

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
May 26, 1980

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF TELEPHONES — VOTE 38

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order. It wasn't on the schedule but there's a small item in Department of Telephones; then we could clear Mr. Cody away. Would that be O.K.?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Supplemental estimates, page 5, Vote 38, item 1: Executive Administration — \$15,000.

Supplementary agreed.

DEPARTMENT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION — VOTE 5

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're dealing with the Department of Continuing Education, page 26, in your estimates. I call on the hon. member to introduce his officials.

HON. D. F. McARTHUR (Minister of Education): — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to the members Dr. Alex Guy, deputy minister of continuing education, beside me to my left; just directly in front of me, Mr. Bob Barschel, who is the assistant deputy minister for occupational training; beside Mr. Barschel on his left is Dr. Don Philippon, who is a research officer in the planning division of the department; behind me, Mr. Frank May, who is director of administration in the department; and next to him, Mr. Morris Campbell, who is director of student services in the Department of Continuing Education.

Item 1

MR. D. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — My first question to the Minister of Education is: why, when the House agenda is drawn up for education, do we come in with continuing education as the first estimate?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I had requested to have continuing education dealt with at this time. I'm sorry if it has upset the hon. members. It was more convenient because one of my staff members, who is critical to the review of the estimates of the Department of Education, was not able to be here just at this moment. I made that request and I understood the House was accommodating me in that request. I'm sorry if it has upset your . . .

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, I don't hold you entirely responsible for what goes on as the order of the House, but seems that . . .

Point of Order

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, as far as I am aware, the lady who is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I am advised, (and I should reply to the hon. member's question) that the lady is here under the auspices of Mr. Speaker, preparing a slide-tape

presentation. I understand she had agreement from both sides. There was another person here earlier in the session who was also taking some pictures at that time. This is part of the same project and she is here under the auspices of the Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I've been sitting through a number of estimates in the House and I have not seen photographs taken in any of the other estimates. This afternoon, the minister knows very well, when both he, I and the member for Rosetown stood to speak there were pictures taken every time. I see pictures being used from this Chamber in the Leader-Post. These things have a serious connotation for the voters in this province. So I would like the Attorney General or whoever runs that side of the House to explain why every time that I, the Minister of Education, or the member for Rosetown rises we are photographed in action when that hasn't taken place in any other estimate in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I take it that the hon. member is rising on a point of order, raising a point of order.

MR. TAYLOR: — Yes, we'll take it as a point of order. I just wanted an answer to this, Mr. Chairman, but if that's the correct procedure to go through as a point of order, I will call it as a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Fine. Just hold it. Just to explain the situation, I find it difficult to speak for Mr. Speaker, but the Speaker had, I understand, consulted with the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government concerning this project of taking pictures, and with their agreement he allowed the pictures to be taken which is his duty. However, I can point out to the House that if there's some objection to the taking of pictures, it's up to the House to decide that. If they don't wish the photographing to take place, a motion to have her excluded would be in order.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I think you will remember that about three weeks ago I raised the question with the same minister about a brochure which was full of pictures and I just wonder why in continuing education and education discussions we are being totally photographed. I don't think it's fair to be always thinking of what posture you have to have or if your tie is straight when you are trying to discuss considerably important matters here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I think the best way to handle this is if there is some objection, (and I guess there is) is that we should ask the person to be excused if that's . . . I don't think we should get into a big debate over . . .

MR. L. W. BIRKBECK (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Chairman, if I may just speak to the hon. member's point of order. I don't think it's a matter of exclusion of the particular photographer who is in now during estimates. It's a question of whether or not photographers in the Assembly are going to be used for just one particular set of estimates. That's the issue. If they're going to be used uniformly across the board for all estimates, that is quite agreed upon by this side of the House.

Mr. Chairman, further to the discussion, I think as an individual member I have a right to know upon whose request from the Department of Education a photographer was requested. I would like to know by whom the particular photographer is employed. Is she employed by the photographic arts division, or another department of government, or an individual group in the city or in the province, or is she just an individual, private photographer?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I think I'm going to rule by asking the photographer to excuse herself and we will straighten this situation out.

MR. R. L. COLLVER (Nipawin): — Before you make that ruling . . . You weren't quite complete in your discussions. Mr. Speaker not only spoke to the Leader of the Opposition, and I'm sure, to the government side, but also to me about inviting a photographer to come in for this special purpose. I say we had agreement. We gave agreement in writing, I believe, to Mr. Speaker, that the photographer would be allowed in here to take pictures for the presentation of those slides. We did not give permission for those pictures to be used for any purpose other than that for which Mr. Speaker requested. I say you should not, under any circumstances, exclude a photographer who has already been agreed upon by the leaders in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! I'll call on the Attorney General.

HON. R. J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Well, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to support the member for Nipawin. I am frankly shocked at this attempt by the Conservative caucus (apparently taking a contrary position on other matters than television in this House) to try to arbitrarily kick out a photographer of the photographic division of the information services. By agreement, said photographs were not to be used outside this Chamber, but to be used as training in the presentation of the slides. That has been acknowledged by everyone and it is shocking that the Conservatives are now taking this position. I, for one, would not agree to that kind of an arbitrary dismissal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I've made my ruling and I think I'm going to have to stick with my ruling. I understand that (if you want to put it this way) an agreement was apparently made with the Speaker to which I am not a party. I don't want to put myself in a position of deciding this issue without any motion or anything before me. If some group doesn't agree with the agreement or the agreement somehow has fallen through, then I think it is my duty, without any other substantive motion or anything to back up a decision I would make, to ask the person to leave.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, I think if you would check the record my concern was and I asked the minister, why this lady was taking pictures during our discussions this afternoon and this evening and not any other estimates? I think this was the concern that was raised . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That was the question asked.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sit down.

MR. TAYLOR: — I'll sit down when I feel like it. Just don't be silly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order!

MR. COLLVER: — You've made a ruling. I'm sorry, but I must move the photographer be allowed to stay, in keeping with the agreement made with Mr. Speaker, and for the information of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, I have been informed that the picture at which we all were upset was taken when the curling group came in this Chamber and was taken illegally against the rules of this House. Mr. Speaker alluded to it at the time and said it wouldn't happen again. As a matter of fact he said so from the

Chair, but I move, therefore:

That the photographer not be excluded from this Chamber.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Move it against the Chair.

MR. COLLVER: — I am like hell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! It has been moved by the hon. member for Nipawin and seconded by the hon. member for Swift Current that the photographer presently in the Chamber be permitted to continue as agreed with Mr. Speaker. Is the committee ready for the question?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, the motion moved by the member for Nipawin was absolutely unnecessary, as was your decision (and that is not casting any aspersions on you as the Chair) to have the photographer removed, because no member from this side of the House asked for the photographer to be removed. The record, Mr. Chairman, will clearly show that. This side of the House, Mr. Chairman, was clearly asking the reasons why the photographer was in the House taking photographs of this particular set of estimates. That was the issue.

Mr. Chairman, we simply asked for some clarification of that in the House tonight. Rather than give any indication of clarification, you made a decision as Chairman to have the photographer removed, (not one which we asked for) and subsequently the member for Nipawin, with the Attorney General herding him on, moved a motion which will keep the photographer in the House when she was never asked to leave in the first place. I never heard of anything so ridiculous in all my life; absolutely idiotic.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objections whatsoever to the motion moved by the member for Nipawin, if in fact, Mr. Chairman, you're going to allow that motion to be in order, because Mr. Chairman, I view that motion as a censure against the Chairperson of this committee. That will be a precedent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to the House that the first series of questions on this matter were raised by the member for Qu'Appelle to the Minister of Continuing Education, to which Mr. Chairman of this committee responded, outlining what he believed to be the agreement involving Mr. Speaker and all the parties. This prompted thereafter (the record will show clearly) the allegation by the member for Qu'Appelle that taking photographs in these circumstances was dangerous and undesirable. This was followed by the comments from the member for Moosomin about the photograph taking and thereafter by your suggestion that the agreement was now being broken or doubt was being cast on it so you had no other option but to ask the photographer to withdraw which prompted the motion from the member for Nipawin in that regard. The record shows that absolutely clearly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — State your point of order.

MR. G. S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — I wonder what the member for Qu'Appelle is going to say when he sees allegations made about him tonight, and he's not even here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! That's a question of debate, not a point of order.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I have made my point about the motion. I think I'm fortunate . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order! He was speaking when a point of order was raised. I had to deal with the point of order immediately. He doesn't give up his right to speak.

MR. ROMANOW: — There's one correction. It is not the member for Qu'Appelle, who is not in his chair; it is the member for Indian Head-Wolseley who took this position straight across the line.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — On the motion put by the member for Nipawin, Mr. Chairman — I would like a ruling from you before you put it. Is it not basically a challenge to the Chair, by the way it is worded, if you have already made a ruling? Correct me if I'm wrong. I'm just asking for clarification before the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I obviously found the motion in order by putting the question to the Assembly. Is the House ready for the Chair?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, obviously I don't think so. I can't get into a debate on the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt this motion?

Motion agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I guess the photographer is free to take pictures.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Department of Continuing Education — Item 1 (continued)

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I think we can probably get on with the discussion of the Department of Continuing Education. If there is not too much talk from the cheap seats, maybe we can get into a meaningful discussion regarding education in Saskatchewan. This is something I believe you as the minister are deeply concerned with. I can't say the same for some of your noisy colleagues, but I believe you have some deep concerns in this area, as do I. I think we can get into a meaningful discussion on the estimates and how you are planning to spend the money of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan in providing to the people and the students of this province — the adult citizens through the community colleges and students through the universities and the technical schools — needed and very important avenues for continued education.

I would hope, in my introductory remarks, that we would realize there is a very great expenditure of dollars for the Department of Continuing Education. I would think, Mr. Minister, I speak for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan when I say that no one questions the need for continuing education and higher education; however, I do think there is a need for some degree of scrutiny, Mr. Minister. I know and I want to say at the outset of my remarks that I believe in academic freedom as much as you or anyone else in this Chamber. However, Mr. Minister, I think there is a fine line between what one could call freedom, and licence to do as you please. I think that, in these times of escalating costs in education, people want to know if they are getting their dollar value. I know from my

experience in education that this is a very hard thing to ascertain.

But on the other hand I don't think that we can disregard the demand by the general public to have some degree of feedback or some degree of a positive feeling that their dollars are being spent in the best interests of the society and the development of new ideas, of new programs and the equipping of expertise that will lead our society in the next decade. I don't think people question that at all. They want to have this type of training. But I do think, because of the high cost, they want to be assured they are getting a return on their money. And in equating it to the education system where we do have quite a degree of, I wouldn't like to use the word control, but we do have a mechanism by which Joe Public can find this sort of thing out, Mr. Minister . . .

They can find out if their tax dollar is being spent in the way that they hope best serves the children within their schools. There is a parent advisory council as a provision in the new act. Also there are committees on curriculum on which there is lay representation. They have a voice into that. There's the avenue of the school board which is enshrined in our heritage here in Canada, of the public school board and separate school board, where you do have these (shall I say) monitors would be the word I would use, on the education system. Now, I know that we have the boards of governors in the universities. The mechanisms in the technical schools are I think a little closer being under the deputy minister or the ministry of the Department of Continuing Education.

I do sense though, in talking to the general public that there probably is a need. Maybe we don't have to create a new avenue. Maybe the board of governors or the senate of the university or something seems, by its name and because most of the people that come on there have an expertise (they've come through the university and so on) maybe the average person seems removed from them as input, as questions, as to how the operation is taking place. I sense that as I talk to people, Mr. Minister, there seems to be a growing bit of frustration in this regard.

