

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the other members of the Legislative Assembly, some visitors from outside our country who are seated in the Speaker's gallery, and their names are Rob and Suzie Leitner. They're visiting us here from Cairns, Australia — more often improperly pronounced Cairns, Australia, Mr. Speaker. But this was the site for the original meetings for the free trader countries of which Canada is a member of.

They're here visiting friends in Regina, and as I understand they've had an opportunity to take in some of the Western Canada Summer Games. And I would ask all members of the Assembly to welcome these visitors here to our country, from Australia, and I'd ask them to stand and be acknowledged.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a relative of mine, and also I would say happily, a special friend of mine who is visiting today. It's my brother, Terry Hagel, who is visiting from Calgary where he is a special education teacher in the Calgary Separate School Division.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask all members in the Assembly to help welcome him here to this Assembly.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, a special guest from France who is with two of my constituents, Bob and Karen Richardson, in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Bertrand Issard is a student from Louviers, France, which is near Versailles. He is staying with Mr. and Mrs. Richardson in Melville on a student exchange, and they've brought him in to observe the workings of our legislature today. I would like all members to welcome my constituents and their special guest, **Mr Bertrand Issard.**

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me today to introduce, through you and to this House, a group of 45 seniors from the town of Humboldt in my constituency. They are here with their president, Agnes Kochin, the chaperons, Robert Dagenais and Marlene Heibert, and bus driver, Bruce Lucas.

This is a very active group of people in Humboldt, with approximately 500 members, and they provide many activities for the seniors in the area. And I look forward to meeting them afterwards for coffee, and I would like to have the House welcome them today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to also join the member from Humboldt in extending a very warm welcome to some pretty wonderful people and old friends of mine from Humboldt who are here. It's good to see them all in the Legislative Assembly, and I join with members in extending to them our best wishes to a very enjoyable trip to Regina and an enjoyable visit in the Assembly. Thank you.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's certainly my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, a group from my home town . . . or home city of Melfort. They have just arrived in the gallery; they have just taken their seats.

This group, Mr. Speaker, is the part of the committee for the 1988 Saskatchewan Summer Games that the city of Melfort has the distinct pleasure of hosting. The committee is . . . And we're certainly very proud of the work the committee has done. We're certainly very honoured to have been selected as the city and as the site for the 1988 Summer Games.

This committee is headed by Mayor Arnold Orr from the city of Melfort; Dr. Lionel Lavoie, the executive director; Bob Degelman, vice executive director; Dub Henderson, the game services director; Doug Lyon, sports director; and I believe Heather Audette, their executive secretary, is along as well.

I do want to welcome you personally, ladies and gentlemen, and I would ask all members of the Legislative Assembly to join with me in wishing them the best of luck.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Canadian Transport Commission Decision on Regina Rail Line Relocation

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. It deals with the decision this week from the Canadian Transport Commission on rail relocation in Regina. The minister knows that I and most Regina residents fully support the idea that the rail yards and lines now running through Regina should be moved. There are serious safety and pollution problems for many Regina neighbourhoods.

My concern is that the problem isn't simply shifted from one neighbourhood to another. Those rail lines should be relocated far enough away from existing homes that they won't have to go through this long and expensive process within a very few years again.

With that in mind, with the Minister of Transportation tell us whether the Government of Saskatchewan will appeal this latest CTC decision to the Mulroney cabinet and urge

that Regina's rail lines be relocated farther away from existing neighbourhoods in north Regina?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd be happy to respond to the hon. member's question. And certainly this item is a very, very topical item. The decision has only come down in the last few days. I do understand the Minister of Urban Affairs is reviewing the decision. It certainly is a topic that is not without controversy.

I would not want to commit at this time what the position of the government may or may not be. I can give you my fullest assurance that the Minister of Urban Affairs, as well as the cabinet and the caucus of this government, will look at all angles of the situation. We will assess it, and in due course I'm sure that we will present to you the official position of our government.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, thank you. A new question to the Minister of the Environment, if I may. During your estimates a few weeks ago in this legislature, you told me that you and your department would see to it that the relocated rail lines would meet all environmental standards, especially with respect to the transportation of hazardous goods. But the CTC decision will see those rail lines located with 300 metres of existing homes in north Regina. That's much closer than the regulations respecting the transportation of hazardous goods allow.

My question to the minister is: what do you propose to do to make sure that those regulations are met? And will you encourage your colleague, the Minister of Transportation, to bring this problem to the federal government's attention?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Swan:** — I'd like to advise the hon. member that the report is new. It's just been placed before the public. My department is review that report, but it's pretty hard for us to say yes, you can go ahead, or you can't go ahead, until we have some firm decision that there is going to be a rail line relocation and where that relocation is going to take place. At this point it's not firm enough, and our department will not be making a final decision on it.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, the CTC has brought down a decision, and the decision is that that is where it's going to be located.

