

April 24, 1985

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Swan: — It's my privilege today to introduce a group of students from division 3 in Rosetown. There are 25, approximately 25 grade 8 students. They are accompanied by Mrs. Gail Deboice, Mrs. Brenda Hamilton, and Mr. Ted Brumwell.

These students have travelled something like 200 miles to visit us today. I would like to welcome them to the Assembly and to tell you that I would be pleased to meet with you, following the question period, in the Speaker's boardroom. At that time, if you have any questions about the operations that are occurring here in the House, I'd be pleased to answer your questions.

I would ask all hon. members to welcome this group from Rosetown.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, His Excellency Paul H. Robinson, who is the Ambassador of the United States of America in Canada. And accompanying Mr. Robinson is Mrs. Lillian Mullin, Consul General of the United States in Winnipeg.

The Ambassador has been here on a couple of occasions, and he is now visiting us for two or three days, so I'll have the opportunity to meet with him. We'll be discussing several areas of interest to the United States and to Saskatchewan.

I would like to extend a very warm welcome to the ambassador and his wife, and to Mrs. Mullin, and hope they have a very enjoyable stay here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a group of 45 students visiting with us today from William Grayson School in Moose Jaw.

William Grayson School, of course, is situated in the constituency of Moose Jaw North, and a school which holds many fond memories for myself, having attended William Grayson School at one time in my education process several years ago.

The students are accompanied by two of their teachers, Steve Coffin and Pat Robb. And I understand they're on a very busy time frame this afternoon, so they're only going to be with us during question period. So, to that extent, I hope that the opposition will maybe ask a couple of new questions today so that you might find it enjoyable and interesting.

And I'd like to ask the members on both sides to join me in welcoming our young group of visitors here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pickering: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, five grade 11 students from the high school at Yellow Grass.

They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Gordon Rutton.

They will watch the proceedings of question period till 2:30, and then I will meet with them in the rotunda area for pictures and refreshments downstairs. I would like all . . . I hope they find their stay here informational and perhaps educational, and I would know they will enjoy question period as mentioned by the member from Moose Jaw North; perhaps the opposition could come up with some new questions. So I'd like all members to joining with me in wishing them a warm welcome to the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rybchuk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, three adults that are seated in the west gallery. They consist of Adolf Euken, and he is chaperoning with a couple from West Germany by the name of Mr. and Mrs. Games. I want to welcome the Games to Canada and to Saskatchewan. I want to wish them a pleasant stay in Saskatchewan, and I would like to ask them to stand so we can give them a warm welcome.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Cuts in Budget to Municipalities

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs, and concerns the fact that you have done with this budget what you did with the last budget. You have oversold it and misrepresented it. Last year it took the public several months to catch up to you.

As I said, you've done the same thing this year except that this year the public are a good deal more cynical about believing you, and catching up to you quicker. My question is based upon the fact that Herb Taylor, who is president of SUMA, is quoted in both the print and the electronic media as having said that while they had no option but to take the Minister of Finance at his word on budget night that there were no cuts for the municipalities, in fact they now find massive cuts in the area of urban transit.

My question, Mr. Minister, is: will you meet the request of SUMA and meet with them? And having met with them, will you then urge the Minister of Finance to withdraw this budget and deliver the budget which he promised on budget night.

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the member opposite . . . Let me point out to the member opposite that the new capital fund that we've introduced is 25 per cent richer than the one that they had in place, which is now in place; that we have followed SUMA's recommendations that they made to your administration and to our over the years, to try and get it with one capital fund instead of four in three different departments; that, in fact, when we went over the figures with SUMA this morning, who we met with this morning — we did not have to wait for you to ask for it. We met with SUMA this morning — that, in fact, 90 per cent of the communities now have more capital funding than they've ever had before, and that we are following the recommendations of SUMA, and we see no problem with them.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the one municipality . . . New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, one municipality after another has been groaning over the last few days and weeks with respect to the effect that your budget is having upon their capital programs. Mr. Minister, that was not what we were told on election night. My question again is: will you urge the Minister of Finance to withdraw this sorry document and delivery the budget which he promised on budget night?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, I will provide for the member opposite in a number of days, when I have the complete list, the 496 out 536 that are receiving more funding this year than last year.

Mr. Shillington: — Supplementary. Will you admit that Moose Jaw and Regina are two of the municipalities which are not, since they have both complained about the amount allotted to them under urban transit?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, of course the city of Regina has its own problems, as we know. But let me say to you, and you should know, Mr. Member, that the city of Regina claims that they are \$1.5 million short on urban assistance. If you check with the Department of Highways, they had no project signed for urban assistance and the member ought to know, having been in government for some years, that that is the way urban assistance programs work; that is, it wasn't a set amount every year. If they had a project, they would have to negotiate with the Department of Highways. Once that was signed, that money was committed. There was no money committed for this year with the city of Regina, and therefore they're not \$1.5 million out. They could have had \$10 million in the budget, but until they have commitments from the Department of Highways, there is no money committed there.

So to say that they are \$1.5 million short because that's what they'd hoped for, that is not true. Under the capital program this year, they're getting more money than they did last year.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the minister will know, the alderman and former mayor of Moose Jaw and now president of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) is quoted as saying, "We're extremely opposed to what was recommended in the budget." And then it is reported that the Moose Jaw city engineer says that there will not be room for any new capital programs if roads are maintained at last year's level. This is the city engineer at Moose Jaw — nobody with a political axe to grind. Do you agree that the grant levels contained in the budget are such that there would be no new capital program in Moose Jaw if roads are maintained at the same levels as last year?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, I'll try and clear something up for the Leader of the Opposition. When you deal with the municipal budget, the maintenance of roads is an operating budget, not a capital budget. So capital funding to Moose Jaw will have nothing with the maintenance of their streets.

Under the new program that we have introduced, there are two things eligible to Moose Jaw. There is more money in capital funds which they can spend on roads if they wish. They can spend it on parts if they wish. And that's the whole point of where we're trying to go with urban municipalities in capital financing. We want, Mr. Speaker, to provide the municipalities with one fund, as unconditional as possible, and let the urban local government make those priority decisions, not the province.

As far as the city of Moose Jaw, who appear to be using the same argument, who appear to be using the same argument that they may have lost urban assistance money, there were no projects committed to Moose Jaw. So, until they had a commitment, and if they had a commitment they will get the money from Highways this year . . .

So I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that that argument holds water.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, do you agree, after all of the talk about commitments and non-commitments, that the budget presented by the Minister of Finance provides only half as much money for urban assistance as was provided last year?

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, urban assistance, as you know, is not in my budget, but I do know this. I do know that the capital fund, which is under my jurisdiction, is 25 per cent richer than any program that your government gave the municipalities.

Letters Sent to Government Employees

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Premier, and my question is to the Premier, and it deals once again with the thousands of letters he sent last fall, at taxpayers' expense, to the government employees.

Does the Premier now have the information I asked for yesterday? That is, how many letters were sent, what was the total cost to the taxpayers, and why are Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. A question that has previously been asked ought not to be asked again. The minister took notice of the question yesterday and will bring back an answer in that form.

PCB Spill in Saskatoon

Mr. Shillington: — My question is to the Minister of the Environment, and it deals with your department's delay in publicly announcing a PCB spill in Saskatoon last week. On Monday, in your absence, the Premier told the Assembly that your department delayed in making a public announcement about the spill for 48 hours because, "they wanted to make sure they had done a good job."

Mr. Minister, given the consistent record of this government as incompetent administrators, one can understand why the Premier might have been concerned about whether or not the government would do a good job. That also suggests, Mr. Minister, that if they hadn't done a good job they never would have told the public.

My question to the minister is this: as soon as the spill occurred, why didn't your department let the people of Saskatoon know there was a problem, put up barriers around the spill area, and ask joggers and others who might regularly use that area to stay away?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I answered it yesterday. And I would reiterate today that the reason that it wasn't put out as a public news release as it was until the soil samples that had been taken and PCBs were found to be there for sure — there was no use alarming the public unnecessarily.

Secondly, the city of Saskatoon was notified, and the city crews from Saskatoon come out. So it wasn't kept a secret. The city of Saskatoon was involved as well as the Department of the Environment, as well as the power corporation. So it was public knowledge.

It was cordoned off safety until it was checked out to see what it was. It was cleaned up. And, in fact, the news media from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* were out taking pictures of it being cleaned up the day afterward, while they were still working on it. So there was not secret about it.

Mr. Shillington: — New question, Mr. Minister, you would have heard on this morning's radio an interview with a Saskatoon man whose name is Norman Clark, who jogged through the spill area last week because he had heard no warnings and saw no barriers, and now he's off to get medical treatment. That's a problem, Mr. Minister, that could have been avoided if you had warned the public of the possible dangers.