We all want to see our students come out, if they are capable, with university training, with technical training. I think you aspire as I do to maximizing the potential of the individual. I think that's the goal that you hold and I think that's the goal that society holds. But I do think that when, and I'll admit some may be rumour, there are mechanisms for gauging the ratio for pupil to teacher, the program in the school system — I'm not saying that we should operate it on a pupil-teacher ratio, don't take me wrong in that regard, but anyone can find this out pretty well within any school jurisdiction in the province of Saskatchewan very quickly.

When I see those mechanisms in place and when, as I say, some may be rumour, some may be fact, but a very low pupil-teacher ratio in some situations in institutions of higher education and very little public knowledge of the actual research, independent research that is going on. I wonder if there can be some way that the general public could feel or could know the ongoings of the institutions of higher learning so they have that general feeling they are getting the educational value for the dollar spent and we'll start with a discussion of that. I'd be interested in your reply.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. member's comments with regard to the legitimate public concern and public feeling that all of us who have responsibilities in the education system should take whatever steps are open to us and available to us in our good judgment and within our powers to see that we make the best use of the education dollar spent.

I think it's particularly important in our province where we have developed through many years a very, very comprehensive, complete system of education. Our philosophy of education works from the principle that our citizens should have the opportunity of a high-quality education right from the kindergarten years through to the completion of their life (their adult years). We should have continuing education opportunities available and as a result, we have developed a wide range of educational institutions and opportunities. Certainly, each of those institutions has and must have, because of the history and tradition, their own systems of accountability which meet the needs of the public and the needs of us as legislators.

I might say I share very much the other part of the hon. member's interest in this question. Education is the business of our public, not just as taxpayers, but also because it is such an important public activity. And therefore everyone does have the right to understand, to know about and to have the opportunity to express concerns about our education system.

I do want to caution the hon. member, however, with respect to certain comments he made. I think if one looks at, for instance, the university community, some of the comments the hon. member makes are directly applicable to the university community.

I say to the hon. member that we have some very, very good reasons, historical as well as contemporary, for needing to be on guard as public officials to ensure that the university and the university community has the opportunity to govern its own affairs without fear of interference from the political side or the government side or from other such agencies in our society which might wish to interfere because they object to what is being done in the university in terms of research or writing or teaching in terms of the content.

We have established the tradition that our universities should have a free opportunity as part of free enquiry and open education to peruse those intellectual areas and areas of research which they deem to be important in their own judgement.

As a result, we've built up a system within our universities, a self-governing system, that does have participation, not just from within the university but also from without. The board of governors is the supreme administrative governing body of the university.

I point out that there are a large number of members of the board of governors who are on the board because they represent the public interest in the university. And they are there not only to represent the public interest, but to be accountable. I think people who have an interest in the accountability of the university do have an obligation to take their concern to the board of governors. I also agree, likewise, that the board of governors has an obligation to make sure people are informed and knowledgeable about the activities of a university so the public can have the feedback the hon. member talks about.

In addition, we have other bodies of the university, such as the senate, which also draw upon public representation from interest groups and others in order to provide as much openness as possible. I might also point out that our universities have a very, very fine and long-standing tradition of public service and community service.

They do extend themselves in the community. This goes back to the very early days of the University of Saskatchewan when that university, perhaps more than any other university in the whole of the country, reached out into our rural areas and was

accessible to our rural citizens as well as our urban citizens. Through that they built up, not only knowledge and understanding about what the universities were doing, but also carried back information from the citizenry about the university to the university administration.

I might add, with respect to the technical institutes, that we maintain advisory councils for each and every program and course within them. Those committees are drawn from outside the institute communities, so as to bring information from and feed back information to the community and particularly that part of the community which is interested in those programs. I might also add that this very process here, I think is important so that we have the ability as legislators to review how our dollars are being spent.

Having said all that, it is never particularly easy, as the hon. member points out, to evaluate efficiency and effectiveness of educational dollars on such things as intellectual pursuits and research. To a certain extent you must take some gambles and risks and hope that this side of our education system will provide a pay-off to society. I think the history of our universities in this province, the history of our technical institutes, and now the recent history of our community colleges very clearly show that we do have a very substantial pay-off to our society.

Might I mention just one other thing with community colleges? The philosophy of the community colleges, I think more than anything else, supports the point the hon. member makes about making our educational institutes part of the community. The community colleges are different from all other community colleges in Canada. They are based in the communities. The membership is drawn from the communities. Each of the community colleges contains many (what are called) needs identification committees, based throughout the province. They work with the people in the communities to identify what they need and want in terms of educational opportunities and work within the community college to provide them. I think that direct participation perhaps more than anything else, is the proper way to guarantee that people do get value for their money out of the education system, because they participate as decision makers in determining what they get out of their educational system. I think that is something our community colleges are uniquely capable of doing, and it is something we are very proud of.

MR. TAYLOR: — I would be in agreement with you, Mr. Minister. I want you to be very clear on this. I think you realize I am in no way suggesting the government should be looking at the internal aspect of the university, interfering maybe with the ongoing program; that has an inherent danger. However, Mr. Minister, there should be some degree of public scrutiny, or an avenue which the public can go through. Maybe it is the very fact that the majority of the public are not university graduates. I get to know who is on the board of governors and in the senate as you do, because we are alumni of the university. Other people seem to feel, and express to me, what can I do? I am concerned about things which are going on in there. I don't know the avenues to go through. I don't know where to turn. Maybe there should be a little more publicity of who the contacts are if you have concern. I am sure you must get letters about this; I know you do, from people who probably never attended a university in their lives. Their child is going to university. They come home with stories of things they don't approve of, or they question. They don't seem to know where to turn or who to voice complaints to. Or on the other hand, not everything is a complaint; we don't want to paint a negative picture. There can be some (and there are some) very good things going on. Some people out there have some good suggestions. But there seems to be a breakdown which there

isn't in the public education system.

So I just put this forth as a suggestion, that perhaps things might run a little more smoothly if there were more emphasis from your Department of Continuing Education on letting the general public know, or having some way of knowing (if they have complaints or if they have bouquets for the university) which way to go, rather than coming or writing to me or something of this nature and wanting to politicize it; I don't think that is what we want to do here. I think we want to develop the best type of university and continuing education program that we can for this province. That's my desire. And I just feel that there is a need in this regard.

With technical schools, I don't get that kind of input so much. There is some concern about cutting programs and what this would do with staff and things of this nature. I do get that sense of futility or if I have a complaint against the university — to whom do I turn or where do I turn? I don't know if you want to comment any more on that. If you do I will entertain what you have to say.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I do personally take an interest in trying to see that we have more information available about our educational institutions. We are currently examining some ways of providing more information. We are looking at the present time on student assistance in university entrance and that type of thing. We certainly can have a look at the question, as you point out, of just a better public understanding of the nature, structure, organization and functioning of the university. That is something we can look at. And in undertaking such a program, it will likely involve some publications. We'll take great care about the kinds of pictures we include in those publications.

MR. TAYLOR: — It's very nice of you to scrutinize the pictures, Mr. Minister. Getting into research, in talking to people in the university community there seems to be a concern as to whether the amount of research funds provided are adequate. I must admit that most of my discussions are with people in the college of education. Could you indicate to me what increases there have been, if any, and what funding under these subvotes would be for research, or is this entirely an internal matter with the various departments and disciplines in our universities?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice that in the funding . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I would ask the hon. member for Rosthern to withdraw the remarks toward the Chairman, namely that I have two sets of rules. I would ask you to withdraw it. I would ask you to stand up and put it on the record. I'll ask you to rise and withdraw the remarks. I would ask you to rise and withdraw the remarks about the Chair. Thank you.

MR. KATZMAN: — I withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Thank you.

MR. LANE: — Now, on that point of order, Mr. Chairman, I assume we'll see those remarks in the record tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There is no point of order.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order! I would ask all hon. members to try to maintain some order and decorum in the House. I call on the Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. McARTHUR: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley had asked a question with respect to the funding of research at the universities by the Government of Saskatchewan, or the Department of Continuing Education more specifically. I want to indicate to the hon. member that we provide almost without exception our funding to the universities on an unconditional basis. We provide funding and then leave it to the university to determine the appropriate use of those financial resources in terms of teaching, research, community service or whatever. We do believe that largely brings about the most effective distribution of the use of the internal university resources.

I might add that part of the reason that tradition has developed is because there has been a complementary organization of research funding on the other hand by the federal government, which organized its spending to universities on the basis of mission oriented or directed research. So its funding tends to be tied to particular research projects. We reviewed that as being an appropriate way to approaching the division of responsibilities between governments as well.

There are instances where we have a very specific and particular interest, as a government, in some matter that we wish to have researched and in that case we will undertake contract research. But the amount of research undertaken on that basis is relatively small. By and large our funding, as it is directed toward research, is part of the global funds that go to the university.

MR. TAYLOR: — Then if your funding to the university in general is a little on the skimpy side, or they're having a tough time meeting their expenditures, would it be correct to assume that maybe the research would be cut back because of just a general lack of funding?

MR. McARTHUR: — I think it's certainly true to say the more money the universities have, likely the greater will be the amount of research and teaching time, as well as the amount of extension time, that's put in. This is simply by virtue of the fact that by and large the university staff is expected to divide its time between research, teaching and, to a certain degree, extension or community service.

So, clearly, the more staff the university is able to engage, then it is likely that there will be more research done because those additional staff members will at least be devoting part of their time to research.

However, I think one shouldn't confuse the situation here. I don't think there's been any indication or any history in this province of any pressure to cut back the level of university activity. Clearly the universities would on occasion like to have more money, as their aspirations and their hopes sometimes exceed the resources they have. That's a situation all of us face when we're trying to manage any kind of public agency with scarce financial and other resources; they're always scarce in that sense.

MR. TAYLOR: — Fine, then in regard to program could you tell me, with the aid of your officials, has the program at the University of Regina been decreased in the last year, and if so, in what disciplines? Also, what about the University of Saskatchewan, has it been decreased in program offerings? I mean in the various disciplines. Have they had to drop any of these?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any disciplines or programs which the universities have eliminated at either Saskatoon or Regina. There may very well have been. It is not my responsibility nor my place to have any involvement in this. There, I'm sure, have been cases where, because of the shifting priorities of the university, or because some aspects of the university are growing in terms of student enrolments and some are declining, they have shifted certain teaching resources. They may have taken some positions and reallocated them to certain other areas; the result of that would be that certain areas would no longer have as many teaching positions as they once did.

I'm sure some of that goes on. It's gone on in every public institution, government department or whatever, that I've ever been involved in. I'm sure it goes on in the university. However, I have not been notified of any decision to eliminate any programs or disciplines of that sort within the university over the past year.

MR. TAYLOR: — When would these changes, if there were shiftings or cuttings or so on, be made? Are these made well in advance of the academic year so that the students enrolled would be aware of these types of changes?

MR. McARTHUR: — The university fiscal year is from July 1 to June 30 of each year. Therefore, the university would have to be in a position of having their budgetary plan and their operational plan into place by July 1 of each year.

The main university program starts, as you know, sometime in early September so there would be at least that kind of lead time in terms of changing of teaching resources. I don't think, (and I could be wrong on this) that any of the changes which have taken place are the kind that would impact the way the hon. member indicates. That is to say I don't think a student would find that a program he or she wished to pursue (a particular program of study) has likely disappeared because of these reallocations of resources. It may be that there are not as many teaching resources in a particular faculty. I don't know. There may be a reduction of one, or something, in a faculty. But that would not likely result in any disappearance of any part of the program that a student would be planning to participate in.

MR. H. J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Minister, I just wanted to talk for a moment about the universities commission.

The board of governors often feel that the universities commission stands between them and the legislative body in the province. The board of governors at both universities often feel quite a sense of frustration when they try to deal with their budgets. They can't talk directly to the government who provide the funding. They must go through the universities commission.

