

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

April 4, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. DIRKS: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly this afternoon, two very distinguished senior citizens who are seated in the Speaker's Gallery, and I'm referring to Mr. and Mrs. Ted Azevedo from Nipawin, and I will ask them to stand in a minute. Mr. Azevedo has been serving as the president of the Saskatchewan Seniors' Association here in Saskatchewan, and he's presently serving in the distinguished position of chairman of our Senior Citizens' Provincial Council.

We are indeed pleased and privileged to have such a gentleman, and well-known senior citizen, serving on behalf of Saskatchewan seniors, and I'm wondering, sir, if you and your wife would rise in order that we could recognize you and welcome you to this Assembly today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the member from Rosemont in welcoming here today Mr. and Mrs. Ted Azevedo. I've had the opportunity, on a number of occasions, to work with them very closely while minister of social services, and welcome them here today, and hope all other members join with me in that greeting.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SAUDER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to just join with my colleagues in welcoming Mr. And Mrs. Azevedo to the Assembly to watch the proceedings for a while this afternoon. I would agree with the Minister of Social Services, we are indeed fortunate to have people like this working in the interests of their constituents and the groups that they're concerned with. I know I certainly have enjoyed working with Mr. Azevedo on a number of things, and he has a widespread concern for the seniors and is working on their behalf.

One particular project which has impressed me is his concern into northern Saskatchewan which is almost a new frontier as far as services to senior citizens. And he's taken it upon himself to work on their behalf and present their case to governments, and to work with them in their endeavours. And I would just like to add my appreciation to what as already been said for what he's doing for us. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you a group of 49 students from William Grayson public school in Moose Jaw. They came down this morning and have toured some of the buildings in Regina. I've had pictures with them. I'm sure they are a very enjoyable bunch of children to talk to. With them is their teachers: Steve Coffin, Keith Silversides, and Mona Lowe. I certainly wish you all the best in your home trip today. I will ask all the Chamber to welcome them.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. ZAZELENCHUK: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, approximately 27 grade 8 students from W.P. Bates School in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by Mr. Larry Lazecki, phys. ed. teacher and coach of the Goldfins; and Mr.

April 4, 1984

Forsyth, one of the parents and also fireman for the city of Saskatoon; and their teacher, Becky Hansen. I'd like to add that Becky Hansen is the current Miss Saskatoon, and I've had the pleasure of meeting her on an earlier occasion. Everyone in Saskatoon is very proud of the way in which she has represented our city in that capacity. I'll be meeting with the group at 2:30 for pictures, and I'd like all members to join with me in welcoming them here.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite. It's my pleasure at this time, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this House, visitors from St Andrew elementary school in Regina, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery.

There are 26 grade 8 students, along with their teacher, Alma Tibeo. And I understand there are three parents: Mrs. Thauberger, Mrs. Hungle, and Mrs. Biegler.

I hope that you will find your visit interesting and educational, and that you will take back to school with you a little better understanding of what happens in the Legislative Assembly. I shall be meeting with you immediately after question period for pictures in the rotunda, and in the members' dining room for refreshments.

I would ask that the members on both sides of the House join with me in extending a cordial welcome to our guests.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Legislative Assembly, two guests who are seated in the visitors' gallery.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Debbie Morris is an exchange student from Johannesburg, South Africa. She is herein Canada for a stay of one year, and is sponsored by the Rotary Club. And with here is one of her counsellors, Mrs. Jessie Carlson, a constituent of mine from Regina South.

I'd like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Rotary Club for its excellent work in encouraging international friendship and understanding through exchanges of this kind, that bring Debbie Morris here today.

I would ask Mrs. Carlson and Debbie Morris to please stand, and ask the hon. members to join me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Size of Reforestation Program

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources. And my question has to do with the need for jobs in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister, and the need to regenerate one of our key renewable resources in the North, and that is our forests.

In 1980, Mr. Speaker, by way of information, our government planted 12 million trees under its reforestation program, and we had developed the capacity to plant between 17 and 20 million trees by the mid-'80s.

Mr. Speaker, my question is this: what size of reforestation program will the industry, and

government undertake this year under the budget introduced on March 21? How many trees will be planted in the North this year, as a result of this budget? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We'll get to the burning of the trees.

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that we have come to an agreement with the federal government, whereas over the next five years we will be spending somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$34 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many trees?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — You are asking how many trees. I think if you divide the trees into \$34 million you'll come up with a lot of trees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. PICKERING: — The previous agreement that was signed by your administration was a three-year one, for only \$21 million. And this is a 20-year agreement which we will open up after each five for negotiations as to further funding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's my information, Mr. Minister, that the reforestation program this year calls for the planting of only six million new trees. That is about one-half the level of reforestation undertaken by our government in 1980. And my question is this: when the unemployment in the North is so tragically high, and the need to regenerate our forests is so obvious, would you not launch an adequate reforestation program this year, and indicate to the House how many trees will be planted?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well, I can't give you an actual figure of exactly how many trees will be planted, Mr. Speaker. But I will say our share for this year is \$1.4 million, which will be matched by the federal government, which, if you add it up, it probably will come pretty close to \$2.8 million.

MR. THOMPSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister is indicating dollars on this here reforestation program. Could you indicate to the House the number of trees that you will be planting this summer in Saskatchewan's forest — the number of trees? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If the hon. member for Meadow Lake would let me finish here. I'm not interested in dollars, Mr. Minister, I'm interested in the number of trees that your department will be planting in Saskatchewan this summer.

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well one thing I will say, Mr. Speaker . . . One thing we have to get under control is fires. We have purchased two new water bombers to fight the forest fires, at a cost of \$14 million. We are trying to save what we've got. And something that happened in the past was the fact that the former administration was mining the forest. We are in the process right now — it will be complete within the next two or three weeks — of having an overall forest plan in place, and we will continue to harvest this forest and not mine it. Reforestation will take place over the next five years under that agreement.

MR. THOMPSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to try a new question, as the minister has completely avoided the question. On three occasions I asked you the number of trees that would be planted in our forests in Saskatchewan this summer. And on three occasions you got up and indicated dollars, and you talked about the new aircrafts that you were buying to fight fires.

My new question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate you for purchasing these water bombers. I think that's a good addition to our fleet.

April 4, 1984

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — But I want to also talk about your long-range plans with respect to Saskatchewan forest industry. For example, it is my information that your government burned three million seedlings at the Prince Alberta forest nursery last year because your budget didn't provide enough money to cover the cost of planting them throughout the North. Three million seedlings wasted up in smoke. That kind of waste of tax dollars of a renewable resource . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order, please. The member is giving information, not seeking information. This is question period. If you have a question, will you proceed with your question?

MR. THOMPSON: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is: can you assure the people of Saskatchewan that this kind of incredible waste will not be repeated?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with what the member is referring to. I will take notice of that question, and I will also take notice of the amount of trees, or the number of trees that will be planted in the North this year.

Harvesting of Timber in the North

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources, and it's regarding the harvesting of timber in the Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Dillon area in the last two years. Could the minister indicate to this House how many board feet of white spruce and jackpine that was taken out in the Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-la-Crosse, Dillon area, and could you indicate who the contractors were?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a pretty detailed question, and I've been quite busy changing policies in my department to the better liking of the people of the province. And until I get time to go up and count exactly how many they took out, and get a chance to come back and report to you, it might be some time.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is quite interesting to have a minister stand up in the House, be asked a question about how many board feet of timber there was to be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. If you have a question, proceed with the question. But you don't have opportunities for statements in question period.

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A new question to the Minister of tourism and Renewable Resources. Since he indicates that he has not been able to go up into that area and count and take the stumpage himself, I want to ask him here a couple of other questions that he will take notice of and probably give me answer tomorrow, if he just would ask his officials. They would have that in their records. You don't have to go and count the stumps.

Who were the contractors? How much white spruce, and how much jackpine was taken out in the Ile-a-la-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows, Dillon area, in the last two winters? Who were the contractors? And my final question: how many Northerners were employed by the contractors that took out this timber?

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a . . . that question I would have to take notice of it, and I'll certainly get back to the member with the answer.

Funding for Darke Hall

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education, and it concerns the University of Regina and the city of Regina, and the building known as Darke Hall. The minister will know that Darke Hall is a building which was given to the city of Regina and to the University of Regina a good number of years ago by a philanthropic citizen. It has been described as a beautiful part of our heritage, our educational system, and performing arts community, and it's quite literally being allowed to collapse for want of attention by the government.

My question to the minister is this: have you provided adequate funds in the budget of the University of Regina this year to permit the immediate commencement of the rehabilitation of Darke Hall?

HON. MR. MAXWELL: — Mr. Speaker, to give you a straight answer: no, the funds have not been provided in the budget for this year. I could elaborate on that without reference to my hon. colleague's wife, the spring chicken.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I would say is that to this point in time, we have not yet received a program rationalization for the future of the whole campus down there, the old College Avenue campus. As it relates to what the university plans to do with it, we have not received that plan, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The University of Regina, I believe, makes quite clear that its first priority for rehabilitation construction for the year 1984-1985, in the budget which it presented last October 13, was Darke Hall.