Mr. Minister, will you now admit what is obvious, and that is: there was a conflict between the government's political safety and the public's medical safety, and you chose to look after

yourself and let the public worry about themselves. And as a result, one individual, at least, has been exposed to this very toxic chemical.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, I'll answer, although I'm not too sure that it warrants an answer. First of all, just let's go back about five or six years ago. You want to talk about delays in reporting. Two years it took to report the Federal Pioneer spill which was literally thousands of gallons. So let's be fair about the situation.

Secondly, when that was reported to us at 7:30 at night — I believe that was the time — there was somebody sent out immediately. It was cordoned off, and nobody jogged through it as per se. To the best of my knowledge, nobody jogged through it.

So it was cordoned off. There was somebody there. It was cleaned up — totally cleaned up, and it's been checked and the analysis has been done. And in regards to that, all the stuff, as I said yesterday, has been taken away, has been stored safely, and has been all cleaned up, and all the material used has been stored safely. So I don't know what else a guy can say, except that it's been looked after properly.

Mr. Shillington: — Supplementary. Are you prepared to say to Norman Clark that if he suffers medical problems as a result of your failure to warn the public, that you will provide fair and just compensation to him?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know if anybody jogged through it or when they jogged through it. I can't say for sure.

I know that when it was reported, the department environment was out there, went out shortly. Department of . . . Sask Power cordoned it off. The city of Saskatoon officials were there on site to do the inspection and help do the clean-up. I know that. I don't know if they . . . and that's the best to my knowledge of what happened.

Whether somebody jogged through it before it was reported, I don't know. I can't answer that.

Mr. Shillington: — Will you admit, Mr. Minister, that if you had taken the ordinary and reasonable precaution of erecting barriers, and signs and barricades, Mr. Clark would not be put at the risk that he now is?

Hon. Mr. Hardy: — You know, Mr. Speaker, that assumption can always be taken by the opposition at any time that, if you'd done it. First of all, when it was reported — I'll reiterate — when it was reported, the necessary and right precautions were taken to safeguard the people of Saskatoon involving the city of Saskatoon as well as the Department of Environment officials, as well as Sask Power's officials. And as soon as we knew what was there for sure, a news release was put out. We have many spills on a continuous basis (said that yesterday) many, many every week. We go out and check them to be sure what's there and do the necessary things.

Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program in the North

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Speaker, on April 19 I took notice of a series of questions put forth by the member from Athabasca, and I'd be pleased now to provide those answers.

On that day the member from Athabasca indicated that six seniors under the Senior's Home Repair Program were approved in northern Saskatchewan, two in Buffalo Narrows, and he wanted to know whether that was factual. He also wanted to know whether it was a five-year program and how many seniors were eligible in northern Saskatchewan. I understand those were the key questions.

First of all, there are 392 eligible seniors in northern Saskatchewan who have their own homes

who qualify under that program. It is a five-year program. It is a program which was increased to a \$1,000 grant from the \$650 grant previously in place, Mr. Speaker.

However, the member's numbers are not correct and not factual. Since the program came in — it's been less than a year, Mr. Speaker — Saskatchewan Housing Corporation has approved 270 of the applications that were submitted to it. Mr. Speaker, this represents 68 per cent of the eligible seniors under the program in northern Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Speaker, this also is almost 100 per cent more approval than under the total five-year program under the NDP government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Speaker, referring to Buffalo Narrows, which was raised in the question by the member from Athabasca. He indicated there were two approvals. There were, in fact, 11 approvals in that community, and there were, in fact, 38 eligible in that community, Mr. Speaker. So, in point of fact, I believe that answers to the questions have been provided, unless that member has any more specifics that he'd like to have clarified.

Mr. Thompson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. You indicate that there was 270 approvals. Could you indicate how many of them had been paid out — not approvals, but had been paid out in the \$1,000 grants to the seniors?

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have it broken down as to areas. Roughly, I'd say it's 50 per cent of the loans have been, or the grants have been paid out under the program, and specifically using . . . I can see La Loche here with 18 approvals, a total of \$15,989. The amount paid out thus far has been \$10,899.02. And in Cumberland, over 100,000 was committed, and almost precisely have been paid out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thompson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister is using "approximately." I gave you 30 . . . I gave you 40 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . New question, Mr. Speaker, and by way — could I have a new question?

New questions, and by way of information to the minister, which I gave you the information, and I gave you 41 forms that were done in late March. Of them 41, there was only six that was approved. Read them, read them — there's only six that have been approved. The other 36 have not been approved, or have been approved had it not been paid out.

I ask you this question specifically: of the 41 applications that I gave you that we checked into, how many have been paid out, and how many dollars have been paid out?

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Speaker, again I would be pleased to check out the 42 that were submitted by the member from Athabasca and provide that information to the House. What I'm trying to tell the member is that his figures are completely inaccurate. When he asked the question, he indicated that six had been approved in northern Saskatchewan. Now if I even use approximations, that's a fair distance from 270, Mr. Speaker.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the people in northern Saskatchewan are getting little bit annoyed with the conduct of the member from Athabasca, because he's interfering with some of the process and progress that has been made regarding housing.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, the member asked us to ask two young ladies who were civil servants . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Thompson: — Final supplemental, Mr. Speaker. The minister has indicated that his

five-year program at \$1,000 for the five years is working well, and that the \$650 program that we had . . . And I want to tell you that our was for three years, not five years. Are you saying that the 41 applications, the 41 forms that I gave you and you have in your possession, are false, and that the information contained in them, the 41 applications, are false?

Hon. Mr. Dutchak: — Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make, for the benefit of the members and benefit of the Northerners, is that I would appreciate it if factual information was brought to the House. The member just indicates that the NDP program was a three-year program. That is also false. It's a five-year program. It was a five-year program.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to deal with these kinds of things when facts are not being brought here. So I will undertake to check the 42 applications that were submitted by the member from Athabasca, and will provide that information. However, I hope what he has stated today is a little more factual than what we are used to.

Cost of Trip to China

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the, I guess he's now termed the former minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, and it deals with his 14-day trip, I'll call it, to China last October.

In a written answer tabled in the Assembly in December, you said that six people, including yourself, travelled to China. And what I'd like to ask the minister: can the minister give us sort of a ballpark figures as to the cost of that trip? I'm talking about the travel, the hotel, the food, the entertainment, booze, and other expenses for the six people that you say travelled on the taxpayers' expenses.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to provide that kind of information in the estimates. And I'd like the question, Mr. Speaker, to come from the muck-raker from Regina Centre.

Mr. Koskie: — Obviously, again, Mr. Speaker, there's a basic cover-up for this little holiday taken by the former minister of advanced education, a holiday that he took prior to getting kicked out of advanced education, and at the taxpayers' expense. I want to ask a supplement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I'd like to read to the hon. member from *Beauchesne's*, page 132, and paragraph 359(6):

A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government. The minister to whom the question . . .

Order, order.

The minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his present Ministry and not for any decisions taken in a previous portfolio.

Mr. Koskie: — I'll address the question to the now Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Your predecessor — the one that was booted out of the office by the Premier because he couldn't handle it — took a holiday to China, with six people to China, and the taxpayers of Saskatchewan would like to know, Mr. Minister, sort of a ballpark figures for the junket to China.

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Speaker, I recognize a little, I would say, undue amount of excitement over this particular issue on both sides of the House. I'm completely partial, impartial — one of them anyhow.

I would be very pleased to answer this particular question when my estimates come up. I think from the briefing that I've been given, I do remember that those figures are there, and I'd be pleased to present them at the time of the estimates.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to ask a further question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. I wonder whether he can explain to the people of Saskatchewan how it was possible for a back-bencher who is not even a legislative secretary to accompany the former minister of advanced education all the way to China at the taxpayers' expense.

I want to ask you: in what capacity? And is it your understanding, Mr. Minister, that the policy as set down by the Premier is that any MLA back-bencher can travel throughout the world accompanying their ministers, or any other ministers?

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I have an accurate reply for the hon. member from Quill Lakes. It would seem to me that perhaps the appropriate time to have asked that question would have been last fall, of the minister involved.

However, having said that, from what I recall (and this is strictly from the top of my head), it seems to me that the reasons that were given for the member from Redberry accompanying the minister to China were twofold — one, because of some association, affiliation in agriculture; the other was in regard to Crown corporations, two of these reasons that the Chinese were very interested in receiving information from, and he was able to represent that to the Chinese people.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would like you to look at the record of a question asked by the member from Athabasca yesterday. The member asked the Premier about certain letters that were sent out to employees of the government, and in part he asked:

On December 10 you agreed to tell this Assembly and the Saskatchewan taxpayers how many letters were sent, the cost of these letters, and why the Progressive Conservative party of Saskatchewan shouldn't be paying for these political letters. Since he has had many weeks to prepare that information, can the Premier now give the information to the Assembly today?

