

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**March 1, 1983**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**HON. MR. SANDBERG:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the House, guests from Saskatoon and Toronto. They are representatives of Saskatoon Region Community College, with their supervisor, Robin Stonehouse, and also from Toronto, Darrell Nunn, the teacher chaperone from Seneca College in Toronto. So, we hope you enjoy your visit to the House this afternoon, and I would like to extend to them a great welcome on our behalf, and I will meet with them after question period.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Saskatchewan Government Insurance Layoffs**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As he envisions, my question is to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. Yesterday, Mr. Minister, you announced what must be the most extensive layoffs of any crown corporation in the history of this province, involving some 10 to 15 per cent of the workforce. Will the minister confirm that the entire safety section was eliminated in SGI?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the opposition woke up. In response to the member's question on the safety division, the functions of the safety division have been assumed by other people in other departments at SGI. There are several other provincial departments and agencies involved in traffic safety promotion and education, including the highway traffic board, the Department of Education and the Department of Highways. There were many areas of program duplication. We have eliminated those programs at SGI that were being carried out elsewhere. And, Mr. Speaker, as well, of the \$6 million that was spent by the provincial government in 1981 on safety, only \$400,000 of it was spent by SGI. As I said earlier, a safety function will be performed at SGI and carried out by the public affairs units. As well, SGI still supports the high school driver education through its premium tax.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, by way of background let me say, Mr. Minister, that if you really believe that you can eliminate the entire department . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Is the member on his feet to ask a supplementary question?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I should have stated, Mr. Speaker, that this was a new question. Mr. Minister, I would remind you by way of background that SGI played a role that the

highway traffic board didn't, in that it was involved with safety in all its aspects. The highway traffic board's role is much more limited. And I say to the minister, if you really believe that you can eliminate the entire department and not have any effect, you are the only person in Saskatchewan who does. My question is: how does the minister justify gutting the safety department, as you have, at a time when all members of your government are expressing increasing concern about the accident rate in Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am only repeating myself because I said it in my first reply to the member, that the safety function will be performed at SGI, and carried out by the public affairs unit.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — And will you confirm that they are expected to do so with no increase in staff?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member had been following the news report on the reorganization, the fact is that what we have done at SGI is completely reorganized the corporation. And in every case where we've had duplication we've merged some departments, we've reduced staff, and the concern that the member has is invalid as far as I'm concerned. As I said, we are still going to carry on the safety function.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. By way of background, I would remind the minister that during the decade of the '70s, the SGI grew from having about 60 per cent of the Saskatchewan market to having over 80 per cent. That didn't occur by chance. It occurred because SGI had a peculiar commitment to the public through such programs as the safety program, and had a commitment to its agents. And that leads me to my next question.

I understand that your training division in SGI has been gutted to the point where there is only one person left in the area of training. And I ask you how the agents, particularly the small offices and the rural agents, can expect to receive adequate training when your training department is a vestigial department?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, I can keep repeating myself all day, Mr. Speaker, and the same answer will always come out. As I've said, we've removed departments as such. We have merged them with others. I'm not exactly sure at this point where the training section actually went. I don't have the complete organizational chart with me. It would take me a couple of . . . I do have it as a matter of fact. It might take me a little while to look it up. But there has been merging of departments. Where we've removed a department, we've moved these people or some of them into others, and we've changed the functions. It's a reorganization.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that in 1978 there were 1,200 and some people at SGI. There has been no growth in SGI since that period of time in numbers of customers. We have today over 1,300 employees at SGI, more than they had at that time. The only reason they had growth in staff at SGI from that period to today was for their expansionary plans, a venturing out into other areas where they have no business venturing out into.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Thank you. What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we have

almost 100 people more today than we had at that point in time, and we will provide much better service to the people of Saskatchewan than what has ever been provided, simply because we are going to direct our attention to the *raison d'être* of SGI, why it was there, why it was structured in the first place, and that is the intention of the new organization.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister doesn't know where the training section went, let me be of some assistance to you. I can tell you where it has gone. I refer to an article in the *Leader-Post* and the headline says it all: "Private firms stand to gain from new SGI philosophy." I'll tell you where it's gone, Mr. Minister. They are going to be hiring the same sort of services from the consulting, and it is bound to cost you more. My question is: are you telling this House that you can go outside SGI, hire consulting services, and bring them in and do it at a smaller cost than you can do it in-house? Is that what you are asking us to believe?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, yes, as a matter of fact that brings up an excellent point, and certainly in some areas there is cheaper . . . much less cost to hiring from outside than it is from within, and having a built-in organization — not to say, and again I repeat, not to say that we aren't going to be doing some of it.

There is an association in Saskatchewan that does as well training of agents and training of other people, and as a matter of fact we intend to provide better training for adjusters and claims personnel than what has been provided in the past. Some of it, yes, may be done through the private sector.

The same thing applies to the corporate services in the corporate field. We had 12 lawyers at SGI; we're down to nine. We may even be reducing that slightly, I don't know at this point in time, but not by much at this point, and only through attrition, by the way. The fact is that it's cheaper for us to hire . . . (inaudible) . . . services, legal services in this case, than it is to have them on staff to the extent that we had them on staff . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Minister. Since you raised the area of litigation, something I know something about, let me ask you if you seriously believe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . By way of background, let me say that there isn't anyone who's familiar with the field of litigation who believes that you can do routine litigation cheaper through the private bar than you can through an in-house lawyer. There isn't anybody who's familiar with the area who really believes that. Surely, Mr. Minister, and this is my question, surely this is just good old-fashioned patronage. You want to reward your friends in the bar who have rewarded you. Surely, that's all this is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Well, to answer the member's question on the legal services which was the last one he put to me, Mr. Speaker, let me advise the hon. member that prior to the reorganization at SGI there were two legal departments. They have now been merged into one and the staff has been reduced from 12 to nine. And, I will again advise the opposition and this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation will look outside the organization for legal assistance, just as it has been doing for the past number of years. As a matter of fact it has been going on, not only what we're bringing in, but from your administration as well. You were doing some of it as well.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. Your balance sheets don't show that

your corporate people made money because your balance sheets aren't set up in that fashion. But your balance sheets are set up in a fashion that they show your salvage division made money. I note from the list of people who are fired that you've gutted the salvage division as well. And, I say to you again, Mr. Minister, surely that's just good, old-fashioned patronage. There can be no other excuse for having eliminated most of the salvage division.

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I don't know where the hon. member has been, Mr. Speaker, or what he's been reading. There are somewhere between 150 and 200 employees, and I'm not exactly sure of the exact numbers — I would call it about 165 employees in the salvage division. Show me. Show me where we have gutted the salvage division and removed those people. And as I understand your term of "gutting," we've thrown it out. We've removed some people, of course. We've trimmed the fat all the way through the organization. We still have more people than what we had back, and I'm referring to 1978, prior to their moving the growth to take care of the new programs they wanted to come in. Mr. Speaker, we are going to run a more efficient corporation than what they have ever run, and their record will show the kind of efficiency they had in the operation, losing 50 some million dollars on two statements. We don't intend to do that, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. Will he confirm that yesterday's firings wipe out the licence renewal personnel in Estevan, and in Weyburn, and in North Battleford and in Swift Current?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — If you want me to look it up, I could check it out, Mr. Speaker. No, I will not confirm it at this point because I simply don't know. I have gone through the list. I have it here and I can check it out. I will take notice of that question because I'm not sure that we have removed any or all. I'll have to take notice of that question.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Minister. Your list will show licence clerks — one, two, three and four and four issuers at Estevan, Weyburn, North Battleford, Swift Current — Estevan, Weyburn, North Battleford and Swift Current. I wonder if the minister would check and confirm that he is, in fact dismantling the renewal offices at Estevan, Weyburn, North Battleford, and Swift Current?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that until I have more evidence of what the hon. member is indicating. And, where are you looking, if I might ask the question, because I don't see what you're talking about? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I haven't got that information.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. I am looking casually at your list, and I certainly don't have a full list. And I note that seven positions at North Battleford have been eliminated, and I suspect more since some of them are not identified. Would the minister confirm how many positions at North Battleford have been eliminated? How many SGI jobs at North Battleford are gone?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of that question as well. I will say though, that if you're looking at the in-scope list, that the — and I'm not sure that he is — but if he is looking at the in-scope it's a matter of seniority as to who is bumping who. We've laid off those with the least seniority.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, I wasn't asking at that point, who had been laid off, but what jobs had been eliminated? I say to you that the jobs of licence clerks and licence issuers at North Battleford and Estevan and Weyburn and Swift Current had been eliminated. I ask you to confirm that or deny it, and if you're not able to do so, I ask you to do it later.

