

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Education
Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 5

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order, please. The business before the committee is Education, and I would like at this time to ask the Minister of Education if he would please introduce his staff.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my right, I have Lawrie McFarlane, the deputy for the department; to his right is Liz Crosthwaite, assistant deputy minister; behind me and to my right is Glen Penner, associate deputy minister; and to his left, Don Wright, assistant deputy minister; and to my left, Steven Pillar, associate deputy minister.

Item 1

Mr. Shillington: — I think, Mr. Chairman, my first words must be one of thanks to the House Leader. I didn't expect to have an opportunity to get into Education estimates close to the beginning.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I, and a number of others who might have had to sit while the member from Prince Albert, who is our critic, conducted these, now have an opportunity to get in and discuss issues which are of interest to us.

It is, of course, accurate to say that when the critic's back, the same issues will be canvassed again. He'll want to do it from his own perspective, but we have an opportunity to do it tonight. So, as I say, my first words must be one of thanks to the House Leader for giving us this extra evening on which we can pursue some estimates in a slightly different fashion.

I want to address some general comments to the Minister of Education. The path of destruction which your government has wrought in the five years it's been in office has really been awesome, Mr. Minister.

If someone had told me on April 26, 1982, when you were elected, four years hence the provincial deficit would be over \$2 billion, if someone had told me that skilled tradesmen would be begging jobs, if someone had told me that our education system, particularly higher education, would lay in ruins, I would have said nobody could do that much damage in four, short years, but you did. And since the election, Mr. Minister, the path of destruction has broadened considerably.

Mr. Minister, our educational system ought to make all of us ashamed of ourselves. In my riding, Mr. Minister, I have an abnormally large percentage of the old and the young. It just happens to be the demographics in my riding. So I meet with a fair number of young people, and I say to them, Mr. Minister, if you are not . . . I say to these people, if you're not furious about what's happening to

you, then you haven't been where I've been, because when I was your age, the educational system was a lot better than it is now and we didn't face the challenges which you face.

Mr. Minister, the technical institutes are bursting at the seams. The universities are in such sorry shape that during a general election in October in Regina, the Conservative Party couldn't find anyone with sufficient courage to go to that university and participate in a debate. Mr. Minister, not one person was prepared to go and try to justify what you people have done to higher education . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, you showed up two weeks late after you were thoroughly embarrassed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — The member from Regina Centre, who might have been trying to figure out his party affiliation at that time - that may have been one of his problems . . . The member from Regina Wascana said he was there. The member from Regina Wascana was there two weeks late. He wasn't prepared to come when the debate was on, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, the scope of the destruction which you have wrought in the last nine months leaves us an endless number of areas which we are going to examine. Mr. Minister, I want to begin with one of your more widely acclaimed triumphs, your amalgamation of the technical institutes.

Mr. Minister, I have met with a number of my constituents. All who are attending the institutes fear a loss of autonomy. The native education institute, Gabriel Dumont, the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, have a particular need for a separate board of governors, a separate board to ensure that those institutes reflect a particular culture of native people and their particular needs. And you've washed that away without, apparently, any consultation with native people.

Mr. Minister, if you don't care about the preservation of the native culture - and that's a big part of what those institutes are about - and if you don't care about the success of those institutes in training native people - and they have a very impressive track record - one would at least have thought that common decency would have moved you to discuss it with them in advance. But you didn't have that kind of courtesy.

The rationalization of the technical institute, Mr. Minister, has meant a very considerable difficulty to students. It is just simply irrational to suggest that one course in the province of this size in any given discipline is enough. That's just irrational to suggest that. That's what you've done. You have, Mr. Minister, said to students that if you want to take a given course, you've got to travel. That's an option for some people. For some who have recently graduated from grade 12, who haven't any ties, that's an option. But for a lot of people, Mr. Minister, who need technical training and who want it, travelling is just simply not an option.

Mr. Minister, I want to read you one letter which I got,

given the vindictive record of this government in dealing with people who have the temerity to suggest that there's any room for improvement. I'm not going to use this individual's name; we'll call her Jane Smith. She wrote to me as follows:

I am writing my concerns about the recent government cut-backs in adult education. I am presently a student enrolled in the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences (Business Division).

These cut-backs directly affect (me and) quite a number of students in this province. Myself, I know that I will not be able to continue my education, at least for a few years. To do so would mean making a move to Moose Jaw, which for me is financially impossible, going to school during the day to pick up one class, (I am self-supporting) and not being able to hold down a job unless I was able to find one with shift work that could revolve around a class in school.

Even if I were able to make this move and incur all expenses . . . it would mean staying out of school for at least one year, as the enrolment at STI . . . is presently full, and has been such for the last two months.

I think the real problem involved here is the lack of communication between the government and the students directly (involved) . . . We have no idea (and had no idea) how extensive the problem is or may become, and we also have no idea what our possible recourses may be.

Madam Minister . . . Mr. Minister, it's an easy mistake to make. Mr. Minister, I would appreciate your giving me an answer which you might bring to this student who is unable to continue her education. She not only wrote me, Mr. Minister, I phoned her, and the facts in her letter are accurate.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd tell me what you think . . . how you think this letter ought to be replied to.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, there is a number of points in your opening remarks. I suppose the essential one is why did we put together a new blueprint for post-secondary or adult education in this province. You suggested in your remarks, wrongly of course, that higher education - I think these are your words - is lying in ruins, talked about widely acclaimed crimes, talked about how when you were in school it was a lot better. And I would suggest to the hon. member that really probably that is part and parcel of the problem with the NDP party today, is that they continue to cling to the past when it comes to addressing the issues of the future. And the issues of the future consist of things like addressing education and its importance as we move towards the 21st century.

And I say that because, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman, rather - the young people of this province who are going to be the big users of the adult education system over the next couple of years, no matter what political stripe they

are, recognize that there has to be changes, that some of the structures in the institutes that we cling to in the past, albeit that they served us well - it's not as though they somehow failed us or somehow that we were wrong in those policies because we were not - but you must face up to the future. You must face up to the realities of the future.

And I would suggest to you that's why there have been resolutions, resolutions like this one where young people endorse . . . resolutions like this one from the young people of this province, where young people endorse and actively support the reorganization of technical institutes under an independent board similar in nature and structure to the university board of governors.

That's the kind of thing the young people are saying. They said to reorganize, support the reorganization of technical institutes under an independent board similar in nature and structure to the university board of governors. That, Mr. Chairman, was the resolution at the last NDP convention from the Saskatchewan Young New Democrats. The youth in the New Democrats recognize there had to be change. They put forth this resolution, Mr. Chairman; they are ahead of their party. Young people across this province want these changes, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. member harkened back to the days when he was in school - and they were grand old days then and I loved them too - but . . . And back in those days we farmed with horses, and horsepower - in the very, very classic sense of the word - was important to the well-being of a farm. That was replaced by the horsepower in tractors. And to have told a farmer then that to be successful, and rather than buy a tractor, that you should somehow double the number of horses you have on your farm, would make no more sense then than if we were to suggest that today. And that's exactly what we're facing in education. Horsepower is going to be replaced by brainpower, and that's why we must make these changes.

Back in your days there was, what, one university, maybe one institute, compared to what we have today. So how can one say that you should cling to the past, stick to the status quo, and make no changes. The budget then was probably a quarter of what it is today.

And you made reference particularly to native education. And I want to read to you from the report, the document *Preparing for the Year 2000*, adult education in Saskatchewan, which will serve as our blueprint for the next couple of decades in this province, insofar as the course we will chart with adult education. And here's what it said - and we released this, as you know, a couple of three months ago:

The province will propose that there be joint native ownership and management of the new Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology. This will be accomplished by establishing a Native Studies division of the new institute, on an equal basis with other program divisions. Native representatives would be appointed to the Board of Directors. By this mechanism, not only can native programs be

delivered by native people, but native people will also have a say for the first time in the running of the entire institute.

We believe this proposal breaks important new ground in native education by creating a partnership of equals. If this approach is successful, the province will consider expanding it to other parts of the adult education system.

(1915)

And indeed that is breaking new ground. And it flies exactly in the face of what you were saying about no consultation, no involvement. That is involvement like we've never seen before, Mr. Chairman.

And as it relates to the number of spaces that are available, training spaces that are available, in this province this year at technical institutes . . . And you can resort to your inflamed rhetoric, your overstatement that quite frankly no one believes. I mean no one buys, nor is it the truth. No one buys, nor is it the truth that higher education lies in ruins. That's silly talk. You know it's silly; I know it's silly; the people know it's silly. Because the reality today in Saskatchewan is, we are spending between the school boards and this government something well over \$1 billion on education in this province, kindergarten right through to universities - over \$1 billion. And although the opposition may try to suggest to people that somehow higher education will lie in ruins because of \$1 billion expenditure in education, they will look at what you cannot do for \$1 billion. The people of Saskatchewan, the young people, the parents, the teachers of this province prefer to look at what we can do with \$1 billion in educating our young people as it relates to technical institutes, specifically, and the spaces in technical institutes.

When you were in government, did you ever build a new technical institute at Prince Albert? No. We have expanded to four centres. We have now a fourth campus in Prince Albert. And there are now 1,700 more spaces in . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order, please. I'm having difficulty hearing the minister.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — There are 1,700 spaces today, additional spaces that exist today that didn't exist when your party was in power - 1,700 plus spaces. That's a 25 per cent increase. And that doesn't address the expectations we have for things like our extension programs, our off-campus programs across this entire province through distance education and the extension network, whether it be for university programming or institute programming.

So by whatever measure, by whatever measure, what we have done in the last four years has set us apart from other provinces, quite frankly, and what we are doing now will set us apart from other provinces, quite frankly. Saskatchewan has traditionally been known to be ahead of the pack, and I would suggest to you that with these changes we will continue to stay ahead of the pack.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, when I was in university, the classes were not overloaded. Instructors had time at the completion of the classes to go with students and discuss the content of the lecture.

Mr. Minister, you said that you are the way of the future. I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that the worst fear of these students is that this is the way of the future. That is their very worst fear, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, one out of four students who apply to get into a technical institute actually are admitted. They're afraid that yours is the way of the future. Mr. Minister, the universities are impossibly overcrowded. No one could learn in such an atmosphere. They're afraid, Mr. Minister, that that's the way of the future. Their very worst fears are that yours is the way of the future. Their highest hope is that a new government's going to get elected which will have a much more a compassionate . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that they're getting closer to their dreams and further from their nightmares as this charade carries on.

Mr. Minister, I said there's 5 bucks in it for you if you can remember what the question was. You didn't take it, and I assume you couldn't remember.

Mr. Minister, what do you say to the students who can't get into the classes, whose own classes are cancelled, who can't get into the courses at the neighbouring institutes, who can't afford to travel, and who can't, Mr. Minister, and who can't arrange their job schedule to do that? What do you say to them? Wait for the year 2000?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, made reference to when he was in college there were no waiting lists, and he somehow thinks that we should be proud of the number of people that had access to post-secondary education in the country 20 and 25 years ago. Well I want to tell you what the University of Saskatchewan report, *Issues and Options*, had to say about accessibility to universities and post-secondary institutions in this province 2 and 3 and 4 decades ago. I don't have the report in front of me, but it goes something like this, Mr. Chairman, it goes something like this: some several decades ago about four young people out of a hundred had the opportunity to go on and get post-secondary education or university training in this province. That might have been the days when the hon. member was going and the days that he was referring to - four out of a hundred - and he somehow suggests that was a good track record.