Now I ask the minister: in view of the fact that the first priority of the University of Regina in its rehabilitation construction budget presented to you was Darke Hall, have you provided enough money to cover even the first priority item?

HON. MR. MAXWELL: — Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for raising this matter, so that it can be brought out in the open in the House, in the Assembly, and to the media, so we can lay this right out . . .

It was not the number one priority as identified by the university. It was not any priority whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, until such time as we asked the university — I asked the university officials: where do you want to prioritize Darke Hall? And the direct answer given to me by the representative of the university officials at that time was: Darke Hall is a priority to the university if it is up with, over and above, and nothing to do with the funding procedures in place to the university.

I notice that it has been stated that Darke Hall has become a priority of the citizens — the citizens of Saskatchewan — according to a recent letter I saw to the editor in the newspaper. I assume, therefore, that this is a major priority to the citizens of Saskatchewan, that it must be a burning issue in Athabasca and Cumberland, Mr. Speaker.

I've also wondered why, Mr. Speaker, I sat here all fall and received not one question of any description — far less, before the budget procedure — one question as it relates to Darke Hall. And now I'm rather mystified as to why the opposition has found this new-found zeal to find money for things like Darke Hall, when all they did when they were in power was throw up edifices to their own glory, like the T.C. Douglas building, etc., etc.,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I ask the minister again so that there will be no doubt what he is

April 4, 1984

saying. Do I understand the minister to be saying that Darke Hall was not included in the projects submitted to the minister in October last, and that it was not a priority item? In fact, it was not on the list, at all, of items that was requested by the University of Regina. Is that what you're telling the House?

HON. MR. MAXWELL: — Mr. Speaker, what I'm telling the House is that the priority list that was submitted to my departmental officials placed Darke Hall as number three priority.

I don't have the document in front of me but, if memory serves correct, sir, it was number three priority. And in the initial discussions which took place between my officials, officials from the university, a meeting that we held with the board of governors, Darke Hall was no priority at that point, unless it was going to be out with the funding, and out with the guidelines.

It was not going to be a priority. The university wanted it done out with that funding formula that we've been discussing, Mr. Speaker, and when the priority list came to me, as I recall from memory, it was listed number three.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Advanced Education. Mr. Speaker, the University of Regina, the director of the university physical plant, one Mr. Tom Tribe, is quoted as saying that Darke Hall was third on the list of 20 items contained in the capital rehabilitation category, behind a request for a new heating system, and a request for an updating of a telephone and computer system and was, in fact, the first building in the building rehab list.

Will the minister confirm that?

HON. MR. MAXWELL: — Mr. Speaker, if memory serves correct once again (I don't have the documents in front of me), after we had asked the university where they wanted to prioritize Darke Hall, after we had said what kind of priority is it with you, after extensive discussion in that regard, I would say to the hon. member the university officials felt compelled, at that point, to include it in their priority list.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the minister now admits that it was in the priority list of the university, and in view of the fact that he now admits that it was, in fact, the first building rehabilitation – that was first priority in building rehabilitation, behind only repairs to heating, planning, and telephone system – will he explain to the House why he has ignored that high priority given to it by the University of Regina and has, in fact, provided no funds for the University of Regina to do anything with Darke Hall?

HON. MR. MAXWELL: — Mr. Speaker, the administration of the university has made it very clear to me, in discussions with them – discussions which did not include people from the Darke Hall "save Darke Hall" coalition – they have made it very clear to me where their building priorities lie. They made it very clear, Mr. Speaker, where those building priorities lie. The ones that they wanted to do didn't even appear in their priority list, the one to which the hon. member has been referring.

Escort Service Advertisements

HON. MR. LANE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On April 2, a question was asked of the Premier by the member from Regina Centre. The question was:

The government continues to profit by a recent explosion of prostitution in the province. I'm talking about a proliferation of escort services, which law enforcement agencies and women's groups – they'll both tell you – are simply fronts for prostitution.

He then went on to refer to yellow page ads in the directories. He referred to Regina. And, Mr.

Speaker, the notice was taken of that particular question, and I have information to reply to the hon. member today.

The allegation, of course, made, is that the government is profiting by prostitution, indicating that, in fact, the advertising of escort services was a new practice.

I go back to 1980, and I believe the hon. member was minister responsible for Sask Tel. At that time the NDP carried ads for escort services, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How many?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of how many. I go back to 1976, and I have a picture in the yellow pages, Mr. Speaker, with a nude female, a massage parlour which was subsequently shut down, which was advertised in the yellow pages and allowed by the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I take it a step further. Ads in 1982 authorized by the NDP for escort services in the yellow pages – allowed by the NDP, and I'm not sure whether the hon. member . . .

But I take it even a step further when we talk about the question of prostitution and pornography. I have a CPN (Co-operative Programming Network) ad, and most of us will recall the now demised CPN, our pay television network owned by the government of the day – the previous administration bought it – which showed soft core pornography on government pay television. Mr. Speaker, not only . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm going to respond, Mr. Speaker, to the allegation made. There's little doubt that the previous government were purveyors of pornography. And, in fact, the question of prostitution is one that I'm going to urge the hon. member to forward, to my officials, evidence that he has that all escort services are fronts for prostitution.

I can advise that, at present, there are two matters before the courts involving escort . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's the allegation that was made. Two matters, two escort services, are under investigation regarding prostitution.

If the hon. member has evidence that all escort services are fronts for prostitution, I think he has an obligation to forward that information to my officials, and I will give the commitment that they will be investigated as soon as possible, because that type of practice, Mr. Speaker, we condemn, and we will do everything to stop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — . . . (inaudible) . . . make a couple comments to that six-minute-long diatribe by the Minister of Justice. Let me say, by way of background to my question, that I've never been minister of Sask Tel. Let me also say, with respect to your question, I've never been minister responsible for CPN, but let me say with respect to your question, the issue, it seems to me, is not whether or not something was done in '76 or '78.

The issue, Mr. Minister, is: what is your policy, here and now, with respect to the advertisement of escort services? If the minister is short of evidence that a goodly number of these escort services are, in fact, providing prostitution services, then I suggest the minister ask your own police forces, because they don't have any doubt.

I ask the minister to stop evading the question and tell me: yes or no, are you going to continue to carry these advertisements in Sask Tel? Stop evading the question.

HON. MR. LANE: — I notice the hon. member is backing away from his statement of the other day. Let me tell him what the policy is, and there's been no change in policy.

April 4, 1984

Sask Tel is not to be a censor. The ads of all kinds, any yellow-page ads, must be in good taste, must not be obscene and, I think, looking at some of the ads, the policy has changed, I think, in the last couple of years compared to your 1976 ad, that they must be in good taste and, as I say, they must not be obscene. Sask Tel cannot be in the position of being the censor; if that's what you're asking, I'm sorry. That would be highly inadvisable, in my view.

But the question of what action are we taking to deal with escort services where we have evidence of prostitution: we are acting aggressively; we will continue to act aggressively. And if the hon. member has some evidence – any evidence – that all of them are fronts for prostitution, I suggest you have an obligation, not only as a member of this Assembly, but, as a lawyer, to bring that evidence forward. I suggest to you though, the political question you raised, you're the party that wants the legalization of prostitution. Svend Robinson called for it. You support it. That's the NDP position. And I suggest to you, when you owned CPN, you were the purveyors of pornography in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the activities of escort services have been the subject of vociferous complaints by women's groups, from your own police forces, and from the mayors of virtually every major city in this country. My question, Mr. Minister is: are you going to turn a blind eye to the problems of the mayors, the women's groups, and the downtown areas, by continuing to facilitate this activity by carrying their ads?

HON. MR. LANE: — I have already indicated that there are presently two cases before the courts, which I cannot comment on the question of prostitution and escort services. And I'm satisfied, and the reports I have is that the police are pursuing, where they have the evidence, matters aggressively.

I think, though, that the comment that all escort services are fronts for prostitution is one that the hon. member – I notice that he backs off because I'm not sure that that's the case. An if you're saying that all escort services, including those that provide escort services for females are to be closed down and shut down, I hope that you've got some information to give to me, because if there's illegal activities, we will take action, and we will take it immediately. And give us the information – and let me tell you my prosecutors are working in conjunction, in close co-operation with the police of this province to shut down illegal activities, and we will pursue them aggressively.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Question period is over, and I want to rise on a point of order as to what happened during that question period.