I have a new question I'd like to address to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Urban Affairs, who appears to be using the dispute over the location of the new lines as an excuse to cut funding to the project completely.

I say again that the rail line relocation is not in dispute. Everyone agrees that it should be moved, including myself. All the people of Regina North want is that we locate the new lines a little farther north from existing neighbourhoods so we don't have this problem all over again in a few years.

I ask the Premier whether or not the provincial government has committed funds to rail line relocation this year, and is so, where does this appear in the budget? And will you tell the people of Regina that you remain financially committed to the concept of rail line relocation?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member at his word that he does endorse rail line relocation in the city of Regina and that, in fact, he and his colleagues will now publicly support rail relocation. I'm not so sure that has been the case in the past, but I'll take him at his word.

Given that, the key is, is to find the best way to do it if, in fact, it is environmentally sound and it meets all the rules and regulations. The best place to put it . . . Or if you can't move it far enough away, what are the kinds of things you could do with respect to the corridor that the member and I have talked about that would make it reasonable for people that live in the area?

So we're prepared to look at all options, Mr. Speaker, and I'll give the member that assurance. So we'll examine any ideas that come forward, either where it should be, or how it should be put forward, and who is all going to pay for it. And obviously the people of Regina are involved, the city is involved, and governments at various levels. We are open to suggestions and ideas of how to best do it.

#### Relocation of Residents of North Park Centre

**Mr. Hagel:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, you will have received many letters from friends and relatives of residents of North Park Centre in Prince Albert, a facility for mentally handicapped adults that you are planning to close soon.

One of those letters, Mr. Minister, came from a woman from Regina, a Mrs. Eva Zaron, whose uncle used to be a resident at North Park Centre. And she wrote to you urging you to keep the centre open. When you answered her letter on July 13, Mr. Minister, you added in your own handwriting a snide postscript, and I quote:

I don't believe you have visited your uncle in the last six months.

Mr. Minister, on January 11, this woman's uncle had died. And I ask you what the point of this insensitive and callous statement was.

**Hon. Mr Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, the statement was not insensitive and callous. I wrote her a letter explaining concerns about North Park, and she sent me a letter. Among other complaints, she asked for my resignation, accused me of being a farmer, and having no idea what these people need. And then she wrote me as follows:

I have an uncle in here for many years and I visit here often.

So I inquired as to the circumstances about her uncle and found out that he had died six months earlier, and I didn't

know if this woman didn't know that her uncle had died or if she was trying to mislead me. And I didn't want to write a letter to her saying that your uncle died six months ago. I didn't want to scare her in that way. So I simply indicated that I don't believe you visited your uncle for six months, and I would think she would then inquire as to how her uncle would be.

But I quote — her letter says:

I have an uncle in here for many years and I visit here often.

I was let to believe by her letter that her uncle was still there, and I found out he had died six months earlier.

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Minister, I support that woman's statement wholeheartedly when she asks for your resignation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Hagel:** — It is clearly a measure of your insensitivity that you stand and offer this tasteless explanation of your unexplainable conduct. And I ask you, Mr. Minister: will you stand in this Assembly and apologize to that woman and to the people of Saskatchewan for your insensitivity and your callous comments? Will you do that?

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — No, I will not, Mr. Speaker. When somebody tells me she is visiting her dead uncle, what am I presumed to think? — that this lady hasn't visited her uncle in the last six months. What more could I expect? There is no reason to apologize. I didn't want to write the lady and say, lady, your uncle died six months ago. So I thought I would have a reference that she might inquire as to where her uncle is, because her letter says, I quote:

I have an uncle in here for many years and I visit here often.

She didn't say that her uncle died six months ago or who was she visiting.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. We've just heard another example of the callous way in which you deal with people, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, when the North Park Centre closes next February, you claim that most of the 180 residents, many of them seniors, will be placed in super-group homes, or that they'll be shipped to Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw. Yet at a public meeting that I had with friends and relatives of the residents, it was clear that they still don't have answers that they want. They want to know when these homes will be built; they want to know where they will be built; they want to know who will operate them; they want to know how they will be financed; and they want to know who will staff them. Mr. Minister, can you answer these questions today?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, I can answer those questions, but it would take quite some time, a little more

time than is allowed in question period. I can tell you this, that it was not my idea to close North Park Centre; that the Canadian Association of Community Living, which is the Canadian organization of the mentally retarded, and the provincial association, have for many years asked for community living for all retarded people, and if you're going to have retarded people living in the community, at some stage you're going to have to close an institution.