Since that time we have moved up to, Mr. Chairman, something in the order . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order, please. Members wishing to contribute to the debate will have that opportunity by standing.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Back in those days, Mr. Chairman, four out of a hundred young people, something in that order, had the opportunity. Today, now

something in the order of 25 country, and the urban centres more like 35 young people out of 100, have the opportunity to go to universities and get post-secondary education. So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have, what, a 6, 7, 800 per cent increase in the number of young people that are being able to go to university. And where some people think that somehow a large number of applications and a large number of enrolments for our universities is somehow a problem, I look upon that as a positive thing and that a lot of young people are having an opportunity to get a post-secondary education that never had to before.

And he would further try to suggest that somehow, somehow waiting lists all of a sudden have come on the scene magically, and that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. Waiting lists, unfortunately I suppose one might argue, have been with us for some good long time. I think it's safe to say that they are probably no worse, particularly, now than they were four or five years ago. In fact, in some institutions like STI, for every 14 students that apply, 10 get in.

I can recall the days when I was in college, which probably weren't that much different than when the hon. member was in college, not that different in terms of time frame, there was a 6 and 700 applications for 30 and 31 spaces. So to suggest that somehow this is a new phenomena, it would suggest to me that the hon. member has a poor memory.

But it's no good just to talk about waiting lists, it's no good to talk about the very, very large enrolments, one has to do something about them. And that's why, Mr. Chairman, that's why we're moving to deliver more and more programming to rural Saskatchewan, whether it be institute programming or university program, particularly through our regional college network.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'll deal with the question. What do you say, Mr. Minister, to students whose courses are cancelled, who cannot get into the courses at the other institutes because they're already filled up, who can't afford to travel, and/or cannot arrange their work schedule? What do you say to them, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What I say to them is, yes, we are doing something about it. We have 1,700 more spaces today than when your party was in government, number one. And number two is, we have an extension program for rural Saskatchewan, province-wide accessibility that was not in place when you were in government.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, they'll be delighted to know that you're doing something about it. That's all she wanted to hear, I'm quite certain. She just wanted to know that it was a matter of concern.

Mr. Minister, did you give any thought at all to the human misery you were going to cause with this abrupt change? Did you give any thought at all to the students whose careers were going to be interrupted, perhaps ruined, as a result of this? Did you give any thought to that at all? Or did you simply allow those who believed that the deficit is the only problem you've got, did you simply allow them

to run amuck in your department and cut whatever they like?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Because we recognize that, in fact, moving in the middle of, for example, a two-year course might cause some hardship, what we have done there is, for those students enrolled full time, we're going to allow them to complete their course at the campus they were at. And I don't think that . . . I think that's very fair and certainly isn't causing any human hardship.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, did it ever occur to you that there was a more . . . If this is a good idea, which we hotly dispute, did it ever occur to you that there's a more compassionate way to do it, in a way which wouldn't interrupt the training and the courses of students such as this? I've got a file full of these things. If you want to hear, Mr. Minister, from other Jane Smiths, I could read these letters all night. Did it ever occur to you, Mr. Minister, that there was a more compassionate way to do it than this?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well I've already indicated to the hon. member, if he would have been listening, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to see the letters. Because if he's so concerned, I would have thought he would have forwarded them to my office, but I don't think I've had one letter from the hon. member, Mr. Chairman.

And I'll say it again. If those people were enrolled in a two-year course, for example, and in the middle of that course, and they're a full-time student, as far as is possible, they're going to be allowed to complete that course where they first enrolled. Now that sounds awful fair. And if you want to continue to scare young people and to distort the facts, then you go right ahead because that's just part of clinging to the past, and the NDP does not want to accept change.

Everybody, the 550 groups, individuals, and associations that I met with over this winter, recognized we needed a system more in tune with this new economy. Your own critics, wherever they might be, recognized that there had to be change. They circulated a questionnaire to the institute people. Did they bring that forward to me with their recommendations? No.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I'm going to leave the subject of this letter with just this comment. Every time there's a monumental screw-up in this government - and they come about once a week - the response of you or the Premier is, write me, bring these problems to me personally. Mr. Minister, that's a sign of a bad program and an incompetent government. If you can't design a program which doesn't make a mess of students' education, you shouldn't have introduced it. And if the only response you've got is, well come to me and I'll personally fix it up, that, Mr. Minister, is an admission of failure.

Mr. Goulet: Mr. Minister, I'd like to direct my questions, my first series of questions, in regard to the North, and more particularly in regard to the creation of that northern career college.

An Hon. Member: — Where does the North begin?

Mr. Goulet: — The minister over here wants to know where the North begins. The Deputy Premier doesn't know where the North is. He's been governing for five years; he doesn't know where the North is.

(1930)

The first question in regards to the North pertains to the involvement of people in northern Saskatchewan. That has been a continuing issue for many, many years. In 1973, when the La Ronge Region Community College was one of the first four in the province of Saskatchewan, a lot of the people mentioned that it was extremely important during that time in getting northern involvement. And of course, they had gotten that first through the NDP government. As time went on, in the latter '70s, the people from the west side wanted involvement. So the West Side Community College was created and there was more involvement of people at the community level. Then, in the early '80s, the people from the north-east side wanted more involvement, and the NDP government said, yes, we will have more involvement of people at the community level. So approximately 20 communities were involved in the decision making of adult education in northern Saskatchewan.

When this government came in the second time around, after decimating the North in the first four and a half years, the issue of involvement of people came to be of paramount interest again. The creation of a northern career college was put on people's laps when they didn't know and were not consulted to any great extent at all. People didn't know anything about this northern career college that was all of a sudden dropped on their laps this spring.

I really feel that this aspect of involvement and consultation so that you get the people of northern Saskatchewan governing and controlling their own institutions - that this government is straying away from that. The minister mentioned that we were supposedly clinging to the past. Well, I would say that he's not only clinging to the past, he is clinging to the colonial past of the way back. Now you're coming back to the real past. He's trying to establish a northern career college with less involvement, from approximately 20 people to maybe 7 people.

The other thing that was very important is the fact that people said, look, we have moved to the stage of involvement, we want to get in the stages of actually an elected board in the North. That's the progression that it directly leads to.

So the first question I would ask the minister is this: is that board that's going to be governing the northern career college in northern Saskatchewan, is that going to be an elected board?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I'm prepared to give that consideration.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Chairperson, I am not at all satisfied with the answer by the minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Every time people from the North ask a question, the ministers from across here always don't want to give you anything straight. It's always under advisement. It's always looking into it. Thirty years down the road it'll be looking into it if they were ever that long. But we know we're going to knock them off the next time around.

We are here for answers. The people in northern Saskatchewan want answers. They want to know . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — They want to know, Mr. Minister, whether or not there will be an elected adult education board in northern Saskatchewan. Come out straight and say something about that.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — As it relates to the North, I suppose, I approach this job with the view that I'm not a minister for the North or the South or the East or the West. I like to think that I'm a minister, and that we're a department for the entire province, would be the first point I would make.

Secondly, the hon. member is somehow suggesting that we're decimating the North. I think that rhetoric does little to enhance the debate, quite frankly. It really has no place in here and it quite frankly doesn't stand up against the facts.

As I said in my earlier response, I'm prepared to give that option consideration, and I can tell you quite frankly that giving a consideration is a heck of a lot more than your party ever gave when it was government. And the thing that we are maintaining absolutely is all of the best of what we had in the past system, the local contact committees - and those centres will still be there; that network will still be there.

Certainly, I suppose, we'll have less need for triplication or duplication of administrators and some of those kinds of positions, albeit we are trying to accommodate all of the staff as best we can. And I suppose I shouldn't be surprised that you don't like what we're doing there because I know your party, for the most part, operates on the theory that the more government the better, the more administrators the better - big government is better government somehow.

What we are . . . the Northlands Career College will offer a number of services: university extension, vocational technical training on an outreach basis, and on a brokerage basis from institutes - the literacy training, I think, and the literacy initiative will be of great benefit to that area; enterprise assistance to provide specialized training to northern businesses, career services, counselling - that kind of thing.

And it seems to me that the questions that the hon. member should be asking, including the member from Regina Centre in his earlier remarks, when they talked about responding to letters and saying where will I get this

course and that course, it seems to me as we move into the information age, the knowledge-based economy, the more appropriate questions that you should be asking and, quite frankly, that the young people were asking us is - and I relate specifically to, for example, the northern part of this province - you should have been asking, where are the programs that will match the jobs of the future? Where is the training for the tourism industry? Very important in your area of the province. Where is the training program for the mining initiatives that are going on in northern Saskatchewan? It seems to me that was the sad fact in this province. Where were these training programs?

The hon. member from Regina Centre would still like to train buggy whip manufacturers and buggy whip repair men when we don't need those jobs any more. They are not positions there. It seems to me that you should be asking, where are those people who can work in gerontology as our population ages? Where are those people? Where is the training for those that will find jobs in the information industry, whether it be the new AV (audio-visual) technician courses at the northern campus?

It seems to me you should be asking about where are the training for those jobs that the electronics industry is going to need. Or, where is the training programs for something like welding, the new kinds of welding technology that will go into the construction of the NewGrade upgrader, Mr. Chairman?

It seems to me you should be asking . . . In this new knowledge-based economy there's going to be jobs in industrial instrumentation technology, and where is the training there? Where is the training in the computer-assisted design job areas? Where is the training for the wild rice industry, and the kinds of jobs that are involved in that industry? Or the hog production industry, where are those jobs?

It seems to me not to address all of these areas is to let our young people down, and to not address the jobs of the future. And whether it's north, south, east or west, that's what we're doing with this restructuring of our post-secondary education system.

And you mentioned that there was no consultation. Well I want to tell you, I was in La Ronge and held a meeting there with a number of people, and these are the kinds of things I heard: I heard this from the chief of the band up there - I believe it was the chief . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. Order. I think what we're going to have to do is just have a little bit of a look at what's happening here tonight thus far.

I look at my role here as the chairman to enhance debate, and it's certainly not my intention to do any stifling of the ability of members to debate. However, I do think we all have some sort of an obligation here to maintain some kind of decorum within the House, and I am certainly of the opinion right now that that is somewhat lacking.

Now I know that you're all anxious to get into the debate. You will have the opportunity to do so. When a question

is asked, please let the minister answer and then you can have your comments following that. So I ask for your co-operation at this time. The minister may continue.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What I'm saying is: no matter where you are in the province, to not put the training opportunities in place for these jobs of the future which I've talked about, and which we have no capacity in the past . . . And one can say we should continue to turn out people and put people into courses where there are no jobs, just because we've done that for the last 10 or 20 or 30 years. And what kind of a favour are you doing those people? None, I would argue.