My point, Mr. Speaker is this: the member for Regina Centre asked specific questions to the minister in charge of Sask Tel. We got questions back from the Attorney General going off on what the Attorney General should be doing, what other people should be doing about prosecutions. Since when is Sask Tel in charge of prosecutions? That was totally irrelevant. So, indeed, were comments . . . so, indeed, were comments about the federal NDP, or about CPN, or any other comments like that. And this, Mr. Speaker, was in reply to a supplementary question. Totally irrelevant. Totally out of order. And I think, Mr. Speaker, it ought to have been called out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the point of order, I think it very important

that the question raised by the member from Regina Centre on April 2nd, where he accused the government . . . The question was accusing the government of profiting by prostitution, and that was the question that was raised on April 2nd. And I think, Mr. Speaker, I've responded to that question, and I've proven that the question, or the allegation, was false. And secondly, I've also taken, indicated, and proved, that the practice of previous administrations was actually to promote pornography. And in fact, the advertising policy has not changed.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm going to ask for order. If the members realize that when the speaker is on his feet, the Chamber is to remain silent. And both sides of the House, I will indicate, have not been following by that particular order of this House, and I would ask that that order be obeyed.

As far as the point of order today, I would like to review the record, and I will come back with a written answer to your point of order. I would like to draw to the attention of the members though, that *Beauchesne's* indicates that question are not to provoke debate. And I believe that the member from Regina Centre, when he did ask his question, very much asked a question that would provoke debate. And when the minister responded, he also provoked debate. But I would like more time to review the record of the question, and the answer, and I'll bring in a ruling tomorrow.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: — Today I would like to lay on the Table the 1983 report of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

MOTIONS

Referral of Bills to Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, just prior to Orders of the Day, I have three motions regarding the referral of bills to the committee on non-controversial bills.

First of all, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That an order for second reading of Bill No. 31 – An Act to amend The Commissioners for Oaths Act, be discharged, and the bill referred to the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills.

I so move, seconded by the hon. member from Maple Creek.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 34 – An Act to amend The Farm Security Act, be discharged, and the bill referred to the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills.

I so move, seconded by the hon. member from Maple Creek.

Motion negatived.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member from Maple Creek, and by leave of the Assembly:

That the order for second reading of Bill No. 37, an Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act, be discharged, and the bill referred to the

April 4, 1984

Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Motions for Interim Supply

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I move the following motion in committee, please:

Be it resolved that the sum not exceeding \$256,024,240 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1985.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, I think I heard that figure, and that's one-twelfth, is it? One-twelfth of the total budget?

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is, and I should have clarified that at the beginning. I apologize. It is one-twelfth of the amount, and that's as is the tradition.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, I move:

That it be resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$256,024,240 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman:

Be it resolved that a sum not exceeding \$63,572,590 be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1985.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — That is one-twelfth of the heritage fund vote. Am I correct in that ? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, the fourth motion in the interim supply:

Be it resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$63,572,590 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman, the next two motions deal with the Special Projects Fund:

Be it resolved that a sum not exceeding \$2.5 million be granted to Her Majesty on account for the 12 months ending March 31, 1985.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Chairman:

Be it resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$2.5 million be granted out of the Special Projects Fund.

Motion agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

FIRST AND SECOND READING OF RESOLUTIONS

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolutions be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to and resolutions read a first time.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the resolutions be now read a second time and agreed to.

By leave of the Assembly, the said resolutions were read a second time and agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (Interim Supply)

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That Bill No. 40, An Act for the Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1985, be now introduced and read the first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the bill be now read a second and third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second and third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (continued)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

EDUCATION

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 8

Item 1 (continued)

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, we alluded to a situation in the city of Moose Jaw last night. I wonder if the minister can at this time indicate whether any new developments or any changes can, in fact, give us an update in respect to the situation, whether indeed there have been any changes since we spoke last night.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, there has been no change since last night.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, last evening you indicated that one of the problems that you saw in the area of education is the declining enrolment throughout the province. I wonder if the minister could, in fact, indicate whether she has, in fact . . . if she could

indicate whether there has been, and to what extent – a decline – that is during the past year, relative to the year before. I'll just ask that first of all.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — I'll use figures from '82-83 and then to the year '83-84. First of all, enrolment or declining enrolment is not a uniform factor within the province. And what we have in terms of declining enrolment being a problem is in the rural area, and particularly within the high school age group. That has not levelled off yet. I suppose on the positive side, we've seen it levelling off in the elementary level, and particularly in some of our urban centres.

The total figures are very positive over the year that I'm going to give you in terms of the province, and the potential for growth. We have, in fact, for the first time in many years seen an increase in total provincial enrolment by 57 from the year '82-83 to the year '83-84. And the enrolment is at 203,887 students.

MR. KOSKIE: — And I would ask the minister, and I think you have alluded to it, but have you done a further projection for say, into the future of the next five years and be able to project whether, in fact, we will be having a declining enrolment? Or whether the positive factor, which you speak of, of the increase of 57 overall from '82 to '83, whether you see further positive signs, and that, in fact, there will be rather than a decline, a growth in the school enrolment.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Yes, we do do some projections, and we see on the overall factor an increase moving forward into several years. I guess to use, you know, a few specific examples, school boards over the past several years have gotten into some sophisticated projections in terms of various factors within their community.

And I look at some of the communities that are really indicating a growth factor, such as Kindersley, who has had a substantial projected increase that they will be faced with in a few years, particularly, in the age group of one and two-year-olds. And also, the birth rate is up too. So while the province does projections, so does the local level. And, of course, that shows up also when they start submitting their budgets and that type of thing. But overall, we do do a projection, and it is one of moving upward over the next several years.

MR. KOSKIE: — I take it, when you referred to one of the problems relating to the question of student enrolment decline, that you are specifically, primarily referring to the rural communities of the small communities in Saskatchewan.

This is the concern that I have, is that throughout Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan do, in fact, want their local community to continue to exist. The school is a very important factor to the continuation of a small community in rural Saskatchewan. And it seems to me that what is going to be happen is that there is going to be a precipitation of that problem by the very policies of your government which I think you, as Minister of Education, should be conscious of. And that is, there is further centralization of government services by your government from the small communities of Saskatchewan.

We find other indications of it. We find it in the form of, you know, the farm bankruptcies, and that leads to eliminating family farms. We find the proposals of your government towards inland terminals also counter-productive to the maintenance of the rural communities.

And similarly, I think in respect to the overall development of business, I know we had some reasonable success during the 11 years under our party, and certainly in my constituency, a great deal of success in the allocation of manufacturing and processing establishments which gave yet another base to the community, and helped to be able to establish that population base and give some substance and growth to the rural areas.

And so I am concerned, and I think the minister should be concerned, because it's a concern to the people of this province that their schools be closed down in their communities. I can think in

my constituency in the town, the village of St. Gregor, they only have, I believe, up to grade 7. Now if they were to lose that school, that community continuance and life would be in jeopardy.

And so, in addressing this question, I don't think it's necessarily just a matter of taking a look at the decline in school population in rural areas because that can be, in fact, redirected by government actions. And I leave with the minister's consideration the concern of many people in this province that the direction that we're heading is for further and further consolidation of the educational system, the removal of schools, and the closure of schools throughout the province, which I will be getting into.

I want to also, in respect, you indicated that last year, or '82 over '83, that there was an actual increase of some 57 students, if my figure is correct. What I want to ask you as a corollary is: can you indicate whether there was any teacher decline — that is, the number of teachers that were employed last year as compared with the previous year? In other words, were there fewer teachers out there last year than the previous year?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — I fully appreciate your concern particularly in the issue of consolidation. I would suggest, however, it's 11 years too late, and somewhat before your time the whole issue of consolidation and what it did to the rural areas is pretty drastic. If you go back in history and you look at the year 1944 when it started to take place under the CCF government, you would see, immediately, a third of the school systems lost.

Obviously you feel this government is centralization, and clearly we have a difference, in opinion. From my perception, under your government it was a move to Regina and Saskatoon and very little else, and I would suggest that the policies of this government have been just the opposite.

One of the things that we've done over the last year was extend to the elementary system in rural areas the grant for small schools that, previous to that, was only to the high schools. And we did that for some obvious reasons: to keep those schools there, that perhaps consolidation had taken place to its fullest point.

On the matter of the teacher decline, it is my understanding, from the information that we have, there are approximately 70 less teachers in the province over the last year, out of a total of about 11,000.

MR. KOSKIE: — I wonder if the minister would indicate that while she states, at least, that the population, or the student enrolment has increased, but that there are 71 (she says about 70; the report from the STF indicates 71) fewer full-time teachers. In other words, if the student population has, as she has indicated, increased by 57, how do you account for a cutback of some 71 full-time teachers?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — In reply, Mr. Chairman, to the member's question, I guess there's several factors that come in, particularly in the area of staffing, that a board will look at, along with its administration, and also with its school staffing. The boards have been very responsible in terms of staffing their programs and maintaining a certain level, even through several years of serious decline.

The whole issue of pupil-teacher ratio has not been an issue. You know, we went through a period of time when the overall ratio was 16 in the province, and the pupil-teacher ratio, at that very same time, was also becoming an issue in several other provinces. Today the pupil-teacher ratio would tell you that it is approximately 18.3, which also includes the northern component of Saskatchewan education.

So while, yes, there's been 57 more students in the K to 12 system, and 70 less teachers, I would suggest if you take a look at the whole picture it would put it into proper perspective.