That process, though it may be good, does not really fit with the method which the former minister of education used when he described the need for the negotiations between the government, the trustees and the teachers. He said that he was paying the piper and must call the tune. If the government is still paying the piper in this case and they set themselves apart from the universities by putting the universities commission

in between, then that doesn't fit. I'm having a little trouble understanding the thinking of the government and I'd like an explanation of why you see the need of the universities commission.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we have to go back just a little in history to understand the role and development of the universities commission. As you know up until 1974 there was only one university in this province. It had two campuses, the Regina campus and the Saskatoon campus. But there was only one university, the University of Saskatchewan.

With the introduction of the plans and the legislation in 1974 to create two universities — two self-governing university communities in the province — it was recognized that there would be certain problems and difficulties and certain additional needs as a result of the requirement to have an appropriate relationship between government and those two universities. As a result of that, because of the very legitimate fear, (not fear, but concern) about maintaining as much as possible a distance between government and universities in terms of management of the universities, it was recognized that with two universities you get into questions of division of the overall financial pie for the university sector and into planning questions about the appropriate distribution of programs between one university and another, or the appropriate distribution of capital facilities. Recognizing that those kinds of decisions would have to be made and you no longer had a single board of governors making those kinds of decisions, it was felt that it would be most appropriate to establish, (as has been done in other provinces which have more than one university) a universities commission that would deal with those kinds of planning and financial allocation matters.

Again, perhaps it's an overabundance of caution, but we on this side of the House believe that even though it has its difficulties and frustrations that a free and independent functioning academic community in this province is extremely important to the well-being of the province. We believe history has shown that a free and independently functioning academic community does contribute and we believe that left confident to function in that way in the future it will contribute in a very important way. Therefore, we have taken these kinds of measures including the creation of the universities commission. I appreciate that it creates frustrations. There is not the same kind of direct communication between the boards of governors, now that we have two, and the government as there was previously when we had only one board of governors. But I think that's an unfortunate side effect, if you like. I think all of us need to work for finding more effective ways of communicating within that framework but I'm not convinced by any means that the framework itself is not appropriate, given the very legitimate concerns and interests in this whole question.

MR. SWAN: — The University board of governors feel that separation, where they can't speak to government. When we in turn ask questions of the government about the operation of the university, you again say, well the university commission has control and we really can't say anything. So you don't just cut off the universities but you also cut off the opposition in the legislature by your process. I'm wondering whether you indeed have the right process or if there isn't some way it could be improved?

MR. McARTHUR: — I'm not sure that I fully understand the relationship of the points the hon. member is making. I don't think I have ever claimed in this House that I could not answer any questions because of the existence of the universities commission. I don't believe I've ever had any question directed to me but there could be occasion, where some matter, within the knowledge of the universities commission and not within the

knowledge of the minister, makes it impossible for the minister to inform the House of what that matter is. But I'm not aware of having ever found that I could not answer any question because the universities commission had the information.

MR. SWAN: — You may not have felt that you couldn't answer; you just wouldn't. Is that the case?

MR. McARTHUR: — Perhaps I should try to speculate a little bit about what the hon. member is actually referring to. If he is referring to questions which have been directed to me in this House about the operation of the University of Regina, I want to emphasize to the hon. member and to all members of this House that my inability to answer for the behaviour of the university has nothing to do with the universities commission. My reasons for not being able to answer have to do with the fact that the university historically and by statute, is a self-governing institution — an institution of learning, and institution of research.

Aside from the whole existence of the universities commission which has really nothing to do with that particular issue directly, we, on this side of the House, and I, as a minister, maintain the position that it would be wrong for me to interfere with academic decision making and academic freedom of the university. I think that any attempt on my part to hold the university accountable for decisions it makes, would amount to interference which I think would cause a great deal of alarm (legitimate alarm) and concern within the universities. So I do not, in that sense, attempt, nor do I think it would be my right, to hold the universities accountable for their decisions and therefore I cannot answer for those decisions within this House.

I might add that the whole tradition of universities within the free world has developed such that those universities are self-governing institutions with their own accountability systems and their own means of being accountable for their decisions outside of being accountable to the government or to the state. I think that is clearly a very fundamental principle. That is why I have not found it possible to answer for certain decisions of the university; it has nothing to do with the universities commission.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, getting back to changing of courses within the year, I have a letter here I'd like to just read for your information. The letter was written to me and says:

I'm writing to you in regard to the change in policy of majoring in accounting in the college of commerce at the University of Saskatchewan. Here are the facts as I know them.

In early February the accounting department held a general meeting for all commerce students who were interested in majoring in accounting. At this meeting they told us they had figured out there would be too many of us majoring in accounting in the following year to facilitate us all. Therefore, they would have to set up a system of eliminating some of us from going into accounting. As it turned out, they had had this problem the year before and had dealt with it on a first-come, first-serve basis.

However, this year they thought that way of doing things was not fair. Therefore, this year we had to apply to get into accounting just as though we were applying to get into university. They looked at the average grade of all of the classes we had taken up until December, 1979 and they chose the

applicants with the higher averages until the major was filled. Up until this meeting, all a student needed was a 59 per cent average to get into the major he chose. Also at this meeting they told us they knew about this problem last fall but they told us nothing about it until this February, at the February meeting.

As it happened, of the 250 students who applied to get into accounting, 190 students were accepted and 60 students were turned down. The average mark which turned out to be the cutoff point was 70 per cent.

I was among the 60 students who didn't get into the accounting major. We were either faced with quitting university, transferring to another university whereby there was no guarantee of our getting into the accounting major there, or like myself, forced to turn our reference to another commerce major and follow through with it or try again to get into accounting after the following year. Again, we are still not guaranteed to get in unless we have a certain average.

Also on the basis of this system that they have set up, some third year students who have already taken classes toward their accounting major did not get into the accounting major for their fourth year. So now where does that leave them?

There's some more in the letter, Mr. Minister, but I think you have the general gist and that's why I asked earlier, when are these decisions made? Because I think that's rather an injustice. I can understand that you have to have a quota of students whom you can admit. You just can't let everyone in there. But I think it is an injustice and a gross injustice for students to think they are going to be able to major in this and get to second or third year (I think he mentioned some of them going into fourth year) to find out they cannot get the necessary courses. And I think your assurance to me was that these things were usually made by June so they would know in September. This letter points out that this happened in midstream in February.

Were you aware of this situation, Mr. Minister? If we're safeguarding the education of these students, that's the kind of thing we should be avoiding in the universities, the technical schools or wherever it may take place.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, generally I've been aware of the situation with respect to accounting at the University of Saskatchewan. It is a program, as the hon. member has pointed out, that has quotas with respect to enrolment. As I understand it, those quotas are in existence for two or three reasons.

One reason, I think, is because of the interest of the university and the college in maintaining certain levels of academic standards which they have chosen to do and which is not anything for me to argue with them about.

The second thing is that the college of commerce itself has been a very rapidly growing faculty. Apparently it is a faculty in which student interest is great. Also I take it that the

demand for graduates is great, so it's been a faculty which has grown quite considerably. The universities, I think, are feeling the pressure in that faculty and feeling rather badly about the fact students do have to be turned away from the accounting major. The universities have not at this time, as far as I know, advanced any proposition to the universities commission and through it to the government about any steps that we might take to assist them with their problem.

I am told by university officials that one problem they do face and that they have no ready answer for, is that highly competent highly trained and professional accountants are in such great demand that they have trouble attracting an adequate number of faculty members to instruct in the accounting major. And as a result of that, if they want to keep their teaching program within certain limitations in terms of the demand upon the instructors, they have a great deal of difficulty in seeing exactly how they can overcome this problem. I understand it is something they're working on, but it's not something they see an immediate or early solution to.

I might also say I'm not sure that I fully understand the member's criticism of the university for informing student in February about this difficulty. I would think any decision provided to the students in February would be a decision that would not come into play until the following fall. I would say that is a case of a very substantial amount of advance notice (probably as much advance notice as is practical under the circumstances) for the university to be giving those students. So I would not share the hon. member's criticism of the universities for having made that decision in February.

MR. TAYLOR: — I think the concern there, as expressed by the students, Mr. Minister, is what's the foresight in planning within the department? Why let these 250 in if you're only going to have 190 that you're going to allow to continue? Where is the guidance?

You're telling me the future for accounting and commerce is very bright. I would think that if this is so, certainly why do we not accommodate the 250? Maybe there is a problem in getting professors, but surely if there's that demand out there for commerce graduates, we're doing a great disservice to the students of Saskatchewan if we are not allowing them to continue their training.

The 59 per cent average to get into the course, if that's not adequate, well then raise it to 70 per cent if that's what it has to be. But let's not be doing this in the middle of the stream on these kids; that's what I'm saying. If they knew they were going to have the 190, Mr. Minister, then they should have been told in September and not part way through. I think I indicated that some of these people were third and fourth year students.

Getting back to what you were saying, if it is that good out there for accounting and commerce, then I think if I were in that university and having some decision-making say (if that's where the possibility is to forward this province and to give young people the opportunity to make a decent and respectable living and contribute to the ongoing society and economy), surely to God I wouldn't be saying cut 60 of them out. I would be making provision for those 60 to join in this great future in accounting.

MR. McARTHUR: — I think, Mr. Chairman, we need to be a little careful about being armchair managers. I think the difficulty the university is experiencing, in predicting the demand and mobilizing the teaching resources to meet the demand, is a real one.

I might point out that while it's regrettable, my understanding of that situation the hon. member is referring to is that the university cannot determine exactly how many people are going to pursue a particular major, such as accounting, until somewhere well into the second year of that class's enrolment in the college of commerce. Then they get an accurate indication of the level of interest in the different majors. Therefore they can't exactly predict as well as the hon. member might be implying. I think what they probably have found is they are getting in a position where, out of a particular class, they have many more students interested in pursuing a particular major than they can accommodate. They must make some of these decisions about requirements for acceptance in that major and the possibility that some of the commerce students will have to pursue one of the other majors. It's regrettable, but it's a real fact of life.

I might also point out that it is my understanding that the option for those students to pursue an accounting career is not entirely closed off, in that there are relatively effective mechanisms for a student upon graduation from commerce (say in administration or one of the other majors) to pursue a career in the accounting profession through a further study program.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, it is obvious that the courses they wanted to take, Mr. Minister, they weren't allowed to pursue. I may be an armchair manager (that could be right) but I'm of the opinion that if a young person meets the entrance requirements and has the desire to do that, I would say: fine and dandy, you just go ahead and give it a try. I think that is what we should be doing with our young, encouraging them, instead of having good young kids like this writing to people like you and me expressing frustration, because they were allowed in and then pulled out. That's like putting a fellow in a 100 yard dash, and if he isn't really doing very well at 50 yards, saying: hey buddy, get out of the race. Neither you nor I know what burst of speed he may have for the end, and that's the possibility here too. I'm not saying let everybody into the program, but if they meet the entrance criteria, and if the possibility for earnings and a career is good (and I accept your word that it is good), and if we are really interested in providing continuing education for the students in this province, then let's make it so they can fulfil their aspirations and potential we spoke of earlier; let's not cut them out because of some arbitrary standard which is brought in halfway through the course. I would put that forth for consideration, and I think it is the route we should be looking at. I think we've responded to that; we've both had some discussion there; I bring it forth as a sincere concern.

The next thing I am a bit concerned about is the degree of graduate training in our universities. That hinges on what I was talking about earlier in research, and I quote from an article Mr. Minister, I am sure you are probably familiar with, which quotes Dean Kenneth McCallum. It says:

Low financial support is one reason the University of Saskatchewan is not attracting many graduate students, Dean Kenneth McCallum of the college of graduate studies and research said Saturday in Saskatoon. . . Proportionately Saskatchewan has the lowest percentage of graduate students in comparison to other universities . . . In 1977-78 full-time U of S graduate enrolment as a percentage of full-time undergraduate enrolment was 5.4 per cent, compared to the national average of 12.3 per cent.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that is rather a significant difference in graduate training. I think you realize, as well as I do, the potential that is there from graduate students entering into our labour forces as well as instructors in classes and so on. He points out that maybe

some of the reason for the decrease in graduate students is the funding available to them in graduate teaching fellowships. He goes on to say:

Nationally three-quarters of the students remain within their own province for graduate study, but only 56 per cent of Saskatchewan students do.