That is in reference to a question that was taken notice of by the Premier last fall.

Today in your ruling, when the member rose in his place, he didn't repeat the question — and I would remind you, didn't repeat the question, but asked the Premier whether he had the information today — whether or not that question is in order. Because it was a new and different question, and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you whether your ruling, to recheck it, because I believe, and our members of our caucus believe, that the question put by the member from Athabasca was perfectly in order and should have been accepted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the ruling. The long-standing tradition in the House is, yes, when a question is taken notice of, that that question is then answered either by sending the information across the floor, or by being recognized in question period at the earliest opportunity ... (inaudible interjection) ... at the earliest opportunity answering verbally in question period, and that's been a long-standing tradition in this House.

And, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite are really interested in getting this information, which is prepared — as I see it on the desk here every day when the Premier comes into question period.

If they would simply, Mr. Speaker, sit quiet and allow the Premier to be recognized to delivery the answer in question period . . . That hasn't been the case to date. I'm sure that the Premier, at first opportunity, would love to be recognized in question period and provide that information.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The rule book states, in paragraph 359(8):

A question that has previously been answered ought not to be asked again.

And it also says that a question that has been asked should not be asked again.

Now the member was dealing with exactly the same subject today that he dealt with yesterday, and for that reason I ruled his question out of order.

What is the member on his feet?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I will challenge your ruling and ask you to relook at the situation because I simply will not accept the fact it's a similar question.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. I have given my ruling.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, we challenge your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — That's fine.

There's no process to challenge the Speaker's order in the manner that you are doing it. The only way is by notice of motion, and putting the motion on the order paper.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 44 — An Act to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act

Hon. Mr. Klein: — I rise today to move second reading on An Act to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act. Mr. Speaker, one year ago new initiative to stimulate the provincial economy was the venture capital program. This program was designed to develop a supply of investment capital for equity investments in small business in this province, requiring capital for growth and expansion. Introduction of this program became an important milestone in the economic development of our province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for we knew that Saskatchewan residents had a high level of savings. We knew there were abundant investment opportunities in our expanding economy. We also knew there was an insufficient supply of formal investment money in the province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we did is bring all these factors together, with the overall intention of expanding business and industrial growth in order to increase job opportunities for our citizens. Although this concept had been attempted in other provinces, we were the first to utilize a tax credit as an incentive to encourage investment. This innovation has recently been copied by the Government of British Columbia, who has introduced a similar Act after their staff spent considerable time in our province.

It was a brand-new program for our province, and it took time to develop, but it's now starting to gain momentum and is providing a real shot in the arm for our economy. Mr. Deputy Speaker, activity in the venture capital field is really picking up. My department is receiving calls from all

parts of the province from groups wishing to form Venture Capital Corporations. To date six VCCs have registered, and eight more have been incorporated, but they are not yet registered. Eleven others are in various stages of development. In the next couple of months we can look for the setting up of some large corporations. They will be making significant investments in many companies to help them grow, to help them expand. I know that the public generally will soon recognize that the introduction of the venture capital program was a major step in the economic development of our province.

The venture capital program has two thrusts: firstly, in the rural areas, and secondly, in the urban areas. In the rural community three Venture Capital Corporations have been registered and six more are incorporated but not yet registered. The venture capital program can be a definite boon to the rural communities of our province. In the urban areas, the venture capital program is opening up new methods of providing investment capital for growth and expansion of business and industry, and to create even more jobs for our citizens.

We have, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a result of working with this Act and with working with the various interest groups involved, discovered four areas which we must address. First, in section 3, debt obligations as it's presently written, "of any small business that is an eligible investment." We propose to change the word to "eligible business," and we propose to add "at the time that the investment is made."

Firstly, the reference should have been, "an eligible small business." That was purely an error rather than an "eligible investment." This is in keeping with the spirit of the Act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in that it adds stability to the small business involved should it ever grow out of its eligibility.

The second change in the Bill, section 4, the existing provision refers to, "widely held venture capital corporation." That must be properly clarified. This is a highly technical section. The present clause does not do what it was intended to do. The intention of the clause was to prevent any shareholder controlling, through associates or affiliates or personally, a block of more than 10 per cent of the shares of a VCC. This amendment brings the clause into step with paragraph 11(2)(b) of the Act.

The third change, Mr. Deputy Speaker, refers to section 5, dealing with the unused portion of the tax credit. This item will be rewritten. The section will be repealed, but appears restated in the new section 19(1). The new section defines the party entitled to carry forward the tax credit in terms consistent with the rest of the Act.

Clause 19(2) is new. Under the Act as it stands, no provision is made for the event of an investor dying or seven years expiring before a tax credit is used up. In such an event, the unusable balance should be convertible to a grant.

(14:45)

And finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are adding section 6 as a new section.

The amendment in two subsections provides for the forgiveness of the recapture of the tax credit after five years. The amendment also addresses the perception by many members of the public that the incentive is not an incentive if it must be repaid at some point.

These amendments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should provide this Act with the clarity that we originally intended, and I trust that it should not raise any concerns with any member of this Assembly. And I now move second reading of An Act to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I'll just take a moment to comment on this. We will be

supporting the Bill. The first couple of amendments are to remedy what were drafting imperfections, perhaps is the way to phrase it. The third portion, third point in the Bill, providing for a grant of unused portions of tax credits, I think can best be discussed in committee. The fourth point is the one which I would like to raise, not in detail, since we will do that in committee, but with respect to the manner in which it is dealt with in the legislation.

And we have here a Bill which says that when the minister is satisfied that someone acted within the spirit of something, then there will in effect be a tax concessions.

That strikes me as legislation which would be better drafter otherwise. I doubt whether taxes should apply, or not apply, depending upon whether a minister feels that someone has acted in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Act. I think tax legislation should be a little tighter than that, and taxes, by and large, shouldn't be up to the discretion of the minister.

I think we can pursue some of these points in committee. I do raise that point of principle with respect to whether or not citizens should have their financial interests depend upon whether a minister feels that they're acting within the spirit or intent.

Nothing wrong with saying what they act in accordance with, because then the lawyers can tell you when you're acting in accordance with an Act. But the spirit or intent is clearly a highly subjective judgement. It's left with the minister. I query whether that's good legislation in form. I have no particular objection to what is sought to be achieved, and I will raise further points in committee. And accordingly, I will be supporting the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to explain in detail to the members opposite during committee, slowly and clearly, so that they can fully understand the meaning of these VCCs, and I'll look forward to that.

So in closing debate, Mr. Speaker, I urge . . . And I'm happy to hear that all members will in fact support this important amendment, so that we can get on with the task of providing another all-important tool to the private sector, so that they can get on with the task of what they can do best, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is, that of creating jobs for the people of our province.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Hepworth that Bill No. 51 — **An Act to amend The Farmers' Counselling and Assistance Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Yesterday when we dealt with second reading, and I asked for some time to consider the minister's remarks on looking at the cosmetics and looking at this Bill, I felt that we might as well proceed ahead with it today, because the minister indicated there's some urgency to get these changes made to get some money in the hands of the farmers. I hope it works.

The Bill didn't work last year. I consider a Bill that only helped 100 farmers a total failure. When this Bill was heralded as a piece of legislation last year that would be the umbrella and the safety net and all these words that the Minister of Agriculture used, to keep farmers in business, I think helping 100 farmers is an indication that this Bill didn't work. The many, many auction sale notice that are up this spring, and the many auction sales that are going to be held throughout the summer, are indications that this Bill didn't work. This Bill didn't do the job that it was

intended to do.

There are reasons why this Bill didn't work. If you want to know all those reasons all you have to do is look up the second readings speech that I made when the Bill was originally introduced last year. I hate to brag about being a prophet, but I was able to tell you last year and to say in this House that this Bill wasn't going to work.

It wasn't a good loan guarantee. When you make a blanket guarantee and say to the credit unions of Saskatchewan, we will guarantee such a percentage of your loans, it's not going to work, because which credit union is going to get the guarantee? I predict that with the cosmetic changes, this Bill still won't work.

Henry Ford should have taught you fellows a lesson. The Deputy Premier will remember this. When Henry Ford designed an Edsel, they made some cosmetic changes the first year, and then the second year on the chrome. The Edsel still didn't sell — until he'd made a completely new vehicle and gave it a different name was he able to sell it.

This is the same case with this Bill, where you have a loan guarantee program that you call a guarantee. You've got to get your head out of our of sand, Mr. Minister of Finance. I see the agriculture minister isn't in today. You have to get your heads out of the sand and come up with a program that's going to help farmers.