April 4, 1984

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, I think what you have said has helped to put it into perspective, and obviously it puts into the perspective that I want to deal with, and that is the question of funding.

Obviously what has happened here, as the minister has alluded to, is that the number of students from '82 to '83, in fact, increased, and during that same period of time, because of the basic underfunding of this government, the school boards have had to slash, have had to slash the number of staff and indeed the services — the quality of education is being in jeopardy. I don't think there is any other explanation. She says it's the board's prudence, and I have full respect for the frugality of the boards and the efficiency of their operation. But I think what you are alluding to is that, obviously, if the previous year they had 71 more teachers with fewer students, then, if you follow your logic, they only suddenly started to become more efficient and more frugal in their approach. I guess we have to ask why are they, in fact, decreasing the number of teachers as, in fact, the population of students has increased as the minister indicated.

Obviously what is happening is that your funding — and certainly what we want to talk about is this year — is going to play havoc, I submit, on the educational system. I want to take what has happened just as an illustration in the community, for example, where I reside. There they have been continuing to slash teachers. I am told, and I want to check this out, is the Humboldt School Division will again have to cut some six teachers from their complement. In the home community in which I reside I know we did have a phys. ed . . . competent phys. ed teacher. That has been dropped. Now it is distributed among other teachers trying to perform those duties.

And so what I'm really alluding to, Madam Minister, certainly one can appreciate the necessity for restraint. I'm not being blind to that reality, but I think that the high proportion of what is really happening is in respect to the funding, and particularly we'll be raising some instances where I think it has been very serious. So I would really ask the minister, will she not agree that to some extent that the reality that some 71 teachers has been cut from the system, while their student enrolment has increased, that the amount of funding does not have a direct bearing on that particular situation, and has driven boards to do economies which they otherwise would not have done?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well no, I don't agree in total, Mr. Chairman. He is ignoring a lot of factors that schools operate under. For instance, you may very well have 57 more students in the province, but they could also be in one system. Does that mean that part of those 70 teachers all come from that system, or somewhere else? Like, obviously you're not looking at the whole province. If you want to talk just about your constituency, let's talk about Humboldt. Let's talk about Humboldt.

The member says there's no funding. Before I get to Humboldt specifically, and its funding and its mill rate, maybe I should go back to the year 1975, and what I saw was a decrease — a decrease in '75, '76, '77, '78, '79, '80, and '81, and then, in '82, before you left office, a decrease — in every one of those years as to the government's contribution. What I saw, when my colleague from Regina Wascana became minister of education, was a holding of that position, not going down like it did under the former administration, but a holding pattern — at least being able to maintain without dropping any lower. And I suggest to you that you can't ignore those figures, Those are hard facts.

When I look at the mill rate, specifically Humboldt School Division, and I go back to the year 1980, there was an 11-mill increase. In 1981, there was an 18-mill increase, and, in 1982, 9 mills. And it was 4 mills in 1983. So I don't agree with you.

MR. KOSKIE: — I wonder if the minister would be good enough to provide us with a list of all the school boards in the province receiving provincial grants, and indicating the operating grant received in '83-84, and the amount of the grant to be received in '84-85. This certainly was a

tradition in the past, and it would be very useful to be able to take a look at the provincial picture, and I was wondering if she would have that available and could provide that to us.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to provide the information, and the department will prepare a package, and when it's ready, we will send it to you.

MR. KOSKIE: — Certainly, Madam Minister, I appreciate your co-operation. I would have thought that it would have been germane to the discussion today to have that information. It makes it rather difficult, taking a look at the whole province, when you have the sole package which sits before you on your desk, and are not able to provide that during an estimates, where funding is of ultimate concern.

And so I want to ask the minister now, what are you saying? Are you saying that you cannot provide to us, during this estimates, forthwith . . . whether you have not, in fact, formulated that package? I want to ask you, are you hiding behind the figures to escape the wrath of the opposition for your inadequacies throughout this province? I want to ask you . . . You can no longer hide. You know, you come to funding in one place. you say you hide under the formula. You go into another area, and you hide under a study. Now you are wanting to make it impossible for the opposition to properly address the whole question, which is very germane to estimates, and that is the particular grants that you are providing throughout Saskatchewan to all of the school boards.

I certainly think . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll tell you, a lot of people are starting to take a look at this outfit, since you mentioned it, and they're starting to say that there is no sincerity over there, because what they're saying to me is, when the opposition is asking for information, and I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this is very germane . . . Vital. This is vital to the continuation of the discussion here of these estimates.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, how short our memories are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Either that or order a hearing aid. If I had thought that you would have liked one of my briefing books, I guess I should have made one for opposition. Of course we have information as it's put in, but I have suggested that we will send it over to you. It's no different than what has happened in the past. You may have the information. We will put it together in a nice package for you with your name on it, and we'll send it to you.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to say, Madam Minister, that this is probably the first time that a minister has come forward and has refused to provide, during the estimates, vital information, and I think that certainly, unless we can get that information, I think it's the obligation of the opposition to give you an opportunity to do it, and move the adjournment of the continuation of the estimates.

Or we can get a list of them, and I know you have the information, and we can go through it, one by one, school board after school board, and you can read them out. Because certainly you have them there, because you were able to allude to what the Assiniboia School Division was getting, and you were able to allude to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right, and you allude to the Humboldt School Unit. But it seems that you want to hold back this information until after the estimates.

And I want to again make a sincere plead on behalf of the opposition, and indeed, who we represent, the public of Saskatchewan, that you reconsider what you have, in fact, said in the refusal to provide this important information at this particular time.

I ask the minister: will she ask her officials to scurry around and run to a duplicator, and send over some of these copies of the sheet where it indicates the particular grants to all of the boards?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, I hope you are sincere in what you're saying. I have my doubts

April 4, 1984

that you are, and I think everybody else in here does, including your own members.

You have said that this is the first time that this package has not been provided to the opposition during estimates. Well, I challenge you to prove that. You tell me that this happened when Mr. Douglas McArthur was minutes of education . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will give you the information in a package. We'll put it together for you. I suggest you withdraw that remark.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I want to ask the minister: do you, in fact, have today, in your possession, in your briefing book, the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, no, just a minute . . . the information which we are requesting? In respect to the question which I asked is: would the minister please provide a list of all the school boards in the province receiving provincial grants, indicating the operating grant received in '83-84, and the amount to be provided in 1984-85? I ask the minister: does she, in fact, have that in her possession here in the House today? Because if she does, we're prepared to ask the page to take that page, have it duplicated so that we have it, since she apparently thinks it's not important. But we do.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I will provide the information as requested. I will simply honour the traditions of this House.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't have the *Hansard* with me, Madam Minister. My resemblance of this is different than yours. My remembrance of it is that ministers traditionally tabled the details of the grants, as the minister of highways traditionally tables the details of the highway construction.

Madam Minister, your estimates are difficult to deal with in the absence of this information. If Madam Minister prefers, we could adjourn these estimates until we get them, but your estimates are very difficult to deal with without knowing what the school boards are getting. We know what the Regina . . . I'm in a different position. We know what the Regina school board is getting, because it's notorious; they've complained about it. But for my colleagues in other parts of the province, these estimates are extremely difficult to deal with.

And Madam Minister, let me remind you, you're talking about, we are talking about, the vast bulk of your budget. I would guess that 90 per cent of your budget goes out in grants, so we're talking about a big chunk of your budget, and we're asked to take it on faith and take it in the mail later on. That simply isn't satisfactory, Madam Minister.

Will you undertake . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It was my remembrance of it that that information was tabled, Madam Minister. I'm not calling . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is that a fact? Well, I'm glad to know.

I stand by my comment though, Madam Minister, that your estimates are difficult to deal with unless we have this information. If it is . . . Madam Minister offered to table her briefing book, and I'd welcome that. If Madam Minister wants to provide her briefing book, I'll sit down and I'll stop complaining. I don't think the offer was serious. I think she was being facetious.

But we can't deal with your estimates very well without having the picture of the vast bulk of your expenditures, and we don't have it. So I would ask Madam Minister to photocopy the page. I assume those grants appear upon a few sheets of paper. Photocopy the page and give it to us.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what game is trying to be played, but we have an ex-minister of education across the way. This did not happen. He honoured a tradition of the House that I have said I will honour, and we'll get the information to you. What happened last year? How did you deal with estimates last year? Was it any more difficult than it is this year? Like let's forget the games, and if you've done your homework let's get down to some questions on education.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman and Madam Minister, of course last year we weren't dealing with the same number of cut-backs as we are this year, and I would like to find out from you very clearly whether or not you have in your possession, or outside the door, that information that we are requesting.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The member from Shaunavon indicates masses of cuts. He is still ignoring that there has been a 5 per cent increase on the operating grants. He is still ignoring that, and that the overall budget . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well of course you know that — you have a blue book that has the figures in it. You also know the factors that come into the funding formula. And be fair. The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, he knows his school board received an increase . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Are you suggesting I'm not telling the truth, you know? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, we will give you the list . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm sorry we don't have it right now. You want a package of individual school divisions. Come on, guys. I said you'll get the information, and it's simply no different than it ever has been before.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — You still haven't indicated whether or not, in your office, in this building, or in your possession among your staff, or in your briefing book, whether or not you have the information. Are you saying that you don't have that information in your office or in your briefing book?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — What I have in my briefing material are preliminary figures. It is a soft figure until the actual mill rate is set, and for those school divisions that are going through reassessment, some of them are in discussion with the assessment authority, so that is also a soft figure. The actual figures that I have are the 5 per cent increase on the operating grant which is basically based on a per pupil.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Have all of the school divisions been notified of the increase or the cut in their funding for this year? And that's public knowledge.