I think with that we're losing a brain drain perhaps. We're not attracting many from other provinces and states. We're losing some of our top students, and as Dean McCallum points out, maybe this is due to funding. Mr. Minister, I would be interested in your comments on the retention of graduate students in our universities.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I want to say first of all that I think I share the concern and interest Dr. McCallum has expressed about finding ways of increasing the interest and participation of our graduating students in graduate programs at our universities. I think it is quite evident that one of the things we are going to need, and need very much over the coming years in Saskatchewan, is highly trained professionals. And I think one of the means of developing highly trained professionals is by interesting them in pursuing graduate study programs in our universities.

I might add, however, it is somewhat difficult to determine exactly what it is that would bring about an increase in the interest of students pursuing graduate studies in our universities. There are a number of reasons why tentatively some of us have identified here in Saskatchewan there is a somewhat lower than is the case in Ontario, participation in graduate programs amongst our graduating students from our universities. I think one of the things that is clear in the case of Ontario is they have a very substantial number of universities. We find students in all universities often wish to transfer to another university to pursue a graduate program. Because we have only the two universities in Saskatchewan, and in many programs in which there is only one university offering a program, it does seem to be somewhat of a pattern with students graduating from our universities to look to another university outside the province as part of that trend to looking to a second university to do graduate work in. That's not a bad principle I think to take your graduate work at another university.

Another difficulty that we've identified is the fact that job opportunities are so significant for bachelor degree graduates, baccalaureate graduates, in Saskatchewan at the present time that many, many students go straight into the work force out of their first degree, many, many more than was once the case. Part of that is simply because they are taking advantage of very, very generous and substantial job opportunities that exist today in our province, associated with the growth and development in our province. I would relate to the hon. member that I was speaking to a faculty member in the faculty of geology recently, who was talking to me about this very problem that the hon. member mentioned. I was pursuing with him what he thought would be a possible solution to this problem. He pointed out to me that he wasn't very sure what the solution was at the present time because it didn't seem to matter what was placed before a graduate of the first degree in geology. The opportunities for work were so attractive that it was difficult to convince them to pursue postgraduate work of any sort.

I do think, however, we do have to look at it. We are the present time reviewing financial assistance, scholarships and other types of fellowships, that are available for graduate work with the possibility that we can provide some additional financial incentives by improving those. Now I don't know whether that will bring the response we might hope it would, but that is one alternative we are currently looking at. It will be further examined in the coming months for possible implementation in another year.

I might say we have raised some of the fellowships and graduate scholarships at the present time, and we'll get some indication of what effect that's having. I think it is something we need to review a little further. It may also be something the universities themselves, could be looking at in terms of the kinds of teaching assistantships and so on, that they provide out of their own resources. It may very well be they need to look at enriching those as well, as an additional incentive to keep graduating students within the university community to do graduate work.

MR. TAYLOR: — I heard you right, Mr. Minister, in that you are reviewing this with a look at maybe increasing the funding for graduate research and so on. If this is the route you are looking at I think that's quite important. Your suggestion that maybe they go into the work force, I would think the same opportunity would be possible in other provinces of Canada as in Saskatchewan, to go into the work force right out of the baccalaureate. That doesn't explain to me really why we are lower in the percentage. I realize the difference made by two universities and I accept that, but still I do think that we have, as I said earlier, a brain drain. I think if we can put money into this it is very good, because I point out here, and I quote again from Dr. McCallum and he says:

Unless Canadian universities sharply increase their output of highly-trained research personnel, such scholars will soon have to be imported from other countries, a University of Saskatchewan administrator said.

And he points out a Science Council of Canada study shows the cost of doing research is escalating at a rate much higher than the consumer price index and that we, in Canada, only put 9 per cent of the GNP into this type of research, which is one of the lowest in the western world. So if you would take this as a suggestion that we don't want to be losing this expertise and if you don't accept that we in Saskatchewan are in the optimum position here, I think maybe it would improve our situation if you did react upon the suggestions and increase the funding for research in the coming year.

While we're on this topic, we could discuss student loans in general, Mr. Minister. I have here a clipping which indicates that students find loans do not cover expenses. It says:

Although Canada student loans are supposed to enable all people to go to university, a large number of students at the University of Saskatchewan who had to take out loans find them inadequate according to a Star-Phoenix survey.

Mr. Minister, one of the things that has been brought to my attention as an inequity in this student loan program . . . I realize it is a Canadian student loan program, so before you tell me it's in the federal sphere, we'll get this pinned down.

Being the Minister of Continuing Education, I think it would be incumbent upon you to raise this concern with the federal authorities. The concern is that the parents' assets have to be taken into consideration. I think there's a \$100,000 deductible or something of that nature. This would certainly affect the children of grain farmers in the area. You know you don't have to have too big a farm to have assets in excess of \$100,000. You are well aware of that.

These people, and many of them are people who have been paying a good percentage of taxes throughout this province, are finding it very difficult to get student loans

because of the very fact that the father is somewhat successful. Now I'm not saying that the parent doesn't have some responsibility in helping to finance their student in higher education.

I think parents, as a whole, accept this responsibility. But on the other hand, I don't think we should have a system where if a student would declare to move away from his home and set up independent housekeeping or something, he should become eligible for a lot of government help in the way of a loan, where the other kid, who maybe goes home in the summer and works on the farm or something of this nature, is penalized because his father has assets. Have you made any representation to the federal government about this concern?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, indeed, I have been making a number of representations to the federal authorities and to the other provinces with respect to what I think are a number of changes required in the student assistance program that we offer as a joint bursary-loans program between the provinces and the federal government.

I might point out to the hon. member that there has been a certain amount of resistance to reviewing this, not just from the federal government, but also from some of the other provincial governments. Many of the provincial governments apparently do not agree with the hon. member's assessment of the need to expand the eligibility for student assistance under the bursary and loans program. However, we're working that through.

At a recent meeting of the Council of Ministers of Canada with the federal minister, I was successful in convincing the group that we should undertake a major review of the whole student assistance program. As a result of that, as the hon. member is probably aware, there is now a task force functioning across the country to examine the whole question of student assistance and the various criteria and so on which should be changed. We have recognized that the assets requirement, the \$100,000 maximum on assets that one could have before those assets started to be counted in determining the assistance was a particularly pressing problem in this province. As a result, we proceeded to make some changes in that particular part of the program for this year which will, I think, alleviate the problem. We are going to increase the basic exemption on net assets from what was previously a figure of \$100,000 to \$150,000 for the basic loan on bursary calculation and will also be increasing that exemption further to a \$250,000 level in the case of loans themselves. So that is a very, very major change in that asset requirement in the calculation of the eligibility which, I think, will very substantially loosen up, if you like, or free up the eligibility of people who do not have sufficient income to cover the cost of education, but who have these assets which, as you say, are not particularly liquid so therefore, not easily transferable into resources to support the student. So, yes, we have recognized that particular problem and have gained agreement on this change.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, just to follow a little bit on the same topic. You talk about \$250,000 solving it. You know, it sounds like a lot of money to many people. But if you take a farmer in Saskatchewan today with one section of farm land (and that is a small farm) and you start to price the cost of that land with the necessary capital investment of equipment which that man would have to have to operate, he will far exceed your \$250,000. Yet his net income to try and support a student on may be indeed very small. So I think you are perhaps moving in the right direction, but I think you will have to move a lot farther when it comes to agricultural land if you are going to look at a capital figure as your base. You know, agriculture is a capital intensive program. I believe if you take a

section of land in the constituency which I represent, you will find it is probably worth much in excess of \$300,000 just for one section. That is not including any equipment. So I would ask you to take a serious look at that figure and to adjust it for the agricultural industry so it is meaningful to those people. It is really not meaningful at the present time.

MR. McARTHUR: — I think, Mr. Chairman, the very fact that we are proceeding with this change on the asset calculation is an indication that I have some sympathy with the point the hon. member is making. I think again (not to belabour the point), certainly we must recognize these instances where inflation in land values in particular, but the inflation in the value of equipment and so on has met that, as you say. You may not have a particularly high earning farm operation, therefore not a particularly high income and still have a fairly substantial value of assets. We are making this change which will come into effect for the coming year. We will assess that and see what happens. It may be (as the hon. member, I think, is advocating) that we even need to increase these exemptions further than they are now. But that is something which we will be working on and working through. This is a very substantial increase, I might add, in the exemptions and will no doubt help to alleviate that particular problem. I certainly take the hon. member's comments because I feel I have some understanding and sympathy for young people from the farms as well. I think it is incumbent upon us in this province in particular, where we have such a substantial part of our population living on farms to be very cognizant of that problem.

MR. SWAN: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think I would encourage you now while you are in the process of making a change, that you change it for the agricultural industry far beyond the \$250,000 because I don't think you are going far enough to be meaningful. The cost of agricultural land in the last two years has escalated far more than the change you are making. So, it is going to cut off the same people.

I raised a case with your department this year from Rosetown (and I'm sure your deputy is aware of it) where the family farms one section of land. With the necessary equipment their assets are classed as being worth something over \$400,000. The net income of that particular family was under \$4,000, it was almost impossible for them to support a son or a daughter going to university. Yet, on paper it looks like they are a wealthy family. The reply I received from your department was, if they have \$400,000 they can borrow the money. Well, perhaps they can, but they may have borrowed to almost their limit with the land borrowing. So it's a very real concern. I would hope that you would take a look at the agricultural sector and consider at least the inflation trends that have taken place.

I don't know whether you realize it but for those people to go out to buy a tractor to operate that farm, they probably have to spend \$45,000 as a minimum. That's not a big machine; that's just one machine, one of the many.

MR. McARTHUR: — I might say to the hon. member that I come from a farm myself, maintain very close contact with that farm and am quite aware of the expenses farmers are now incurring. And so, I think that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm afraid not, Mr. Chairman.

I should point out a couple of things. First of all, I should clarify that these asset calculations are net assets. Therefore, if one had a \$400,000 farm and had \$300,000 worth of outstanding mortgages or debts against that land, their net assets would be

\$100,000. So these are net figures and we net out the debts. That's one thing I wanted to clarify. The second thing is that, while we must recognize (and I agree and that's one of the reasons why we're making these changes) there are special problems with the farm community. I don't think we really can make a special provision for farm people separate from non-farm people. I think that would be a difficulty.

I think we must recognize the assets of all people on an equal basis and make our calculations on that basis. And so an implement dealer with \$300,000 worth of assets should be treated on the same basis as a farmer with \$300,000 assets. Now, that is not to say we cannot have adjustments, so if that farmer earns less income off those assets than does an implement dealer on average, that wouldn't increase the eligibility of the farm youth for assistance. And that is essentially what we are trying to do with these changes.

MR. SWAN: — Yes, I agree you should try to treat everybody as equally as possible and that's why I am concerned about the capital asset route that you are using. I think if you were to go back to the income tax form and the net income, it's perhaps fair to all then. It's fair to the person who earns a wage; it's fair to the businessman; and it's also fair to the farm person. If you look at the net income, I believe you're looking at a very real figure for each and everyone. You can establish a figure, whether its \$10,000 or \$20,000 or whatever you think, but at least we'd treat all people equally.

So, I would hope you could proceed in that direction rather than this capital asset area, because often that does not translate into earned dollars.

