with respect to the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly in these buildings are open to the public, and the public goes through them all the time. Clearly, the hon. member has been here for a few months, and he knows exactly what is the case with respect to furnishings. All government employees have the same. It's nothing that is extremely elaborate. It is what's necessary to perform the functions.

You can check in any of the public offices, whether you go into the Department of Agriculture, or whether you go into the Department of Government Services. As the minister advises me, there's a formula that is used by the Public Service Commission that is in place — Supply and Services, pardon me — that is in place that dictates the kind of furniture, the kind of technical equipment, the number of telephones, the typewriters, and so forth, and that's certainly public knowledge, and I imagine the minister can elaborate on it . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Sveinson: — Is Vic Sotropa — is he on your staff?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Sotropa is manager of the visual identity unit.

Mr. Sveinson: — And prior to getting into his qualifications, could you please outline what the visual identity unit is in your Executive Council?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The visual identity unit co-ordinates the marketing designs of various kinds of logos that Crown corporations or various departments would use. And in the design of the logos, we would say maybe the wheat sheaf, or some other things, and to make sure that the Crowns and the departments are in concert and have them co-ordinated, we have a unit that works at that, and identifies it, and either stops duplication or prevents excess overlap. That position has been there for years. That kind of thing . . . I think the division may have been there for, well, let's say 10 years, maybe 20 years.

Mr. Sveinson: — How many employees would, in fact, be involved in visual identity?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Three.

Mr. Sveinson: — I see that Mr. Sotropa is earning 4,700 a month, and I assume that the other staff is probably of lesser income . . . The combined staff of the department, would it be in the area of \$100,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I didn't catch the last part of the question.

Mr. Sveinson: — I just asked if the combined staff of the visual identity department would be in excess of \$100,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes.

Mr. Sveinson: — I see in his absence, that Mr. Jack Harrington isn't on this list. Is he still in your employ?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, as everybody in the House knows, except the hon. member, I went through that and it's on the record. We've already been over it in estimates. I hope I don't have to duplicate everything that was already asked by the opposition, but yes, he still is.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Premier. I may have been out of the House for a few minutes. I'd just like you to outline the income and the qualifications and exactly what the responsibilities of Mr. Harrington would be.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, the income of the hon. member is the same as it was . . . or of the employee, is the same as it was last year and it's on the record and you have it. His experience is strictly, let's say, several decades of political experience, and he's a political adviser to me and he is worth every nickel of it.

Mr. Sveinson: — How often would you consult with Mr. Harrington?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I consult with him as often as necessary.

Mr. Sveinson: — Once a month? Twice a year? How often would you consult with Mr. Harrington?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, sometimes I'll visit with him daily. Sometimes I will visit with him on a weekly basis. Sometimes I'll visit him on a monthly basis — as often as I think is necessary, or he thinks is necessary. And that's . . . He doesn't camp outside my office, he travels throughout Saskatchewan as I do, and we talk together on the telephone or personally when we think it is important. And frankly, you know, I say in all respect, that the hon. member should have talked to him years ago and he might have received some good advice.

Mr. Sveinson: — I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Harrington and I certainly have had opportunity to talk to him over the years, and I've received a lot of good advice from him.

I think somewhat in the last year or year and a half, his responsibility, as your adviser has been somewhat downgraded although I believe his salary which is approximately \$80,850 a year has certainly been upgraded, although you're saying that he's earning this year the same as he earned last year. Is he still earning \$80,850, Mr. Premier?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, what I said earlier, and the hon. member wasn't in the House, and I hate to have to repeat it all, but he's on a personal services contract. It's the same contract that was last year. It's been made public. It's in *Public Accounts*. Last year's record is available to the hon. member, and it hasn't changed.

Mr. Sveinson: — And just for the record, on women — before we get off staff — I would like to say that the hon. Premier, on many occasions, has referred to the hon. member from Quill Lakes sister, in less than . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Certainly not.