Well, what I'm saying is: if you've sent it out to all the school divisions, why can't we have it? And it's public knowledge, and in the newspapers. Why in the world wouldn't you allow the opposition, who represent a good number of people in the province, access to this information?

And I can tell you, Madam Minister, that there are a great number of people who are interested in this information, and this is our job. We're not trying to do something that isn't legitimate, or illegal. It's simply very important to my school divisions, and to the people in my community, to know what the grants are to those school divisions. And why are you refusing to give it to us?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — I guess the bottom line is, in the form that you are asking (and I'm making some assumptions, so you can correct me if I'm wrong), the information is not compiled here, in what you're asking for. And I'm making the assumption that you are asking for division by division, and all the factors, pardon me, that make up the formula component.

We don't have that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you know, you need that, because that tells your total picture.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Chairman, the minister maybe doesn't understand my question. I'm not interested in the formula. I'm not interested in all the components. What I'm interested in is the amount of money each school division is going to receive this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Compared to last year.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I have what they got last year. What I need now is what they're getting this year. They've all been notified of what they're going to get.

April 4, 1984

And we can go at this another way. We can go division by division, asking you, one at a time, how much money each one is going to get. And I'm sure you'll give it to us, because why wouldn't you? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, then, start.

Let's get it going, because we need that before we can continue on. Because when I find out if one of my school divisions is getting a 10 per cent cut, then I have further questions to ask you.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — I will prepare the package, with all the components that you require in order to get the whole picture – division by division, factor by factor.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Madam Minister, for example, can you give me the amount of grant that the Shaunavon School Division will be receiving this year?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, Shaunavon School Division No. 71, in 1983, received a grant of \$1.92 million. In 1984, and this is an estimate, will receive a figure of 1.95. This estimated figure does not take into account shared services, which I believe Shaunavon is into; if they have any bilingual programs, with the possibility of bilingual grants in any of their schools; and I would suspect they don't have any community schools. But those are the kinds of components that we don't have together in the kind of package that you want today.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, Madam Minister, you're a little off on what you're trying to get for us. What I want is that number that you just gave where you compare the basic grant of 192 – 1.92 to 1.95. I don't want to put you through the trouble of the shared programs, through the problem of the French language. What I want is the basic component, that grant that you just gave me for the Shaunavon School Division. What we want is that number for each school division throughout the province. You have those numbers there, and we can go through it this way, one by one by one, or you can send that across to us right now.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, the 1983 figure that I gave you for Shaunavon School Division has the factors built into it because that's a final. I told you the 1984 is an estimated figure that does not include those factors. So the comparison would be really unfair. Do you understand that?

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Madam Minister, I am well aware what programs are available in the Shaunavon constituency in each of the divisions. And if you are willing to give us those numbers – the basic grant – we will make those comparisons, and if we see very large differences, we will come back and ask you on specific cases whether or not there's a problem with the funding. We are simply insisting that we get that basic grant that you have sent out to all the school divisions, so that we can carry on our questioning here in estimates.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I will repeat myself. I will get the figures for them so that you can do a reasonable comparison, which you will not be able to do with the figures that are here, because all the factors are not in those totals for '84, but they are for 1983.

And I still maintain: that is simply in accordance with the traditions of this House, as the member from Regina Centre well knows.

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, Mr. Chairman. We feel very strongly on the matter of the minister providing this type of information. As has been pointed out, she has a budget in the neighbourhood of 379 million – 380 million – and the operating school grants represent 350.5 million in rounded-out figures. We find it very difficult – next to impossible – to be able to continue with out the minister being able to provide it.

For the minister to stand up and say that she can't provide it is not accurate, because she has provided it in respect to Shaunavon. We think that it's vital to our continuation of the estimates, and because the information isn't forthcoming. I think that it's impossible to do an adequate job in the area of funding throughout this province, and therefore I'm going to move, Mr. Chairman:

That this committee be adjourned and that the minister be given an opportunity to come back later with the information.

I so move . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it be adjourned. That's what I mean.

Motion negatived.

MR. KOSKIE: — I think that funding has a lot, Mr. Minister – since you're speaking from your desk – funding has a lot to do with children and the quality of education.

Well, I want to have my colleague here do some recording, and we're going to get this information from the minister. She has been able to provide my colleague from Shaunavon with the details in respect to the question he asked.

I want to go through the rural units. I'd like to start with Arcola. I wonder if the minister could, in fact, give the '83 amount of the operating grants that was received, and provide us with the amount for 1984 under the budget under review.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — I can give you the same kind of information that I gave Shaunavon, but there's some factors that are not in it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We know that.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — No, I don't think you do know that. Arcola School Division, based on the actual '83 and the estimate that is missing a few factors for '84, has an 18.39 per cent increase which could conceivably be higher if I had the figures about all the other aspect of their program.

MR. KOSKIE: — You were able to calculate, Madam Minister, the percentage. Could you give us the numbers on which you based your calculation? That is the '83 operating grants, and the '84.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The actual in 1983 was 3,204,237. 1984 is 3,793,610, without shared services and a few other factors in it.

MR. KOSKIE: — The Assiniboia Rural School Division: would you give us the same.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, Assiniboia – 1983 grant was 2,171,982; 1984 estimate is 2,518,445. That's a change of plus 15.95 per cent increase. Obviously there is several factors in there. Their enrolment has been very minor in terms of increase, only about 5, I believe. But the other factors of the formula come in, and Assiniboia come up with a 15.95 per cent increase.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, would you give us the figures for Battle River?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Battle River last year received \$3,209,720. This year the estimated figure (and this is a soft figure, and I'll give you the reasons why) is 2,941,822, which shows a minus factor of 8.35.

Some of the major factors affecting Battle River are the assessment growth, and also they've had a major increase in their assessment, and that may need adjusting, but we don't know that yet.

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, can you provide us the information for the Battlefords?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Battlefords School Division No. 58, in 1983 received a grant of \$2,594,285. In 1984 the estimated figures is \$2,844,394. It is a positive change to 9 per cent – 9.64 per cent. Obviously some other factors come in there, such as a change in assessment growth – up or down – and capital debt retirement.

April 4, 1984

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, can you give us the similar figures for Biggar?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Biggar was 2,109,656 in '83. Estimate in 1984 is 2,068,104. That is a decrease of 1.9 per cent. The major factors in Biggar is the decline in their enrolment by approximately 39-40 students. They've had a plus factor on their assessment growth, and they've had a change in their tuition fee agreements. They are paying less fees to other jurisdictions most likely, for special ed students.

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, can you give the information in respect to Blaine Lake.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Blaine Lake School Division No. 57, in 1983 received a grant of 1,907,420. The estimated figure for 1984 is \$2,023,213. That's a change percentage-wise of 6.07. Some of the major factors, even though they've had an enrolment decline of 36 pupils, that has been counter-balanced by an increase in capital recognition, and the payment of an under-payment from 1983.

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, can you give us the information respect to Borderland.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Borderland School Division No. 68, in 1983 received a grant of \$1,706,180. In 1984 the estimated figure is \$2,415,964. In dollars that's approximately 700,000; works out to a 41.66 per cent increase. And I guess some of the major factors that would come into it would be a change in their assessment and a change in their capital debt.

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, can you give the details in respect to Broadview.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The figures that I will give you for Broadview are tentative, because we have to have some discussion with Broadview, or at least a look at one figure. The 1983 grant was \$2,273,005; 1984 estimated grant is \$2,168,877. It shows a minus 4 per cent decrease. They've lost about 27 students. The factor within the formula that is in question is on transportation, on the calculations that we have, and there will be further discussions on that.

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, this is a torturously slow procedure, which I think that we were really entitled to have had, because obviously you do have the information . . . And it indicates trends, and, I think, problems in the area of financing throughout the province, and that's what we wanted to look at, is the entire picture.