MR. McARTHUR: — I might say to the hon. member that what we must try to achieve in any program based on income is an accurate reflection of income. That is what we've tried to do. However, before we had this particular requirement in terms of the contribution based on the asset value of the farm family. We were provided with (if you like) two options by the federal government. The other was to include depreciation as an expense, and we ran into all kinds of difficulties from farm people who objected to the difficulties in writing depreciation in as an expense. So we switched over to this option, which is an option provided under the program. It may be that after a year or two of experience with this we will have to have a harder look at it and further review it.

I should say also that the agreement with the federal government does restrict (I think rightfully) the methodology for calculating income. We cannot use the straight income tax calculation of net income for the obvious reason that there are parts of the tax system which provide special allowances, special credits, and other things of that sort, which tend to decrease the taxable income but are not in the true sense a full reflection of the income. And so, for that reason, there has been a requirement that income be calculated on a relatively standard basis, that is separated to a degree from some of the other objectives of the tax system in terms of special incentives which are provided within that. And so, therefore, it's not possible because of the nature of the program, because of the nature of the agreement, to have strictly the use of the income tax form as the basis of calculating income.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, trade schools, Kelsey, Moose Jaw and so forth, are playing a more important role in the community in training young people to earn their livelihood. It seems to me I keep hearing that you are cutting programs in Kelsey and so forth. Mr. Minister, what would be the reason for cutting programs at Kelsey and Moose Jaw?

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I should say first of all that I suppose to a certain degree in keeping with the urgings of the hon. members opposite (although we do this aside from the urgings of the hon. members opposite), we attempt, on a regular basis, to evaluate our programs against the need for those programs, in terms of the need for graduates from those programs as well as the interest by students or the demand on the part of students to participate in those programs. Now, we periodically do eliminate programs or reduce programs because perhaps we have identified less demand for graduates from those programs and, therefore, a need for fewer spaces in those programs. Periodically, we identify a change in the demand on the part of students attending those programs and make changes.

There are other cases where we actually plan to have a program in operation for a certain period of time, and we had a (I think the member for Kindersley's favourite term) sunset clause where we had planned that a program would fill a certain need for a period of time and then we would switch our priorities somewhere else. So what we go through is a process each year, with also a longer-term planning horizon, of trying to evaluate the appropriate priorities and within that, the appropriate use of our resources.

I might point out to the hon. member that we have had a very, very substantial growth in our vocational training institutes over the past few years; we foresee substantial growth into the future. I think the big challenge for us is going to be meeting the demand with the financial resources we have. We certainly do not have any intention or any plan for general or substantial reductions in programming within the technical institutes. Indeed within the general field of vocational technical training. I think it would be fair to say that our general plans are for a very substantial and continuing growth. Exactly how that's going to be covered, and the amount of financial resources we have, will depend upon the general financial position of the province and the priorities we can determine within that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, a program that people are demanding (or should I put it this way), a program where there is a waiting list, and jobs waiting for people who graduate, I think would be a program which would be of major concern for enlarging that area obviously. A program where there are fewer people wanting in is obviously a program you would sunset or close down. I think the way to judge that would be the number of people applying, the number who are graduating, how quickly they find jobs, and if they are taking jobs in the field they are trained for.

There was an article in the Star-Phoenix several weeks ago which made a reference to people taking trades at school where manpower was assisting them, and then suggesting they never worked in that occupation even though there was work. That kind of comment sort of hurts because that's not what the system is built for. My concern is, do you have any idea, or statistics which would indicate) the number of people for an example, taking a particular trade) how many find jobs in the province of Saskatchewan, how many go elsewhere, and how many leave that field they tried for?

MR. McARTHUR: — Yes, indeed we do, Mr. Chairman. I think we have a very, very sophisticated program of assessing applications, assessing job opportunities and assessing placements within those particular occupational fields.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the Saskatchewan Department of Continuing Education leads the field in this kind of work in Canada. I might point out to the hon. member that I do have a summary table here (if I understand the hon. member's

question) which indicates, for instance, the results of surveys for 1978-79 year which shows by program, the number of students we have surveyed, the number of responses we received back, because you're doing follow-up surveys and you don't get — it gives an indication of the number of students employed at the time of the survey, (which was three months after the end of the program) the number of students employed in training-related employment at the time of the survey, and the number employed in training-related employment in Saskatchewan. This deals with the questions. I would be quite happy to give the hon. member a copy of this document at this time.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, further to that, do you have anything that checks the number of people who want into this program, so you know if you're leaving enough space or if you have to increase that program?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, if I understand the question, it was the number of applications for programs, and the number of enrolments so you could then compare to employment follow-up? Is that correct?

MR. KATZMAN: — That's basically it, Mr. Minister. For an example, let's assume a young lad wants to become a mechanic. He can go to Kelsey or Moose Jaw to apply, and there is not sufficient space for him so he goes to Winnipeg to Red River College or to Mount Royal College in Calgary. So I'm asking, do we have enough space in our provincial places so we can educate the people who want to enrol, rather than sending them out of the province of Saskatchewan?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the number of programs is very large so it would be quite complicated for me verbally to answer the member's questions. If I could just send over to the hon. member, another document which contains descriptions of program — this one for Kelsey but I have them for all three institutes. I will send all three to you. The number of applications by program and the enrolment by program for the 1979-80 year.

Now I caution the hon. member that some of the applicants (some substantial number, I don't know the exact number) are turned down because they don't meet the entrance requirements. That's a normal part of qualifying people to enter. In addition there are some who are turned down simply because it is true we cannot accommodate all of the applicants. I don't have the breakdown of that but I do have here for you the breakdown between applications and enrolments.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, the other obvious part of the question is (maybe you have statistics for this one too), how many people pay their own way through and how many are assisted by Canada Manpower? I understand Canada Manpower people get first chance at getting into the schools.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not able to put my finger on the exact statistics in this regard, but may I just try to answer the hon. member's question by indicating first of all, that we have a certain number of spaces, particularly in the one-year industrial programs, which are purchased by Canada Manpower. They make an arrangement to purchase those spaces and then we have an agreement with them through which people who go through a certain selection process can be enrolled in those purchased spaces. I believe in some of the one year or shorter industrial programs, Canada Manpower in some programs may purchase up to 40 per cent of the spaces.

That is an extension of the general program that developed some 10 years ago or more,

I guess. It was a federal provincial program through which the institutes were partially constructed and were to meet certain industrial training needs. In return for that Canada Manpower agreed to purchase certain spaces as well as financing part of the capital cost and we agreed to make provision for those spaces.

The remainder of the spaces are then an open competition for fee-paying students, all of whom pay only the tuition fee (which is not a very substantial part of the total cost of operating the program, I might add). But they do pay the tuition fee. They are then eligible for the student loans and bursaries program for additional financial assistance to enter the programs.

I might point out also that for all of the two-year certificate programs there are no Canada Manpower purchased spaces in those and they are all fee-paying spaces in which students compete for places.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, let's deal with auto mechanics. Let's pick a trade. I think it takes several years. They go out and work part of it in the industry; they take school for so long and then work in the industry. Using that one as an example, could you pull the figures on it? Is it called MVMR? We're trying to pick it off the list here.

MR. McARTHUR: — I think, if we're reading you correctly, that's correct (if you are dealing with the apprenticeship programs, which I believe you may be dealing with. O.K., in that particular program, the apprenticeship programs are not full year programs. The time spent is 6 to 8 weeks on the average per year in the institute-based part of the training program. All of those spaces are covered by Canada Manpower for the apprenticeship program. Now I point out to you there are many other programs besides the apprenticeship program, even within the industrial component of our program.

MR. KATZMAN: — What I can't understand is when somebody is refused entry to that particular program in Saskatchewan. I know of two cases in particular which I'm going to refer to. One of them went to Manitoba and one went to Calgary; they started in the programs in those provinces. Therefore they got into the Saskatchewan program but you had no room for them in the Saskatchewan program to start with. Now how do you work that? They paid for their way into Red Deer College in Winnipeg. Then they dropped out of there after, I believe, a year, and came back and got into our program. Yet you refused them originally because they had not been out of school long enough.

MR. McARTHUR: — I think we're mixing apples and oranges. Maybe I should make an attempt to clarify. We have, Mr. Chairman, within this motor vehicle repair program, which you're speaking of, the apprenticeship program, first of all. That's the eight week per year training within the institute. The students are not selected by Manpower or by us for participation in that program. They are selected as apprentices through the program that's operated under the apprenticeship program. Then they are taken into our program and will receive their institute-based training at our institutes.

Now, in addition to that, in the motor vehicle repair area, as well as in a number of other areas, we have what are called one year pre-employment training programs. In those particular programs, students must make application as fee-paying students or they can be sponsored by Manpower. If they are sponsored by Manpower, they must be out of

school for a year. So the particular type of student you are referring to, if I get your question correctly, would be in the pre-employment program, would be participating in a Manpower-purchased space. Therefore, the requirements would be to be out of school for a year.

We do not for the fee-paying, the ordinary fee-paying, student make that requirement. So it could not apply to the ordinary fee-paying student. I think that's, in summary, what the situation would be with that particular student.

MR. KATZMAN: — The individual was informed, when he went to the pre-employment (I guess is what we're talking about now) that first of all the only spaces that were available were through Manpower and he couldn't pay his own way in Kelsey. But the moment he had had a year elsewhere, they let him back in the program. He bought his way in in Winnipeg and paid his way for a year there, then he came back and got into our program here. But he was refused here in the first place. That's the concern I have.

MR. McARTHUR: — I think we'd have to get the details of the particular student. But the picture I can put together from the student you are referring to is that the student made application for the pre-employment program as a fee-paying student. He was not accepted because there were not sufficient spaces. That student then perhaps went to Manitoba where he found an institute that had a space, took a one year pre-employment program, then perhaps returned to Saskatchewan, was accepted into the apprenticeship program, at which time the student would be able to take the remainder of the training as an apprentice at our institute as an apprentice student.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, he couldn't even get into the apprentice program in Saskatchewan, and he had a sponsoring firm that was willing to take him in. The school kept saying we don't have room. There are conflicting stories here. That's what I'm trying to understand, why that would happen.

MR. McARTHUR: — I think that as far as the student not being accepted, even though the student had a sponsoring employer into the apprenticeship program, it would have nothing to do with the question of our saying there is space or there is not space. That would be a decision which would be made with the appropriate board structure within the Department of Labour, and a question that would have to be directed to the Minister of Labour because our responsibility we very clearly define as being in the training area. We do not step into the determination of requirements or acceptability or anything else for a person into an apprenticeship arrangement. Therefore, they must meet the requirements for apprenticeship through the apprenticeship structure. Having met those requirements, then we don't deny them any training. They have the automatic right to the training and will receive that training.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Minister, I'm going to ask you a series of very quick questions. I hope I won't get into a long discussion, so if you could give me some quick replies.

First of all, how many apprentices can you put through STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute) in the motor vehicle repair program?

MR. McARTHUR: — Two hundred and seven went through in the last fiscal year for which we have figures, 1978-79. Excuse me, at Kelsey, you asked, was it? STI? That's correct — 207 at STI and 205 at Kelsey.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, why in 1979-80 did you only have 97 and 48 respectively?

MR. McARTHUR: — Well again, we're mixing apples and oranges. That would be the one-year pre-employment program, for which you have the figures. The parallel figures would be the apprenticeship programs.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — They're not listed here then? All right. The figures you gave, are they the maximum? The maximum you can put through?

MR. McARTHUR: — I gave the actual enrolment, and I believe in that program the actual enrolment is very close to capacity, so approximately, yes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Has the program changed at all in the last few years, the apprenticeship program?

MR. McARTHUR: — In particular, the motor vehicle . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm referring to the MVMR apprenticeship program. Has it changed much in the last few years as to the kind of program being taught?

MR. McARTHUR: — You mean has it changed in terms of numbers, or the nature of the program?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The nature of the program.