When the Minister of Finance dips into the pocket of every farmer in Saskatchewan for \$1,000 and comes up with a piece of legislation like this, the very farmers you're trying to help — the very farmers you're trying to make a loan guarantee for and say, look we're going to help you survive — you're still taking \$1,000 worth of cash away from them.

Do you call this a government with compassion? Do you have any concern for people that are in trouble? I think it's a disgrace that we're dealing with a piece of legislation like this and let 50,000 farmers in Saskatchewan suffer and continue to suffer. Fifteen thousand farmers think it's okay. They don't need a loan guarantee. They don't even care if they don't get their home improvement grant. They don't even care if they can't get the home quarter school tax because it isn't even 1 per cent of the taxes they pay. But what about the average farmer? What about the guy that \$1,000 means a lot of money? I calculated what \$1,000 a farmer is going to mean to the town of Gravelbourg, Mr. Minister, and do you know how much money the people of Gravelbourg are not going to have to spend this fall because of your \$1,000 that you're taking from every farmers in my community? It's serious — a half a million, \$500,000 is leaving main street of Saskatchewan and going into your treasury so you can give oil companies \$1.2 billion more than they got under out administration.

I think this is ridiculous, dealing with this kind of cosmetics when you have this kind of legislation. It maybe will be an improvement. Maybe you'll help another 100 farmers. Maybe you will. I hope you will. That's all you helped last time. That's all I have to say on this PC bill. Thank you.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 48

Birkbeck
Andrew
Berntson
Lane
Duncan
Hardy
McLaren

Maxwell
Young
Domotor
Folk
Muirhead
Petersen
Bacon

Tusa
Meagher
Glauser
Saunder
Zazelenchuk
Johnson
Weiman

Smith (Swift Current)	Parker	Swenson
Baker	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Morin
Hepworth	Hopfner	Blakeney
Currie	Myers	Thompson
Sandberg	Rybchuk	Engel
Klein	Caswell	Lingenfelter
Dutchak	Hampton	Koskie
Embury	Gerich	Lusney
Martens	Boutin	Shillington

NAYS — 0

Bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 8

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask a question of the minister, and if she finds it in order, I'd like her to indicate whether it's a proper question. Because she has taken the attitude that we have to clear our questions first with the minister, before they will be answered.

And in respect to the Executive Administration, Madam Minister, I note that there is an increase of from right to 10 in the Executive Administration subvote. And I think you indicated that you are bringing in two additional people, one a secretary, and an associate deputy minister, if I'm not mistaken, from the past, what you had said.

And I'm wondering, Madam Minister, in respect to this subvote, could you provide me with a list of all the persons that are employed under personal service, item 1 — a list of those persons employed, their positions, and their salaries.

Now I wonder if you're able to provide that at this time, or whether we should wait for that to some other future date. We want to get this clear with you, because obviously you have your own position.

So I was wondering. In the past we have been able to get individual ministers to send over a list of all the personnel under the Executive Administration, and I'd like you to indicate the ones that are being added under the subvote.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, yes to the first part of his question, which was an associate deputy's position and a secretarial position, that made that up. I have the names of the people in that office. I can give him the names, but it does not contain the salaries. The other day he had asked for the salaries of my office staff, and I would be pleased to send that over to him.

Just along with that, Mr. Chairman, I believe the member from Athabasca had asked about the La Loche capital project and the pupil-teacher ratios, which I had taken notice of in order to get him

the specific information. And I will include that along with my office staff.

Just before leaving the issue of my office staff, I believe the member from Quill Lakes had made reference to very high-paid ministerial staff or personal staff, and he had done it so in relationship to what teachers get paid. I have a teacher on staff, Mr. Dave Spencer, who has a year's leave of absence from his school division, and he is presently making \$38,150 in my office. And I would like the member from Quill Lakes to know that he took a substantial reduction from 41,000 and a few odd dollars down to 38,000 in order to work in the office.

Mr. Koskie: — I appreciate the minister's supplying this information. I would have thought, you know, there would be no problem in respect to that because that's a normal question, and I thank her for providing it.

Madam Minister, I wonder in what way do you justify a very, very substantial increase in the Executive Administration, and a considerable decrease if you look through other subvotes. And do you think you're justified in bringing more of the budget into your office and at the expense . . . And we'll be dealing with the other subvotes, but I look at the School for the Deaf, for instance. There's a cut in the personnel. I look at the amount of money that is being spent, and it's cut.

I can look at all the other subvotes and I think there are . . . in fact, I can . . . There are 20 of them. And there are about 14 of them, if I'm not mistaken, that are down. And at the same time, there's something like a 21 per cent increase in the Executive Administration.

And I wonder if the minister would give her views as to the justification of that, when at the same time, if we look at some of the programming — and I just use the School for the Deaf where there's both a cut in staff and a cut in funding.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, this is the second time we've dealt with this particular subvote and issue. As I had explained the other night, we are basically dealing with two additions to this area. One is an associate deputy minister and the other one is a secretarial position.

The reason for the addition of an associate deputy minister was when we took a good look at the department, and some of the initiatives, and some of the functions of that Department of Education has a mandate for that it has perhaps not attended enough interest to in past years. It was the whole area of curriculum and materials in order to get out to the schools. As the member well knows, we also have given a commitment for some changes within the school system to do with directions. The major component of that, as it affects the Department of Education, is core curriculum.

So we looked at the structure, the admin structure, the kind of expertise that we would need. And we elected to go for an associate deputy who had experience directly from the field in education — a teacher, principal, a director of education — and who knew a great deal about curriculum and core curriculum.

There is really no other explanation other than that. We think it's going to serve the department well. We think it's going to serve school boards well. The move has been met with agreement from the teachers' organizations and teachers who have had anything to do with the department in its development of core curriculum.

Mr. Koskie: — I take it that the minister has chosen — and I guess I'm asking whether she has in place already — the associate deputy minister. And if she has, I would like to know the name of that person, the qualifications, and the salary that you intend to pay in respect to that position.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, the associate deputy's position that is in question has

been filled by Mr. Brian Ward. His educational background is attendance at the Moose Jaw teachers college in 1948. He received a Bachelor of Education degree from the University of Saskatchewan in 1952. He obtained his Masters of Education from the same university in 1960. His work experience has been one of a teacher in rural and small-town schools before entering university. He has been a teacher in a collegiate institute, a vice-principal. He was the academic director of a comprehensive high school. He was the principal of that high school, and he was the director of education for approximately eight years, not only of one public school board, but also a comprehensive board and the Roman Catholic board in that particular division.

His skills as a educator and his contributions to education in this province have been recognized by many organizations over the past. The most recent one, and perhaps one that says it all, was the award that was bestowed upon by his colleagues, and that was one of administrator of the year two years ago. That, by the way, came from the educational administrators of Saskatchewan.

His salary is at approximately \$62,000.

Mr. Koskie: — Madam Minister, I want to ask you, as you go through the total number of displacement of personnel in the department under your budget, I believe there is a loss of 13 positions, if I'm not mistaken, in total. And what I would like to ask you: can you elucidate in respect to what positions? I can deal with those in individual subvotes, but I want, in a general way, whether these positions lost, or were they vacancies not filled. I guess that's really what I'm asking right at this time.

(15:15)

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, these are vacancies that we are dealing with. Nobody lost a job out of the Department of Education.

Mr. Koskie: — It keeps changing from time to time, and I perhaps should be up on this, but does the minister have a Legislative Secretary at the present time, and have you had any during the course of the year?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a Legislative Secretary, have had for some time. I have one, and it's the hon. member from Last Mountain-Touchwood. Thank you.

Mr. Koskie: — I wonder whether the minister could give us any expenses or expenditures by the Legislative Secretary in carrying out any of his duties as assigned by the minister.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the expenses of the Legislative Secretary, or the allocation of them, would depend specifically on the duties. For instance, if I have asked him to attend, to stand in for me at a specific function, or I cannot attend a speaking engagement because I am committed to another one, I will often ask the Legislative Secretary to take it. Then those expenses become mine or the department's. He is simply acting on my behalf.

For instance, he has some expenses in the budget to do with the Tusa report that was done on native education. Any of the other expenses that he would have in terms of his MLA are covered through his own expenses or through Executive Council.

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to the so-called Tusa report, can you give us the amount of expenses incurred in respect to that?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I have the total number and I would like it noted that it is expenses for approximately three people — Mr. Tusa and Melona Palmer, who was a SUNTEP grad that was hired to work on the report, and one other. The total comes to \$37,844 — 22,000 of that was on salary and travel for Ms. Palmer, and 11,000 were the travel expenses. And we had

an estimated of 4,700 for the printing of the report.