We had courses in this province, Mr. Chairman, where we had 20 spaces; something less than half of them were filled because the people themselves recognized there was no job opportunities after they'd spent two years in that course. So what was the sense of having those training spaces?

But it seemed to me that when we didn't have spaces in the new high-tech areas, and in the mining industry that's so very important for the member who raised the question, or in the wild rice industry, or in the berry industry, and all those kinds of things; then it seems to me he should have been criticizing us, why haven't you got training in those areas? Gold mining is flourishing in the North. How are those companies going to get trained people? What are you doing about it? Those are the kinds of questions you should be asking us.

I'll tell you what the answer to those questions are. We're doing something about it. In fact, what we are doing about it, Mr. Chairman . . . If we back up to '82-83 there was one program, the northern training program, in place, responsible for something in the order of 1,133 jobs - budget at that time, in total, something in the order of 5 million.

Well since that time, Mr. Chairman, we have put the following in place: Saskatchewan skills development program, Saskatchewan skills extension program, apprenticeship native career development program, winter works, Saskatchewan youth access, Special ARDA (Agriculture and Rural Development Act), Northern Economic Development Subsidiary Agreement, - federal.

And so we've gone from a situation where we had 1,133 jobs that were put in place, Mr. Chairman, to a 165 per cent increase - now 3,000 - and as well, the budget has gone up, Mr. Chairman. And it seems to me that that speaks well for what we're doing. We're listening to what the people are saying up there, and we're responding to where the jobs are because there has been some very, very, very positive activity in the North, whether it be in the agriculture sector and wild rice, or the mining part with the gold - a tremendous amount of excitement up there.

And I have to tell the hon. member and the House . . . I have to share a story with them as to what I heard when I was at the La Ronge meeting consulting. And I believe it was Joe Roberts, the chief of the La Ronge band that related this. In fact, I'm almost certain, Mr. Chairman.

This is what he told me at the La Ronge meeting as it relates to K to 12 programming for his young people. And it stuck with me because, in a way . . . The story, in a way, tells a tragic situation.

He related to me at this meeting, and to the others there, that in some instances they were grabbing U.S. educational programming off the satellite - off one of these satellites flying around the world - so that they could use that programming for their young people in the schools. Now he was careful to point out that they just don't grab anything, and they just don't use that as the only teaching tool, but in fact they are grabbing some U.S. educational TV programming off the satellites that are circling the earth.

(1945)

And as I sat there and I listened to that, I said, what a tragedy it is, and how we are letting this person and his young people down. Why don't we have a distance education network? Our geography in this province . . . A distance education network would make so much sense, given the geography. They are already doing it, but we weren't giving them access to Canadian or Saskatchewan programming. And, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly why we've got money in this budget for a distance education fund, so we can look at some of that kind of technology, get a policy in place, and do some very positive things for Joe Roberts and the people, the young people, that he has in his school system.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Chairperson, in regards to the next question, Mr. Minister, and in regards to your arrogant ramble that you've just . . . the pompous ramble that you just went through, this is the same type of pompous ramble we heard in the past five years in northern Saskatchewan, and we hear it again from you. When I ask . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — When I ask an important question of elected representation, democratically elected representation in northern Saskatchewan, you go on a petty ramble.

In the past five years you have directed many people to come in the North and every time a Northerner asks a question that is of a central issue, such as control over their own democratically elected institutions, you go on a pompous ramble.

I would like you to be straight. This is not a mere consideration; this is one that demands action. It demands a direct statement by the minister. You are the person who is the final authority on this in education, and you have the right to make that decision to democratically involve people in northern Saskatchewan. Will you or will you not do it? Answer it straightforward.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well I think I've answered the question on two occasions already. I said that I'm

prepared to give it consideration. I suspect there are arguments on both sides, and I'm prepared to go into it with an open mind.

I would want to point out, however, that contrary to the impression that you might leave that there is somehow no support and no consultation relative to the setting up of Northlands Career College, I would like to point out to you that the CEIC (Canada Employment and Immigration Commission) northern training advisory committee - which as the hon. member knows has AMNSIS (Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) membership and support - passed a motion to support the intent of the Northlands Career College as stated in our document *Preparing For The Year 2000*.

And I might add, as well, that I don't think that 21 community college trustees are all wrong either, in fact, because they do support what we are doing with this restructuring. Because they know that, sure, we're going to be doing some things different here, and I suppose that what separates you and me, and you from them in a way, I suppose, is that we are of the view that doing things different can in fact be doing things better.

And you want to cling to the status quo, never change. Well this is a time for change and these are the right changes. And I'm not trying to suggest to you or to the people of Saskatchewan that somehow you go from what you had and three months later you've got this smoothly running, well-oiled machine, up and percolating along, because you don't. It takes some time.

But I can say, I think, in all fairness to all involved that it's going quite smoothly, and it's going to be for the betterment of the people of the North, not unlike it will be for the betterment of those across this entire province. And I look forward to this restructuring, this new blueprint, as do, I think, most people in this province.

And I will grant you that we can argue with the process, and whether we should've done it this way versus that way, you know, which is the point you've raised, appointed boards versus elected boards.

But the reality is, when you talk to the people, that's where the arguments come down. For the most part they're process arguments. Because the reality is, for the most part, no one disagrees philosophically with what we're doing. They know that the agrarian economies are a thing of the past. We're into the post-industrial era, the technological age, the information age, the knowledge-based economy, and change was necessary. And that's what we're doing.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Minister, you said that you have to go forward in adult education. The question that I'm asking you, in regards to an elected board, is a step forward. The appointed board that you are proposing is a step backwards.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — It involves less people. Because it'll be a new board, there will be greater control by the PC

government on the few that they will appoint to that board. We see the patronage and the appointments in the South; we'll definitely see it in the North if it's strictly an appointed board.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — What is forward, an appointed PC board or a democratically elected board by the people of northern Saskatchewan? What is the forward one, Mr. Minister? Tell me.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — As I said earlier, I mean, I'm prepared to give consideration to the elected board concept, but I think perhaps the hon. member is being somewhat unfair to the existing board members. I think they have served well. I don't think they've let us down in their advice and guidance and in the way they've operated things in the North. And it's unfortunate that the hon. member would leave that impression, that somehow these people haven't done a good job and can't do a good job because they're appointed rather than elected. The reality is they have done a good job and will continue to serve as well in whatever capacity.

But I want to point out to the hon. member just some of the very positive and very tangible, concrete results of a thrust that focuses on having Northerners, and particularly of native ancestry, involved in a very real way in our economic development in the North. I think it's worth pointing out to the members of the legislature, Mr. Chairman, that approximately 75 per cent of Northerners in training are native or of native ancestry, and as well - and this, I think, speaks well for the department and our officials - has a firm commitment that entry level as well as skilled positions for the Cigar Lake mining will be filled by northern people when the project begins because so often there's criticism that Southerners, if you like, get these positions. And I think that speaks well for the corporation and it speaks well for the department and speaks well for the people of Saskatchewan, and they recognize that these jobs should be for the northern people.

And what we're talking about is these kinds of things, Mr. Chairman. We're talking about making sure that we have the mill operators for the uranium mines. We're talking about making sure that we have native ancestry diamond drillers for the gold and the diamond drilling that must go on in advance of that mining. What we're talking about is making sure we have the skilled labourers for the many jobs in these mining projects, whether they be uranium or otherwise, and that we have assayers, Mr. Chairman, and that we have surface utility workers, and that we have prospectors - who I know have undertaken some of their field course work outside at the Anglo-Rouyn mine just outside La Ronge, which I visited last year when I was in Energy and Mines - and also that we have these geophysical technicians. And these are some of the very, very positive things that have happened because we've expanded our training initiatives there from merely having one program to now having a range of programs, and in keeping in tune with what's happening in the North because it has been a very exciting area.

Mr. Goulet: — My question now goes into a bit on programming. In '82, of course, there was \$6 million that was transferred from northern Saskatchewan to support the election of Sid Dutchak, which a lot of our money from the North then went to the P.A. technical institute. And of course that was good for P.A., but in regards to the North where we needed the facilities, that just was not good.

The question I would ask . . . There was a lot of rhetoric coming from the PC government at that time that Northern Institute of Technology in Prince Albert would help out the people in the North. A question I would like to ask is this: how many graduates directly from northern Saskatchewan have graduated from Northern Institute of Technology, and how many of them are working, and where are they working?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well insofar as what's happened to the disposition of the graduates from the northern institute, that campus, because it is a relatively new campus, I think the hon. member can appreciate that there has been very few graduates to date. And until they graduate, it's pretty hard to determine what jobs they do take. I can tell you this, that something over 50 per cent of the enrolment there is native or native ancestry, and we expect that number to increase. And I think, at least in terms of our goals, that I would say it is on track.

And the hon. member from prince Albert asked how many grads. My officials advise me that there could be a handful. So it would hardly be . . . I mean it's not that many because the institute is still relatively new, and if it's a two-year course, you've got to take two years to finish it before you can go to the job market. So I think the question will be better posed next year at this time.

(2000)

Mr. Goulet: — For \$6 million being transferred for the North to Prince Albert and all you can give me in reply is a handful. What do you mean by a handful? One? Two? What do you mean by a handful?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — We don't have with us how many have graduated but I will undertake to get that for you. But I reiterate again, and I want to be very clear on this, that something in excess of 50 per cent of our enrolments are Northerners, or of native or native ancestry, and I think that certainly in terms of our goals or what we had in mind for that campus, we're on track and we expect it to increase.

Mr. Goulet: — When will you have that information for me, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I'll endeavour to have it for you the next time we are in estimates here.

Mr. Goulet: — Could I have a more concise answer, Mr. Minister, because the estimates can go for a long time and I would like to know. If it's only a handful, you should be able to figure that out. You know, counting from one to 10 shouldn't take you two months. It should take you a day. Could you get that to me at a more precise time?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well the hon. member can be a little bit cute and he can criticize my officials and they can guffaw from their seats, but the reality is, my first inclination on that question was to say that we've had for the most part virtually no graduates because the institute hasn't been up and running long enough. But in the sake of trying to be as precise as possible and because, as I understand, the program there is competency based and they go at their own speed, there may well have been some early graduates.

We do not have that information, but we will get it for you as soon as we can, and I'm sorry that I don't have it tonight. And I know my officials are sorry that they don't have it for you tonight, but we will be absolutely as forthcoming with you as we can. And I'll tell you why, because we're proud of that campus.

The Northerners wanted a campus up there for a long time, and it never got built under the NDP, I can tell you that. And that's why we've got 1,700 more training spaces in this province today, is because we built institutions. We recognized that training was needed in the North and for natives. Your party never recognized it. We built it, and Northerners are reaping the benefits, and I'm proud to say that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I'd like to remind the minister that he keeps talking about the North in terms of the P.A. Northern Institute of Technology. Most of the people in Athabasca and Cumberland consider that still in the southern urban area, so I would like to correct you on that.