MR. McARTHUR: — The trade advisory boards, which advise on these programs, review them constantly and regularly. We make changes in those programs each year as is deemed appropriate; we make incremental or other changes as recommended to us and that we find are deemed advisable.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — What I remember of the apprenticeship program is the general apprenticeship. In other words, they had to learn everything about an automobile as a mechanic. Has no representation been made to you to move into the specialized area, by the motor dealers' association or other groups?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the trade advisory boards deal with this matter as set up under the apprenticeship boards. As far as we are aware, there are regular discussions about further specialization within these programs. It seems, when you look at the area of vocational training, the trend is toward specialization and that raises some concerns for us as well. In many of these areas, there are pressures for getting a further degree of specialization. My understanding is that, with respect to this program, the trade advisory board has not recommended we break down this program into further levels of specialization at this time.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You might check it, Mr. Minister. I've been out of the business for some time, but there was a time when the dealers would have approved of a specialty training program for mechanics. As you know, the automobile is becoming highly technical and the automotive trade is becoming highly specialized — automatic transmissions, engines, whatever — and they were looking for that kind of specialization at one time. Now this may have changed for the motor dealers' association, but I think you might be wise or it might be to your advantage to check on it.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I will check further into the actual recommendations which have been made, and indeed I will undertake to make available to the hon. member whatever information I have. I won't be able to do that

immediately but I will . . .

MR. TAYLOR: — While we are talking about the technical institutes, I note a statement by your deputy minister, Dr. Guy, who said that by '85 we are going to need 4,700 more skilled tradesmen than are presently in training. My question is, is this going to require an expansion in the technical institutes in the province to meet the need Dr. Guy foresees?

MR. McARTHUR: — We are constantly involved in trying to predict what will be the expectation and need for trained people in the vocational field. One of the things we are clearly noting, and it is reflected in the statement of Dr. Guy you have quoted, is a very, very rapid growth and demand for skilled people in the vocational areas. I think that, while we haven't answered all of the questions about how to meet this very rapidly escalating demand, in some sense our target would be to try to head in that direction. We've got some questions that we still need to answer.

I think it is clear that if we are going to meet that need, we are probably going to have to look to some refinement in the way we provide training and probably to some forms of decentralization that will allow more people to be trained at their place of residence or in association with their place of work. That is something we are engaged in assessing at the present time. I have distributed to interested parties — community colleges, technical institutes, employers, union organizations and so on — some discussion documents centering on that very question. So I think it would be fair to say that is the recognized need.

The challenge for us is to try to organize some cost-efficient way to try to meet that need within reason. And I might say also, recognizing this trend toward specialization, I believe that we can't totally legitimize the suggestion that every type of occupation, defined in a very specialized way, justifies a special training program. I think we must recognize we are still educating as well as training. There may be some level of generality in training in education within the vocational training area as well that adequately prepares an employee for entry into the work force. There is some responsibility on the part of the employer to further refine that person's skills and abilities in terms of the very highly specialized needs of that employer.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Minister, surely if Dr. Guy has been able to gather these figures of 4,700, he didn't pluck them out of here or there. I respect his research and I accept the figure of 4,700 as being a correct figure. Therefore you must have some idea if you know there are 4,700 of them; are there 4,700 bricklayers? You know, you must have some idea, Mr. Minister, of what fields these skills will be needed in. If you know that, if you know there are 4,700, then you must know what fields. If you know what fields, then you must know what demands this is going to place upon your program and your offerings at this point in time. My question was, were do you see expansion? Do you see that you are going to have to expand in Kelsey? Are you going to have to introduce new programs? What are these 4,700 skilled tradesmen? Are there new things?

We are into a whole new era in communications, Mr. Minister. As you well know, the pace of the communications technology and hardware is expanding at a galloping rate. Is this a field that you would be looking at? I would be interested in knowing what areas you think you may have to expand, and to make it precise, what institutes you may be looking at expanding in? We'll follow on with the line of questioning on this.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, one of the things about public servants and research people is that they are engaged in an exact science and we poor souls in politics are engaged in an inexact science, so we deal in a little different level of specifics I suppose. But I want to say it is the responsibility of our public servants to try to define as precisely as they can what our needs might be. One can never be 100 per cent certain and you can't base everything on what is the best attempt possible. You must retain some flexibility as you move along.

But what our department, under the direction of Dr. Guy, has attempted to do, is get the best picture possible of what some of the needs are going to be as expressed by employers at this time. It is based on their predictions over the next five years within the currently defined occupational areas with some expansion into areas we are recognizing as new legitimate occupational areas. What we are doing is trying to work up a program of expansion of these programs which will meet these needs as closely as possible, within the limits of predictability that are possible at this time.

We have started on the process now and not just in terms of expanding the existing institutes. I point out to the hon. member that we have announced a \$5 million expansion plan for the technical institute at Moose Jaw. The hon. member for Moose Jaw North is expressing considerable pleasure, but not total pleasure of that program; he feels perhaps we should even do more at Moose Jaw; that's fair enough. But we have announced a major expansion program at Moose Jaw.

We've announced in this year's budget a less substantial program at Wascana in terms of facilities. I might point out to the hon. member that in terms of Kelsey, we have the capacity to expand in terms of physical plant, the capacity to expand somewhat, so we're not facing that constraint there. What we will be doing as part of this expansion plan is looking at the expansion of training programs we can provide in those institutes to meet the needs.

In addition we are looking at utilizing existing facilities (some of the comprehensive high schools that we've built around the province have very sophisticated vocational training facilities). We are looking at ways of tying together the community colleges with those facilities and with those school boards to provide a greater degree of training in those centres. We have not been able to work out all of that in total at the present time. We're still in the important early stages of planning and developing the program.

I would point out (the hon. member for Rosthern would be interested in this since he was concerned about the programs within the institutes) that this year we have created six new programs within our institutes and have a major expansion in Saskatoon of another, the office education program. We have a new day care worker program for instance; we have a new telecommunications technician program which was perhaps the program being referred to. We have a number of other new programs coming in.

We will continue to add programs over the next five years to pick up some of the occupational areas that we are not currently meeting. So it's partially new programs, but to a considerable extent, it's expanding the capacities of the existing programs. It's partially using existing institutes. It's partially spreading out around the province and finding new cost-efficient ways of providing the instruction at decentralized locations.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I'm very pleased to hear about the use of the comprehensive high schools because I think that was a suggestion I brought up last

year with the minister at that time if you check Hansard. Probably some of your officials were listening and took my good advice.

I notice in your budget (and I think this is the right way to be looking) there was a lot of money allocated for native education. And I think that in the technical schools some of the courses are the types of courses native students could profit from.

I am not criticizing your expanding in Moose Jaw and I'm sure the member for Moose Jaw North is very happy and rightly should be. But a large proportion of the native population, the urban natives, live right here in the city of Regina. And I was just wondering if you've thought of some methods of developing technical courses that would help these people fit into the mainstream of our economic life.

While I'm on the topic, I'm going to offer a suggestion to you, Mr. Minister, and perhaps this could be something which you could consider. That is, I believe the community college is certainly a way to bring this about. I agree with that concept. One could bring, say, a number of short courses in through the community college and a person could take some time off work. I am thinking of native people.

The other thing is facilities are very expensive for us to expand, as you well know. I am thinking of Regina here and looking at what is happening in the core area where some schools, I understand, are down to very few students (80, 85 students or something of this nature) and may be in danger of closing. I wonder if your department has looked at the utilization of these facilities as a method for community college or technical instruction for the urban native population here in the city of Regina. Have you given any thought to this sort of thing? To me it seems a feasible type of suggestion. I have talked to some native people about this. They seem to think it has potential. How are you looking at upgrading the skills of the urban native who, I would say, is beyond the high school age or not attending high school?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, this is very much a group which we are involved in developing programs for at the present time. I think, (as the hon. member will recall) both the Minister of Finance in his budget speech, and I in my contribution to the budget debate, outlined an undertaking to advance our training programs directed specifically to the needs of native people. I should point out to the hon. member, first of all, before I talk about the new initiatives in this area that, at the current time, we do have quite a substantial number of programs offered for native people which operate just very much on the principle which the hon. member has indicated.

The NRIM (Non-Registered Indian and Metis) program is a program which operates through the community colleges. The community colleges organize training programs (many of which are vocationally related) for native people. Those programs tend to be offered in the community. A substantial number of them are offered within schools, in terms of using facilities within the schools, within our urban centres. And so we are making use of the existing facilities to some degree.

I can report to the hon. member the enrolment in 1978-79 in the NRIM program, which I mentioned, was very close to 3,000 students, of which approximately 2,000 were in skill and trades training. Another 182 were in our universities or the private trade schools and 640 were taking an adult basic education program.

We are now looking at further extending our capacity to meet the needs of native people for vocationally-oriented training by going into a new program that is going to

very much integrate, if you like, the capacity to utilize our training facilities and our community colleges to organize training and the capacity to bring together the employer with the rest of that process, as well as the native organizations in terms of identifying students into a full stream of educational and training opportunities. That will realize as the end point, the placement of the person into a job situation where a considerable amount of the training takes place right on the job. So we will be looking at building up a process of identification of potential clients, a process of working with those people to identify what they see as their interests, their needs and the types of things they would like to pursue, then putting together an integrated program of training, counselling, and of on-the-job work environment activity which will result in those persons being in a position to take advantage of a job in the kind of occupation they are looking at, and indeed to be placed by an employer into a job.

As part of that we are looking at some new techniques in organizing programs. We're looking at modularizing our programs, breaking them up into component parts (what we call competency-based systems) which make it possible for the student to combine education or training and work in stages. This makes it possible for the student to leave the work force, take some training and return to the work force and so on, and also integrates the on-the-job experience with the training package itself — the more formalized training. You have a stream of training and work which leads to the student developing the competencies and skills required for that occupation.

We're really working on developing a program of this sort. We are now engaged in consultations with native organizations, employers, labour unions, and other to make this a co-operative arrangement such that we get full participation by all parties. I'm not able to give you the final details of the program as it will likely be worked out but that's the basic nature of the program.

MR. TAYLOR: — I raised in question period one day the limit on the enrolment of students in tourism and renewable resources technology at Kelsey Institute. I believe the quota has been cut down to about 27 students. The reason, I understand, is that jobs (although the government opposite says they are here) for students of TRR are not as plentiful in Saskatchewan as they have previously been.

The unfortunate part, as I find out from students in this regard, Mr. Minister, is that staff cuts are going to take place. When I first investigated this (it would have been about March, I believe), I was informed by some of the members that staff members were going to be cut. I hear, since that time though that because of seniority of some of the staff members, the cuts have changed and the students tell me they're pretty alarmed about this. They feel that some of the most competent instructors are going to be let go because they're lower on the totem pole. These students are looking at transferring out of the province, looking at the feasibility of this even though they're part way through their course.

Again, this hinges on something like the accounting topic we talked about a few minutes ago but I do think this is a serious thing. I realize sometimes there are quotas, and you have to cut the number of people who are in the program because there's no sense training them if they cannot get employment. That's letting them down. But it seems bad if we're losing our competent instructors and the program is maybe a bit in jeopardy because of this. Are you aware of the cuts which are taking place there, and have you been informed that the program may be suffering because of these staff cuts?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the particular program you refer to, I think, is a good example of a kind of challenge, as well as the way we accept that challenge, in terms of planning our programs within our technical institutes.

This program was established some years ago in order to meet the demand for people working in this whole area of forestry management, renewable resources management. At the time we established this program, the other provinces in western Canada did not provide such a program; we were the first to provide such a program. There was also quite a substantial demand both inside and outside Saskatchewan for graduates.