I know I can spend the next hour or two, but I will be prepared to do this, Madam Minister: to proceed on with other questions that I have, if you will, in fact . . . if the minister will, in fact, provide us, say tomorrow, when we reconvene for her estimates, this information. That will give her staff and so on an opportunity to compile it. It is compiled; it's a question of getting it run off and providing it to us. I ask the minister whether she is prepared to take that very good offer for the help to proceed as rapidly as possible, and if you provide us with that list tomorrow when we reconvene for estimates, we can get on with it very rapidly. Otherwise, if you're not going to provide any of this information during estimates, then obviously we have one alternative, as I see, and that is to continue with the one by one. So I make that offer.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I have stated I would provide the information. We will put the package together. I'm working off of three documents here. I have done more than give you a commitment; I have also honoured the tradition of this House. If you want, let's continue on in the manner that we've been, and we'll work from these three or four documents. I'm prepared to do that. You're not prepared to take my commitment that, as soon as we can, we will get a package together that tells the whole picture. We are still dealing with some estimated figures here. You're not prepared to accept my word, so I am quite prepared to do today what you want, if you feel that you need to go through this, and that I will not abide by the commitment that I have given.

MR. KOSKIE: — What I have asked you to do is to, tomorrow, provide us with the information as we are eliciting from you today. Certainly you have staff which could certainly provide that for tomorrow. The only thing . . . What you're saying is that you're going to complete this document and provide it to us, but that in fact you are not going to provide it during the period of estimates. That seems like a highly unsatisfactory reply.

I ask the minister once again to think seriously of what she is denying the opposition, which is readily available to her and which could be compiled into a table as has been the practice in the past. We can proceed on with other topics of discussion in here. And certainly, you could compile it. Give us your commitment that you'll have it here tomorrow. Can you do that?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I will provide the information as quickly as I can. I have already indicated to the opposition, to you, to this House, that it is not a simple matter of providing one document that may be in this briefing book, if they are sincere about wanting all the information that goes into the calculation of grants and the pay-outs. We will give it to you as quickly as we can.

MR. KOSKIE: — When you indicate, Madam Minister, "as quickly as you can," I ask you: will that be in time to have it to review within the estimates tomorrow? I mean that's really the crux of the question. Can you have it ready for tomorrow?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I will try and give this information as quickly as was provided in the years from '72 to '82.

MR. KOSKIE: — I think that the minister has no legitimate reason that she has been able to put forward. She tries to indicate that she's following precedent. And factually, just because the opposition in the past was less than competent, does not indicate that the same procedure should be followed. I think it's critical to the discussion of . . . \$350 million out of a \$379 million budget, and it clearly would indicate the overall funding picture in the province. We know of particular areas, and I think it should be clear to the public of Saskatchewan that here we, eight of us, are endeavouring as an opposition to clearly outline to the public what is going on, which we believe is inadequate funding to the school system. And we have asked for the minister's structure of funding for the various divisions, and today it has been denied. I think that is indeed a departure from allowing this House to thoroughly go through the most significant area, and that is funding.

I'm going to leave it at that, and I'm going to rest my case with the public of Saskatchewan, that we have been, in fact, denied that very vital information. And I'm going to go on with funding the areas which have been, of course, very, very public, and that is in respect to the areas of the public school and separate school here in the city of Regina, and the public school and the separate school of Saskatoon.

I think that the minister is aware that there has been very substantial decrease in the amount of funding to the respective schools. The Saskatoon public school – the reports by the board – is \$1 million less than the year before. The Saskatoon separate, about 550, or somewhere in that neighbourhood. The Regina public school is in a deficit position – that is, less money than the previous year in the tune of 1.3 million, and the Regina separate school is reported to be in the area of \$990,000.

Now what I am saying to the minister: we have asked the questions in respect to the funding to these four major school boards in this province. And what she did in question period, and is likely to do today, is indicate that it is, in fact, the formula is the problem. Now, what we wanted all of the statistics is to indicate – and she alludes to the fact of the reassessment in the two cities being essentially the cause of the problem of decreasing the actual dollars paid to those major school boards this year over what was paid last year.

April 4, 1984

So what I really want to say: if we take a look at the two major cities, we find these very drastic amount of decreases, and I want to ask the minister –I see in the paper that she is purporting to meet with these school boards. And first of all, I want to ask her whether you think it's possible for these school boards to have less money and sustain a quality education – less money this year than the year before – and be able to maintain a quality education. I want to also ask you what steps are you prepared to take to alleviate the basic problems with these two school boards.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, could I ask the member from Quill Lake which two school boards he's talking about?

MR. KOSKIE: — The school grants provided in Regina and Saskatoon. I indicated to you that the Saskatoon public school has reported \$1 million less funding this year than the previous year; the Saskatoon separate school around 550,000; Regina public school, 1.3 million; the Regina separate school, 990,000 – in that vicinity. What I'm asking you is the specific question: One, do you feel that these school boards can provide quality education with a decrease in the amount of funding that you are providing? And secondly, are you taking steps to recognize the high degree of underfunding, and will you be making adjustments?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, I have never indicated that the fault lies within the formula when we have been discussing the issue of Saskatoon and Regina, as the member from Quill Lake has alluded to today. I made it very clear where the major problems were in terms of Regina and Saskatoon, both public and separate school boards this year. You know, the adjustment, if there is to be any adjustment at all, I have indicated will not be on the formula for this year. Those boards have indicated that they are satisfied with the formula. The problem they are into this year, and will face for the next two years, has been one of the reassessment that has been done by the assessment authority. And the member from Quill Lake knows that. If you want to talk about actual dollar figures in total to those four school boards, I'm quite willing to lay that out. I think that's already been done.

For instance, the Regina public board in 1983 received a grant of 30.2 million. That was in 1983. The estimated figure in 1984 is 29.9 million. Now that is a change of a minus \$279,000 — .94 per cent. Regina Catholic board in 1983 was 15.2 million. In 1984 it will be 15 million. There is a change of 202,000. Percentage-wise that works out to 1.33 per cent.

Saskatoon public, in 1983, was \$23.7 million. In 1984 the actual dollars is 25.4 million. The change is 8.73 per cent plus, or an increase of \$1,709,000.

Now obviously there's a lot of factors in there, including capital, which does in effect haven an effect on your operating grant. The issue that we are facing with those boards is still one of reassessment, and we'll be discussing that with those four boards tomorrow.

MR. KOSKIE: — The suggestion, or what has in fact been done, Madam Minister, in respect to the revenue sharing in the Department of Urban Affairs, is, as I think, right – that they continue basically under the formula. But they indicated that no urban centre would, in fact, get less money than they received the previous year. And that was the safety value (if I might use that expression) to allow them to get over the very problems of reassessment.

And I'm asking you here: why did you not also adopt a policy similar to the Minister of Urban Affairs? Obviously, when you were going through your calculations with your department, you must have realized the amount of funds that they would be getting for their operating grants would be severely cut back. And it seems to me that what you do with this hodgepodge approach, just as you did last year (or your government) with the universities – underfunded them, and then came through with a subsequent amount.

It's very, very difficult, I think, for the boards to operate in a fiscally responsible manner, and to properly make their plans, unless you do the proper work prior to the release of the information. And now again, you're going to be meeting with them; and I urge you to consider the problems that those four major school boards in Regina and Saskatoon – the public and separate in each city, respectively – that when you meet with them, that certainly the minimum that should be expected from you is to not give them less than they previously had. I would hope that in keeping with the quality and the standard of education, that you would see fit to, in fact, give them an increase.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, since revenue sharing was first brought in in Urban Affairs, grandfathering has been a standard practice in one way or another. And that's been understood today, and when you were also in government. And you're probably understanding it, but playing some games with it.

Grandfathering has not been used in the school foundation formula for years – nearly a decade. And school boards have accepted that, in terms of fairness, and believing in the equity of the formula. The member for Shaunavon interjects with a statement earlier that, at least, no decrease. That's what he says. "Make sure there is no decrease."

You know, I go back, and I look from 1979, and there's some before, 1980, 1982, '81, and I look at decreases to places like Estevan Rural in 1980, 6.85 per cent decrease. And that was supposedly in a time when the government of the day said, "What a rich place we are. How much money we have to put into social programs." They said that publicly. Privately they went into crown corps and not into education.

You know, I take a look at, for instance, in 1979 the Unity Roman Catholic district saw a decrease of 63 per cent. I heard no human cry from the member from Shaunavon, the member from Quill Lake, and the minister of education of the day would have been the hon. member from Regina Centre. Where were you then? Maybe you should explain what you're doing now. What I see are two faces, and nothing very concrete.

MR. KOSKIE: — When I asked you the question in the House, whether or not you were going to reconsider the funding to these two major boards in the province, you seemed to indicate and determine that you were going to hold fast to the formula. And what I'm asking you today: if you're going to be meeting with these boards, have you been able to reassess the situation, acknowledge the basic underfunding to the two major cities of this province, the basic underfunding to the quality of education?

And can you advise this House that you will, in fact, do as your colleague in Urban Affairs did, to, as a minimum indicate that you will not give them less than they received last year? Surely you can come forward with some indication as to the direction that your department is going to take. I think it should have been done before it went out to the school boards, because I find it very difficult that the school boards were so . . . the school boards indeed were very shocked by the situation, the funding situation, that they found themselves in. And they expected what the minister was saying, the 5 per cent guide-line, and I think it's incumbent here today to advise this House what steps you plan to be taking to alleviate this problem.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member asks me if I'm going to reconsider that formula, and I have already stated that school boards, including the large urban boards, believe in the equity of that formula. They have readily admitted that is not their problem this year. Their problem is reassessment. I have also indicated to you that I will be meeting with those boards tomorrow. We will be talking about reassessment, and the effects on their school system.