In regards to the programming and administration, budget-wise, your forward-looking government cut \$500,000 from the three northern colleges. Where is that money gone, I would like to know? There was promises in the paper at that time that it was going to be going to programming. Did that money go back to programming in northern Saskatchewan, and if so, where? And how was it put in the community college budgets in the past little while?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I really have to thank, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for his question, because there are savings in the neighbourhood of \$500,000, as the hon. member pointed out, savings that result from, at the administrative level, the single board of trustees, eliminating the unnecessary duplication of administrative personnel, and better use of administrative facilities.

We are going to take that money and plough it back into programming, so I think you'll be happy to hear that. But even over and above that, the new structure will allow for a greater revenue generating capacity. And thirdly, the \$3.2 million distance education fund or the education outreach fund, I think I would suspect very highly at least, although that's not worked out yet, that some of that money and certainly the initiatives at least, given the example I gave you about satellites and satellite technology, I would suspect some of the benefit of that \$3

million will find its way into northern Saskatchewan.

So the answer to your first question is: the savings from administration by having that money can be ploughed back into programming, in fact, to increase it there; a greater revenue generating capacity; and thirdly, the distance education fund. We score three times. That's a triple header on that one, I'd say.

Mr. Goulet: — My next question . . . Maybe I'll pursue a statement that you made in regards to the development of adult education with the NDP, but just quickly because the development of education within the NDP was to move adult education right into the North to be controlled by the people of the North. That's what the NDP did. They moved three community colleges. Your government dismantled them.

That's what the NDP did. They had community level involvement at the greater scale. That's what the NDP did. They moved the facilities right into the North. That's what the NDP did.

When you came in, you took the money from northern Saskatchewan to build the La Ronge facility, and you took it down to P.A. That's what you did. You robbed the North of a proper, strong build in La Ronge . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Precisely.

An Hon. Member: — What does the member from P.A. say about all this?

Mr. Goulet: — I said at the beginning that it was a very good deal for Prince Albert. I have absolutely no problem with that. The problem that I have is this: that you always rob the North, as far as you're concerned and as far as your government is concerned, and leave them with nothing but to work from a lot less than what you expect that people from the South to work from.

I would like to go into another area of education that's very important, and that's aboriginally controlled institutions of education. More specifically, I would like to make my comments in regards to Gabriel Dumont Institute. Again, here is the situation that demands a very important question and the question of control and autonomy. And it's the same problem that you have, of course, with the colleges.

The question of autonomy has always been a central issue, especially in regards to the long-term goals of self-government, especially in relation to adult education institutions. And Gabriel Dumont's goals, of course, are geared in that direction.

My understanding of the situation that you mentioned in regards to this joint native ownership concept that you do have is that it is transposed to the complete autonomy of Gabriel Dumont Institute. Right now, the Gabriel Dumont Institute is governed by a 25-person board, which of course includes - included - the democratically elected representatives from 11 areas and four people from AMNSIS, and also representatives from the universities, and also from the education, from the government, and also from the federal government. People enjoyed that control.

When you came in with your budget this spring, as I heard the story, there was either you take a 20 per cent cut or you come in to our joint ownership situation. I want the minister to tell me: is that true or not, that you had, more or less, a gun pointed over the Gabriel Dumont Institute in regard to your joint ownership concept, when they were really for complete, true autonomy? And you said, come with us and our so-called new joint situation or you're going to get cut back by 20 per cent. Of course they will agree with you when you give them a threat.

Mr. Minister, the question is this: in your joint ownership concept that you do have with the technical institutes, where Gabriel Dumont Institute gets one directorship out of seven - they get one vote out of seven decision makers in the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology . . . You call one out of seven joint ownership? I thought it was usually 50-50 when you're talking about joint ownership. Is it not true that the joint ownership concept at the directorship level is actually one out of seven? Is it not true?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — No.

Mr. Goulet: — Every time, of course, that an important question is asked, the minister either goes on and on or just simply says no. The question I would ask therefore is this: well, what is it? What is the management structure? How many board members are going to be on Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, and how many members will Gabriel Dumont Institute have in that overall board?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I think the relationship between SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) and Gabriel Dumont Institute is basically one that I'm happy to report on to the member because it's been an example, again, of having some new ground broken, literally, in North America. It's very much a good news scenario, and I've been very proud of the co-operation that's gone on in the negotiations and the meetings between departmental officials and Gabriel Dumont. We would envisage this as two interlocking boards in an interlocking relationship.

I think we talked about joint ownership, and that would be the first of its kind, literally, in North America. They can keep their board. I mean, virtually every point that has been raised, as I understand it, we have been able to meet and adjust and work out with them. And there's been good co-operation. And I am also proud to tell you that as a result of this, there will be a funding increase.

So by every measure, it seems to me, we're making good headway here. New ground is being broken, and I would suggest to you that it will serve everyone well in the future. They keep their board, there's an interlocking relationship, there's been good co-operation, and there's a funding increase. I don't know what more you can ask for.

Mr. Goulet: — On that same question, on the same topic, the Gabriel Dumont Institute board will still exist. Who will it report to in regards to the overall structure of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology?

(2015)

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The staff at Gabriel Dumont would report to both boards, in fact, depending on where the jurisdiction is, or what the issue is. There's the external component and the internal component, if you like, and it seems to be one that everybody's satisfied with. It's not something that we have rammed down anybody's throat, I can tell you that, but one that's been worked out, and as I understand it for the most part is a mutually agreeable situation. As I said in my earlier response, I've been very impressed with the co-operative nature and the constructive nature of the consultations that we've engaged in, that my officials have engaged in there, because I think everybody's come out a winner.

Mr. Goulet: — I wasn't talking about the specific process of negotiations. I was asking you a structural question, and that structural question is one of reporting authorities. The question that I asked you was: who does the Gabriel Dumont Institute report to? My understanding is this, that they report to the government representatives, who then reports to the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, and the final authority is Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — My answer is really no different. Because of the interlocking relationship, when it comes to institute affairs, report to the institute board - by institute, I mean SIAST - and when it comes to issues that are purely Gabriel Dumont issues or affairs, report to Gabriel Dumont. It seems to be something that everybody has mutual agreement that they've reached through the normal consultative process.

Mr. Goulet: — Then I will ask you more specifically, in regards to your theoretical interlocking structure, who has the final authority in terms of overall finance? Tell me.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Relative to funding, it would be a contractual arrangement through Gabriel Dumont and SIAST, and would, in that way, I think, provide some protection, as the hon. member might want and as they might want. To try and give you some sense of how this model might work, I'm advised that an example that is already in place that has many of the same kinds of features is the Luther College affiliation with the University of Regina, for example, that kind of structure that seems to work well.

Mr. Goulet: — I think you've answered my question. The Luther College, in finality, does report to the university. In other words, the Gabriel Dumont Institute, in finality, will have to report to Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — No. For example - and now we're given the track of the Luther College - it does not because there's obviously the involvement of the church and the board of governors, or regents, or whatever the correct term is relative to Luther College. If I'm misleading you with the example because you're not conversant with it, I apologize for that. I was trying to make this exercise more lucid and clear and not to confuse it.

Mr. Goulet: — I am very conversant with both the structure and the university, and both the structure of . . . I am conversant in both structures at the university level and the proposed one.

In your answer you are stating, therefore, that you have final authority. You have agreed that the government has final control. It is not indeed real joint ownership as you theoretically state. The financial controls are, in the final analysis, decided by you.

Luther College cannot take any budget of the total university and say it is theirs. They can't just go in and take Arts' budget or anybody's budget. The same with the Gabriel Dumont Institute - they will be restricted to the budget that you give them. Is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well it seems to me what is important here is the goal which we are trying to obtain in terms of training and opportunities for natives and Northerners. And I suppose what you're talking about here - and negotiations are still ongoing, certainly, with the Gabriel Dumont - but what it comes down to, I suppose you're making the argument that what would they rather have, 100 per cent control of 5 million or joint ownership of SIAST budgeting in the range of \$60 million, something like that. It seems to me, that sounds like a pretty good choice to them.

Mr. Goulet: — How much real control would they have of that \$60 million that you've just tossed in the air? How much of that in that joint ownership concept?

You're thrown in a figure of \$60 million. How much of that will the Dumont Institute be able to control? If they were in now, they would control at least 10. What is the improvement? Are they now controlling \$10 million out of the \$60 million?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — It seems to me that anything is an improvement because right now they have zero. They have nothing. And what they will have in the future is representation on that board, (a), and a chance to put in their views about how that money should be managed and the programs that should come out of it, first of all. And secondly, they're going to have a senior executive member in the administrative structure. They have none of that now. So, to me, it seems to be entirely an all up-side potential for them.

Mr. Goulet: — How many in that new administrative structure, how many senior administrators do you have that are about the same level as where you will have your GDI (Gabriel Dumont Institute) administrator?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — There will be very few positions at that level. This is still in the formative stages. I would guess, senior vice-presidents, probably somewhere in area three, four, five, something like that, and this person will be one of them. So it seems to me that's a significant positions and it's not some kind of moot position. That, and along with the board representation, is a very real commitment.

Mr. Goulet: — The initial proposal - was it not for seven

positions at that level?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I'm advised that in terms of all the models that were looked at, administrative models, there was never one that had seven at the senior level, which you talk about.

Mr. Goulet: — How many did they have, then?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — As I said in response to the question before this, it's still in the formative stages. But I think if this takes on some of the characteristics that other administrations have, something in the order of three, four, five, seems pretty normal. And I suspect we'll find it and that'll be where it'll come shake down at.

Mr. Goulet: — So what you're telling me is that under the joint co-operative ownership concept you will have one out of five of the senior administrators.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — That is incorrect. The member is trying to, unfairly I think, twist what I said. And I'm disappointed at that. Because what I said, what I said now three times, is that there would be something in the order of three, four, or five. Now you've said that I say is what I say is that will be one out of five then. That is clearly not what I said. And I don't know why you would try and twist it that way.

Mr. Goulet: — Well what did you say then? I heard number five. I heard you trailing off saying four or five. So I picked off the figure five because you mentioned five. Well, what was it? Was it four or five?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What I said, first of all, some several questions ago, will be a heck of a lot more than they've got right now, Mr. Chairman, because they have none - absolutely zero. And they don't have access to a \$60 million budget. So they're a long ways away ahead of where they are this very day, or they have been in the past, I can tell you that.

And if it's three, it'll be one out of three; if it's four, it'll be one of the four; if it's five, it'll be one out of five. And I think that, quite frankly, you're trying to make light with some silly mathematics, when the reality of the issue here is we're trying to put some very real management and board level input here from the Northerners and the natives.

Twenty-one community colleges as trustees think what we're doing is right, CEIC northern training advisory committee think that what we're doing is right. Somehow you think it's wrong. I would suggest to you that you're in the minority.

Mr. Goulet: — Well, I guess, as you said, I'm a minority. And in regards to minorities, we're always one out of five, or one out of four. And that's the point that I'm making. All I'm doing is pointing out what your administration structure . . . the importance of which is not a question of the numerical questions I'm asking. What I am really interested in is the human factor and the human beings that are involved in it, in terms of administrative decision making. And I would state that it would be a lot better if you said, oh, we are going to have two out of five. Then I would have said, hey, the minister is going somewhere,

now he's really improving, because that would be what I was trying to get at. You always misinterpret some of the questions that we throw out.