Since that time, the situation has changed considerably in terms of demand for graduates. We are finding that because of the fact that there are now new programs that have been mounted in other provinces, and also because we find that particularly the other western provinces and Ontario were employing fewer and fewer of these graduates, that the demand for graduates is not nearly as substantial as it was. So we have made a decision (in keeping with a rational process in setting priorities) to reduce the number of graduates coming out of this program. As a result of reducing the number of graduates, we have now cut the class from about 60 to 48 students. We feel that will more than adequately meet any foreseeable demand for students. As a result of reducing the number of students, the number of permanent teaching positions has been reduced from nine to seven. Now that's just an adjustment process which I think is important for any institution to go through when you recognize that the demand for the graduates has declined in the way it has in this program.

With respect to your comment about what the impact of the reduction in the two teaching positions has been on the quality of the teaching force, I am afraid that I

couldn't really make any kind of intelligent comment on that. I suppose that you are always going to be second guessed on whether or not some instructor who is unfortunate enough to be in this position was better than some other instructor who is not. I think all I can say is that our people do their very best to recognize the competency of the instructors but we also recognize the very, very important matter of seniority for staff people when you are reducing positions; I think there are prior rights which we must recognize in terms of seniority for staff people when making these changes and that's just something which any responsible employer should recognize.

MR. TAYLOR: — Well, my concern is that I had a number of students who were always vying to get into TRR. I don't know if there is something glamorous about that or whether all young boys want to be game wardens or park superintendents or what the benefits are to this thing. I can imagine some of them. It seems to me it would be a real shame if our Saskatchewan program in this did deteriorate because it is a popular program, and as I say I am disappointed to see there is the cutback at this time. I'll accept that perhaps it's necessary, but I think we want to keep a very viable program in there because I know in dealing with students it's a very popular one. I would like to see Saskatchewan continue to have a good program so that our graduates certainly get whatever jobs there are in this province in TRR, and in fact they may be able to pick up jobs in other provinces, because I think it satisfies the need of many boys and fulfils their dreams and aspirations of a glorious career or something which seems very appealing to them.

MR. McARTHUR: — I might say to the hon. member that I think I speak for the members of the department when I say this is one particular program that, in recognizing the decreased demand for graduates, it hurt a bit to have to make that recognition. Because it's a program of which our department has been proud, and of which Kelsey Institute has been proud. I think it has been a very good program. However, I think we do have to periodically recognize the facts of life and the facts of life are that there simply are not nearly the opportunities there once were for graduates and, therefore, I think we mislead graduates if we don't recognize that fact by reducing somewhat the size of the graduating classes. That's an adjustment which I think hurts a little bit in a program we are so proud of and which does have a bit of glamour to it I agree, both for the students and also for our institute. It always hurts a little bit to make that kind of change. I am assured by Mr. Gunn, the principal of Kelsey Institute who has joined us here, that he feels very proud of this staff and also feels that we will have a high quality staff for the program with seven remaining instructors (who are very good instructors) for those 48 students in the coming year.

MR. TAYLOR: — I certainly hope that this is true, and if it isn't I would urge the principal and the staff to make whatever changes are necessary to ensure that we continue to have a very fine TRR program at Kelsey to serve this province.

MR. SWAN: — I'd like to raise a question. I have had a number of letters from students telling me they are very concerned about your approach to the solution caused by the SGEA strike as it relates to the institute people. I would raise it in particular with relation to a number of the nurses who should have graduated at the end of June, but because of the strike have been delayed. They are going to now look at being in school through the month of July. It's been a fairly high cost to many of these people, not only in the tuition they have to pay, but the cost of maintaining a residence wherever they happen to be taking their course and the loss of job opportunity for the month of July. Now, in your news release you provided a little bit of relief. I think it came out to something like \$42. That's a very minimal assistance to these students. I would like to hear your

comments on that.

MR. McARTHUR: — First of all, may I say to the hon. member it is always unfortunate when you have a strike. It is most unfortunate, I suppose, for innocent third parties affected by the strike, but I think that is nevertheless one of the consequences of a free collective bargaining system which we must recognize and accept. It is just a regrettable but unavoidable consequence of a strike when a strike does result. So I certainly feel as badly as anyone else that we have inconvenienced and caused some hardships for certain students as a result of this.

Certainly we have in certain cases been forced to extend the program for those students in order to ensure they get a full quality program in accordance with the training requirements set out. The hon. member mentions the nurses as being the group particularly hardest hit, and that is correct. The nursing programs did have to be extended. I want to point out a couple of things to the hon. member.

First of all, we have been able to organize the extension of the program such that, it is my understanding, all nursing students will be able to sit for their exams in early August. One of our big worries was whether or not we would have to extend the programs to a point where they would miss those national exams (which we don't set) and as a consequence of that miss a whole year or part of a whole year of employment opportunity. We have been able to organize our programs such that that is not happening. So to the extent there is any loss of work, there could be some short-term loss of part-time summer employment; that would intervene between graduation date and exam date, although as to the full extent of that, I don't know. You would have to know the exact circumstances of the individual student to be able to answer that question and the degree of hardship created.

But recognizing there was some hardship created, and recognizing these were students in provincial government institutions, we have, as I announced earlier, introduced a program to alleviate and to assist students in their financial needs as a result of this circumstance.

So we have provided first of all a basic \$43 bursary that assists all the students. For those in the extended programs we have brought in an extension of the student loans and bursaries program. Those who are eligible for student loans and bursaries based on need were able to continue to get, on a prorated basis, that assistance for the extended period of their studies in order to cover the cost of living and so on. For those who weren't originally eligible in that way, we brought in a special provincially based, interest-free loan program that provides for loans that can cover those full costs for those who didn't qualify for the needs-based loans and bursaries. So these are steps we've taken.

We've processed those applications now and I think that's pretty well complete. The information I get is that while many students were suffering some anxiety before we were able to announce this program, generally they have found that this program, in conjunction with the way we have organized the extended training in order to meet the examine deadline, is providing a satisfactory solution to a difficult situation.

MR. SWAN: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think you are right in saying that many of them have seen a little of that anxiety removed. But I believe your government has gone very lightly on the money side of it. Think what it cost these young people to maintain residence through the time of the strike. You look at what it's going to cost them to maintain a

residence through the month of July now when they should have been out to work. It's a considerable cost and perhaps you can still remember student days a little bit. You're not that old. Many of these people are finding, indeed, that it is a real burden to them. And the ones who were making it on their own without student loans are finding that basically they have had to go to banks to borrow. And they are losing at least a full month's wages for the month of July.

You talk about part-time, but the people who I was mentioning could go on full-time employment immediately in July. A number of them had employment arranged for. In some cases, they will lose the opportunity for employment because it is necessary to fill those jobs and other people will be taking them.

So I wonder, could you not consider a bursary situation to assist these people rather than a loan? It was not their fault that the strike occurred. It was the Government of Saskatchewan which was not able to negotiate successfully. I believe the Government of Saskatchewan has a responsibility to these students far beyond forty-some dollars each. I'd like to know whether you can proceed to change that figure.

MR. McARTHUR: — I'd like to point out to the hon. member that the recognized cost for the assistance program, the \$42.50, was a basic payment made to all students whether or not they had extended programs or whatever. It was a payment essentially calculated in lieu of the tuition they would have paid for the period of the strike. That was essentially it.

But that wasn't the substantial part of the assistance. The substantial part of the assistance came through the bursaries and loans programs. I might point out to the hon. member that the rates we recognized for the bursaries and loans programs were the full level of the recognized rates that the federal government, at least the last time I met a Conservative minister, defended as being the appropriate rates to cover the cost of education across Canada and in some cases in much higher cost centres than Regina or Saskatoon. So we recognized those full costs.

In the case of a single student it is approximately \$325 a month to cover the costs of living. So we did make provision on that basis. We stuck with the principle of a combination of bursary and loans because that is the outstanding system as it currently exists. I was hoping; I am still hoping, to be able to convince the federal government that, indeed, the hon. member is right and we should be looking at a more general extension of the bursary program for students and that we would then be applying this principle to these kinds of programs as well.

However, I was extremely disappointed when the hon. member opposite threw a monkey wrench into my hopes that we would get unanimous consent with that kind of view (by proposing an amendment to a resolution introduced by one of the hon. members of this House suggesting we should have a bursary program). The hon. members opposite proposed an amendment suggesting that instead of an extended bursary program, we should have a loans program. That indicated we can't expect full support from all members of this House to a federal bursary program.

That's a little bit of an aside. I just pointed out to you that I agree the bursary principle is an important one and if we can get a basic change in the philosophy to student assistance, then we will be able to look at extending bursaries generally for these kinds of programs.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, it would be the first time ever than an amendment from this side went through if you were opposed to it. You seem to have a few more members than we do so I think that's a very weak excuse you're using — a very, very weak excuse.

And you're talking about federal funding. I was talking about strictly a provincial concern because the strike here was caused because the province of Saskatchewan could not negotiate with its own employees. It was not caused by the federal government. So when it comes time to pay the bill for these people, I don't think you necessarily should be running to the federal government for assistance. I think it is a Saskatchewan problem and you should deal with it locally as a Saskatchewan problem. You're putting a lot of money into other things. I think this is a very worthwhile cause for a lot of young people who have just begun on their life's journey to prepare themselves to be qualified and capable employees in our system. I believe you could spend your money very wisely assisting these young people.

I would definitely encourage you to still make that move, to supply a bursary for each of them which would cover that month of July they are going to have to continue on to further their education because of the disruption that occurred last fall. I would like your response strictly on a Saskatchewan basis; you don't have to talk to anyone except to the government here in Saskatchewan. I'm sure you can come up with some dollars to solve the problem of many of our young people.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point the hon. member is making. It was announced some time ago and the program has already been implemented. I think it would be very difficult now to change horses and go another route. One can always mount a criticism of any program I suppose, and the hon. member has mounted one from his point of view which is valid for this particular program. I think however, that we have put together this program; we indeed did do it from our own resources, we did not get any help from the federal government. Indeed the hon. member might remember the federal Conservative government even withdrew the Manpower living allowances those students needed to survive on during the strike. We didn't do that, instead we came in with financial support in this form to help them. It is the form that we have implemented and it is now really too late to make the kind of changes you are suggesting.

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Chairman, it seems like we're getting a little political here. I think it is time we got back to a bit of basic education in our discussion. I would like to assure you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . What are you saying about the truth, Henry? You know I tell the truth, Henry.

I would like to assure the minister the issue I want to raise now is certainly not, in the words of the Attorney General, a witch hunt at the psychology department at the University of Regina, but I think there are a few things here the members of this Assembly should know (and I don't think they do know). I refer to a letter you and I received from Dean Blachford regarding the famous Chinese comic book that is used in research class 830. I quote from the letter. The dean says 'The main aim of the class was to discover basic issues and trends in the graduate psychology production.' He goes on to state, 'There are 150 theses and they had to read six of them.'

I think you and I both know from days in graduate studies how interesting it is to read somebody's thesis. You look at a few of them to see the format of how you should be doing yours and then you go about it. He says:

The book is instructive from a methodological point of view and this is how it is used for the brief session.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to take a minute or two to read this little book to the members of this Assembly because I do think they should know what the contents are. This is graduate research, class 830 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry I can't give it in the original. The minister asked for the original and the reason he asked for that is because this book is printed in the People's Republic of China. Therefore I'll have to take the English version of it. It has quite a little heading here, it is: How the Foal Crossed the Stream. Remember this is from a methodological point of view. Some of you people who are ex-school teachers, watch for the importance of that. The book is illustrated very well. I took it home and my little boy, who is three, was quite taken with it and liked the pictures. Page 1 says this, and I'll just, with the indulgence of the House, take a minute or two to read through this research book in class 830.

There are a lot of big horses in a Chinese mountain village. They pull ploughs and carts for the people. This white mare has a foal and the foal follows his mother about all day long. One day, mare asked foal to take a bag of wheat to the mill for her. Foal comes to a swift stream. An old bull is eating grass by the stream. Foal asked him, do you think I can cross the stream, Uncle Bull? Bull replies, the water is shallow, just over my knucklebone. I know, because I crossed it yesterday. Foal is about to cross when a squirrel scampers up and calls to him, stop, the water is deep. A friend of mine was drowned in it yesterday.