Mr. Koskie: — \$37,848. In respect to your Legislative Secretary, can you indicate the length of time that that study was undertaken, and what it entailed in the ways of travel and so on?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, it was in November of 1983, Mr. Chairman, that I had first requested that the Legislative Secretary undertake a province-wide consultation on the Indian and Metis education. The gentleman conducted approximately 140 meetings with parents, students, trustees, the directors of education, and various interested groups and professionals.

Besides those, he also had discussions with some people outside of the province — by letter, by telephone, that type of thing. His final report, entitled *Reaching Out*, was given to me in February of this year.

Mr. Koskie: — And in respect to the report which was given to you in February, have you acted on that report? Is there any other further follow-up in respect to the report? What was the general . . . Well, I'll ask you that what I've asked you.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, the report, entitled *Reaching Out*, will be released within two weeks, and along with that will be a preliminary response, my response to the report.

Mr. Koskie: — As the minister said, she has had it since February. And you're indicating that the report will be released within two weeks. I take it that's a firm date, or will it be subject to when the House adjourns?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — No, Mr. Chairman.

Item 1 agreed to.

Item 1

Mr. Koskie: — In respect to item 2, Madam Minister, in General Administration there is a loss of one position there. Could you indicate what position is lost from 9.1 to 8.1?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. We had a personnel officer transferred to the Department of Advanced Education.

Mr. Koskie: — Will that position not be filled in the Department of Education, the personnel office? What are you doing . . . Having transferred the personnel officer from General Administration to Advanced Education, what provision have you within your department, or do you not have a personnel officer?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I will no longer have that position within my department. It is simply part of the government's efforts to look at groupings and efficiencies and effectiveness, and this is part of the personnel grouping exercise that we have gone through.

Mr. Koskie: — And who will then, under the grouping efficiency — quote — who will be doing the work that was previously being done by the personnel officer that was transferred over to Advanced Education?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the work for my department, when it comes to the personnel duties, will be done by the personnel officer that will be located in the Department of Advanced Education.

Item 2 agreed to.

Item 3

Mr. Koskie: — Madam Minister, in respect to item 3 of Financial Management and Support Services, you'll note that their same number of personnel, 10.4 person-years, that the other expenses have taken a substantial nosedive, from 258,790 to 122,560. Can the minister indicate what items were cut to reduce the amount of the other expenses in that subvote?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, let's make it clear that simply because the figure shows a reduction, you're not necessarily talking cut. At one time the department had its telephone charges . . . At one point, the Department of Education had its telephone charges consolidated into one area. Each branch is now accountable for its telephone charges, and that's the main reduction that he sees here.

Mr. Koskie: — Are there any other reductions, and can you give me the figures for the basic reductions?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, the approximately dollar figures, those telephone charges were 113,000, and the remainder would be miscellaneous for such things as contractual arrangements, that type of thing.

Item 3 agreed to.

Items 4 and 5 agreed to.

Item 6

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the minister, on the Official Minority Language Office, if she can explain to me the increase in the other expenses. I don't know what that would be, but if you could give me a breakdown on why there's almost 100 per cent increase in the other expenses, I would appreciate it.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the 46 per cent increase is made up on basically three components; the transfer of \$80,000 for professional development from Advanced Education and Manpower services; the conversion of \$100,000 1984-85 budget allocation to an A budget base; and adding \$100,000 of fully reimbursable federal funds for instructional resource development for French materials.

(15:30)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The federal program that you are talking about: can you just give me a little explanation about what you are referring to? Are you talking about federal money that's given to your department and then is allocated in this subvote? Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Yes, we're basically taking federal money. We spend it, and then we are fully reimbursed by the Secretary of State at the federal government.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — If I understand this program, that's on a per student basis in a designated school, or is this . . . What would this program entail?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — This has nothing to do with the number of students. It's not per student. It is simply moneys for the development of instructional material in the French language.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Madam Minister, I wonder: is that development done within the department, or is this money that is given out to the school division? I think that it's done with in the department, but I would like you to clarify that for me.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well there's a little bit of both in it because we do contract out to some school divisions to do some.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I have a couple of further questions on the Official Minority Language Office. I wonder about the office in Gravelbourg. Can you tell me how much the individual who works in that office, Mr. Rene Archambault, the brother-in-law of the Premier, gets in salary? And I would just like you to tell me what the salary was last year, if you could — a monthly salary.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman we are dealing with a gentleman who has had a great deal of teaching experience, and also has the benefit of coming from the francophone community in dealing with this.

At College Mathieu, Mr. Archambault was paid a monthly salary of 4,200, for a total of \$42,000 for the year 1983-84. There was also a travelling allowance against the actual cost, to a maximum of \$500 per month. Now effective on July 1, 1984, as a permanent government employee, his salary is \$3,964 per month.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Within that office and his job description, does he also have an automobile and an expense allowance, credit cards, and that sort of thing that would go with it, or not?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — There is not credit cards involved and no expense allowance. He would have access, however, to a CVA vehicle for governmental or departmental purposes.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Madam Minister, when individuals from various departments are allocated or can use a department car . . . For example, what are you saying: that this is one of the instances where that individual puts his own gas in? That seems like an unusual arrangement. My understanding is that he uses an automobile out of the CVA fleet and the fuel is paid for, and there's credit cards with the vehicle. And I would like you to clarify that.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, he simply gets reimbursed for the actual cost the same way that other government employees do in those positions.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, I understand that. But there are either credit cards or a book in the car that the government pays for the fuel in the automobile that he would use. And when I asked the question originally you said, no, he has no access to credit cards, and made it sound like he didn't have that kind of an advantage.

So, Madam Minister, I would like to ask you if I have it clear that this individual makes about \$48,000 a year; he has an automobile, or access to an automobile with gas and tires and everything paid for. And this is the brother-in-law of the Premier, who got the job with no competition. There was no competition held for this job.

And I guess what bothers me a little bit is the fact that while in opposition, either in Ottawa or in Regina, you people are so critical of this kind of thing occurring. I well remember poor old Gillespie in Ottawa when he got some sort of a contract after he was a member.

Here we have the brother-in-law of the Premier getting a job for close to \$50,000 a year with no competition — just given to him. And he has an automobile. And he has a credit card, or whatever means he has of filling the car with gas whenever he wants. And I say that's unfair; that a competition should have been held. And I would like you to tell me why there wasn't, why it wasn't open to the public, and why others weren't eligible to get this \$50,000 a year job when the unemployment rate is around 9 per cent in the province. Why does the brother-in-law of the Premier have that kind of an advantage?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify what the member from Shaunavon has to say about this particular position. When you were first dealing with credit cards, you made reference to entertainment. He does not have an entertainment allowance expense nor a credit card attached to that. He has access to a government vehicle, only for department business, like several other government employees. There is nothing different about this man simply because he's the brother-in-law of the Premier.

The member from Shaunavon is totally wrong when he says there was absolutely no competition for this job. That is totally wrong. He successfully competed for the position through the competition conducted by the Public Services Commission for the director of the French minority education, and he assumed those responsibilities effective July 1, 1984. It was a competition, legitimate. He was not simply given the job without a competition through the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Madam Minister, I would very much like to see the other people who competed for the job and have their qualifications, and on what basis the hiring was done. Do you think you could provide that for me?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I'm at liberty to provide that, but I will check with the Public Service Commission to see if it's possible.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Madam Minister, I know that your word, you always keep it. I don't know when I might get that report, but I imagine it would be well after the next election. But I would say, in closing, that it seems unusual — it seems very unusual — that the brother-in law of the Premier, the candidate in the last election for the Progressive Conservative party, would get a job in his home town for \$50,000 a year, probably the highest paid person in the town of Gravelbourg — the highest paid job.

And I say to you, Madam Minister, that it's just a little unusual, and there's too many coincidences in this case, that the Premier's brother-in-law, who ran unsuccessfully in Gravelbourg, would get the highest paid job when there's many people unemployed in the province.

Now you may say it's all a coincidence. And you may say that Michael Wilson's relatives getting contract for the federal government — that's all a coincidence; or Dalton Camp, who is today on the front page of the *Star-Phoenix*, is getting a contract.

The people of this province are getting a little sick of paying for Tory hacks and flacks . . . are getting money out of the coffers. And I say to you, Madam Minister, that it's an unfortunate position for your and your government to be in. And I don't blame you personally. I don't blame you for hiring the individual. You're a cabinet minister. And I would imagine that when the brother-in-law — the Premier's brother-in-law who ran unsuccessfully — wants a job, that you don't have a lot to say about it.

But I would say to you, when you have the individual who came in the very lowest of any Tory candidate in the last election . . . doesn't deserve to get a job over other people in this province at the rate of \$50,000 out of the taxpayers' pocket. Because I don't think the people of this province want to pay increased taxes for that kind of an operation.