In regards to the Gabriel Dumont Institute, again, Mr. Minister, did you or did you not cut them back by 20 per cent?

(2030)

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — To give the story as best I can to this point in time, given that I think I'm correct when I say that some negotiations are still going on, if one backs up far enough in history, yes, there was a decrease in the core, but throughout the negotiations, I think, we have offered back more than the original decrease. So it seems to me at the end of the day, they're going to net out ahead.

Mr. Goulet: — Could I ask then how much of an improvement are you getting at the present time. If you were cut back by 20 and you made an improvement, it would only be 19, you know, per cent cut. It would still be a 19 per cent cut-back. Is it a significant improvement?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — It's going to be more than what was there previous. I can't tell you exactly what the number will be because it's still under negotiation.

Mr. Goulet: — Will it be . . . I'm not too sure about your statement. Will it be more than what you originally cut back, that 20 per cent? Or what do you mean by zero budgeting during the year? Is it more than the zero budgeting basis? Is that what you're saying? Or are you saying it's more than the 20 per cent cut-back? Are they going to get more than what the usual budgeting is for the province in general, which is zero or 1 per cent budgeting? Is that what you mean?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I can't really be much more specific than I've been. There is going to be an add-back. Whether it's 15 or 25 per cent, or what, I can't say yet, because it's under negotiation. But it could well be. The add-back could be higher than the loss. It may not be, but that's all what's in negotiation.

Mr. Goulet: — Well I'll make a summary comment, Mr. Minister.

Number one, I might say that the PC government policy on adult education is unwise, regressive, and really lacks the basis for true and meaningful consultation of people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — It appears that they are bringing back the old colonial model of having the financial gun over the institutes or colleges, and saying, do it my way or else. And then you interpret it as co-operation.

I think you would do well, Mr. Minister, if you followed up on some of the suggestions that are implied in my questions, especially in regards to a democratically elected board in northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — I would say that is wise, that is forward looking, if I heard you do that, Mr. Minister. But all you say, oh, I will consider it. Oh, the same old story we heard in five years. How can the people believe you? You've been saying that for five years. It's the same thing. You will consider. Oh, we will encourage you from the North. That's all you need, is what you always say. And the end result, the facts come out and we are cut.

In regards to the whole issue of coming out with new structures for important delivery, you are using a centralization model that has been tried in the past. In the North especially, we have tried coming to school in Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, P.A. for many, many years.

The greatest success, Mr. Minister, has always come from the developmental-type structures that are brought in by democratically elected people in such concepts as northern teach education program, controlled by an elected board in northern Saskatchewan, where they deliver the training right in the North - not by mere satellite, but by real people teaching in real class-rooms and delivering them right at the community level. I mean, that is the essence of education. Satellite-type education becomes just a support system for an effective people-centred model of education.

So, Mr. Minister, you were at the graduation at the NORTEP (northern teacher education program) program which was run by a democratically elected board. And the success was great, and you saw that in regards to the people that were there.

Mr. Minister, the success has been great also in regards to the establishment of aboriginally controlled adult education institutions in this province. They have been operating now for about 15 years from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, from the Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan. The success has been astounding in comparison to what it was in the past. And I must say that, Mr. Minister, you should learn from these models.

Re-centralization or re-assimilation is not the proper solution. Unless people have real voice and a real representative voice in any new restructuring, which you may call joint ownership, unless there is real representation in the administration, in the instructional staff, and in the governing board structures, your so-called joint concept will fall flat in the long run.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — So my advice, Mr. Minister, is to re-examine carefully some of the questions that the people have relayed through me in this legislature, and be prepared in the future to say, yes, we will give education and put it back under people's control. And I hope that happens.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, and members of the legislature, I'm happy to see that for the most part the hon. member agrees with the

philosophy and the changes that we're undertaking. Certainly we have disagreements on the process, whether it should be elected or appointed. And as I've said before, I'm prepared to give that consideration. But the important thing is to know that you too agree with the fact that there needs to be change, because that's a . . . I think we've accomplished something here tonight in that we're both agreed on that.

I suppose what I have to take exception to, though, is your - I think what I would call it - this trite speech on colonialism. I mean, if there was ever an example of colonialism in this province it was DNS (department of northern Saskatchewan). There is no question about that. And I'll tell you what. I'll stack up our PC party policies in the North any day. I'll stack up the young; I'll stack up those natives and Northerners who today have \$60,000 a year diamond drilling jobs against the NDP \$12,000 a year road building jobs to build roads to the South. That's colonialism.

And you ask that young person today who's doing that job, at \$5,000 a month with bonuses, which he prefers. And I'll tell you, he'll give you the answer in spades, time and time again. We have done more for the young people, the adults in northern Saskatchewan, than your administration ever did. And that is unequivocally the fact.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well the Minister of Education has just indicated to this House that he will stack up the Conservative program in northern Saskatchewan against the NDP program in northern Saskatchewan. And I'll remind members of the House this evening that he's done that, and the answer was delivered on October 20, 1986, and we have in this House the result of that comparison. We have two members from the constituencies of Cumberland and Athabasca as a result of that comparison.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — What that means is that the program put forward by the Conservative Party is a program that is not accepted by the people of northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education was queried by my colleagues from Regina Centre and from Cumberland about pertinent matters that apply to many people in this province. The member from Regina Centre raised questions with respect to technical institutes, and the member from Cumberland raised questions with respect to problems that he sees in appointed boards in the North. And the minister continues to give answers that he believes are applicable to the year 2000.

I'd like to address my questions this evening to the minister, with questions that are a little more historical, a little more closer to 1987. And I'd like to ask the minister whether he can tell the House this evening whether his department, the Department of Education, has undertaken renovations at 2220 College Avenue in the last year or two.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes.

Mr. Solomon: — What part of the Department of

Education, Mr. Minister, was renovated?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, as the hon. member will know, as of April 1 the new, and I might add new and stronger, Department of Education consists now of what used to be Sask Library, K to 12 system or the traditional Department of Education, the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. And some renovations were undertaken at the location you referred to bring together, and as a result of that amalgamation, to make sure that we're providing the best service to the people of the province given the new amalgamation.

Mr. Solomon: — My question to the minister is: what offices in the Department of Education at 2220 College Avenue were renovated in the year 1985 and '86?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The hon. member raises a question relative to the year '85-86. I was under the impression that we're in the '86-87, '87-88. We're two years old - that's two years ago you're referring to. You may have difficulty with me looking towards the future and the year 2000. I'm having difficulty going backwards far enough to catch up to you.

(2045)

Our best recollection, not that we have the '85-86 stuff here particularly, would be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Our best recollection . . . And for the hon. member from Regina North East, I resent the term empire-builders when it comes to my officials; they're extremely competent officials. And there may well have been some changes to the ground floor to accommodate the computer system.

Mr. Solomon: — Were there any renovations, Mr. Minister, to the offices occupied by the deputy - the former deputy minister of Education, not the current one - by his associate, by his assistant, or by anybody in his office in '85 or '86, at 2220 College Avenue?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — In 1985-86, I'm advised that there was changes made to accommodate an additional associate deputy minister.

Mr. Solomon: — Could the minister tell me whether that project was tendered or not; who the successful company was, if it was tendered; and if it was not, who undertook the project; and what the cost of that project was?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I'd have to advise the hon. member that the Department of Supply and Services would have undertaken this work. You're best to question that minister which would now be the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation. I mean, just to sort of give you everything I have on it, if you're looking for some project here that's a multimillion dollar project, forget it. I'm advised that it was a relatively minor renovation.

Mr. Solomon: — Could you please define in dollar terms your word "minor renovation" for us, please.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Not several millions of dollars.

Mr. Solomon: — So the minister is telling us that there

were renovations in '85 and/or '86 to the suites occupied by his deputy ministerial staff.

I ask the minister now a question: are there any renovations being undertaken at 2220 College Avenue in the offices that are occupied by the current deputy minister and/or his staff.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes, as I mentioned earlier, to accommodate the reorganization was - the old K to 12 department - advanced education and manpower, and Saskatchewan library. That's what I said just a few minutes ago.

Mr. Solomon: — What was the size in relative terms and comparative terms to the renovation? How many square feet were renovated previously compared to what is being renovated now?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Once again this question is probably more properly put to property management, but in an attempt to be as forthcoming with the hon. member as I can, I'm advised that our best guesses are the renovation will be costing somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 to \$60,000.

Mr. Solomon: — I'm surprised that the minister is not aware of major renovations being undertaken in his deputy minister's office.

I'd like to ask the minister whether the current renovation being undertaken has been tendered; if it has, who is the successful bidder; and when was that contract awarded?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, hon. member, I have to correct a statement I made previously; I do not want to mislead the House.

I said \$40,000 to 60,000 - that's incorrect. It would be 40 to \$60,000 for renovations at two of the office locations we have, not at the 2220 address that you mentioned. And they would be spread out over 10 floors to accommodate the amalgamation. So it's not 40 to 60,000 at the one site. And these are all our best guesses. And the additional information required, I would have to defer that to property management.

Mr. Solomon: — So you're telling me that the property management corporation is involved with all of the matters relating to the renovations in your department. is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes.

Mr. Solomon: — How many secretaries did your former deputy minister have?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I'm almost embarrassed to give you this response, but this is an example of what happens in this day and age when persons become person-years, etc., etc. The former deputy's office had 2.6 secretaries or persons or person-years.

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And how many secretaries does your current deputy minister have occupying that suite of offices that are being renovated?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Four.

Mr. Solomon: — Four. Can you tell me, Mr. Minister, who occupied the deputy ministerial suite of offices of your former deputy? Was it the deputy, his assistant and his associate, plus the secretaries, or was it not?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The former office had . . . I mean I want you to be clear on this because this is a critical issue, and when it comes to excellence in education, I get quizzed on this a lot when I'm out in the country. We have established by a great deal of stealth and cunning that there are 2.6 in the former deputy's office; there were 2.6 secretaries. And now I will tell you - I will add the other parts of the puzzle - there was one deputy and two associates. You've dragged it out of me successfully.

Mr. Solomon: — Is the space occupied by your current deputy the same size as was occupied by the former group that we referred to?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Is the space where we had 5.6 persons before, we now have six.

Mr. Solomon: — So what we've seen, Mr. Minister, is: you've had renovations a couple of years ago in the deputy minister's office, which at that time provided room for an assistant deputy, an associate deputy, and two to three secretaries. We have now seen, a year later, with this magical shift of amalgamation and a magical shift of personnel out of the department and into the department, another major renovation. The ADMs and the associate deputy are no longer there. We have the deputy occupying an area of equal size with four secretaries.

Does the minister believe that this is a cost-effective procedure as a result of the amalgamation?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What I'm advised is: with the amalgamation we've freed up one whole floor, and we have one associate or assistant deputy less than we had - one deputy less, rather - in total, obviously, than we had before.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Minister, I'd like to just turn for one moment to another topic, then I'll come back to this other one.