But I just would like to say, for the record, that the accusations that you made of me today, Mr. Premier, are totally inaccurate, totally inaccurate. And I specifically asked questions about individuals on your staff, and I don't relate that to anybody else outside this House, or certainly anybody else on your staff. I just asked for qualifications and salary. And I think in doing that I didn't do . . . I absolutely didn't make any allegations about women in general.

While you drew out comparisons out of the *Globe and Mail* and reiterations of ministers who are running for the Liberal leadership nationally — I don't think that reflects on what I had to say today. But I believe that every time your government has referred to the family of the hon. member from Quill Lakes, who just happens to be in opposition, it is in certainly derogatory terms.

And I suppose the last question, the last question I would have is: Mr. Jim Petrychyn is a member of your staff, and I understand his sister is also a member of your staff. And I would just ask what Loreli Petrychyn earns, and where she works.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I can't find it, but Loreli Petrychyn is on staff as a clerk typist. Jim Petrychyn is not on staff, and just for the record let's make it very clear, he's not working for me. But let's make the record very clear. Let's make it very clear.

In *Hansard* today you will read that the hon. member said that women were overpaid and rude. Let's put it on the record. Let's put it on the record. Let's get it on the record. Let's put it on the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. The Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, let's just make it very clear, Mr. Chairman. Let's make it

very clear that on the record today . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order, order. The member from Regina North West is making too much noise so I can't hear what the answers. I would like him to be quiet in the House when the Premier's on his feet.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, let the record show that the hon. member, that the hon. member spent most of the last two hours individually attacking women in the public service in the province of Saskatchewan.

Secondly, secondly, he said, he said that women, that women . . . Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman. He can speak when he likes, Mr. Chairman, Let's go through it and make the record very clear, very clear.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The member from Regina North West continues to make loud noises while the Premier is on his feet. I would ask him, I would ask him to refrain from shouting when the Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to review the record for the public, and they can read *Hansard* for themselves. The individual member opposite . . . The individual member opposite started selectively picking on women in the public service, in Executive Council, to attack women. He said that their salaries should be reduced. He said that women were rude, and they continually . . . Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, the hon. . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order! I will warn the member from Regina North West once more, and then I will have to call in the Speaker to make a ruling. The Premier has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear . . . I want to make it very clear that you can review *Hansard*, and you can find that the hon. member said that women were overpaid. We know that he doesn't like women, but he attacks women on staff. He says that women are rude, overpaid. If they don't have a degree, then they shouldn't be anything more than a secretary, and that's on the record. And if that is a reflection of this so-called individual . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Muller: — Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the estimates from Executive Council, I repeatedly called the member for Regina North West to order. He continued to disregard my orders. Under rule 25(2), I am obliged to report this to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: — Under rule 25(2), it's a very grave issue when a member refuses to obey the Chair in the House, and I would ask the member now if he would apologize to the Assembly for his behaviour.

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, the House was so unruly, the members opposite, I could not hear the Chair when he addressed me with respect to my own activities. The opposition was carrying on . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The member is not given the opportunity to make a speech but, rather, to apologize to the House for his behaviour.

Mr. Sveinson: — I will apologize with the caveat that the rest of the House apologize.

Mr. Speaker: — The member has no opportunity for caveats. An unequivocal apology is the only thing that will be accepted under the circumstances.

Mr. Sveinson: — I would like time for consideration.

Mr. Speaker: — The member, I'm asking again, if you wish to make an unequivocal apology, that you do it to the House now, otherwise, I will move on to rule 3.

Mr. Sveinson: — Well I do it under duress, Mr. Speaker, certainly, but I do apologize unequivocally to the House, and certainly apologize to you for any inconvenience. But I do believe that there has been a misdemeanour, not only by myself, but by other members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the House accept the member's apology?

Agreed

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Mr. Speaker: — I do now leave the Chair.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I would move that the House do now recess 'till 7 p.m. with leave of the Assembly.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.

CORRIGENDUM

There was a problem with the typesetter in the Hansard numbered 61B for May 29, 1984.

The third line on page 3143 should begin thus:

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[NOTE: The online transcript for March 29, 1984 has been corrected.]