And I'm not going to spend a long time haranguing you over why the Premier's brother-in-law is working for you. But I say that that's \$50,000 that should have been allowed to go to another family because I don't think that running for the Conservative party or being a brother-in-law to the Premier is a good enough reason.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that we do an injustice to the gentleman that holds this position based on his qualifications and his experience. And perhaps the member from

Shaunavon needs to refresh his memory. Mr. Archambault had both teaching and administrative experience. He taught . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the member would be quiet for a while, we could finish, and perhaps that will satisfy some of his curiosity.

He has taught at the elementary and secondary levels. He has taught the core and French-designated programs. He has been principal of the Gravelbourg High School and director-general of Collège Mathieu. He also. Mr. Chairman, co-ordinated the summer French immersion program in 1969 and 1979 for the University of Regina, and he has been involved to a great extent in cultural activities in the francophone community.

Now I hope that the member of Shaunavon isn't going to say thousands of others in this province have the same qualifications. That simply isn't true when it comes to the teaching of the French language and knowing the francophone culture in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Madam Minister, I can't resist making a comment about the French language school, and the ACFC (Association Culturelle French-Canadienne), and their pleasure with dealing with you as a minister. You may say you're doing a great job, but there are many people in that association who would disagree with you. And there are those who also say that they are concerned about your hiring practices, and they would not agree with you when you say you are going a great job in dealing with some of the cultural issues I this province.

And the issue is that people who are involved in the PC party — whether it's the brother-in-law or the sister-in-law of the Premier — should not have decided advantages, I believe, either in getting jobs through the government or, I say, using them as a stepping stone to get nominations. And I think it's unfortunate that you guy and you women over there take that position.

And I don't expect you to ask your officials to defend this because I don't believe that they're involved, either. I think the directions came from the Premier's office. And I don't expect them to try to defend this position because I don't think they want to.

And so, Madam Minister, I think it's unfortunate that the taxpayers have to pay increased taxes to keep families of the Premier in a job. I just say it's unfortunate.

Item 6 agreed to.

(15:45)

Item 7

Mr. Koskie: — I just would like to ask the minister, in view, of her long dissertation that she give us here in the opening of the estimates — a long harangue, I guess, is a better description of it. When we come to program development, we find a very, very small increase in the total expenditures. I note that the minister has had no problem in increasing her executive administration by well over . . . well, it's close to \$77,000. And, when it comes to program development, there's less than \$50,000. And, certainly, if you look at the minister's office, in respect to ministerial assistants, there are three of them. It comes to \$95,000. And there's no end of spending the money available when it comes to your individual needs. We went through the expenditures in travel, and you that that was great. You thought that \$95,000 for ministerial assistants is okay. You think it's all right to have a Legislative Secretary, and an expenditure of \$37,000.

It comes to program development — and I thought that you were going to be putting forward a thrust — here we find only \$50,000. I'm rather disappointed that, while you are singing one song, you seem to be out of tune with the evidence . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. So I'd like if the minister would justify the very small increase in respect to program development.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member from Quill Lakes may not know, but I'm sure the member from Regina Centre well remembers that often priorities within the program area shift from year to year. It depends on the subject matters that are in questions, which needs the most work on, and the update on.

As I had indicated in my opening remarks, plus I believe I indicated yesterday and the evening before, that there was approximately \$800,000 within the Educational Development Fund that would be used for directions, most of that going towards program development. So while you see a very small increase in this particular subvote, there is money in the Educational Development Fund, approximately \$800,000.

Item 7 agreed to.

Items 8 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Item 12

Mr. Koskie: — There is a decrease in respect to personal services, as well, in this subvote. I would ask the minister to explain.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I'm informed, Mr. Chairman, that those are simply two vacant positions, and they were clerical.

Mr. Koskie: — Go ahead, next item. I just have a question of item 12 if I could. Just in respect to correspondence school vote, other expenses are down almost \$100,000. I'd like to ask the minister whether she could indicate why there is a substantial cut in respect to other expenses under correspondence school.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The correspondence school is similar to program development and often seconds teachers, and this is due to three teachers that had been seconded, basically for program development or course development within the correspondence school itself.

Mr. Koskie: — Well there's \$100,000 in respect to it and I'd like, if you would, to provide a complete breakdown of a decrease of nearly \$100,000.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The secondment of three teachers comes to \$66,000, the software development for computer management instruction was \$16,000, and the preparation courses by contract writers was 12,260.

Mr. Chairman: — It's very difficult to hear, and I imagine the member from Quill Lakes, when he asks a question, would like to hear the answer, especially when he's writing down the figures, and I would ask the members of the House to keep a little decorum in here so we could hear what's going on.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, in respect to correspondent courses, can you indicate whether there has been an increase or a decline in respect to enrolment in the correspondence courses?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — There has been an enrolment increase in the last year of 22 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — Pardon?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — An enrolment increase over the last year of 22 per cent.

Mr. Koskie: — And can the minister indicate whether there was any increases to the

correspondence students for enrolment fees, for courses, (any increase), and itemize the areas where there were; if indeed there were any increases?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — There are no increases, Mr. Chairman.

Item 12 agreed to.

Item 13

Mr. Koskie: — Madam Minister, I would like an explanation first in respect to the School for the Deaf. First, there is a decrease in the total expenditure. There is a decrease in person-years, from 84.7 down to 80.2.

Can the Minister, first of all, indicate how it was possible to decrease so substantially the staff in respect to the School for the Deaf, and why a slash in the funding?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly, in dealing with the enrolment factor on the School for the Deaf, it's rather interesting to look at some of the research that's been done on schools for the deaf right across Canada and, in fact, in North America. We have had a decrease in the enrolment in the School for the Deaf. We've also done some projections, up until the year '89-90, and there, foreseeably, the enrolment will continue to go down.

I would suggest to the member from Quill Lakes that you will probably also see more school divisions. And, particularly, the Saskatoon Board of Education is getting into a total communications program that could conceivably meet the needs of some students that normally would have gone into the School for the Deaf.

The enrolment factors, in going down, it would appear that it's . . . some of it's natural movement through the system. And, of course, most everybody here is well aware these students have been affected by rubella in the 1960s and '70s. I would guess that you won't see too much more of that in the future.

It is also anticipated that more students from rural areas, as well as more multi-handicapped deaf, and deaf-blind students, will require the services of the School for the Deaf.

For the benefit of the member from Quill Lakes, a committee has been formed to study the future role of the school throughout the province and deal with the provision of comprehensive educational services to hearing-impaired children. And the director of special education in our department has presently been granted some time to study this issue and work closely with the appropriate officials, including the School for the Deaf itself.

So while the enrolment is down, we have had some vacancies within there, plus some other efficiencies, such as the closing on weekends. Along with that, freed up some positions such as parental care, and which will basically . . . nobody lost their job. They were vacant positions at the time that we removed them.

Mr. Koskie: — Can the minister be more specific in speaking of the . . . indicating that the enrolment is down? Can she clarify the degree and the extent of the decrease in the enrolment?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The actual enrolment in 1984-85 was 105, 91 of those being deaf students, and 14 of the 105 were deaf-blind students. For '85-86, this enrolment year, the estimated figure is 96. And just to give an indication of what I referred to earlier, the year after the estimated figure will be 86 students so as you can see, the enrolment factor is something to keep your eye on.

Item 13 agreed to.

Items 14 and 15 agreed to.

(16:00)

Item 16

Mr. Koskie: — Item 16, Madam Minister, Educational Media Services. And in talking to teachers, they are very appreciative of the services, the media services that are provided, and certainly with Saskmedia they appreciated what was being provided. And my concern here is that again you have personal services from 29 down to 27, and you have also a decrease in the budget from 1.075 million to 951,680. And I'd like to ask the minister whether in view of what you're indicating in respect to the report on directions and developing resources centres under the development fund and so on, whether you feel it's consistent that when we come to Educational Media Services — which I think undoubtedly is a part of the resources of the schools — why you would be, in fact, decreasing the budget and cutting the number of person-years.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had a couple of early retirements and the position deletions are two clerk positions done through early retirement. I would also like to state that the types of services that the teachers make the most use of are not being reduced, those services being basically two major ones and plus the third one where we have seen some changes.

The 16 millimetre film lending library contains approximately 3,000 titles and over 13,000 prints for use by schools and all Saskatchewan residents, and that is intact.

The audio and video tape duplication is another area where teachers made use of. The rental of the technical facilities for audio and video production, we have, where we can, moved this to private sector producers, and as a consequence you see some efficiencies gained in that particular area.

Item 16 agreed to.

Item 17 agreed to.