I ask you now to tell me how much money was being spent on traffic safety promotion and education by the Government of Saskatchewan, which you felt was wasted. How much extra money was your government spending on traffic safety, promotion and education which you are slashing by this move?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — I replied to that question earlier, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have the figures for 1982. I gave you the ones for 1981. They were the latest figures that I have, and the Government of Saskatchewan in 1981 spent \$6 million, of which \$400,000 was spent by SGI, of which most of that will be eliminated since it was redundant, since it was duplication of what was being done by other departments, which was a waste of money. If you don't call duplication a waste of money, I don't know what you would call it.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, the minister has confirmed that \$6 million is too much to spend on traffic safety promotion and education, and therefore . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Minister, is it not true that you eliminated the money and did not put the money into other areas of safety promotion and education, if, as you say, there was needless duplication? You didn't use the money to expand the program or reinforce it. You slashed it. Isn't that true?

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, what I have said to the hon. member is that we have removed the amount that was duplication of other areas. If the Leader of the Opposition does not understand the meaning of the word duplication, I can't help him. They were programs that were being implemented or being used or being provided by other departments, and there was no need of having duplication.

I did not, as the member indicated, say that \$6 million was too much money. I didn't say that. No; I said that \$6 million was spent, and if the program of safety is being duplicated and only really \$3 million is being provided, as an example, what's the point of spending another 3 million? In our case it was \$400,000. We are still spending some of it, but it has been merged with another department.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — A question to the Premier. We're having a very difficult time finding out exactly what's going on in SGI. What I would like to ask the Premier is whether he knows whether the licensing renewal office in Estevan has been closed or not.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I believe the minister has taken note of the question, and he can respond. I'll take note too, if you like.

### **Bulk Price of Farm Diesel Fuel**

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier. On April 26 last year, the price of farm diesel fuel was 29.5 cents a litre, or \$1.34 a gallon, as most of us would understand a little better. Tonight at midnight the price will increase once again, and tomorrow the price of farm diesel fuel will be 36.2 cents a litre, \$1.65 a gallon. That's 23 per cent increase in bulk price of farm diesel fuel in just 10 months. My question is this: what will be in your government's March budget to cut the cost of diesel fuel for farmers?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of observations. The first is that it was the rural population in the province of Saskatchewan who asked the new government to take the tax off gasoline. Rural Saskatchewan asked for that because people in rural Saskatchewan drive most to curling rinks and to schools, and there are school bus divisions and so forth.

Second, with respect to diesel fuel, that is a federal tax and not a provincial tax. Now, if you are suggesting that we subsidize the farmer so that the federal government can come in and tax and tax and tax and the Saskatchewan government subsidize that so it can be taken right back to Ottawa, I don't think you would find that very popular among taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, I would take some exception to the argument that we begin to subsidize so that Mr. Trudeau can pick up the tab or take that kind of money. There is no tax in the province of Saskatchewan; the tax you are talking about is federal. So let's make that very clear.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. I didn't ask about it being a federal tax. I'm aware of that; I'm aware of the tax. My question was: are you going to do anything in your budget to help the farmer? I can't help it if your new policy is that we have a love-in with the federal Liberals all of a sudden, with this government, that you want to get along with them, in the Minister of Finance's words, "We have to compromise and see it their way." My question is: what are you going to do to protect the farmer in the meantime? It's not my fault you couldn't negotiate a better deal.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, to adequately answer the question would take more time than there is in question period, but if the member will look back on April 26, and if he would look a week ago Monday, he would know that our farm policies and our farm programs, whether it's farm purchase programs dovetailed with the farm credit corporation, our natural gas distribution systems, the removal of tax that applies to all rural Saskatchewan . . . If he doesn't think that's popular, he should look back at April 26 and a week ago Monday, because it is very popular.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — If it wasn't for his party opposite, we wouldn't be facing these increases in Ottawa today. There was a handful . . . Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, he asked for it. There was a handful of members of parliament from the province of Saskatchewan who voted against the prime minister from the West, the minister of energy from the West, the minister of transport from the West, the minister of the wheat board from the West. Your party voted against them for what we have today, and we are receiving that today. So, that's where it belongs — not here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, he takes credit for our party defeating that government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order. Is the hon. member asking a supplementary? I would ask the hon. member to preface his comments by the type of question he's asking. If it's a new question, please say so.

**MR. ENGEL:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a new question. My question is this. You're saying that our party was responsible for defeating that wonderful Clark government. Who was responsible for electing the Liberal government is the real question. But the farmers in Saskatchewan were led to believe during the April campaign that they'd get a 40 cent discount on their purple and their diesel fuel. They really did. They lost a \$65 million advantage over their city cousins. You're a farmer; you have a quota book. You tell everybody that. The farmers expect you to do something for them. They want at least that \$65 million back that they had before . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! This is not a debating period, but when members ask questions in a debating form, they're going to get answers in the same way. I think today's question period has been a perfect example of that from both sides of the House. So I would ask members to ask succinct questions and you will likely get that type of answer.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Two quick observations. Number one, if anybody misled the public it was members opposite about the gas tax removal. We said clearly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not on diesel fuel.

The saving in Saskatchewan is now over \$1 per gallon, compared to, say, the province of Quebec, Quebec city, Montreal. Number two, about 70,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan . . . I believe you'll find there's 55,000 automobiles (ball-park) in rural Saskatchewan. And those people are the ones that initiated the idea with us to give them a break. They have received that benefit far more, in a comparative sense, because they travel to and from places 30, 40, 50 miles at a crack. So in terms of the benefit applied all over the province of Saskatchewan, rural people are delighted. We said if there was some provincial tax on diesel fuel, we'd take it off. But there isn't.

And finally, I want to find out, does the member say, is he asking us to raise taxes so that we can subsidize Mr. Trudeau and his increased taxation on rural farms? What was he asking for? Because we're not prepared to do that.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

### Return No. 1

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Yew that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 1 showing:

With respect to construction projects in northern Saskatchewan announced in the Legislature in March, 1982, including the DeTox Centre and the Crisis Centre in La Loche, the Training Centre and the Crisis Centre in La Ronge, the Dillon Road, the Beauval-Pinehouse Road, the Cumberland Weir, and construction on highways 102, 106 and 155: (1) for each project, whether approval has been given to proceed; (2) for each project, whether tenders have been called; (3) for each project, the amount of the provincial grant which has been offered; (4) the formula used as the basis for the calculation of the provincial grant.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Are we not going to get answers to these questions, all of them? I'm not sure if the member can speak at all; I'm just curious if we're not going to get answers.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I can give the House an indication that what we will be asking for is to stand those motions for return down to 14. Starting at 14 we will start indicating to the House that we would be prepared to accept that particular motion and to be providing to the House those particular questions. What I will be doing is asking simply to stand the questions from no. 6 through to no. 14; no. 14 will then start being ready and we will start providing that information to you and hope to have the rest of it available to you next week.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, on the motions that we are talking about, namely from 6 to 14, I think there has been plenty of time, plenty of time for the ministers to get an answer to these questions. This has been going on for a long time. I believe since June in some instances. For example, the questions being referred to here — I would like to use one that was proposed under my name, no 8, which asks with respect to the construction of special-care homes in Biggar.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! We are in fact beginning to debate. We were on no. 6 and now you're talking about no 8, and I don't think that the House can proceed in that fashion. If you want to debate, then we're going to have to go back to no. 6 and deal with no. 6 and then proceed. No. 6 was called and we'll have to come to a solution of how we dispose of it.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I thought that we were dealing with the motion that we deal with the resolutions from 6 to 14.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I believe that was a suggestion by the Minister of Finance and he did not have leave to proceed. Can we come back then, to return no. 6? Return no. 6, stand?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I just want to be clear that we have the commitment from the minister that he will be providing either answers to these, or amendments to them, or passing them next week. If we had that assurance, I think the opposition wouldn't be as alarmed as we are. So do we have a commitment that you're going to deal with these next week, either by passing them or rejecting them.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — For, say, a specific response, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you have a question period type thing, but with regard to motion no. 6, I am of the view from the procedural people that that particular answer will be ready next Tuesday.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I'm asking the House what your pleasure is in dealing with this. Is it to be stood or are you going to debate it or what is the process?



**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would ask that we stand this particular motion with that undertaking to you. If not, we can simply adjourn the debate on it.

Stood.