And the real debate here it whether or not these people should be living in the community as normal as possible, or whether they should be living in an institution in Prince Albert. And I am advised by the experts around the world, by the association that represents these people, that this is the right thing to do. It has not been easy, and it has not been popular, and I don't do it because it was my idea. But I'm doing it because I'm advised and believe it is the right thing to do, **Mr. Speaker.**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Minister, I never asked you to stand up here and debate with me as to whether you should or whether you shouldn't close it. We've taken for granted that you are a man that won't change his mind what the decision . . . once your decision has been made and once your mind's been made up.

I asked you some very specific questions, and I'm going to pose them to you again, and I ask you for some very specific answers. When are those homes going to be built? Where are they going to be built? Who will operate them? How will they be financed, and what kind of staff people will you have in to look after these people? Can you answer those questions?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a very long question, and the answer is at least 10 times as long. I can try briefly to give you an indication, Mr. Speaker, as to what the situation is. We have a target date for the closure of the institution, in February of 1988. Workers in my department, in co-operation with the Saskatchewan Association for the Mentally Retarded, are assessing all of the individuals to see what would be most appropriate for the individuals involved, as to where they would best fit into the community.

We acknowledge that in some cases it may not be possible for these people to live in the community, and they may have to transfer to our only remaining institution in Valley View, which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, we will try to also close, but we can't do that in a short period of time because there is still some need for institutions. We can't do this all at once.

But in any event, our people will try to assess the situation, and once the assessments have been made they will be placed in either community living arrangements, in private homes, either in existing group homes where there are some spaces, in some super-group homes which will be built where needed in the province — and I've indicated publicly that there will be one constructed in Prince Albert.

However, if the member opposite thinks it should be somewhere else, we could look at that as well. And we will deal with each family and try to ascertain what is best for each of the individuals — and that is a brief answer to what should be a very, very long answer, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lautermilch:** — On final supplementary. Mr. Minister, you haven't answered one single question. More rhetoric, more diatribe. You've got seven months to house those people. You've given them an ultimatum that either they find a place . . . this is what you're telling them, they find a place on their own because you haven't got any plans for them. There are going to be 180 people that are looking for homes. You haven't got an answer.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, are you willing to go back to your officials, find out what kind of plans there may be for these people, and table those plans in this legislature? Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, many times I've stated publicly what the plans are. I've given you a brief overview today of the plans. And the Saskatchewan Association for the Mentally Retarded is supervising, on behalf of the residents, and is making sure that my officials are doing what's best for the individuals involved.

And as I indicated, this is not popular. It's not popular with the union in Prince Albert, who is resisting vigorously because they value their jobs more than they value the lives of the people that they serve, and it's not popular with the president of CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees). And it's not popular with a lot of people that have vested interests.

But I have to do what's right for the people. And I am convinced, by all of the authorities throughout the western world, and by the association that represents these people, that this is the right thing to do. I tell you, for the fun of it I wouldn't do this. I could play golf. I could do many things. But I'm doing what is right.

#### Comments by the Minister of Social Services

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. And the Premier will have heard of the comment — I call it the incredible comment of his Minister of Social Services, the comment that that minister has made in writing to a Regina woman whose uncle had died.

And as the minister has conceded, he had known that the uncle had died. We have made the comment known. I've sent the Premier a copy of the letter, and I ask the Premier: does the Premier condone this kind of conduct by his minister, and does he propose to take any action with respect to it?

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for sending me a copy of the letter. It's the first I've been made aware of the letter or any of the information around it. I will take the opportunity to . . .

well first to take the minister's comments today as information and review it any further. If in fact the letter received by the minister was misleading, then the minister obviously has to respond to the facts as he finds them.

I understand from what I just heard in question period that the lady said that she was, in fact, the relative of an uncle that lived here and visited here often, which would leave the impression that, in fact, that was the case. Now if it is or if it isn't, I'll review it and respond.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Premier knows that this is not the first comment which I would label tasteless and insensitive made by this particular minister. We've had comments about foreigners working in hotels. He seems to know foreigners by sight. He speaks of . . . gives . . . makes comments that suggest that prostitutes and drug dealers are the major users of legal aid; that he has talked about braless speeches. We know that. What I am asking you, Mr. Minister, and this is one of several: when are you going to indicate whether or not this man is speaking for your government. And if he is not, when are you going to remove him as a minister and not burden the people of Saskatchewan with a minister who speaks in that way on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, you can examine your members, and I'll examine mine. And we can look at the history, we can look at the history over the years of people that have been in the NDP party and people who have been in the Conservative Party, and those that have been cabinet ministers and their statements.

You've drawn a fairly long . . . you draw a fairly long bow when you start to say that people who perform illegal acts, like drug pushers, should not be paying some of their legal costs, and that it's something that the minister shouldn't be saying. Well, I endorse that very much. People who break the law and make money and have to go to court, and obviously have money because they're operating illegally, I believe should be paying some of the costs. And it's completely unfair to draw that conclusion or to put it in here.