You know, you talk about underfunding. Well, maybe we should talk about it for a little while from my perspective. Battle River School Division in 1980 saw a decrease of 4.13 per cent; Borderland School Division, in 1980, saw a decrease of 1.51 per cent ; Estevan Rural, while I've

April 4, 1984

already given you the figure for 1980, two years later they saw themselves in the same situation, based on the grants that you gave in March of 1982. In effect, what they saw was a decline of almost 12 per cent. Eston-Elrose, for three years running – 1979, 1980, and 1981 – continually saw a decrease in their grants from the then NDP government.

If you go to the south-west part of the province, even Herbert School Division – the member from Shaunavon had a colleague that lived in that division; I didn't hear a great cry about a decrease in the grant – and they had one in 1980. Kerrobert and Kindersley were no different in 1980. Kindersley felt the effects two years running – decreases – 5.86 in one year and 3.62 per cent in another year. Two years running – decreases.

Lanigan, 1980, saw a 3.41 per cent decrease, and that was in the days of 10, 12, and 14 per cent settlements on teachers' salaries. And yet these people had a decrease in the Lanigan School Division.

Leader School Division was probably one of the harder hit under your government, and they had four years running of decreases – four years. You want to talk about the development and the lack of consolidation in rural area. Let's talk about Leader School Division and the decreases that they felt under your then government. In 1979 they had 7.71 per cent decrease; and then they felt another, 2.53 per cent; and then another, 6 per cent decrease – on top of all that, the two years previous.

Rosetown, no different, two years running. In 1979, the year that the member from Regina Centre was minister of education, they had a decrease; and the year after that they saw another decrease.

The member from Shaunavon, I wonder how well he knows his constituency, and what they faced under his rule. Did they have increases or decreases? Maybe he'd like to go back and check the year that the hon. member from Regina Centre was minister of education. If he doesn't know the year, the year was 1979 – a decrease for Shaunavon School Division under the NDP government – and the minister of education was from Regina Centre.

Weyburn School Division was not left untouched under the minister of education from Regina Centre in the NDP government in the year 1979. They saw a 4 per cent decrease – a decrease, not an increase.

Then we have this little Catholic school division. It is an excellent school, one school in the constituency of Shaunavon. In 1979, again Shaunavon got hit, but this time the Catholic school, 3.8 per cent decrease. The member for Regina Centre was minister of education. And if that wasn't bad enough, in the year 1981, that little Catholic school division saw a 9.13 per cent decrease. Now how do you explain that in small, rural Saskatchewan? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . There was a lot said, obviously, the politics were not right. That was very obvious. I suggest that you go back and you take a look at the decreases under your administration.

Grand Coulee, a small rural area just outside of Regina, in the year 1980 saw a 47 per cent decrease – a decrease, 47 per cent. And the member from Regina smiles. In 1982 of March, that same school division saw a 61 per cent decrease, in a three-year period under the NDP. That school board saw over 100 per cent decrease from the provincial government that was said to the local people, "You pay for it." Over 100 per cent from 1980 to March of 1982.

Lemberg, a consolidated unit, in 1981 saw a 5.32 per cent decrease.

Mankota School Division — the member from Shaunavon will be well aware of Mankota – in the year 1978 they had a 2 per cent decrease, and then in March of 1982 they had well over an 8 per cent decrease.

Pense School Division in 1980 had 10.88 per cent decrease.

Then we move to the area of Biggar, Saskatchewan, St. Gabriel, a Roman Catholic school division. In 1979, saw a decrease and again in 1981 another decrease. And of course I've already mentioned Unity, but then there was the Radville area and St. Olivier Roman Catholic school division, 14.99 per cent decrease. Wilcox Roman Catholic school division, 1978 had 18 per cent decrease in their grant. In 1981 they had another 10.43 per cent decrease in their grant. Humboldt School Division and the high school, each of those places had a decrease in '81 and '79. The Humboldt Roman Catholic had two years running of decrease in their school grants under the NDP government.

About the little Wolseley School Division, where the good Minister of Health is from, two years running – now 1978 wasn't too bad, it was a decrease of 4 per cent. But what really hurt was the year 1979, when the member from Regina Centre was minister of education, and Wolseley got hit again with a 21 per cent decrease in their government grant. That was in the Wolseley school unit, the public system. Then there was Wolseley St. Ann's, the Roman Catholic school division – 1980, 7 per cent decrease; in the year following, another 4 per cent decrease. Wolseley really got hit.

Let's take a look at Estevan School Division. The year 1979, the gentleman over there was once again minister of education. They said to Estevan School Division, "You can do with 18 per cent less." Then in 1980 he came back, and he said again, "Here's another 2 per cent less." You add those up and that's well over 20 per cent decrease in two years. I suggest you begin to ask the then minister of education, the member from Regina Centre, what he was doing for that period of time, and where the money was being shifted to.

Lloydminster public school division was also included in this area. 9.42 per cent in 1978. And Melfort, they saw a decrease. Moose Jaw School Division saw a decrease. Swift Current School Division saw 8.46 per cent decrease. I didn't hear any special consideration coming from the government of the day in any of those cases. None of them.

Yorkton School Division, 6.27 per cent decrease, March of 1982; Estevan again, except this time the Roman Catholic school division, 8 per cent in 1980, and the year after, another 16 per cent decrease in their government grant. And, of course, Weyburn Roman Catholic, besides their public, 8 per cent decrease in 1980, and 6 per cent decrease in 1982.

I suggest that the credibility that you hold when it comes to decreases in school grants is not worth a dime.

MR. KOSKIE: — I thought we had a filibuster, because the minister is having so much difficulty in answering particular questions. I want to refer the concern, the concern that is raised in respect to this ministers' providing of funds to the two major cities of this province: "Catholics Face Tax Hike for Existing Programs." And I can go through the article – that's what they're saying, "Public Schools Face Tough Financial Future." And it goes on to indicate: "Poor Funding from the Provincial Government."

Chairman sees little chance of preventing tax increases. Special grants to school boards unlikely, says Minister of Education.

And here we have: "Cuts in Provincial Grants Cause Rise in Education Taxes."

These are the headlines that have, in fact, been developed, have been written. There is editorials in the *Star-Phoenix* indicating the major cut-backs in the funding of the public and separate school systems in the city of Saskatoon. "Education Funding Shortfall." And undoubtedly here, the editor of the *Star-Phoenix*, and I want to read a little bit:

The Saskatoon school boards are facing tough choices as a consequence of substantial reduction in provincial grants for their operation this year. It's a grim picture (it goes on to say), whether the government realizes it or not. It is forcing educational officials to actually contemplate stepping back from educational standards and options which have taken many years to achieve.

That's the consequences of your actions, Madam Minister. And you have an obligation to indicate to this House, through the major cities. And you're hiding behind a formula. I'm going to ask you specifically, are you going to increase the funding so that it's equitable funding to the students of the cities of Regina and Saskatoon?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, you know, once again what I hear, when it comes to education and the accessibility of all, is the member from Quill Lakes talking about Saskatoon, Regina, and nothing rural. And yet school boards have indicated they like the formula. The formula is fair . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if you would begin to talk to people, and listen to people, you would find those things out. It doesn't take long. Just open your ears a bit, and you'll hear it.

How school boards are paid — there has been no change in the formula. And the member from Quill Lakes would be the first to admit that assessment of property is based on the ability to pay. So if you have a particular area, like Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, their assessment comes in high, their grants are going to be down.

Because the theory in between that is, if the property is based high on assessment, they have a greater ability to pay locally than what another division does where the assessment comes in very high. We have some areas in northern Saskatchewan where the assessment, indeed, is very low, and the grants from government are very, very high.

What the member is ignoring at this time is, first of all, a need — probably several years before it actually took place — to update assessments, so that it didn't get totally out of hand and create the problems that those areas are in now.

For instance, we have areas, Mr. Chairman, in this province, that did not go through a reassessment in 20 years — 20 years. They were behind times. Well, we're into reassessment, and we have been since 1977 under your government, and now under my government. And that is the major factor in determining school board grants this year.

I have also indicated to you I am willing to sit down and talk to those boards. We have said we'll phase it in over three years. Now we're going to hear tomorrow what that three-year phase-in does, based on some soft facts, because they do not yet have their total dollar figure or assessment figure in from the authority yet. So some of those things are still in what I consider to be a soft area in the determination of the actual mill rate.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to the capital funding, would the minister indicate whether her budget is increasing the capital funding to the school system during the course of this year? I wonder if she could provide us, indeed, with a list of the capital projects that you're proposing to proceed with this year. So could you indicate, first of all, how your budget attempts to provide more funding in respect to capital projects?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — As the member will know from reading the blue book where the figures are, there has been a 10 per cent reduction in the overall capital grants this year.