Recently there was an announcement by your government that one Gordon Dirks was hired to undertake a study on private schools. Could the minister inform the House as to what the terms of reference for that contract was and what amount of money will be paid to Mr. Dirks for the service, including expenses?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Hon. member, before I answer this question I want to just address briefly your other points where you were probing and trying to establish, probably, some kind of case for the savings, in your mind, that were probably non-existent with the amalgamation. And the question that you did ask me and that I would like to give you the answer of is: when we amalgamated, did we have any savings, and if so what did we do with the money?

Well, when we amalgamated we saved something in the order of a half million dollars. We freed up an entire floor of government office space, and I would like to suggest to you that that half million . . . One could say that it found its way back into the library system to buy books for northern and southern and eastern and western Saskatchewan. And they're very happy about that, and that's why we will continue our thrust towards efficiency and efficacy in the delivery of educational services in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — As relates to . . . Gordon Dirks was appointed in March, 1987 to carry out a study of private schools and home schooling issues in Saskatchewan, in which he would undertake to look at the quality of the education, issues relating to taxation, funding, attendance requirements, and parents' rights. This study will cost \$30,000. And you asked about expenses, and I don't have that for you. I'll just have to check on that for you.

Mr. Solomon: — You're telling this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that as a result of your terrific efficiency, with massive early retirements and firings in the Department of Education, that you've saved all of this money, and the money has gone to libraries to improve the stocking of libraries. Well it seems to me, Mr. Minister, that you are misleading the House because the Saskatoon library has not had an increase in their position. The Regina library has not had an increase. As a matter of fact, they are suffering a cut-back, and you call that providing them with more money. I think you've misled the House.

But my question with regards to Mr. Dirks is that I would like to know from the minister . . . He has a number of officials here tonight. I'm sure one of them have signed the contract or written up the contract to employ Mr. Dirks. Could you please tell the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan how many dollars in expenses you will be allowing Mr. Dirks to undertake this study, in addition to the \$30,000?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — To pick up your questions in this order. The \$500,000 that we saved, that's merely at the administrative level. The entire government efficiency operation, in terms of early the retirements and the position abolishments, will yield the taxpayers of this province something in the order of \$220 million in savings over the next five years.

(2100)

And I know you and your party believe that big government is good government and the larger the bureaucracy the better. We don't view it that way. The people of Saskatchewan don't view it that way. And where it makes sense, we will continue to down-size and streamline government, but we will do it in a common sense and humane manner, using voluntary approaches where possible, like early retirement and position abolishment.

And as it relates to library funding, for a party that

espouses always as if the rest of us have no heart, it espouses always that one should be fair and provide where the need is greatest. That's exactly what we're doing with that special fund for libraries, because the reality was this - that the cities of Saskatoon and Regina had as much money, or more, than the rest of the entire province had in the library system to buy books. I don't have the exact numbers, but it's something like that. And so it seems to me when we were looking at using our money fairly and providing it to those who are most in need, which the opposition party always claims to have a monopoly on, is moral integrity. And yet when we do provide to where the need is the greatest, they criticize. They say, oh, you know, it's not good enough. Well I'll tell you what, the people of Saskatchewan believe that's good, and it's a step in the right direction.

And, in fact, I'll take it one step further. It was the northern libraries that needed it the most, and so the grant for the North will be double what they are in the rest of the province. And I would say to you that that's being responsible. It's right. And what we're trying to do is get the rest of the province in the same position that Regina and Saskatoon enjoy when it comes to book budgets, and that's right; that's fair; that's responsible, and it makes sense in terms of being fair to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — In fact, Mr. Chairman, in 1986 Regina and Saskatoon libraries, who serve about 35 per cent of the people of this province, spent 1.9 million, or approximately 1.9 million on books and other library materials. Regional libraries, who serve two-thirds of the province's people, had only 1.38 million to spend on books and materials in 1986. Two-thirds of the people had less money to provide library books and materials than one-third of the population had access to.

Is that fair, I ask the hon. member? You stand in this House and you tell the people of Saskatchewan that we should continue the unfairness that was in the system. You stand in the House and can tell the rest of the people of Saskatchewan that, although you represent two-thirds of the population, you should make do with less funding; you tell the people in northern Saskatchewan that no, they shouldn't get extra money for funding libraries and establishing new libraries.

And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I've been very, very happy with our government's performance, even in tight economic times, and what we've been able to do with library funding and books - the heart and the soul of the library system since our government came into . . . have formed the administration in 1982.

I want to tell you about some of the things we did over the last six months since I was in this portfolio, Mr. Chairman, with libraries and library systems, because these are worth noting and worth having on the record. And the hon. member mentions, because he's from Regina, about the hardship in Regina. Well let me tell you about the hardship in Regina when it comes to libraries and library materials and library accession in Regina.

It's just some few months ago that I was over to the

University of Regina. And certainly, Mr. Chairman, on this occasion I was not in the pit, I was in the library. And do you know what we were doing there? We were unveiling or having the official ceremonies for a very innovative and creative funding arrangement that the University of Regina library under Ernie Ingles had undertaken, with a company called U.M.I. (Universal Microfilms International). And this is how it went, Mr. Chairman, and it's a particularly noteworthy story because so often the public, and we who are responsible for the public purse, are asking and expecting all institutions to be more efficient, to be innovative, to be creative.

Well I'll tell you, Ernie and his staff and the University of Regina are exactly all of those things. They're creative; they're innovative. And what they did is they took a million dollars and they got U.M.I. to match that with another million. And normally one would say, well one plus one equals two, and one would think that you would get \$2 million worth of library books with \$2 million. But what they did in this instance, Mr. Chairman, is they took that \$2 million and they bought over \$200 million worth of books, because they didn't buy them in the traditional form, they bought them in microfilm; \$200 million worth of publications, in excess . . . I might even be 300 million. It was a very large number, and I've seen it, something in excess of \$200 million in microfilm accessions for the University of Regina that go right back into almost early recorded history in some of the areas. That will make them one of the university libraries of great renown in North America, Mr. Chairman. That's innovative, and that's creative.

And I could talk about similar funding initiatives that this government has undertaken at the University of Saskatchewan. And I could talk about the numbers of books and resource centres and library facilities that have been updated and built and have had books put into them since my colleague, the Hon. Pat Smith, when she was in this portfolio, brought about with the establishment of the educational development fund which has improved libraries across this province. And now because we recognize the regional library system had a very large role to play here, we've given them a special half million dollar fund. And I think it's fair, and it's right, and it's responsible, and I'll tell you I have had lots of very, very good comments from the library community as a result of that latest initiative, Mr. Chairman.

And in so far as Mr. Dirks' expenses, I would think it would come in - and I can only give you an estimate - at something less than \$5,000. It may even be substantially less than that. There's been some travel involved around the province, I know, to visit many of the schools, private and otherwise - meetings with STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation), LEADS (League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents), SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association), all the players, as he undertakes his study - I suspect SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), etc. I think given his qualifications, the people of Saskatchewan will be well served by this report.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Chairman, the minister went on *ad nauseam* about not having figures. He indicated to this House he doesn't have the figures handy. Then he proceeded to stand up and fabricate a number of figures. He talked about all the wonderful things they're doing in education, what a great job they're doing at the university. We all know that the university has had massive cuts. We all know that the education system has been crippled to the point of severe injury because of the lack of grants to this system by the government, Mr. Speaker.

He talked about what a great job they're doing in the North. The North is just devastated. Mr. Chairman, I worked in northern Saskatchewan for two and a half years, and I happened to work at that time for the department of northern Saskatchewan. During that time we saw people who had never had any hope or never had any experience in terms of running their own communities, or working in the communities for a living, or being involved with learning new things with respect to administering their own affairs, were, through the department of northern Saskatchewan, afforded the opportunity, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, with attaining some self-sufficiency. They were learning skills. They were learning things that would help them provide food for their families. They were learning things which would employ them in industries and occupations that they never before had the opportunities to perform in.

Yet the minister here gets up and says what a wonderful job they're doing in northern Saskatchewan. They are doing a wonderful job. The unemployment rate in La Loche is 95 per cent. Seven or eight years ago it was half that, and that was still too high. But they've done a terrific job there. They've talked about doing a wonderful job in northern Saskatchewan. Well they've cut back subsidies to food in northern Saskatchewan, yet they continue massive subsidies to providing less expensive alcohol to those people who live in the North. That's the kind of education program they're providing, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a total disaster.

The minister skimmed over and flowered over all of the things that he thought he could mislead the House on and fool the House on. But in fact what he's done, in my view, is that he's skirted the issue. The issue here is that the Department of Education is pleading restraint and promoting restraint on the one hand, and on the other they're practising unrestrained spending by giving political hacks like Gordon Dirks \$40,000-a-year - or I should say for half a year contract, a part-time contract which includes expenses. They're giving Mr. Deschambault, or whatever his - René Archambault - who is the brother-in-law to the Premier, a little bit of assistance as well. And yet they're saying we have to cut back in education.

I think what they've done is promoted patronage. They have encouraged patronage among their own people, and we'll be getting down to more of that when we have another opportunity in this department to review the estimates, Mr. Chairman.

What's I'd now like to ask the minister is whether or not a person by the name of René Archambault is currently

employed with the department. And if so, in what capacity?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, I have to take exception to your remarks and your comments relative to university funding, and the word you used is cut-backs. Even this year, in a period of belt-tightening, the universities will receive the same amount of money from this government as they did last year. Now I don't know how you can call funding that's the same this year as last year as a cut-back. And let's look at the record, Mr. Chairman. What is the record of this administration when it comes to university funding? By any measure, if you look at the numbers between '82-83 and '87-88, university grants, operating, and capital, Saskatchewan . . .

An Hon. Member: — Look at operating.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Look, the hon. member from Saskatoon South says, look at operating. So let's look at operating. The University of Regina operating grant, \$40 million. The capital there this year is \$5.2 million. He says, look at this. Okay. Well that represents more in one year at the University of Regina than the NDP in their last six years. That's performance at the universities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes, let's look at it some more. Let's look at it some more. In about 1961-62 and through the '70s, when the NDP were in the administrative and executive command of this province, the university, the agriculture college was reviewed and reviewed and reviewed and reviewed, given lip service, but did the farmers, did the young people of this province have access to a new facility, Mr. Chairman? Did they get one while the NDP were in government? Did they get one in the early '70s and the mid '70s and the late '70s? Did they get one during the entire 11 years that the NDP were in government? No!

And I'll tell you what, Mr. Chairman, because we recognize that agriculture is the backbone of this economy, and that our young people and our adults, and that one job in five in this province depends on that, and that one half the value of all goods produced in this province come from agriculture, and because that one-fifth of the value of all goods and services produced in this province come from agriculture, and because this province is well known across the world for its agriculture initiatives, the University of Saskatchewan is going to get a new agriculture building because our Premier, this caucus, and this party understand agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — But let's not stop there. Let's not stop there because we hear this talk of so-called cut-backs. I will stack up the increase in funding since our party came to power in this province against any other province in the country, without fear of shame or contradiction. Because the numbers go like this . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Because the numbers go like this. And the hon. member said, let's hear the numbers. Well here's what they are: Saskatchewan, between '82 and '83, '87-88, they had an increase of 32.7 per cent, and what was it in Manitoba? 24; Alberta, 9.5; British Columbia, 1.7. The best track record of any in western Canada, and the story line goes on and on and on.