Is bull right or is squirrel right? Foal can't decide. He runs back to ask mare. Why are you back? She asked. There's a stream in the way, explains foal. Uncle Bull says it's shallow enough to cross but squirrel says it isn't. He says the water is deep. Is the stream deep or is it shallow? Can you cross it or not? What do you think yourself? Asked mare. Foal shakes his head for he hasn't thought about it all.

Mare explains fondly, bull is tall and big, so of course the stream is shallow for him, but for little squirrel it's deep and can drown him. Each speaks for himself. What do you think? Foal understands now and prances away.

When foal reaches the stream, bull and squirrel are arguing. One is saying the stream is shallow and the other is saying it's deep. (Seems a little familiar). Each is convinced that he is right. Foal gets the idea and measures himself, first against the tall bull and then against the small squirrel. Let me try, he says. Foal crosses the stream easily. For him it is neither shallow nor deep. He is shorter than the bull but taller than the squirrel.

Foal delivers the wheat to the mill and goes home. Mare, his mother, says he's done the right thing. From then on, when foal does not know what to do he first asks others. Then he considers his own situation before having a try. This way he becomes more and more capable.

And that in its entirety is the saga of how foal cross the stream, something my mother taught me before I got to grade school. I would suggest all of the rest of you over there . . . I don't think, Mr. Minister, I want my tax dollars to pay for this kind of heavy work at a graduate 830 class. I say grade two, fine. Put it in there and let's have some decision-making at the grade two level, where it is appropriate. But for 830? I wanted the

members to know this. I know some of you haven't had the opportunity to see that. If you want to respond, Mr. Minister, fine. I'm just point it out as the type of situation . . . I don't believe it's a witch hunt.

I think the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know that sort of thing, and I don't think many of them would endorse that as the type of material they expect grad students, in whatever department, at the 830 graduate level to be studying.

MR. McARTHUR: — Well, I want to say I haven't developed nearly the insight into bull stories that the hon. members opposite obviously have. But I do want to say that the hon. member makes the point that he wishes the people of the province to know what's in this book or story book he's referring to. I say to the hon. member that I don't know the context within which that book forms part of the program within a particular class at the University of Regina. I have no idea, and I think it's incumbent upon us, if we wish to make any comment about the content of an academic program within the university, that we have a full grasp of what the academic context is within which that is presented.

However, I am not in a position to defend or to analyse or to do anything else with respect to the academic class for which that book may have at some point entered as some sort of material. I don't have any position from which I can judge that.

I want to say to the hon. member that I think there is, however, a larger point. I don't think the Attorney General or anyone else is making light of the importance of our universities, our university programs and our university finances, when he indicates, as I have indicated, that it is a fundamental principle of our academically-based university system that the university itself, as a self-governing institution, must take the responsibility. It has the capacity and information through which it can make judgments about the academic quality and nature of the programs offered within the university.

I am not going to come forward as the Minister of Continuing Education with any kind of criticism or anything else based on information I do not have. I do not intend to come forward and give any kind of impression of wishing to interfere with the academic content of any program within the university. They do have the responsibility; they do have their carefully guarded realm to work with. I hope no member of this House will ever urge a minister, regardless of what the complaints are with regard to the content of an academic program, that the minister should attempt to take any action.

As the hon. member knows, the University of Regina has indicated its capacity to examine what is happening within the psychology department by the announcement that it is setting up a special management arrangement for the psychology department in order to look not only into its rightful concerns with regard to the psychology department, but to better and more effectively manage that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, I think you recall my opening statement about wanting to look at some way of making these officials better known so people can have input through the channels that are there. My intention in reading this was to inform the members over there. I don't think many of them knew of it; I think they have every right to know about this type of thing. They make their own judgments as to whether that's the kind of content they want.

I've made my statements and I think we have a problem. I'm not urging you to go out there to conduct a witch hunt . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would you just be quiet for a minute, my friend? I said we want value for the educational dollar. I think there's a legitimate case there; I think you realize and can see now why students were quite upset about this type of situation.

I hope elected members on either side of the House take note of the content . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you don't think that's what you want, take the right channels and make these viewpoints known. I think that is a right people have.

With that, Mr. Minister, that's all I would have to say on this topic.

Items 2 to 5 agreed.

Item 6

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, we have been discussing community colleges and hoping there was some expansion in the urban native program. Here I see that the budget is down and the number of employees is down since last year. It dropped by two and there is \$20,000 less in the budget. How are you expanding when you're contracting on both staff and dollars?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, I should just point out something about the structure of the estimates that might help here. This particular item is for the administrative structure within the department that relates to the community colleges. It is not the subvote which contains the money through which the community colleges operate.

One of our original plans was, as the community colleges mature, we would withdraw the degree of administrative overlay which we provide at the departmental level and provide more independence and decentralization to the community colleges. That reduction simply reflects the fact that we have started a little bit of the decanting of the field services component of the departmental structure.

If you look to some of the other subvotes, including subvote 17 and including subvotes 22 and 23 you will find there where the funds which go for programming within the community colleges are located.

Item 6 agreed

Item 7

MR. TAYLOR: — I have a question. I see quite an expansion in personnel there. Is that within the department? You have six extra people. What are your plans for that expansion?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, that particular area indeed relates to this program I was mentioning earlier in terms of a new initiative to meet the training needs for native people. The growth of this particular subvote is primarily related to an addition of staff and other financial resources at the administrative level within the department to provide a support system for the development and operation of the new native training and job placement program, not for the training costs and that sort of thing themselves,

but for the administrative and training program development which will take place within the department itself.

MR. TAYLOR: — Fine. It would be interesting to note how many of those people would be natives.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, none of the people have yet been appointed and the positions have not yet been classified so I am not able to answer that question.

MR. TAYLOR: — Is it your intention to include some native people in those positions?

MR. McARTHUR: — Very much so — that would be my intent.

Item 7 agreed.

Item 8

MR. TAYLOR: — No permanent positions, but you have almost \$900,000 . . . Could you explain what that is?

MR. McARTHUR: — That's in one way, an interesting anomaly. At Prince Albert we have a vocational training institute (in a sense) which, particularly in the pre-employment area, provides training programs. However, the program is operated as a satellite of the community college there, and so the employees and all that sort of thing are actually carried by the community college. We simply make this payment through to the community college to operate that program.

Item 8 agreed.

Items 9 and 10 agreed.

Item 11

MR. TAYLOR: — I know that some of the staff reduction here is in TRR. What other programs have staff cutbacks that would account for . . .

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, there were three programs affected by analysis that indicated a decreasing demand for graduates. One of our predictions or analyses turned out to be somewhat less than reliable and so there is a change from what was presented in the estimates. But originally three programs were slated for some reduction in teaching staff because of the reduction in enrolments; a social service worker program, the renewable resources program and a personal development worker program.

Since that time, Mr. Chairman, we have reassessed the personal development worker program based on representations made to us by schools and developmental centres, and so on, who have indicated that even though the personal development worker program may not have been resulting in people being employed in the fields which were originally envisaged for that area that there is a very important need for graduates from this program. So we have now made a decision to reinstate that program and there will not be the full reduction indicated.

Item 11 agreed.

Item 12 agreed.

Item 13

MR. TAYLOR: — One moment there. You phased that out, the two people who were there. What should they do? Why is there still \$30,000?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the science policy secretariat was an agency established three or four years ago within the provincial government to do research, planning and advisory work with respect to science policy within the government. Based upon a review undertaken over a year ago, it was decided the program had not essentially worked as effectively as we had hoped or anticipated. A decision was made to phase down the program, and that is the reason why you see the drop down to essentially no employees.

However we also have a body that worked in association with this secretariat which was the Science Council of Saskatchewan, an advisory council of the lay people, university people, and so on. That council still remains in existence, and one of the functions of the secretariat was to provide some support work for the science council itself. The \$30,000 will remain there in order to provide some staff support services to the science council which it can engage on its own through that budget. We are currently (I might say) reviewing that whole area. I now have a study underway of that whole area of science policy and the way we could most appropriately handle that science policy. I hope within the next 12 months to have a decision about the direction we should go in this area.

Item 13 agreed.

Items 14 to 20 agreed.

Item 21

MR. TAYLOR: — What's the reason for the increase in that, Mr. Minister? There is a considerable increase there.

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the reason for the very substantial increase in grant (and it is very substantial) is that I think, very appropriately in this our Celebrate Saskatchewan year, we have recognized that perhaps we need to put an additional effort into the preservation of historical records and documents and particularly original documents that are available around the province. We also need to do a better job of preserving what we do now have.

As a result of that, we decided to place some considerable priority on the archives program and to up the base budget of the archives quite considerably in order to assist in increasing our ability and capacity for the preservation of historical documents. I think we have an excellent archives in this province; it has an enviable reputation all across the country. I feel their work and the demand for things to be done clearly justifies this increase. That's the basic increase; we're going to greatly strengthen the program carried out by the archives.

MR. TAYLOR: — I would agree with you that this is an important expenditure this year and any year, for that matter. You have a number of dollars here. Is that in personnel; are

you expanding the staff by a considerable amount? With this thrust do you envisage the need for an extension? Are we going to be able to hold all these documents or does it look down the road that we're going to have to build an archives building?

MR. McARTHUR: — First of all, I think there's going to be a staff expansion in the archives because the workload to do the job well is fairly staff intensive. We feel that in order to meet the demands and meet the needs, we should have an expansion of staff. We'll probably be expanding by four or five people the staff component alone.

In addition to that, there are many new techniques of recording and preservation that are developing. Some of these are somewhat expensive, but have proved up to be very, very effective and efficient ways of preserving documents, and so we will be spending a fair amount of money on new processes and new equipment.

I might say that none of this money is directed toward anything to do with the physical storage of archives materials, but I will tell the hon. member that we also have that particular question under review, because clearly with the growth in materials, there probably will, at some point, be a need for additional storage capacity within the archives.

Item 21 agreed.

Item 22 agreed.

Item 23

MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Minister, is that where some of the money is for native education?

MR. McARTHUR: — That is right. Some substantial amount of the money would be required for the purposes both of purchasing training out of our institutes and community colleges and so on, and also for possible wage subsidies to employers who agree to participate under contract and training-on-the-job programs as part of this overall program; both of those kinds of payments would be covered under this particular subvote.

Item 23 agreed.

Item 24

MR. TAYLOR: — After all this discussion on student aids and bursaries and so on, how can you justify cutting the Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund?

MR. McARTHUR: — Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund is an independent account or fund (independent I say of the estimates). What we do is supplement or put money into that fund periodically as needs develop.

At the present time, or I should say at the end of the 1979 fiscal year, because of the accumulation of funds that were unused over a period of time and the build-up of interest in those funds and so on, we have \$9 million cash assets in the student aid fund. So what we are doing is supplementing that \$9 million with another \$5 million to bump the fund up, which will bring the total amount of financial resources in the fund to approximately \$14 million. Out of that we will be able to fully accommodate any of the demand for student assistance even if we do get agreement to make changes to the

criteria to expand the amount of money that we process. We are actually looking toward, if we possibly can, a 10 per cent increase in the actual amount of money disbursed to students through scholarships; loans and bursaries. So one must understand this is a replenishment grant that isn't tied in any direct way at all to the amount of money paid to students in the form of loans, bursaries and other forms of assistance.

Item 24 agreed.

Vote 5 agreed.

CONTINUING EDUCATION — HERITAGE FUND — VOTE 5

Item 1 and 2 agreed.

Vote 5 agreed.

CONTINUING EDUCATION — SUPPLEMENTARY — HERITAGE FUND — VOTE 5

Item 1 agreed.

Supplementaries Vote 5 agreed.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:09 p.m.