## Return No. 2

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lingenfelter that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 2 showing:

With respect to the hospital construction projects at Lloydminster, Yorkton, Cutknife, Melfort, Nipawin, Maidstone, Indian Head, Davidson, Regina and Saskatoon announced in the Legislature in March, 1982: (1) for each project, whether approval has been given to proceed; (2) for each project, whether tenders have been called; (3) for each project, the amount of the provincial grant which has been offered; (4) the formula used as the basis for the calculation of the provincial grant.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I was making a comment earlier on motion 8, which I agree was not in order. Now that we're on no. 7, I'd like to make that point. The question that was asked for on this case was with respect to hospital construction at Lloydminster, Yorkton, Cut Knife, Melfort, Nipawin, Maidstone, Indian Head, Davidson, and on and on. What I'd like to know is why, when this question I believe was put in last summer, a question this simple that the minister should be able to write out today — he's sitting there beside the minister — why doesn't he simply write the answer out and give it to us? I'm not sure why you need officials to prepare an answer for a question as simple as this, or the next question which deals with nursing homes. Surely the ministers have the answers. Why don't they simply write them down and give them to us?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, just simple a short comment with regard to the arguments advanced on this particular motion by the opposition House Leader. I take it that any rules do not indicate that information has to be provided at such and such a time, and I think we probably take a lesson from the members opposite when they were in government. I recall putting in a lot of questions, and I recall (the day before we were about to adjourn) the grand production being made by the then government as they rolled into this Assembly boxes and carloads of orders for return and the information one or two days prior to the adjournment of the session at that particular time. I suppose to a degree we are trying to expedite this a little bit better. Perhaps progress comes in small steps in this particular Assembly, but I can assure you that we would not try to do something like that, and I would beg your indulgence, and I'm sure you'll have the information prior to the end of the session.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — In respect to no. 7, I want to draw to the attention of the minister that the opposition are agreeable to co-operating in complicated questions in which details need to be collected, and it takes a considerable length of time. I want also to say that the minister goes back to the previous government's performance, but I want to indicate that their claim has been that they are going to be a very open government. I want to say that not providing answers to questions of the straightforward nature of a question like no. 7 indicates that what they are heading toward is a very secretive type of government. A closed government won't allow the public the information which we have requested. I don't think it's good enough, Mr. Speaker, for the member opposite to

start going back to past performance. What we are looking at now is the performance and the commitment which that group of people, that government, gave to the people of Saskatchewan.

Accordingly, I want to say we have not received an answer for one single question that has been filed since the session was called last June. As a consequence, I want to say that of course we are concerned with the lack of attention that the government is giving to these questions. Accordingly, I would like to urge the Minister of Finance to give us his commitment that he will indeed provide all of the answers here before the closing of the session.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — May I say, I'd like to hear the response of the minister to that last question asked by my colleague for Quill Lakes. Part of our concern is that we . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You — some of these should have been provided. There is no excuse for not providing some of these.

Also, we have a broader concern, and that is that they are going to be dealt with. Do we have the commitment from the Acting House Leader that items 7, 8, 9 — 10 is in a different category — 11, 12 and 13 will be dealt with next week? If we have that commitment, I think we've registered our protest and we may go on to deal with the items, so do we have your commitment that you will deal with those items next week?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get into a controversy on this, but the facts are relatively clear. There has simply been (and I invite anyone to attempt to refute this if they can) no occasion in which an order of the Assembly — for return no. 2, let us say, and the one that we're debating — which asks for some very simple information, has not been answered in the 46 days of the session, when the minister in charge of that particular department — that is the Minister of Health — has not had his estimates up so that we could ask him any questions in the 46 days of the session. That confluence of events has, I suggest, not happened since 1905. If anyone can find a refutation of that, I invite them so to do, but they will not.

Accordingly, when we are asked a question, "Where do we stand," by some people at Maidstone, as I was the other day, I say, "Well, I'll try to find out. We have an order on the order paper; we have a motion on the order paper, but it's not replied to and we have not had an opportunity to question the minister. I'll try to find out." But, we are, as I point out, at day 46, and we've not had a forum when we can ask a reasonable question as to where the government stands with respect to a hospital at Maidstone — what grants it will get, what the formula is. Those are really not appropriate questions for an oral question period. They are appropriate questions for an order for return, notice of motion for returns, or for questions on estimates. I think we can all see that. We haven't had it.

As I understand it, the Minister of Finance is saying: we will get answers to the great bulk of these before the end of the session, and he will not repeat the error of the previous government, and bring them in just a day or two or three before the end of the session. So we have his commitment that we will get the answers, and they will not be on the last day, or the second last day before the end of the session. I welcome that commitment and accordingly I will raise no further objection to item number 7 on the proposed motion of Mr. Lingenfelter being stood, if that's the way you wish to handle it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What's the motion to stand?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — The motion is the one that is here before you, and the only way to dispose of it is to either vote it off, or for somebody to speak and to stand it — to adjourn it.

**MR. BIRKBECK:** — Mr. Speaker, there's certainly some confusion in the order of House proceedings coming from the opposition in the House today. Notwithstanding all of that, I'll attempt to alleviate some of that misunderstanding and distortion that seems to be across the way. Certainly, we recognize the importance of the subjects that have been placed before the Assembly, and the various motions. I have every confidence that our government will in very due course, and in the very near future, provide the answers to the questions that are raised on these motions. I can say, Mr. Speaker, having been associated with a good number of these members for a considerable length of time, they have never let me down yet. They consistently provide answers to the opposition, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would want to assure all members that we would be looking for replies to these motions that are before the House, and subsequently, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — State your point of order.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to simply advance to the members opposite and to the House that we would be prepared to agree to — and if I can skip ahead and perhaps expedite some time, and I would simply advance — orders nos. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 33, 35, 39, 44, 51, and those up to that point would be provided at this point in time, and I would have an amendment for 49 when we get to that one.

Those are the ones that we're prepared to agree to at this time. That information is now ready and will be presented. The rest of the ones we will be asking to stand, and I'm sure more will be available next week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — To be sure that our votes come out right at the end of this day, it's very difficult to proceed in the manner that you are suggesting, but what I would ask you to do is to deal with each return as they come through, to stand those that you wish to stand, and to deal with them that way.

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — What I would like to know is the numbers that have been left out. Are you giving us an assurance here that we will deal with them and get answers to them next week?

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would give you assurance that we will deal with them next week.

## Return No. 18

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Blakeney that an order of the Assembly do issue for Return No. 18 showing:

- (1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Energy during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial air lines for air

fares. (2) The name of each individual for whom air fare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 19**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Blakeney that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 19 showing:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Finance during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 20**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 20 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Energy.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 21**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 21 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Finance.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 23**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Lusney that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 23 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 24**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Lusney

that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 24 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Rural Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

#### **Return No. 25**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Shillington that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 25 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

#### **Return No. 26**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Shillington that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 26 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development.

Motion agreed to.

#### **Return No. 28**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Shillington that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 28 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Labour.

Motion agreed to.

#### **Return No. 30**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Shillington that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 30 showing:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 31**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Shillington that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 30 showing:

- (1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 37**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Koskie that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 30 showing:

- (1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Continuing Education during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 39**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Koskie that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 30 showing:

- (1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Education during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 43**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Mr. Koskie that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 30 showing:

- For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Education.

Motion agreed to.

**Return No. 48**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lingenfelter that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 48 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Social Services.

Motion agreed to.

### **Return No. 53**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lingenfelter that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 53 showing:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Social Services during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, on item 49 I would propose that the motion be amended as follows:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Social Services during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for employee airfares. (2) The names of each employee for whom airfares have been paid and the amount for each employee.

The reason for that is there could come a situation where tickets are paid for non-employees. That would be contravening the privacy situation. That's not a very common thing but it can exist, and we wouldn't want to duplicate that. That's why I propose that amendment.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I just want to clarify, Mr. Acting House Leader, that "employee" includes the minister for these purposes.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes, that would include the minister and any staff of the minister's office.

With regard to that amendment, then, we will take two or three or more days to provide that as amended to you. It's being worked on if you can have that time.

Motion amended as agreed to.

### **Return No. 54**

**MR. YEW** moved, seconded by Mr. Shillington, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 54 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 the names and salaries of each executive assistant, special assistant and other non-clerical staff employed in the office of the Minister of Environment.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Return No. 55**

**MR. YEW** moved, seconded by Mr. Shillington, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 55 showing:

(1) The total dollar amount paid by the Department of Environment during the period May 8, 1982 to November 26, 1982 to commercial airlines for airfares. (2) The name of each individual for whom airfare has been paid and the amount for each individual.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Return No. 56**

**MR. YEW** moved, seconded by Mr. Shillington, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 56 showing:

Regarding the employment of Ed Charlette: (1) whether he is employed by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan; (2) if so, his position, annual salary and the date on which he commenced employment.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would on that ask leave to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

Debate adjourned.

**Return No. 90**

**MR. SHILLINGTON** moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 90 showing:

With respect to any rental land purchased from any housing projects by or on behalf of Saskatchewan Housing Corporation included in the Cornwall Centre: (1) the amount requested by the owners for such land; (2) the amount of any counteroffer for such land; (3) the amount paid for any such land.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

**Return No. 91**

**MR. SHILLINGTON** moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 91 showing:

With respect to any land being expropriated by or on behalf of Saskatchewan Housing Corporation for any rental housing projects included in the Cornwall Centre: (1) the amount initially requested by the owners for such land; (2) the amount of any counteroffer for such land; (3) the value of the land as alleged by or on behalf of Saskatchewan Housing Corporation in any



court proceedings.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — I would ask for leave to adjourn debate.

And, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is there any opportunity where all these could be moved in one lump, because I will be asking to adjourn debate on each one of them? We could save going through this, I'm sure, tedious exercise for everyone in the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I believe, being that the members are all in attendance, that they could be moved in one lump. Could you propose that?

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, as suggested by the minister that items 6 to 30 be moved as a group, I would move that motion.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for leave to adjourn debate on each of those or as a package.

Debates adjourned.

## **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

### **CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

#### **CONTINUING EDUCATION**

#### **Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5**

##### **Item 1**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his officials?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to introduce the officials from the Department of Continuing Education: Mr. Gil Johnson, deputy minister; Mr. Ed Evancio, assistant deputy minister; Mr. Lorne Sparling, executive director of institutes; Mr. Frank May, executive director, administrative services; Mr. Morris Campbell, director of student services; Mr. Jake Kutarna, director of community colleges; John McKendry, director of policy planning, universities; Mr. Ray McKay, director of northern continuing education; Mr. Toby Stewart, director, office of native career development; Mr. Gerry McIntyre, director, training needs assessment (I guess he's not here); Mr. Doug McGuigan, budget officer; Darrel Hogg, co-ordinator, manpower training; Dr. Alex Guy, special adviser on science and technology to the minister; Mr. Ian Wilson, provincial archivist.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I want at the outset just to indicate to you that in my view, any money that a province or a nation spends on education is certainly money well spent. I want to say that I believe that no province and no country can afford to neglect its commitment to education.

I want to say that certainly we must look and recognize that we live in a rapidly changing world with a great growth of technology and great advances in the methods of

communications. And as a consequence the globe has, to some extent, shrunk. And perhaps, indeed, throughout the world problems become an integral problem for the rest of us. I think as we look all of us are aware of the degradation and the starvation throughout the world, are aware of how little we have really achieved in the distribution of wealth throughout the globe. It seems to me that basically our course in the future is to address the needs and the problems of the human race, or conceivably it could lead to the total destruction of a nuclear holocaust.

I believe that the privileged people of the planet, and I think Canadians are a part of that privileged group, those indeed who have the opportunity to be educated must take a leading role in helping to solve some of the global problems. I think that Canada is not indeed a military power although we have our alliances, and it seems to me that we have a unique role in this global struggle. I think we have an opportunity and a sphere of influence in addressing some of the problems, and I believe that through education of our young people and our society that perhaps we can maximize our benefits in addressing the problems which I've alluded to. Having said that, and sharing, I'm certain, with you the deep importance of our educational system,; and recognizing that Saskatchewan for many years has, indeed, stood in the forefront of being recognized as a province with a high educational standard and level; having made those comments, I would just like the minister, for the period of time that he has been minister, and I recognize that it's rather a short period, to briefly outline some of the priorities of the Department of Continuing Education that he sees as needing to be addressed. And perhaps he could also outline some of the concerns which he feels must be addressed in the future.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like at the outset to say that I certainly generally concur with what the hon. member for Quill Lakes has just stated in connection with the general state of affairs in education as they exist in the latter part of the 20th century, and what he has stated with regard to concerns for where we are going in the future. Certainly it is incumbent upon those who are given the degree of responsibility and education to address ourselves to the needs of manpower at the present time, and to the needs of manpower as projected in the future. One thing that has been abundantly clear, or has become abundantly clear, I should say, to me in the short period of time that I've been education Minister of and Minister of Continuing Education is that the expectations of the people are such that education is not just something where we have growth and development for a short period of time, but rather that it is something that refers to growth and development that takes place from birth until death, for which reason education has grown in scope by leaps and bounds. Add to that, what the hon. minister has made reference to, the tremendous changes that have taken place in science and technology, in social habits and so forth, and we see that it is a tremendous challenge to all of those who have any degree of responsibility in this area.

Now, in speaking specifically to what I think the hon. member wished me to talk about, I would say that we look forward to the tremendous challenge that is there. When I take a look at the report that was just recently submitted in adult basic education — a report that points out some things that perhaps we should have been aware of, and maybe we have been aware of, and maybe haven't attended to, maybe there's good reason for us not having attended to some of these things because of the difficulties involved in trying to remediate some of these real situations.

I speak about such things as the fact that in this province, there are 177,000 people who have grade 10 or less education. That indicates to me that there is one out of

every five to six people in this province who has grade 10 or less education. When you add or put alongside of that statistic the fact that 74 per cent of the people who are on social assistance today have grade 10 or less education, these are statistics that we have to be sensitive to and we have to come to grips with. Because not only does it tell us something about the plight of those people from a moral issue how debilitating it must be for some of these people who end up in that area where they are low-income people, where they are on unemployment insurance, where they're on social assistance as I've stated, or in many cases incarcerated, then I think that it becomes really, really a shocking kind of a situation and something that we must do something about.

So I would think, hon. member, that one of the things that we will be addressing ourselves to is to try to do as much as possible to give education and training to those people who are in worst need of it so that we can therefore make them a part of our human resource. That is one of the things, one of the areas where we will place a tremendous amount of emphasis in the future.

I think that another thing that we are intending to do is to place a much greater emphasis upon skilled training and technological training than we have in the past. Our needs assessment indicates that this is where we have the greatest need and the greatest shortage, not just in this province but in Canada at large. At the present time, the training spots that we have in the present technical institutes meet only about half of the real needs, so that we are going to attempt to improve that situation. We are going to attempt to improve that situation through such a project as was announced, that is the construction of the Prince Albert technical institute. As a matter of fact, we have announced the expansion of the new technical institute in order to offer a greater variety of programs and to offer more training spots, virtually doubling the training spots in the Prince Albert technical institute compared to the original plan.

We are going to be placing a great deal of emphasis upon alternate methods of training. By that I meant to go to such plans with the training facilities that we have, such as expanding the number of hours of training or expanding the school year. We are thinking in terms of decentralization in the offering of programs, and by that I mean an expansion of extension programs certified and controlled and administered from the institutes.

We're thinking in terms of advancing the delivery system, the delivery mechanism that is out there at the present time through our community colleges. These are just some of the initiatives that we have been, not just thinking about, but making specific plans in connection with. And we are also thinking in terms of expanding the development of science and technology and research generally.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you for your comments, Mr. Minister. I want to say that the areas you have mentioned certainly, I think, have added emphasis; or continued emphasis can be placed on the areas which you have mentioned. Certainly those who have grade 10 or less education, properly, I think, to play a role in the mainstream of society, will in fact require skills training.

I don't want to prolong the philosophical type of approach, but you have dealt with the technical schools and the type of training for that specific area. Could the minister outline some of his priorities as he sees them in respect to the university campuses?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, maybe to hurry things along, I will try and sort of wing it, not

having prepared an overview in regard to what we are planning to do, and perhaps not having finalized precisely what our entire direction is with regard to the university scene. For one thing we see there is a problem with regard to the university facilities with regard to university enrolment at the present time. The University of Regina itself has set a record in so far as first year enrolment is concerned, something like 31 per cent increase this year alone. I think, if I remember correctly, that at the University of Saskatchewan, there was something like 13 per cent.

It's going to bring about the need for increased productivity at the university level. It's going to bring about the need for the possibility of increased funding. It's going to bring about the possibility of us looking at makeshift arrangements, and ways of accommodating the students who wish to attend the university.

Where this enrolment is going to take us down the road — a year, two years, five years hence — is very, very difficult to project. As a matter of fact, in discussing this issue with the university presidents, they have great difficulty. They indicate that at no time in the past have they ever felt less confident in predicting what the future enrolments hold in store for the universities. I think that we have to use a lot of common sense, and judgement, and consultation with the university sector in order to determine whether we should be going.

We have to keep in mind that we are going to be making a big thrust in the area of technical education, and we have to try to take an educated guess as to what extent that will affect enrolment at the universities per se. There are a number of variables in there and a number of unknowns. But certainly, I think it's incumbent upon us to do our very level best to address these concerns.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just want to turn to the general budget that was brought down by the minister in November. I recognize that the format of the budget again was set by the previous government, and to a large extent that was adopted. The major victims, it seems to me, in your November budget was that cuts had been made in the post-secondary programs of the North, and particularly the capital budgets in the heritage fund, such as STI, the University of Saskatchewan geological science buildings, and the P.A. institute. I mean money that we had in our March budget for STI, for the P.A. and for the University of Saskatchewan geological science building. I want to say that there were major cuts.

If we take a look at the March budget, our proposal for STI was \$6.2 million; November, 1982, it was 1 million. The P.A. institute, 1.1. million; you proposed to put in 0.216. The geological science building, March, 1982, 0.6 billion; reduced to 0.15 million. And in DNS, the continuing education branch and community colleges, we note that in March of 1982 we proposed over \$6 million; in November of 1982, \$2.92 million. I want to say that in the total for all programs and projects there was a minus \$8.6 million in the November budget compared to the March '82 budget. I recognize the circumstances, but I also recognize what the minister said in respect to priorities.