The operating in capital to universities was the highest in Canada - the highest in Canada between '82 and '86, Mr. Chairman. And the share of the provincial budget directed to university funding, up by 20 per cent, as compared to a 30 per cent decrease during the NDP term. And last year government funding for a full-time equivalent student, the second highest in Canada, and 35 per cent higher than in Manitoba.

(2115)

Now it seems to me . . . But then again, Mr. Chairman, it should be no surprise to us about how the NDP historically have treated universities in this province or in any other province where they are in executive power. They didn't build agriculture colleges, Mr. Speaker; they didn't fund our universities; they were in a state of disrepair; equipment hadn't been updated; buildings hadn't been built. And when we came along, this Premier and this caucus, because they recognize the importance, undertook several initiatives of which I've touched on some.

Through the university renewal and development fund we've had a number of buildings and facilities and equipment replaced. I've talked about the libraries, and the list goes on and on and on.

And so it shouldn't surprise us when we check back into the files and we find in those files, in February of 1980, a memo from one Hon. A. Blakeney, Premier, to one Hon. D. McArthur, minister of Education and continuing education. Because this provides an insight . . . And I presume this document was never made public, Mr. Chairman, for reasons which will become evident.

This shows you how out of touch . . . And remember prior to the 1982 election - that was the issue in 1982. The state capitalists, the NDP, were seen to be out of touch with the electorate. Well I'll tell you how out of touch they were, because here was the predictions and the marching orders from the Premier, Allan Blakeney, to the Hon. D. McArthur, then minister of Education, continuing education, as he related to post-secondary education. And this memo reads in part, Mr. Chairman:

I am particularly interested in knowing how we intend to organize our relationship with the universities, the manner in . . .

Oh, and this is the key line, Mr. Chairman:

I am particularly interested in knowing how we intend to organize our relationship with the universities, the manner in which we intend to reduce the rate of growth of university funding.

I'll read that again. He want to know - this is the

Premier of the day, the NDP Premier in a memo to his Minister of Education, the Hon. D. McArthur - and he's wanting to know how he's going to reduce the rate of growth of university funding.

Now, this is in the 1980s when we've just seen - it's early 1980 when we're poised on the edge of these tremendous enrolment increases, and here is what he says. Why does he want to reduce the rate of growth of the university funding? He goes on to say, "As enrollment declines in the early 1980s."

Now, what could have been more wrong with that. They thought there was going to be enrolment declines, Mr. Chairman. And he went on to say:

... and the methods by which we intend to ensure that Saskatchewan young people are training in the skills which will be required in our resource-related growth over the next several years.

The resource-related growth, i.e. the potash mines and the uranium mines and those kinds of resource-related growth - and we know where those industries are today. So on every count, then NDP Premier, Allan Blakeney, to his Minister of Education was wrong. He was wrong to reduce funding to universities. They were wrong when they suggested that enrolments were somehow going to go down and that these people would somehow disappear off the face of the earth. And they were wrong when they talked about the implications of the new economy, the information-based economy, the knowledge-based economy as opposed to the resource-based economy. He was wrong on every count.

So it doesn't come as any shock or surprise to us when we find that in 1982 we take over a university system underfunded, buildings in a sad state of repair, and equipment not having been kept up. And that's why I take particular exception to the hon. member's implications that somehow there have been cut-backs.

And I want to tell you something else, Mr. Chairman, because this is particularly interesting and I ... when I was being briefed by my officials earlier this morning and we were looking at university funding - and the Deputy House Leader for the NDP will be interested in this one, Mr. Chairman. I was particularly interested when my officials brought forth the numbers showing university funding over the past 10 or 12 years. It showed the funding levels when the NDP were in government. And you know what it showed, Mr. Chairman?

It showed this, and this is typical of those pork-barreling, the pork-barreling attitude of the NDP. What it showed, Mr. Chairman, is every time we were in a run-up to an election the university funding would take a little blip. That was in '77-78, and you remember what happened in 1978. We had an election. And then along came '81-82 and the funding took another little blip. And I made the observation, Mr. Chairman, that what the NDP had there was a case of electoral ... (inaudible) ... The only time those universities got any cash was when there was an election coming.

They liked to keep people dependent and hobbling on their knees, you know, because they like those people dependent on them. They like people dependent on the state. And I made the further observation, Mr. Chairman, that when our government came along there was none of these blips. You know why? Because our funding was always up here, and it's been up there every year, and it's been rising. We don't practise this electoral "wave-itis." And the hon. member talks about Gordon Dirks and somehow he's not qualified to do this study, and somehow \$30,000 is an inordinate sum to spend on it - and it's not 40,000 - that 30,000 is somehow an inordinate sum to spend on him.

And yet, somehow, when every Koskie in the province, practically, had a job with the government, that was okay. And somehow when Ian Dean gets a \$93,000-a-year job with the federal government, that's okay. And somehow when Jack Messer - remember Jack Messer, and what's his buddy there with the potash? - are bleeding the Manitoba taxpayers to the tune of three-quarters of a million dollars, that's okay. Somehow that's okay.

An Hon. Member: — What about Paul Schoenhals?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The hon. deputy leader for the opposition from the NDP, I would suggest to you that if Paul Schoenhals could get one-tenth of what Jack Messer is getting in Manitoba, he'd be very happy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — This is a very disappointing performance, Mr. Chairman. I'm very disappointed in this show. The minister went on a tirade and talked about all these terrific funding levels.

Well the only funding levels that have increased are funding levels to political hacks of his party. I'll mention a few names: Paul Schoenhals, for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, 150,000 or \$100,000; George Hill, 150 to \$200,000; Tim Embury, part of the Coopers & Lybrand-Embury firm now, \$0.5 million; MLA Keith Parker, former MLA for Moose Jaw North, about \$50,000 a year as an executive assistant to the head of the Saskatchewan Liquor Board; Paul Rousseau, the agent-general for Saskatchewan in London now, at \$100,000 a year in salary and expenses; Paul Rousseau's daughter working for SaskTel - another little patronage appointment; of course Sid Dutchak, we won't talk about him, he's getting a few dollars as well.

Now we can go on and on, but I want to say to the minister that his show was very disappointing this evening. I'm very concerned about what he had to say, in particular, when the question had to do with the Premier's brother-in-law, who he refused to answer. I'd like to ask the minister again the question: is the Premier's brother-in-law employed in the Department of Education, and if so, in what capacity?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Director of French minority education.

Mr. Solomon: — And what does he do at this minority ... What is it? The minority language branch of the

Department of Education? What does the brother-in-law of the Premier do, and how much is he paid for this?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Archambault is classified at the professional seven level within the new management professional plan. He currently draws a monthly salary of 4,373. His responsibilities are: advise the official minority languages office on French minority education matters in developing a division 3 and 4 French language arts program for designated programs; provides consultative services to teachers, principals, directors of education, and parents of region 2 which is in the south-west.

Mr. Solomon: — So the Premier's brother-in-law is making 52,000 plus a year, plus all of the other patronage appointments that I've had a very brief time to remind you about. We've heard about all those patronage appointments and the major cost to Saskatchewan taxpayers.

How can the government, how can your government expect Saskatchewan taxpayers to support the tax increases in the budget, to support the cuts in the public services, including the Department of Education, and other wage freezes in the private and public sector, when your government continues to waste tax dollars on massive political patronage?

On top of this, Mr. Minister, we have determined earlier that your deputy minister - the former and the current - have renovated their offices, not once, in the last two or three years, but twice. And the costs, you're not able to give to us this evening. You tell us 40 to \$60,000 for one, but you can't remember the other.

You've got 14 bureaucrats here this evening - none of them would've knowing anything about this. Some of them probably occupy the space. Why can't you give us that figure? All of this money that you're spending, that you're wasting at taxpayers' expense - no reason to have a deputy minister's office renovated twice within three years unless there's some major political problems. And I'd like to know what your answer is to those.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The hon. member asked, essentially, why are we charting the economic course that we're charting? He talked about raising taxes. He talked about the budget in its global essence, quite frankly. And I want to address that point because, Mr. Chairman, that's what separates us from the NDP. I want to talk about it because it's right, it's responsible, and it's fair. And unless the NDP realize that, they'll be sitting over there for a long, long time.

He talks about how can we do the . . . Why we would do these . . . Mr. Chairman, and hon. members, in this budget what we have said is we will get our economic house in order. And why will we get our economic house in order is because, number one, is we want to make sure we have our economic house in order. Because that's the only way you're going to preserve the things that are important to the people of this province, the protections that they see as important, whether they be in the health field or the area of social services or, in fact, in terms of providing good education, is if you do have your economic house in

order. And secondly, if we do not, then we shall deny ourselves of opportunities in the future.

And those are the two essential reasons. Because I ask the hon. member, are his children well served or my children or the children of Saskatchewan well served if we allow the deficit to get out of control and to get ourselves into a situation where several hundreds of millions of dollars that should be being spent on health and education and social services are going to service the debt.

I would say, no, that would not be the right course. It would not be the responsible course. It would not be the fair course. It would be merely transferring a debt to our children. I'm not going to do that. Our party does not stand for that. Our government does not stand for that.

And quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, education would be one of the big sufferers, and I'll tell you why. Education is one of the big spending departments in this government. You can't deny that. Education is a priority, and it's evidenced by the fact that a substantial percentage of the provincial budget goes to this department. And hence, if that money that should be going to education was spent to service debt, we would be the big losers.

And that's why we must get our economic house in order. You do not think we should get our economic house in order, but I am of the view we should get our economic house in order, and that's what we shall do. And that's what separates us from the opposition. That's the course we're plotting for the future. We're plotting it, Mr. Chairman, not because it's somehow easy and that you'll somehow become popular doing it. We're doing it because it's right, it's responsible, and it's the fair thing to do.

(2130)

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Now, Mr. Minister, never before have I heard someone talk about creating a \$3.4 billion deficit in a period of five years, and brag about getting their economic house in order - never before.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — I dread the possibility of what the minister might be describing in getting the house in order as we go down the road two or three years with the kind of financial flimflam that has been carried on by this government, and the track record that it's had so far.

Mr. Minister, never before have I ever seen a minister attempt to drag out with long, flowery, nonsensical, illogical speeches during the estimates period as I've seen here tonight. We have seen you be pompous. We have seen you be insensitive. We have seen you be uncaring to the students and the future of Saskatchewan people tonight. And you've given ample evidence to the people of Saskatchewan to not trust in the credibility of what you so proudly call the blueprint of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, you make it easy to turn this

discussion of estimates of the Education department of Saskatchewan into a game because of the attitude that you bring to this House.

And I want to raise with you, Mr. Minister, I want to raise with you some very serious questions about a very serious matter. And my first question to you, Mr. Minister, is simply this: why did you fire the former principal of Saskatchewan Technical Institute, Dr. Andrew Nicol?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The gentleman to whom you refer, and I will be clear and precise on this, the gentleman to whom you refer was not fired. That position was abolished. And quite frankly, it's unfair, it's unfair to that man's record to suggest that he was fired because it is not because of anything that that man did that he lost his job. That position was abolished; there was no position there for him to fill. And I would not want it to be on his record, nor would he want it to be on his record, that he was fired. And I'm very clear on that.