Item 18

Mr. Koskie: — I'm wondering, in respect to the Grants to Schools — Operating, whether the minister has had sufficient time to be able to provide us with the preliminary print-out, or the print-out which is as current as possible. I wonder if she's prepared at this time to give the opposition that information, as she has sent out to the boards, and as she indicated there are changes from time to time and it's an ongoing process, if she is to believe then . . . What we would appreciate then, if you would be able to provide us today, now that you have had a couple of days to sort it out and find your file. So I'm asking the minister, then, will you at this time then provide us with the breakdown of the \$317 million, and which has been indicated previously, Madam Minister, a very substantial portion of the entire total expenditures in the department?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, as I had indicated previously, when the information is as finalized as it can be, which will probably include the mill rate factor, I will ensure that the opposition has that information.

For the member's interest, I wrote down some mill rates that I have heard of to date, and while those are very preliminary, I have heard of them. For instance, in my own constituency of Swift Current, in talking with the school people this morning by phone, gave me an indication of what they were. Others have been phoned in and others we have heard of through the various media

(if I could have a page deliver that to the member from Quill Lake) just to give him a rough idea, and that is simply on mill rates and not the grants. And it's only a few of them, I readily admit, out of the 100-and-some, Mr. Chairman, as soon as the information is finalized and prepared for the opposition, they will have it.

Mr. Koskie: — Madam Minister, I want to express again on behalf of the opposition our disappointment in that you will not in fact provide the information which we have requested. I think various descriptions of your conduct and your contempt for the process of this House leaves a lot to be desired.

I want to restate that here we are dealing with a major portion of the budget, the operating grants of \$317 million, and the only way that one can get a proper perspective of the allocation of the operating grants and to properly make an assessment of whether or not the actual amount that is being published is being paid out to the respective school boards, whether or not there has been some adjustments within the formula to pick out certain school divisions where it may be of interest to the political party opposite.

These, of course, are exactly the information that we require, Madam Minister. And I believe that it is a total contempt of the process of supplying information to the opposition.

I'll tell you that if you ever come back to this House again as minister of education . . . And God help us if you do, because of what you have been doing in the last couple of years. But what surprises me so much is that you're pretending —pretending that this is a great thrust for education. And when you come before this House, you won't give to the opposition the vital information as to the disposition of the operating grants.

Obviously you have got something to hide, and I can think of a couple of things. I think that you're either hiding the fact that you have publicly published the fact that you're going to have increases of 5.5, 5.6 per cent. But, indeed, the money is not going to be in there. And that's not going to be the first time that this government has indicated large numbers that they're going to be spending and then, of course, don't spend it.

The second aspect is, there's the potential that you may have been, in fact, jiggering the system to suit some of the Tory hopefuls in the next provincial election. But the basic fact is, Mr. Minister, that you have affronted this legislature by not, in fact, providing the vital information which we have for three days, for three days we have asked you to reconsider.

And we have also, Madam Minister, gone further. And if, in fact, you're saying that you cannot get that information to us now, that I ask you again, why don't we finish off all of your estimates but leave open, leave open for this House and for the opposition— when you supply the information — to, in fact, discuss it here in the legislature?

And I want to make one more point. The minister says she will provide this information as soon as possible. And as soon as possible means, I believe, if you look at the record from last year, that she'll provide it when we haven't got an opportunity to discuss it.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I ask again the minister to reconsider: to provide us with that information which she has, which she has provided to the respective school divisions and boards across the province. I think it's only fair that we have that vital information. And so I ask her whether she has had an opportunity to reconsider; and if she has, I'd like to ask her whether she has any legitimate reason for continuing to refuse it.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, last night I heard a statement by the Leader of the Opposition that it was correct and proper that the opposition ask for information and, further to that, be given the information. I agree. That is correct and proper.

It is also correct and proper, when they ask the question to the government, that the government be given time — a minister can take notice — to put together all the factual, final figures that they would like. That is also correct and proper.

As I stated to the opposition, I'm not about to give out some very preliminary figures to the opposition. Number one, they're not final; and number two, I guess, quite simply, I don't trust what they can do with the distortion of such figures. And I think that is fair, correct, and proper.

Mr. Koskie: — Then, Madam Minister, I take strong exception to our integrity when you sit here, for your own political protection, and keep information which belongs in this House. I ask you. You say, what damage could be done? If those preliminary statements were not, in fact, used with care, would not the credibility of the opposition be more destroyed than the government side?

And so you sit there with a smirk on your face and refuse to provide to this House the essential and critical information. And I say to you: you have been an affront to this legislature. You are a disservice as the Minister of Education, and you have denied the opposition the opportunity to effectively evaluate what, in fact, you are doing in respect to the operating grants.

Now I'll tell you, Madam Minister, last year there is no doubt that when we asked for the same information . . . I ask you: why were you prepared last year to laboriously go through one division after another division, and if we had stayed here for four or five hours you would have done it that time?

What has changed your mind now, when we want that information which you said, in fact, which you were doing last year? You were prepared to give us that preliminary information. Why have you taken this protective net around your department in supplying vital information?

(16:15)

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, as I explained last night, we were dealing in part with a budget process that was later than what it was last year, the year before.

We were also dealing with a new fund in education. We were also dealing with the finance formula, in moving the debt retirement out of the formula, which had an impact. We were dealing with pre-budget consultations that had never taken place before with any government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, they hadn't, Mr. Member from Quill Lakes. It had not happened in that manner.

I can only state once again that the figures are preliminary. I expect within a week or so most boards will be finalized. Most boards will be finalized, and I will send the information over to the opposition.

The member makes reference about information last year not coming until it was too late. Well, you know, what's too late? I sat in this House in a session in the fall, and I never had one question on education — not one. So you want to know where the interest is, and what's debatable. It just wasn't there. So let's be fair about it.

Mr. Shillington: — I want to add my voice of protest to that of the member from Quill Lakes. I may say, Madam Minister, you have got a rough ride over the last couple of days. There have been times, over the last couple of days, that I have felt sorry for you. I think I would have had there not been such an important principle at stake here. Much of the purpose of estimates is going to be lost if ministers are allowed to come in, refuse to give information which is obviously available, and tell us they'll give it to us at a time of their convenience. That's what you're saying. You're going to give it to us at a time of your convenience.

Madam Minister, if there were any sincerity in your position, you'd adjourn these estimates until we get these figures. It may be that when we have the figures that we may . . . Our criticism may be muted. We may have no criticism. But, Madam Minister, we have the right to that information before we make a decision.

I recognize that the bleating sheep on government back-benches have insufficient courage, I suppose is perhaps the correct phrase, to raise questions. It's left to the opposition to raise questions of government estimates in a parliamentary democracy. That's what we have been trying to do, Madam Minister, you have stifled that.

I can tell the government House Leader that if this is anything, if this is a pattern, this Assembly is going to be a rather unproductive one. I don't know whether it would be long or short, but it's going to be quite unproductive.

We simply cannot discharge our functions if we are not given the information with which to do it. That's the whole point of estimates. That is why your officials sit with you. They are not there for moral support. They are there because we have the right and, indeed, by tradition, have the responsibility to ask detailed questions. If ministers are going to conduct themselves as you have been conducting yourself, there is little point in asking the officials to come. I say, Madam Minister, that I don't know whether or not you will be back again with Education estimates, but, if you are, I hope that next year's performance will be very different than this one. And I say to you as well as to the government House Leader, that I hope this is the last such display we see in this session.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I would like to repeat what was said last night. For three years we have sat here and we have listened to the member from Regina Centre — plus a few of his other colleagues — patronize, lecture, in other words, tell us what we do wrong.

In fact, the order of the day, Mr. Chairman, becomes one of putting down personalities in order to build up one's own ego, a perfect example of the entire process that they go through.

As I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition last night, Mr. Chairman, if you look in the blue book *Estimates* for '85-86, what we are debating is laid out very clearly — expenditures. The member from Quill Lakes, for a change, is absolutely correct. It's expenditures.

When we come to the grants to schools for operating we are looking at a total figure. I have not heard any mention in question of the finance formula that is an indication of how that 317 is allocated to the various boards.

Now if the members opposite are suggesting that the process should be charged, then they should put that forward to this House, that instead of having one line on \$317 million you would list every school division in here, and then we would debate it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, that's precisely what you are talking about.

I have given all the information, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the finance formula, the per pupil expenditure, the small-schools grant, and all the other factors that go with it. That is what's debatable, in allocating that \$317 million, in this Assembly. Once it is sent out, the figure given, there is discussion between the government and the board, the respective board. Things may change. Things may change from the time the first figure is put out. And that depends on several factors, Mr. Chairman: assessment being one of them, perhaps a miscalculation in the number of students, or the calculation in terms of the transportation grant.