I think it was very clear within the department that the need was to get more facilities in the institutes and, accordingly, the previous government was moving in that direction. And so I will come to those more specifically, but I wonder if the minister could indicate the rationale for, particularly, the decreases in respect to the geological science building, the P.A. institute, the DNS cutbacks in the continuing education branch, community colleges, those items which I have mentioned. Could you give an indication as to why the government saw those as a very low priority?

It seems strange that now the minister is saying that indeed we need to double our spaces in institutes. And that information was available in the department when you took over, a thrust was being made by the former government, and it seems to me what has happened is that there has been really a delay — a very substantial delay — in meeting that particular need.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, at the risk of making the odd error here as far as the numbers are concerned, because I don't have all of the information in front of me — and I guess that's partly due to the fact that there are a number, just a large number, of specific projects and items that have been referred to here by the hon. member — I will try to deal with these one by one as quickly as I possibly can.

In regard to the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, STI, that whole project has been held up. The first phase of that project has been held up due to the strike and, from latest reports, it should be completed sometime in June of 1983. As far as the other addition that was sort of promised for the future, that was reviewed and it was determined that it was one of the things that would not be an essential part of that institute at this particular time.

As a matter of fact, our government reviewed all projects as far as education is concerned, as far as continuing education, health, and so on are concerned. But in regard to the emphasis being placed upon technical education, we ended up spending more money than was promised by the budget of the previous government in each of the technical institutes and in the two vocational schools, namely, at Prince Albert and Meadow Lake . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In operating. In operating where we saw, to tell the truth, a real need for money at the time.

As a matter of fact, I personally made a visit to Kelsey Institute in Saskatoon where there was considerable concern being expressed by students, by staff, and by the administration of that institute because of the fact that they claimed that the money that had been allocated and promised for this past year was going to cause the termination of some of the programs and release of some of the staff. I was very, very pleased to be able to make an appeal to our cabinet for additional funding because of the need that was apparent, and I'm very pleased to say that our government, even though we were in the process of restraint and in the process of deficit budgeting, did feel that education should be placed on a very, very high priority.

In regard to the geological science building, I was personally a little bit confused about where that stood. Going back in to the whole history of it, I saw different figures where cabinet had approved 17.75, treasury had approved 16.7, and budget bureau had approved another figure; then I saw another figure of \$23 million. It seemed, from the best I could understand about it, that the previous government had decided to put it on hold because they could not agree on the level of funding. So that was the state of affairs when I became Minister of Continuing Education. So, the geology building was under review along with all the other projects.

I am pleased to say that it is in the budget cycle for 1983-84, and by that I mean that I am going to be presenting this as a very top priority, as far as university capital construction is concerned, to the cabinet for the 1983-84 budget.

In regard to the Prince Albert technical institute, the initial plan that had been announced by your government was to build a technical institute at Prince Albert at a

cost of something like \$15.4 million. We did review that; we saw many things about that plan and about the programs which we found to be very desirable and very beneficial to Prince Albert and the whole parkland area, as well as northern Saskatchewan. But we felt that it fell short of the real needs for that area. So our government gave the approval for an expansion of the Prince Albert technical institute so that it increased, as far as cost is concerned, from \$15.4 to \$25 million. It increased, as far as space is concerned, from something like 12,700 square metres to 17,000 square metres. It increased, as far as capacity of training is concerned, from 394 to 634 students.

As far as program is concerned, we added such programs as mining and forestry, electronics, an expansion of industrial mechanics, and an expansion of machining, as well as programs such as cosmetology, food services, business education, and leadership training, just to name some of the programs that we have added in that area. Hopefully, we are going to use that as the base from which to offer an expanded program of training in northern Saskatchewan. We presently have plans under way, and are trying to complement those plans with the national training act, to have something which is as realistic and as meaningful as possible for northern Saskatchewan.

As far as community colleges are concerned, the previous government had offered an increase of 14 per cent; we changed that to an increase of 7.4 per cent. We took a look at the community colleges and the programs which were being offered. The decision that we have made is not to eliminate social and interest programs, but to make these as close to cost recoverable as possible, such as exists in some of the community colleges such as Regina and Saskatoon, where the programs already are completely cost recoverable, along with efficiency cuts that we were able to make, and guided by the fact that community colleges had reached a degree of maturity where they could function and still not operate at a reduced level as far as program offering was concerned. This was one of the ways where we realized some efficiencies.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to get into the specifics of those in a moment. I really think that what has happened in the nine or ten months is that a definite program which the previous government had for a substantial increase in the funding toward the development of more spaces in institutes — STI, and get on with the job in Prince Albert . . . There were certainly a number of options that we looked at in respect to the size and the programs. All of those were available. I'm rather disappointed in the minister having delayed for one year, because as he has indicated in his release here, "Saskatchewan may expand training programs in the next three years." He went on to caution about the possibility of doubling the number of spaces because he says, "I'm just one person." I note the minister does use that quite consistently. But he said that he will have to really expand these to help get all of these young people trained for the jobs that are going to be created in the new open for business policy. I want to just raise for the minister's information that the new job opportunity in the province may be some time coming, so he should take that into consideration. If one looks at the young people's jobless rate, Saskatchewan workers in their early twenties had the highest January unemployment rate — 17.3 per cent — of all age groups in the province, Statistics Canada figures show.

What I'm saying is that we can't, Mr. Minister, continue to live on slogans. I think that, as the president of the University of Saskatchewan indicated, more and more people are returning to take training at university and at institute levels. The reason that the

universities are bulging, and the technical schools, with applications — and I grant not all can be met in the institutes — is basically because there are in fact no jobs. As the president indicated, this is an ideal opportunity for young people at least to go into institutes during a period of very low employment or job opportunities and at least do a meaningful thing in obtaining further education as an investment for the future. Surely we must be optimistic to the extent that the economy, not just here in Saskatchewan, but throughout the country, will indeed turn around.

Really what I'm emphasizing here is that I think that we really do need some very concrete action in respect to fulfilling the requirements of the students. I look at the university and one of the areas where there are considerable complaints is undergraduate studies, as being a very low level in comparison to post-graduate studies at the two campuses here in comparison to the Canadian average. I think that's an area also that will have to be addressed. Perhaps with respect to what he has indicated to the public — that he has some pretty large plans for expanding the training program — since he has indicated that to the press, perhaps he would elaborate for the benefit of the members of the opposition.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, in responding to the hon. member, I thought that I had indicated that in my initial response about the emphasis that we were placing upon technical training, but I would be pleased to reiterate some of the things.

First of all, about your concern in the P.A. technical institute, we're doing our level best to make sure that that isn't held up. As a matter of fact, our present plans call for identical timing with what would have happened before — that is, for the first phase — and so it is being planned accordingly. The first phase will be open — of the P.A. technical institute — in September of 1985, and a second phase in 1986. As far as the jobless rate for young people is concerned, this is really consistent with what the situation is right across our country.

We really weren't in a very good position as far as skill training offering was concerned in our province. We were, I think, tied for last place with New Brunswick. I think that we do have to do something, and we do have to do a considerable amount in regard to increasing the offerings as far as skill training is concerned. That's why we're not just looking at the building of institutes, but we're looking at other alternative ways of providing skill training, such as I mentioned — such as extending of school years and school days, such as extension of the university outreach and extension programs, such as purchase of equipment and putting it into buildings that we can put it into, and provide training as quickly as we possibly can.

I agree with you, we can't wait. I think it's too important a thing.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to turn to a few specific areas. I recently got the annual reports, but I took a look at the annual report of 1980-81 when I didn't have the report — the current reports — and I noticed in respect to the training of the disadvantaged, it indicates there that there are two federal-provincial agreements governing the training of disadvantaged, affecting overall costs and the type of rehabilitative training services offered by the department. Under the terms of the vocational rehabilitation and disabled persons agreement, training is offered to mentally and physically disabled persons who are vocationally handicapped.