MR. KOSKIE: — I asked you whether you could provide us with a schedule of the capital projects that you are intending to go forward with during the course of this year, and the value of each of those. Could you do that?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Yes, we will be able to give you that list. We will try and get it to you tomorrow, and there may be some additions, etc., at a later date.

MR. KOSKIE: — I can see that the minister now is starting to co-operate. This is a pleasant surprise.

I want to ask the minister, on another area of considerable concern to our caucus, to many of the educators, to church groups, and that is the question of alcohol advertising. And I want to ask the minister: does the minister agree with the government's measure to indeed allow and encourage more extensive alcohol advertising which, in my view, will surely tend to increase the consumption and abuse, and particularly among young people?

I would like to have the minister's endorsement of the position that the government has taken on this.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess what it comes down to is determining the role of government, and if government is going to legalize something and allow it to be produced and therefore marketed. And with that marketing in some areas comes advertising. Then the question must be asked: at what point does the government become the censorship. What I see for government, if it is honest with itself and its politicians from within, they define that role of government, and it operates under those rules and regulations with a monitoring process.

If I had my way in this world, and obviously I don't, there would be advertising of no kind. I suggest to you that there is some advertising within media, electronic and otherwise, that is probably as harmful to individuals as what this particular advertising is. What I do agree with is that liquor companies, distilleries, breweries, must begin to take a responsibility in order to inform the public of the downside of their product.

We have a lot of protection, as consumers, when it comes to other items within society that are sold, marketed, and advertised. They have had to take responsibility if, in fact, their product is harmful to the consumer, or dangerous. We have seen it with cigarettes. They are required to print on the package. That has not happened with liquor companies, and I suggest that liquor companies have a responsibility to take part in an awareness program of the over-use and the abuse of their product, and I see that happening now.

The other factor that I see happening — there is more awareness to the public on the effects of alcohol and drug education, and there's more to be done. For instance, within the department there are several. We have a member that used to be on the alcohol commission that is now in the department. The department is still, to a degree, involved in the Safe Grad program as it was when you were in government. Our employee has also established the drug and alcohol education liaison committees in Saskatoon and Regina, and I see some very sound potential for that to grow, including into the smaller urban areas and the rural areas, so that communities can begin to deal with this problem on an up-front basis.

I guess when it comes down to the question of liquor advertising is, first of all, the product has been here for some time, including the advertising of it. Because of the change in technology and the effect that that has had on our communications system in society, our children don't live in isolation of the rest of the world. And, I think, under your regime we saw many of our young people leaving this province. They left the province and did not have the ability to cope with what was being hid out there because they had had no education to go along with it — no greater awareness. The awareness is coming now and, I think, that's going to be a positive factor.

So, in reply to your question, I view the issue of liquor advertising as being one, first of all, the role of government, and a definition of that and when government becomes the censorship and when they don't. I'm seeing it as a mechanism of putting greater responsibility onto the

April 4, 1984

liquor companies for greater awareness of the over-abuse of their product.

MR. KOSKIE: — Madam Minister, that is an interesting proposition that you put forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! The debate is quite interesting, but I don't see any place in the subvote where the advertising of liquor comes into education estimates, and I would ask the member to move on to something else.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I want to indicate that we have health courses in the curriculum of Saskatchewan dealing with alcohol and alcohol abuse. And I want to ask the minister what particular steps she has taken, since her government has made advertising of alcohol a policy, what particular steps she has taken, as minister of education, of, in fact, increasing the students' awareness as to the particular harmful effects, the harmful effects of alcohol to our young people.

And indeed I want to ask the minister: has the minister received any representations from concerned parents, teachers, trustees, churches, who, in fact, are concerned in respect to their young children, and whether or not they are concerned about the alcohol advertising?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, there were a couple of questions in there. I'm not sure I'll have them in the proper order.

As to the direct representation, no, I have not had direct representation. I have had from groups concerning education, perhaps five or six letters. I have had some questions put forth to me by a teachers' convention. In fact, it was the teachers' convention from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that I attended. One teacher asked me a question on liquor advertising. But other than that, when you're talking about representation on groups, the answer is no.

As to, you know, what we are looking at in the department is, first of all, a pilot project that was on alcohol and drug education for division 3 will be going forth this year. The testing grounds were run in Swift Current, Regina, and Warman, and the development of the program was a co-operative effort by the people at the local level from teachers, parents, trustees, and the administration. It proved to be very successful. So that will be coming forth, beginning with division 3, which is grades 7, 8, and 9.

MR. KOSKIE: — And the funding of your pilot project for awareness, how much of that is being contributed directly by the breweries and the distillers?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The breweries don't fund the Department of Education, and the member from Quill Lakes knows that.

MR. ENGEL: — Madam Minister, I was interested in this pilot project. Why did it come about that you decided you needed one for some special ed in level 3? What kind of activity is going to be involved, or what kind of curriculum are you developing in this pilot project? You mentioned Swift Current, and several places. Could you just fill us in a little bit on the details?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, for September of '84, we will have approximately 20 schools that will be picking up on various components of the division 3 health, and it's a new health curriculum. Some of them will be on nutrition, safety education, and alcohol and drug education are the major factors in it.

Now to your question on alcohol and drug, some of the components in that, to put it for want of a better word, are basically health, including the physical and the mental effects; also the social implications from abuse, because there are some. It will talk about — along with alcohol — drugs, both prescriptive drugs and non-prescriptive, and the abuse of those. It will . . . The children will have an opportunity to talk about what happens to the body, physically, when it becomes an abuse factor with alcohol or a drug, what happens mentally, what happens with

your mom and dad, with your family, the social abuse, what happens that you can no longer function. And also the chemical factor that perhaps leads to addiction.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Madam Minister. You indicated that the topic is going to relate to the bad effect of the use of alcohol, particularly in that grade, and I think you said it's level 3 – that'd be grades 7, 8, and 9 — tender age I call it, an age of young people that watch the ads and see the young people gathering on the beach, and drinking alcohol on television. You are trying to counteract the effects of alcohol advertisements that show a skier going down a hill, and doing strenuous activities, and it looks like that's a good thing to do.

And I think you've got a major assignment on your hands, because when the young people are watching it on television, and it's looking so good, it's quite a different product than they see what's destroying homes, and what's affecting the body. And I think you're going to have to come up with a terrifically attractive health package to convince a 15-year-old that alcohol is bad for him.

It's what they are bombarded with on the TVs, and on the radio, and on television. That bombardment they are getting, and it's coming at prime time, those areas are against the law. And your government isn't doing anything about it.

I'm pleased to see you're trying to combat it in the education system, but how much time are they going to be spending, or how this pilot project . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is the member for Moose Jaw going to keep interrupting? Does he want to get involved in the question period? I can . . . (inaudible) . . .

My point I'm trying to make is . . . the question I have is: how much time is this going to involve as far as the curriculum is concerned, in hours, or in a course time? Have you got an hour? How many hours a year are they going to get? Or how much time is there going to be involved?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Chairman, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has insinuated that this is a new problem since liquor advertising came in, and I don't think he's being truthful with himself or with this Assembly. These problems have been around for some time. These problems have been around for some time, and society in general has had a difficult time in how you deal with abuse of several kinds, whether it be alcohol . . . We have drug abuse. Drugs aren't even legalized. Nor are they advertised. How do you explain that, and tie that to alcohol advertising? We know the effects, for instance, of marijuana, and you're kidding yourself if you think that our young people are into alcohol, and not soft drugs. Marijuana – there's no advertising on marijuana. None.

We know there's a problem. We know there is a problem how people deal socially with some aspects that have been adapted by society, including under your government. Alcohol is one of them. So how do you get across to young people that this is a normally accepted custom by some parts of society, and you have a choice to make? And here are the pressures that come with it. You may live in a family where there is absolutely no alcohol and the child may not have a difficult time in dealing with that. On the other hand, he or she may have, once they go outside of the family – if they haven't at least had some contact, and some discussion on how one lives, and the kinds of pressures that are outside of that protected environment, as the case may be.

You ask a question – the timing. How much time are kids going to have on this? The program is designed for 120 to 150 minutes per week, and that's in school. Why I like the development of this program is that it has another aspect to it, which is the community at large in taking responsibility, and that is the fact that there has been that contact in development of the program between parents, teachers, administrators, and trustees.

And in some cases you may even find, particularly in smaller communities, that they have included students. You know, I would have to check to see if, indeed, that has happened on this

April 4, 1984

particular program. But it does not prevent that from happening.

So I see two main factors – the in-school portion – a greater awareness, and a greater ability on the part of the community to say, “Hey, we’re going to deal with this problem. We’re going to educate our kids with it.” And there it is.

MR. ENGEL: — You’re saying that there’s going to be about two hours a week. There’s going to be about two hours a week spent in this new health package that you’re introducing. I would ask the minister, and I agree that this has been a problem for a long time . . .

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 p.m.