I hear the member from Regina talk about tradition. He blindly — blindly — ignores the fact that I am doing nothing different than what has happened in years past on individual school grants. Why does he lead everyone to believe something that isn't so? And maybe it's time he asked himself that question.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to make a comment to you, Madam Minister. And we have some doubts about your credibility. And I'm going to give some evidence in respect to why we have doubts about your credibility.

You came into the House and made a major statement in respect to capital moneys — a ministerial statement by the Hon. Patricia A. Smith, Minister of Education, 1985-86, school construction program. And she led the public to believe, in making the list here, of major thrusts in capital expenditure. And do you know what the facts are?

The facts are that the capital money has gone down from 1983. It went down in 1984. It was over 13 million in '83. It went down to 12.276 in '84. And then when she says we're going to have a huge capital expansion, comes into the legislature. And do you know what, Madam Minister? In '85 you're going to spend \$11,676 — over \$600,000 decrease in capital expenditures.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! We're on item 18 in the . . . Order! Item 18 is before the committee: Grants to Schools — Operating. I would ask you to keep your remarks to item 18 in the *Estimates*.

Mr. Koskie: — I am talking about a major expenditure under item 18, Mr. Chairman. And I'm saying that we haven't been provided with the information. And I am saying that we have reasons to believe that there is no credibility in this minister. And I can take and refer to a statement that she published to show that there is no credibility. We can't believe, we can't take at face value that she's going to spend . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Order! The member was referring to construction grants, not operating. And it's operating on item 18.

Mr. Koskie: — I'm talking about item 18. Have you got that clear? Operating grants — \$317 million. That is the amount that she is saying that she is going to be spending, but she will not provide to this House that information in a breakdown of the operating grants to the various divisions.

And I'm saying, we can't trust this Minister of Education without details, because she did make a statement in respect to construction grants. And, if she's wrong — and a decrease, when she's allowing the public to believe that there's massive increase in one area, like capital construction — then why should we believe her when it comes to operating grants? Do you see how that ties together? It ties together, Mr. Chairman.

It is an illustration of her statement, where she says she was going to increase capital construction. And what I'm saying is, there is no credibility because, in fact, they decreased. And so, what I'm saying, Madam Minister, as I said before, you have no credibility, because you have deceived the public in other areas. And there's nothing that will convince us that you are not going to deceive the public when it comes to the disposition of the operating grants.

And so, I ask you once more, Madam Minister, come clean. Take your beating if you're going to get it — or you should — in this House, where we have a chance, in fact, to examine you and to see whether there is fairness in your distribution. Exhibit to this House — or you should — that you are, in fact, distributing, as you try it indicate to the public, 5.6 per cent increase.

I would have thought that you would have been proud to come into this House and make that information available. And I'll tell you, you're hiding something, you're misleading the public, and you don't want the opposition to know. That's as plain and as simple as that.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, perhaps a good example of — we are talking about the operating budget — the information that I sent over to the member one . . . An indication of

examples of mill rates that we've heard is, perhaps, the best example that I can give for today of what the distribution of the operating grants is given — operating grants that, I might add, equal about 7 per cent increase this year.

If I take that 7 per cent increase and compare it to my neighbour next door, Manitoba, 2 per cent is in the order of the day with the NDP government in Manitoba, compared to a Progressive Conservative government of 7 per cent in Saskatchewan.

Broadview, zero increase in their mill rate. Indian Head School Division . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, obviously, Mr. Chairman, the operating grants affect the mill rate. That's the major impact. Indian head, minus three this year. Saskatoon public and Saskatoon Catholic, zero — zero, Mr. Chairman, in a year mid-reassessment. Saskatchewan Valley School Division, minus five mills. Melfort School Division, minus two mills.

(16:30)

Estevan Roman Catholic, zero. Melville, zero. And the two school boards in my constituency, Swift Current Board of Education No. 94 and roman Catholic, are both zero. Kindersley has a plus three, Mr. Chairman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We'll talk about that.

Cupar has a plus one, and that is due . . . Does the member want to hear about the impact on . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! Allow the minister to make her statement.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — The operating grant for Cupar, plus the capital project that they received this year, gave them a plus one mill increase, Mr. Chairman, because of the moneys that the local communities put into capital projects, their down payment. A plus one mill.

Kindersley, who's been into a building process because of the economic development taking there, has a plus three increase on their mill rate, and that is also due to capital projects.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, a statement you made a little while ago — five, six minutes ago — you suggested that the way the numbers are coming in now, it's possible that in a week's time, for sure in 10 days, that you'd have a breakdown that you could give us and that we could live with, so that you could live with us having it.

Now if you have mill rates in 1985 that I've heard of today . . . So if Indian Head is up minus three and Kindersley is up plus three, which includes their capital, are you saying that those numbers are fairly fixed and that you now know what amount of money is going to be going to those particular units, either Cupar or Kindersley? And to save the time of this House and go through the list and say, well now, if you can come out and tell us that Melfort is going to be down two mills, you must know what Melfort's number is going to be, or they couldn't have set their mill rate.

So to avoid going through along thing on that, I'd like to move a motion to expedite the operation of this House. And I move:

That votes 18 and 19 be dealt with in 10 days time, after the minister provides details regarding grants to local authorities and other third parties.

I so move, seconded by the critic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I find the motion out of order, due to being a substantive motion. I refer you to page 64 of your small handbook:

Committees of the Whole House (Adopted December 10, 1980)

That the practice of permitting substantive motions in the Committee of the Whole and Committee of Finance be discontinued.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should make a motion that the committee adjourn, and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 7

Blakeney
Thompson
Engel

Lingenfelter
Koskie

Lusney
Shillington

NAYS — 33

Birkbeck
Andrew
Berntson
Taylor
Pickering
Hardy
McLaren
Smith (Swift Current)
Baker
Schoenhals
Currie

Sandberg
Embury
Martens
Young
Domotor
Folk
Muirhead
Petersen
Bacon
Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Hopfner

Myers
Hampton
Gerich
Boutin
Tusa
Meagher
Sauder
Zazelenchuk
Johnson
Swenson
Morin

Item 18 agreed to.

(16:45)

Item 19

Mr. Koskie: — I just . . . Raised in respect to the actual expenditures in the last three years, in respect to capital moneys . . . And as I indicated, Madam Minister, in 1983 it was over 13 million; 1984 was 12,000,276; and in 1985 it's 11,000,676, which obviously represents a decrease in each of the successive three years. And I wonder whether the minister can indicate whether it's consistent with the development of the educational system in decreasing the actual amount spent on the capital aspect of the budget.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, the internal down payments for the capital payments this year . . . this year it was never intended to be a year where there was a major thrust into capital projects. The major thrust that we saw that had to happen had to come on the operating side, particularly with program and quality improvement areas, including areas where some school divisions have had a tough time in meeting the obligations, such as technology and programs for the gifted.

I don't see this major decrease that the member from Quill Lakes, when I go back — even from the year 1980-81. You know, it's not unusual. For instance, in the year 1976-77, we saw a budget

figure of \$11 million. The year after that, there was only 9 million budgeted for. And the year after that, in the year 1978-79, there was only 5 million. So obviously some of it depends on the needs out there, and where government are putting their priorities.

For this year, as I had explained some time earlier, one of the reasons that you see a reduction in the down-payment dollars the government is giving out this year is the reduction we put in in terms of guide-lines on certain areas. That was a substantial saving for the department.

Item 19 agreed to.

Item 20

Mr. Koskie: — I was wondering whether the minister can supply me with a list of the educational agencies, organizations, associations, and institutions that are provided with grants, and indicate the amount that they received previously, last year, and the amount that they're receiving this year. Could you provide that information?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, I can do it verbally or I can photocopy this and send it over at a later date, whichever the member would prefer.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, it would be fine if the minister would get some of her high-paid staff and run that copy off and send it over to the opposition as soon as possible for our use.

Item 20 agreed to.

Vote 8 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Education Development Fund — Vote 64

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 64 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — What is the next item of business before the committee? Order.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Chairman, in completion of Education's estimates, I would like to take a minute in particular to thank the Chair and the staff for the patience they have shown since last Friday. I would also like to thank the department officials, who have had an extremely busy year.

Along with the department officials, a very special thank-you goes out to the organizations like STF, SSTA, and the LEADS organization for administrators, plus those trustees and teachers who, in consultation, gave us some direction for the budget and the *Partnership For Progress* this year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Chairman, I want to take the opportunity also, on behalf of the opposition, to thank the department staff and the minister, although we have some regrets with her performance; and also to extend to the other bodies in the educational system our congratulations in their efforts in producing the excellent education system that we have here in Saskatchewan.

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

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:56 p.m.