In 1980-81 some 587 persons received training under that program. The concern that I have is, first of all, can you indicate whether the two federal-provincial agreements

governing the vocational training for the disadvantaged or disabled are in fact still in place?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — You're referring to the VRDP? Yes, yes, that's still in place.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — What I'm concerned about, then, is a very substantial decrease in the amount that is being expended. That is not only a substantial decrease in respect to what we proposed in our March budget. In March we proposed \$3,776,070. In the estimated 1981-82 it was \$3,432,790. And I find that what has happened in the current budget is that there was a drastic cut in the training for the disadvantaged of \$2.9 million, about. Could the minister explain the reason for the major cut?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, the information that I have is that fewer candidates presented themselves for training this year, but that no one has been turned down for training.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Maybe in the report could the minister indicate . . . I noticed in 1980-81, 587 persons received training. Can the minister indicate the number that have been received in the current year?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, the statistics wouldn't be complete for '82-83 to the end of this year, so we haven't got that information right now.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — You are saying that the information is not complete. I agree that it may not be complete. I wonder if the minister has any statistics up to the present time as to the number of people that have taken advantage of it.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Sorry, I didn't get the question.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Could you give me the number that have participated to date?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — To date, the number is 525.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Also, Mr. Minister, in 1980-81, the department established what was known as the Outreach program. During that year they set up the administration board for the delivery capacity of something like 40,000 days of training, and began I guess in August of 1981. I would like the minister to indicate to what extent that program, Outreach, has been used; he could indicate the number of days of training, say, in 1981-82 and '82-83.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — The total number of students involved were 1,107. The total number of locations in which programs were offered in the Outreach programs were 34.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I wonder if the minister could give an evaluation of how he evaluates the effectiveness of the Outreach program.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — An evaluation was done this spring and was completed some time in June. The evaluation pointed out that the programs were about the equivalent from the point of view of being cost effective, of the programs in the institutes and that the one real advantage of the Outreach program was that it was reaching the people who would not end up going to the institutes. So it was a good, sound report as far as the effectiveness of the programs was concerned.



**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just on another specific topic, Mr. Minister. In respect to community colleges, I know in 1981 there was a definite formula that was used for the funding of community colleges and I wonder if the minister could provide me with the details as to the actual formula for funding of the community colleges. If it's a formula and a document, if you want to provide that to me now or at a later date, that's fine. I guess the next question is: was indeed the same formula that had been used in the past, in say 1981, used during the current year?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Yes, first of all to your first question. Yes, we could provide you with that formula. It's about a three-page document. And the last time that the formula was used as such as in the '81-82 fiscal year. And now we are using a straight percentage increase and not using that formula, or at least this particular year.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — For the past year you're saying you just used a straight percentage increase over the previous budget. Is that what you're saying?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — That's a straight percentage increase over last year's . . . that would be the flat grants, the grants to the community colleges.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I know that what is being considered, and it has been openly discussed, is that more of the costs relating to the programs in the community colleges will indeed, part of it, or a greater proportion of it, in the future be funded by a fee to be paid by the individual enrolling. I don't know if that is policy but certainly discussions have taken place that that is being seriously considered. I'd like the minister to comment in respect to that.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Yes, well, there has been a trend in the community colleges over the last few years to offer more courses, more programs in skill training — a higher and higher percentage of those programs. But in addition, yes, we are attempting to move in the direction of making the social interest, the personal interest programs more cost recoverable than they have been in the past. And what we are doing is pointing at a situation where we'll have it 100 per cent cost recoverable. But we do have to keep in mind that there is a difference, a considerable difference or variations, I should say, throughout the province and where there is a sparsity of population, the community college has more difficulty in making that a viable operation, as opposed to, let's say, Regina Plains Community College would have. So we have to keep in mind this whole idea of accessibility of programs along with our aim to make these programs cost recoverable in the future.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Just one other question in respect to community colleges. I note that in the overall budget of your government, that in respect to the administration, that there was some cutback there, and some decrease in personnel. I was wondering if the minister could comment on that. (I'm kind of wandering around the report, but I think we can wind it down pretty fast.) I'm really talking about the cuts in the amount of administration for community colleges. It has in fact been decreased over the previous budget, and fairly substantially decreased from what was proposed in March.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — As far as permanent staff is concerned, we've reduced in the administration, three positions. So we've gone from 1981-82 — there were 18 positions — down to 15 positions, over that period of time. Those were . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to turn to another area that is of some concern. We have had in the past a number of general proficiency awards (and I looked in the 1980-81 report of the department) and there were some 1,300 awards granted to top grade 12 students throughout Saskatchewan. I wonder if the minister could indicate the number during the current year, if he has that, or for the 1981-82, I guess. Does he have any plans in respect to the continuation or the discontinuation of the proficiency awards to grade 12 students?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Yes, the situation is that we have a higher enrolment at the grade 12 level this year than we had last year. Because it's on a percentage of students, we will have a larger number of recipients of the proficiency awards, but these have not been determined as yet, and won't be determined until the end of March.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — In respect to student loans, I think the minister has recently had a press release indicating that there was a substantial increase in the amount of the student loans during the past year. The thing that was disturbing to me in the particular release, and considering the fact of the difficulty of young people obtaining employment. (I recall the report — I thought I had it here), but it was indicated by the minister that in respect to student loans and bursaries, over 4,000, or 4,400 had been granted during the course of the year, and the funding was up from previous years. What I was concerned about is that the minister indicated that it may be necessary to toughen up the criteria in respect to who will qualify.

It seems to me that the reason for so many more people requesting the loans through the student loans of the federal government, and the bursaries and loans from the province is that, in fact, they have not been able to get summer employment, and are more dependent upon the student assistance that they can get through this method. So it concerns me considerably. I wonder what the minister has in mind when he indicates that in respect to this topic he intends to look at toughening up the criteria.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — The problem in the past has been that we have really never made use, full use, of the federal loan money that is available. And so what we are going to attempt to do is we will be giving more money in terms of bursary, but we will be using a higher percentage of the federal money, so we are changing our terms of reference, our criteria, in that regard. We have actually given out 12 per cent — \$6.1 million this year as compared to \$4.2 million last year, and we will be increasing that mount by something like 12 per cent next year, so we are actually going to be giving more in terms of bursary help to students, that we're going to be taking full advantage of federal loans. We anticipate that the federal loan is going to increase.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — You indicate that you are going to be taking better advantage of the federal loans. Could the minister indicate specifically what he means by taking better advantage of the federal loans, because I don't follow quite what he is saying? All I know is that there are certain criteria set down and students apply for the federal loan. Many of them get turned down and then there is an appeal mechanism, and I don't quite understand what you mean by indicating that you are going to take better advantage of the federal loans.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, what we are planning to do, in effect, is to loosen the criteria on the loans so that it will be easier for students to get loans. The criteria will not be as stiff for students to get loans. This is federal money. We have not, in the past, taken full advantage of federal money that has been available. We're particularly

concerned when we feel pretty optimistic about the fact that the federal mount of money that's going to be available for loans is going to be increased. We are going to hold, we are not going to loosen, proportionately, the bursary criteria. That's where we mentioned in the news release about the criteria.

The advantage of doing that is so that we will have more money available for needy students. If we are anticipating that there will be another increase in enrolment of students at the university level, then our concern is that we should have enough bursary money available for those students who are needy. This, however, has not been determined as of this time because these are still proposals that we are working on, or recommendations that we are working on, and they still have to be reviewed by the bursary and the loan committee, which has student representation on it.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I was under the impression that the provincial government administered the federal program of student loans, and that the federal government set the criteria. Am I incorrect in that assumption?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Some of the federal criteria are followed, but there are certain areas where we have jurisdiction. That is on provincial amounts of money that we will allocate. We still have control over the awarding of bursary money. That's right.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — You indicate that a greater utilization of the federal component — I don't understand what you're saying when you say that you're going to have a greater utilization of the federal component. I just want to add on this that the former minister was, in fact, the chairman of a committee of ministers of education across Canada. They were, in fact, lobbying the federal government to relax the criteria.

Certainly, one of the areas of great concern was in respect to farm children. Many of the parents had assets which, in fact, took them out of the . . . May not have much income, but will have a considerable amount of assets. Many of the farm children would not qualify, I know that during his period of discussion with the federal government, as I recall it and you can correct me, he did in fact get, in respect to the assets, increased, it seems to me, to \$150,000, which was of some assistance.

What I'm asking, I guess, is: are you anticipating a change in the federal government's student loan criteria by which you are going to make better use of federal funds?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — No, I can't honestly say that we are expecting a change in criteria, I did say that I expect — having met with the Secretary of State about a month ago in Victoria the ministers of education across Canada were very optimistic about the fact that there would probably be an increase in the level of funding offered in terms of loans.

I can't say that we are anticipating that there will be a relaxation of the criteria that the federal government use. I guess what I am saying is that we have never taken full advantage of the criteria that exist in awarding money to students for one reason or another. We have never taken full advantage of the criteria, and now we are planning to go the full route as far as what the criteria will allow us in offering money to students.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do I understand the minister to be saying, when he says take full advantage, what he means is that the department proposes to require students to borrow every penny they can under the federal loan plan before they qualify for any bursaries, and that in that sense of the word, the

department is taking advantage of the federal criteria? The student in fact will be receiving the disadvantage of being barred from bursaries until he has taken the full advantage of the federal loan program.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. leader, partly right, but it will be based upon need, and those with greatest need will get the biggest break, and those who are more able to pay back the loan will have to get a higher proportion of loan, the reason being that we want to ensure that we've got enough money available for those students who are really in need of help. We want to try, as much as possible, to accomplish the principle of accessibility for all people who have the ability and have the desire and the motivation to go to university. That's the reason for us changing our criteria somewhat, or relaxing them.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I had a couple of questions that I wish to ask, and I apologize if they have already been covered while I had to be out of the House, out of the committee.