Mr. Hagel: — Precisely, Mr. Minister, what was the position that was abolished?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Principal of Saskatchewan Technical Institute.

Mr. Hagel: — You were saying, Mr. Minister, that the position of the principal of Saskatchewan Technical Institute was abolished. Did I hear that correctly? Mr. Minister, did I hear that correctly?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes.

Mr. Hagel: — Is there someone at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute today who is acting principal of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The position that is there and is being filled today in an acting capacity is the principalship, and the person who is involved in bringing together the Coteau Range Community College into the institute in the amalgamation process for the new Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology.

Mr. Hagel: — Let me ask the question for clarification, Mr. Minister, because I find it a little difficult to follow the logic. I understood you to say that the position of the principal of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute was abolished. I understand you also, to just have said that there is a person who is carrying out the position of the acting principalship of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute. Is that what you said?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — To try and clear this up for you, what we had was a principal at the community college and a principal at STI. We only need one in the new structure; one position was abolished, and that's what has happened as a result of it. And to explain further, because

I think what the hon. member is trying to do is trying to lead us into the scenario that would suggest - he would try and suggest -that somehow this heavy-handed rotten Tory government has somehow done a disservice here to one of its employees. And that is not true.

I want to tell you what the basis was for what happened there and save you a lot of this fancy lawyer kind of approach to this questioning.

When we undertook the amalgamation - and you must remember this was a provincial initiative, so what we are doing here was going on as well in Prince Albert and Saskatoon and Regina - and through all of this we did not want to have a situation develop where somehow the institutes were seen to be swallowing up the community colleges in this amalgamation process or, on the other hand, that somehow the community college and the boards would somehow steamroller over the institutes who had no boards.

So what we tried to do was set up a situation where we had balance. We picked two from the community college side - two of those principals - and two from the institute side. That seems eminently fair. I'm not happy that anyone had to lose their job because of position abolishment, but certainly you have to recognize that nobody is served well. The taxpayers are not served well if we have two administrative positions where we only need one.

And there was some several thousands of dollars in savings as a result of this amalgamation, but I caution you from suggesting or drawing the conclusion that we went through this process and that it was somehow budget-driven, because that would be an absolute mistake.

Because I'll tell you, as sure as I stand here today, it wouldn't matter if the Department of Education - the community colleges, the institutes, the universities, whatever part of post-secondary education - had had a budget increase of 110 per cent. We would be going through this restructuring because we have to position ourselves for the decades ahead.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, this is not the member from Moose Jaw North engaging in lawyer questioning. This is the member from Moose Jaw North, an educator, asking the veterinarian in charge of the Department of Education some questions about the operation of your department.

Is the action that you have taken at the STI in Moose Jaw, in eliminating - you say abolishing - the position of the principal of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, the Saskatchewan Technical Institute which will be the body that will combine the operations, you say, that were formerly delivered by the STI, the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, and Coteau Range Community College. Is the decision to eliminate the position of the principal of the institute the same as the decisions you've made in Regina, where we have the Wascana Institute and the Regina Plains community college? Is it the same as the decision you made in Saskatoon with the Saskatoon Region Community College, and Kelsey Institute. Is that the same decision you made in all three of

those centres, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The basis for the decision making is the same in all centres. As I said earlier, we tried to have a balance, half and half, fifty-fifty. We didn't want to have a situation develop where it was all the community college principals that got jobs as a principalships, no more than we want a situation to arise where the institute's principals were seen to get the acting principalships. We tried to have a balance. The basis for that was the same at every location you mentioned. I think the amalgamation team, the interim governing council, have done a good job of making some major changes, and it's going as smoothly as one might ever expect it to.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, what will be the title of the person who is the chief executive officer of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute once this amalgamation that you have been referring to in this famous blueprint of yours? What will be the title of the person who is in charge of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — There will be a president - that, I suspect, would be the appropriate title - as the chief executive officer for the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology. STI, as you refer to it, and have known it, will become one of four campuses under the structure of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, and there will be a principal there that will head up that campus, which would be the old STI and the old community college, as you probably would refer to it.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, what is the name of the person who is the acting principal of the STI now, and what are her qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Okay, the acting principal in charge of the amalgamation at the new campus, if you like, is Nancy Lynch: Simon Fraser University, master's in Business Education; M.A., faculty of education, communication and media technology department; diploma in adult education; University of Western Ontario, Bachelor of Arts. Eminently well-qualified, I would suggest. But they're in an acting position, certainly.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, was Dr. Nicol a member of the transition team that was originally appointed to oversee the transition of the STI and Coteau Range Community College to the Moose Jaw campus of the new applied arts and science super-institute?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Yes, all principals and vice-principals sat on the amalgamation team.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, are you telling me that you . . . Did you . . . Who appointed him as a member of that transition team, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The deputy minister.

Mr. Hagel: — And on what basis, Mr. Minister, do you say that the current acting principal of the STI in Moose

Jaw is more qualified to oversee the transition than Dr. Andy Nicol?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — That's not the issue here because that wasn't the basis for the decision making. As I said earlier, we had two principals as we did at all locations. And as I explained before, we did not want to be seen to have a situation develop where all the principals from all the community colleges became the acting principals, because then the institutes would say, oh yes, this is just a community college initiative, and the institutes are being left out in the cold - no more than we wanted to see the other scenario develop where all the principals from the institutes became the acting principals at the new campus locations.

We've tried to have a balance, and I think we achieved that because we have, as I understand it, two from each side.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, you're telling me that Dr. Nicol was appointed to the transition team to oversee the transition between . . . of the two institutes, the STI and Coteau Range Community College. You're telling me also that subsequently, you dismissed Dr. Nicol because you determined that his position was redundant, and the position was abolished.

You are then also telling me, if I understand correctly what you're saying, that you found it necessary to bring in an acting principal to oversee the transition between the STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute) and Coteau Range Community College. Mr. Minister, who is responsible for that decision? Is that your responsibility? And will you justify to me and for the people of Saskatchewan how that represents the best interest of the education system in Saskatchewan?

(2145)

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — First of all, a correction. He was not there to oversee. I said he was on the team, as were all principals and vice-principals. And obviously, as part of that amalgamation process where we took eight bureaucracies, if you like, and made them into one with the four campuses, some positions were redundant. It's that simple.

Mr. Nicol was not dismissed in the sense of firing. As I pointed out earlier, the position was abolished. I'm not happy that anybody had to be laid off, but that's the reality. There were savings there. This is not an anti-Andy Nicol process, this is a pro-taxpayer process, pro-education process. He was on the team, as were others, and the basis for the decision-making from that point on is as I described to you earlier. It's unfortunate. I sympathize with the honourable gentleman. Would there be anything way around it, it would be great.

As I understand it, there's positions going to be available in the new structure that will be open for competition. And who knows what would happen. Many people could apply for them, and I suspect that might be a possibility for the person in question.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, who will be the next principal

of the Moose Jaw campus of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I'm advised that this will go to competition.

Mr. Hagel: — What will be the qualifications that you seek?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Just on a point of clarification. Are you asking qualifications for the Chief Executive Officer of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology, or at the Moose Jaw campus? ... (inaudible interjection) ... Thank you.

We will be looking with somebody with obviously educational expertise, administrative expertise and, equally important, as important, maybe even more important, somebody who has a sense of the new economy and its implications for Saskatchewan, somebody who has a feel for the information age, the knowledge-based economy, and what, in fact, it means for Saskatchewan people, and what it means in terms of how we position ourselves relative to providing training for those new job opportunities in the future.

Mr. Hagel: — Does Dr. Nicol have those qualifications, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I think your question is not well founded. I would not want to speculate on who might fill the position. I think that would be irresponsible of me, quite frankly, and unfair as well to all candidates.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, being irresponsible and unfair would not be a new experience for you, believe me. I ask you again the same question, Mr. Minister. I did not ask you who the new principal was going to be, I asked you if ... you just outlined the qualifications that you'll be seeking for the position of principal of the Moose Jaw campus, and I ask you if Dr. Nicol has those qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — I said earlier that it's a competition and it's an open competition, so I suspect anybody can apply.

Mr. Hagel: — Let me ask you again, Mr. Minister. You appear to be hard of hearing. Does Dr. Nicol have the qualifications? I would assume that you knew, according to this blueprint that you keep referring to, what you're going to be seeking, and I ask you again, Mr. Minister, does Dr. Nicol have the qualifications for the position that you will be seeking to fill?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Little useful purpose is served in discussing qualifications or lack of, because I would point out again that Mr. Nicol was not fired, the position was abolished. It had nothing to do with ... That is just a simple statement of fact ... (inaudible interjection) ... Well, we must be clear about that because I don't think it serves Mr. Nicol's reputation to have anything else but that laid out in the public record.

Let's flip this one around, you know, to look at the other side, because what could have happened is the principal

of the community college, that position could have been abolished. I mean, either way we had an unfortunate situation to the degree that one position was redundant. And I don't think the debate is ... We're well not served focusing on the individual. Either you agree with the logic we undertook - which I think was eminently fair - or you do not.

We did not want to have the community colleges swamp the institutes or the institutes swamp the community college. We have done this in an eminent fair way, and certainly there was position abolishment, but you didn't need eight administrators and eight secretary-treasurers and eight registrars, and you can take that money and put it into programming, which is what the people want. It seems to me that is good public policy, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, let me go clearly on record as not agreeing with the logic of your decision. Mr. Minister, will you tell me what date Dr. Nicol was dismissed?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The job that Mr. Nicol was in, that position was abolished May 12.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, will you advise me and will you please advise the people of Saskatchewan just how it was communicated to Dr. Nicol that his position was abolished and what was communicated to him that day? Would you please clearly state the procedure that was used to abolish the position of the principal of the STI?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — He was advised by his immediate superior that that position was abolished and then, as with some other 100-150 other position abolishments, we had the highly competent firm of Stevenson Kellogg Ernst & Whinney there in a consultant capacity to assist those who had been laid off. And I think for the most part - given that this is a difficult exercise under the best of circumstances - that things were relatively well across the government in that down-sizing exercise. It's never easy; nobody ever enjoys it, but we tried to do it in every step of the way in a compassionate and humane way.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, who, from the Department of Education, was involved in the communication to Dr. Nicol that the position was abolished on May 12?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — His immediate supervisor, the assistant deputy minister.

Mr. Hagel: — And the name of the person in that position, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Elizabeth Crosthwaite.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Minister, one final question. Will you tell me why it was communicated to Dr. Nicol when the position was abolished on May 12 that he was not allowed to attend the STI graduation ceremonies scheduled to be held about two and a half weeks later? Will you tell me why that was communicated to Dr. Nicol?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — The Minister of Education, nor his assistant deputy minister in the Department of Education, have no control over who is or is not invited to the graduation. The student union's council run that particular graduation ceremony. We had nothing to do with it. And if you're trying to suggest that somehow this hard-hearted government didn't allow this to happen, quite frankly, that inference is wrong - 100 per cent wrong.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 p.m.