First I turn to university enrolments, and ask the minister what projected university enrolments he sees. Could he give me the current university enrolments in full-time equivalents at the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan, following the second semester registration at the University of Regina?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — I'm not sure that I'm able to provide the specific information. There are many statistics that come out, and it's sometimes very difficult to differentiate between part-time and full-time and extension and things like that.

It's somewhere in the neighbourhood of between 9,000 and 10,000, as far as I can figure out, who are full-time students at the University of Regina, and somewhere in the neighbourhood of between 13,000 and 14,000 at the University of Saskatchewan, full-time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Minister, depending on what the figures are required for, the so-called full-time equivalents is a fairly common measure of the number of students. But if you don't have that information with you, fair enough.

With respect to space, I suppose the full-time students are a better measure there, since many of the part-time students don't put a pressure on space, although some of them do. Can the minister advise whether or not his government is satisfied with the space available at the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan for the students who are now there and the students which his department projects will be there in the next year or two?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, I did make some comment about the projections for next year. Having spoken with the presidents of the universities, they feel that they have some difficulty in projecting enrolments, perhaps more difficulty than they have ever had in the past, in projecting what will happen for this coming year as far as enrolment is concerned.

And I satisfied with the amount of facility that we have available at the university? No, I think we could use additional facilities at both universities, and perhaps we could have been adding additional facilities over a period of a number of years, or at least this is what is indicated to me. However, be that as it may, perhaps we will have to do some things which we haven't done in the past on a makeshift basis. At the present time I

don't seen an extreme amount of difficulty as far as classroom space is concerned at the University of Saskatchewan. At the University of Regina, perhaps it is more critical. We are presently thinking in terms of what can be done in order to satisfy the requirements.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, if the minister feels that something more might have been done over the past years in providing space, would he explain to the committee why he did not proceed with the geology building at the University of Saskatchewan in 1982?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — I also did attempt to address myself to that question. For one thing, our government reviewed every project that was under way, whether it was educational or with regard to health or social services. When it came to reviewing the geology building specifically, there was a considerable amount of confusion as to what the price really should have been. As a result, it was put on hold. I am hoping to bring this forth as a high priority for the University of Saskatchewan for the coming '83-84 year.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — If it is to be a high priority for '83-84, wouldn't it have been better to build it in '82-83 when admittedly . . . perhaps someone needs to study it, but if it's reasonably obvious then why not go ahead with it when we are very clearly needing the jobs and economic activity which would flow from that sort of project?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, first of all, I think we are faced with a situation where we have restraints, where we were deficit budgeting. I feel that had the previous government stayed in power with the circumstances and the information which was given to me by the same officials, the same decision would have been made by your government.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I can assure you that was not the case. We'd wrestled that one to the ground. We'd had a fair number of proposals for that and had decided on one. There is, I think, no question that that project would have gone ahead, as the engineering project went ahead and as others went ahead in a relatively orderly manner. But that is water under the bridge.

I ask you what the approach of your ministry is with respect to an archives building. Is that still on hold, or are you prepared to bring that one forward at this time?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — I am not in a very good position at the present time to be able to expand upon the '83-84 budget finalization because I just don't know where we stand with regard to that. It is one of the projects, one of the proposals, that we will be reviewing. That's about as far as I can expand at the present time. Certainly I can see the need for us to do something with regard to getting more suitable, better accommodations for archives in the city of Regina.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when you took office there were preliminary plans for an archives building. I have seen models prior to our leaving office. I don't know to what degree of specifics the planning had proceeded, whether it was at line drawing or some lesser stage. The question I direct to you is: what work has been done since you took office on further planning of an archives building?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Planning went on until the end of June, and then it was put on hold.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, has a site been selected for the archives building in Regina?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — The site is still under consideration. Some consideration is being given by the archives board, or has been given by the archives board, for locating it on university property.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, when the minister says “university property” as the consideration being given by the archives board, is he referring to the College Avenue campus or the Wascana campus of the university?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — To the Wascana campus.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, that is a change. Some consideration was given to that, but basically the decision was made to have it along College Avenue some place. I take it then that that matter is now under review and no decision has been made as to a location.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — That is right, yes.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, with respect to facilities at the University of Regina, a recent news report quotes President Barber as indicating that attempts were going to be made to use McNiven School. This certainly would be an appropriate stopgap measure but indicates some considerable measure of pressure on the University of Regina. Could the minister say whether or not his department is working with the University of Regina, planning additional classroom space on the campus?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Leader of the Opposition, yes, I can say that we have been giving some consideration to planning or addressing ourselves to the plight of the university as far as facilities are concerned. As far as McNiven School in particular is concerned, nothing concrete has been decided in regard to using that location.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, could the minister give us additional. Information on what capital projects are in the planning stage for the University of Regina campus?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, as I mentioned, we are just giving consideration to what kinds of initiatives we can use in resolving their problem as far as the facility is concerned. And I have no information. I am not able to expand upon anything more specific than that.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I’m not sure whether I understand what the minister is saying. If he is saying that the department is looking at the problem, I would have thought that that would be true on any given Monday morning in any given week of any year in the last 10 years. That’s what departments are for: to review in a general way the problems and challenges which are facing the post-secondary educational institutions. What I’m really asking is: is there a project that has gone so far as to have a name — an additional classroom building or a fine arts building or any other project on the University of Regina campus? And I’m now talking about the Wascana campus; I’ll come back to the College Avenue campus in a moment. Is there a

project at a sufficient stage of development that it has a name that is under discussion now?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — No. The answer to that would have to be no, not at the present time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I turn now to the College Avenue campus of the University of Regina and ask the minister whether his government has a general policy with respect to either the rehabilitation of the present buildings on the Regina Avenue campus or some measure of demolition of those buildings and their substitution with modern buildings?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — At the present time, the university is doing a study on what to recommend with regard to either the renovation or the rehabilitation of the Regina campus, or the old Regina campus.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, inasmuch as the project will be one which, unless things are very different than they have been in the past, will be carried out by the government in the sense that tenders will be called by the government, is the government participating in the study or will the construction actually be supervised by the University of Regina?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, tenders will be called by the university.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, the project will be approved by either the Department of Continuing Education or the Department of Government Services or both in detail prior to the tender call. Is that accurate or not accurate?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — The universities commission has the first approval and then the government.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, in view of the fact that the government will need to approve the project, is the minister able to state any policy decision of the government as to their favouring the rehabilitation of the existing buildings or their substantial demolition and replacement by new buildings?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — No. I don't think that we would be until we get the recommendations from the study that is being done.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, do I understand then that the government is (if I may phrase it that way) indifferent to whether or not the buildings on the College Avenue campus of the University of Regina are demolished and replaced, or rehabilitated? The government doesn't have a view as to which is better in a broad public interest.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — No. I didn't say that, nor did I intend it. I think that what I would say is that we are most interested in hearing a professional opinion from people who have that kind of expertise.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm sure you are interested. It's quite possible at least to have a preliminary opinion before you talk to an expert. What I'm asking the minister is does he have an opinion on whether or not those

buildings should be demolished and replaced, or should be rehabilitated? Obviously he cannot give a definite opinion until he has costs, and until he has . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you can have opinions before money is committed, notwithstanding the apparent custom that prevails in Swift Current. I am asking whether or not the minister and the department have an opinion on what would be more desirable, other things being equal.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — I think that from the point of view of our government, the main problem that we seem to have is that there's such a backlog of buildings that are in need of rehabilitation and/or renovation that we would like to get a professional opinion with regard to the total picture before making an opinion as far as the government is concerned. If you were to ask me my personal, private opinion, I would see some merit in very carefully analysing and scrutinizing the possibility of renovating and/or rehabilitating the present buildings.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, I'm frankly disappointed that the government doesn't have a position on that, and wouldn't be approaching the project with a belief that the buildings should be rehabilitated, and should not be demolished unless there are fairly substantial reasons otherwise. Very clearly, from the very tentative answers given by the minister, the government has not take this approach, but one other thing is on study or on hold, without any opinion.

After a period of nine or 10 months addressing that question, I would have thought the government would have arrived at an opinion. I'm disappointed to think that they do not at least have a tentative opinion on whether or not they perceive the development of that campus as one which is essentially to rehabilitate the old buildings, or one which is essentially to demolish the old buildings and erect some new buildings either there or on the Wascana campus. It's very clear from the minister that they have not arrived at any such even tentative view, and frankly I'm disappointed.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I just wanted to put forward a proposition to the minister. He alludes to the geological science building at the university, and he indicates that the previous government had not in fact made a commitment to a particular proposal. I want to say that I have received copies of letters which went to the Premier of this province. I want to just indicate a part of the feeling at the campus in Saskatoon. It says:

When at last, after 20 years of waiting, we reached the top of the priorities list, the gloom was dispelled and we have been eagerly planning the new building, which we need urgently. Replacement faculty of high calibre were recruited on the understanding that they would not long have to endure the present awful facilities, and there was a new mood of optimism.

And now your government (and this is to the Premier, Mr. Devine) announces that the funding has been rescinded. The news is heartbreaking.

So, certainly I don't think it's fair for the minister to indicate that in fact there was no approval by the previous government or no commitment to the construction of the geological science building. Because certainly the university was disappointed at the actions of your government.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, essentially the previous government had three figures circulating around — one was in the area of \$19 million, one was in the



area of \$17 million, and one was in the area of \$16 million. The universities commission said that they could not build this building for the amount of money that the OC was approved for. So that was the state of affairs when we became the government. That's the reason it was rescinded at that time, because of the mix-up and the lack of decision on the part of the previous government.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, one is amused at anyone asserting a lack of decision who for nine months has not moved a muscle on a project, for nine months has not even turned his mind to the question of what ought to be done. If in fact there was a difficulty, which there was not (the middle figure was the one which was approved, as the minister will know), if he believes that another figure was the appropriate figure, he could have found that out fairly swiftly and dealt with the matter, but he did not. He confined himself to doing nothing and upbraiding others for what he says is a lack of decision making.

The question that I want to direct to the minister is this. He has suggested that there was a substantial backlog of work to be done when he took office. I'm sure he is right. From that I will take it that his average spending will substantially exceed the average spending of the last couple of years of the previous government. Now, the average spending on capital the last couple years of the previous government was \$16.3 million and \$17 million. I take it therefore that when we get the accounts for the year we are now in, the year that will end next March, we will have a figure as large as one of those. And I know we won't and he knows we won't. If we don't, which we all know we won't, the budget which comes down next month will compensate for that and the first two Tory years will be at least as big as the last two NDP years.

If that isn't so, then I know that his crocodile tears about what hadn't been done by the previous administration are nothing more than that, that in fact he doesn't intend to spend any money. He intends only to bemoan the fact that a previous government didn't spend money. He has a clear target there — \$17 million and \$16.3 million in the last two NDP years. If he could get up to that level of spending in constant dollars, which by now would be in the level of \$20 million to \$25 million a year on the average — and you have made a very poor start and you'll have to get up to \$35 million or so a year in the upcoming year and the year thereafter — then I will congratulate him. But if he doesn't, then I will think that his comments about what his predecessors did not do are scant comfort for those who see inaction on his part and on the part of his government.

There has never been a greater increase in enrolments at the two universities in a shorter time than we have now seen in the last couple of years. That is confirmed. Never may be a long time. It could have happened immediately after World War II. I haven't checked those figures. As the president of the University of Regina has said, the enrolment at the University of Regina has grown by 30 per cent in the last two years which is, I believe, unprecedented for that university. At any rate, by any standard, it's a very high rate of growth. This presents a new situation requiring more action by a government and so far what we've got is less action by a government. The test is going to be in the upcoming budget, and we will see whether or not the minister believes that something ought to happen, or whether he believes that we ought to lament what did not happen in the past and do nothing for the future.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the scolding that I have just received from the Leader of the Opposition. I guess I just have to be apologetic for the fact that in nine months we can't correct what damage was done over a period of — except for what? eight years — approximately 44 years.

As far as matching capital construction is concerned, I don't think we're in the business to try and match what anybody did last year or the year before. I think what we're in the business of trying to do is to meet the needs that are out there — the real needs, educationally. I think what we have to try to do is to take a look at the total picture of the needs. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had been here maybe he would have heard a few of the statistics that I pointed out about the fact that we have a need to educate a heck of a lot of people out there who have grade 10 or less education. We have to place a tremendous amount of emphasis upon that. We have a real shortfall in so far as technical training and availability is concerned for students to get training in technical institutes.

As far as the university scene is concerned, sure, you can point to this year or that year. That's a game. But what you should also start pointing at is that over the years, if you take a look at the ups and downs of capital construction for university, that's what it looks like. Now, I'm not going to stand up here and say that we're going to try to match you and your government, what your government did — not at all! I think it would be foolhardy; I think it would be irresponsible as far as the taxpayers of this province are concerned.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — What I am saying to you is that we will do our level best to look at the thing straight on, to do those things which are most needed, to save money wherever it is possible. Certainly, we are going to try to save money as far as capital construction is concerned, because I think we are expected to do that. I think we can look forward to meeting the needs of manpower which exist in the province of Saskatchewan.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, I am sure nobody in their right mind could take any exception to anything the minister said.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — He is in favour of motherhood, and may I put ourselves on the record as being similarly in favour of motherhood. We are proud of what has happened. I hope he will be equally proud of what he has been able to achieve when he leaves office shortly.

May I ask the minister what he achieved with respect to constructing any sort of a technical facility in La Ronge during the year under review?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, at the present time what we are doing is taking a look at what the needs are in La Ronge. At the present time we are taking a look at the DNS facilities which do exist there. We see the need for expanded facilities in La Ronge, that is true, and for expanded programming. I think that we have made some steps in this connection. We have some plans for the future very definitely.

Also, we are thinking in terms of attaching, as a base, the Prince Albert institute and using it as a base, not just for La Ronge, but for several of the other places in our northern training strategy.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the little satellite at buffalo Narrows was, I think, a particularly successful experiment. I think the earlier one at Meadow Lake was not a successful experiment in relative terms. I am not urging the minister to necessarily build anything at La Ronge. We are not talking about buildings, but programs, and I want to underline that. Has he reached any conclusion about when he would likely go ahead with any additional training programs at La Ronge of the type that are now being offered at Buffalo Narrows in heavy vehicle operation, motor vehicle maintenance, welding, and the like?

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Well, just as a general statement, I think that we could safely say that we have our plans in shape to be announced fairly soon, with the idea of starting in the fall of this year.

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, first of all I want to commend the minister for, I believe, what I class as a very sincere and serious comment regarding education and training for northern residents which he made on February 24. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I fully concur with the hon. member (this was in response to Mr. Koskie) in regard to a need for us to address ourselves to recognizing the need for taking initiatives in order to educate Indian children and Metis children.

He was referring at the time to trips that he made into remote northern communities. I, for one, and I believe a good number of our opposition members, my colleagues, felt the same way — that the minister was speaking from the heart and I really appreciated his comments. I just wanted to make that point clear, and I sincerely respect any minister that can get up and say what he feels deep down and put the goldarn politics aside and feel what he actually believes in — helping minority groups in this instance, especially the people in northern Saskatchewan.

I am puzzled though. For some reason or other there has been quite a reduction in comparing the budget handed down by the former administration for items under the continuing education branch. We had, with the former administration, allotted \$5,003,810 for the '81-82 fiscal year. In your budget estimate for 1983 under the same item, vote 26, item 9, you have earmarked \$2,386,080. That is quite a drastic cut when I take into account your comments of the 24th of February, your arguments, and also the arguments you placed before us just awhile ago that there is a need to emphasize and prioritize training and education for northern residents, when in fact here in black and white we see a drastic reduction. I wonder if the minister may want to comment on that and I'll just rest my questioning for the time being.

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Member from Cumberland, I'm not sure I have the right figures in front of me, or I'm not sure that I am interpreting them correctly in order to answer your question. But the figures I have indicate that in 1981-82 the total of enrolment was 704, and that in 1982-83 it was 934. However, the total number of training days was down slightly from 53,000 to 50,000, roughly, in training days. And, I guess the only way I can explain it is the slowdown in the economy. I also agree with you that it's something that we have to do something about in order to turn around.

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you for verifying the need, Mr. Minister. Mr. Chairman, I'll just go on to indicate also to the minister that there were drastic cuts in other areas that pertain to your portfolio. The other cuts were to community colleges. There are grants to third-party organizations under vote 26, item 19. Quite a cut in there as well from the former

administration's proposed budget of \$938,500. It's been cut by \$534,590, and also there was a cut on continuing education of \$47,900. Therefore a loss of \$582,590 was also incurred in that area.

Now, with regard to getting back to the emphasis you placed on the need for training, skilled training, and industrial training in northern Saskatchewan. This really puzzles me, Mr. Minister, when we take into account the drastic cuts into those basic departments that could deliver that type of much needed training and education programming.

If I should go on, I've noted as well that under your 1982-83 estimates, it's quite confusing on page 66. Under vote 26, item 9, you have noted that portions of certain subvotes are also included in the following votes to reflect a realignment of DNS. You've got continuing education, culture and youth, education, government services, plus maybe another seven branches or departments listed here.

This indicates to me that portions of this budget, or portions of another budget, are amalgamated into these various other branches. And it's really confusing to me, and I'm sure people, communities and various educational associations up in northern Saskatchewan are very confused trying to figure out what portions, what priorities have been allotted to them from these various other branches.

I wonder if you might not be able to clarify that for me. If not now, possibly in writing at a later stage, so that when I communicate with my people, my constituents and the people that I am responsible to in terms of my critic role, I may have answers that will verify what has been allotted for those specific programs.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.