I say, today, I will examine the contents of the letter and the letter received, and I will make my own judgements. It's fair enough to raise the point, but I don't think it's too fair to range a long way from it.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. And I just want to ask a short supplementary on the digression of the Premier. And I'll take one example of your so-called drug pushers. Is it your submission, Mr. Premier, that anybody who is charged with dealing in drugs thereby loses any right he has to support . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask this question. Is it the Premier's position that any one who is charged with dealing in drugs does not have a right to legal counsel because of the fact that he is charged with that — legal counsel with payment if he has no funds — because

he has been charged with that, even though he's been convicted of nothing. Is that your position?

**Hon. Mr Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that people are entitled to a fair hearing before the courts, and the courts will decide whether they're guilty or not. Being charged is not guilty. Being charged is just charged.

I mean, when you want to use the long bow to shift from a question that you've just asked into something else, I mean, obviously the NDP youth has endorsed prostitution co-ops. Now do we expect the public and the NDP to stand up and say they want prostitution co-ops. Is that the policy of the NDP? And if it is, if a minister stood up and said, well I would endorse that, that's something that the general public would think would be a good idea? I don't think so.

I mean, if you want to get in to drawing long bows, we can all get into playing those games. I said I would review this, and I will be prepared to review it, as we are . . . the whole case with respect to legal aid. And people on welfare don't have to pay. Other people perhaps should pay something and particularly those, and I use the whole question of those that are living illegally and selling illicit drugs on the street, and the taxpayer is not prepared to say that I'm going to pick up all the legal costs for somebody who is ripping off the youth, hurting society. I mean, people . . . you can find people, I suppose, who will defend them, but it's difficult.

**Hon. Mr Blakeney:** — Supplementary. Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I want to be very clear on what I'm asking here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please. Could we please have a little order.

**Hon. Mr Blakeney:** — The Minister of Social Services has indicated that in his view legal aid should not be available to people who are charged with certain offences, regardless . . . without

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I think that the hon. members should just relax and allow the Leader of the Opposition to ask the legitimate supplementary question.

**Hon. Mr Blakeney:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I ask a question to the Premier. He knows that his Minister of Social Services has said in this House that regardless of the financial condition of the accused, if this accused is charged with certain offences, convicted of nothing, but charged with certain offences, legal aid should not be available. And I ask you, Mr. Premier, is that your position?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I'll just say I don't believe that that's what the Minister said. And I believe that the Leader of the Opposition is stretching it a little bit, Mr. Speaker. We've drifted so far a long ways from the original question and the topic.

I would just say that when you're dealing with social

crimes and crimes that involve young people, particularly associated with drugs, and the pressure put on young people to become prostitutes and the difficulty that raises across society, society is a little hesitant.

And I think he would have to agree in saying that we are going to provide a large measure of legal support for some of the most difficult problems facing a society today, and that in fact that we should take a good hard look at it, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to something that

And as we know, we've made the decision to . . . (inaudible) . . . drug and alcohol abuse; we've made a decision to make sure that we help young people, make them aware, and we're going to continue that, Mr. Speaker. And I think it's the NDP federally that supports legalized prostitution. I don't, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr Blakeney:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Premier wishes me to get back to the original point. May I then ask the Premier this: if the Minister of Social Services wrote what you and I know he wrote, and if in fact the patient to which he referred was dead, and he knew that the patient was dead, as he said in this House, will you condone that sort of a postscript? And if not, will you take action?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Devine:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard the minister's explanation today that he was written, and the letter advised him that the lad visited here and that she had relatives here and an uncle. Well I will review the record, Mr. Speaker, and will get the information. And as I said to the hon. member, I will take it from there.

## TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

**Mr. Hagel:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I stand to table a copy of the letter written July 13, signed by Grant Schmidt, Minister of Social Services, and addressed to Mrs. Eva Zaron, in which the handwritten postscript, Mr. Speaker, says:

P.S. I don't believe you have visited your uncle in the last six months. Grant Schmidt.

And I invite, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Social Services to table in this Assembly the letter that was written to him, that prompted him to believe that this was an appropriate addendum to add at the end of that letter, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr Schmidt:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a letter dated June 28, 1987 from a Mrs. Zaron — Z-a-r-o-n. And I table this letter, not because it was requested, but because I have nothing to hide.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please. Order. Order, please.

## MOTION UNDER RULE 39

### Anniversary of Christianity in the Ukraine

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I rise pursuant to rule 39 to seek leave of the Assembly to move a special motion commemorating the 1,000 anniversary of the advent of Christianity to the Ukraine.

I will take just a moment, Mr. Speaker, to indicate very briefly the background and significance of the anniversary. This week Canadians of Ukrainian origin are beginning to celebrate the millennium of Ukrainian Christianity.

Almost 10 centuries ago, in 988 A.D., Prince Volodymyr of Kiev accepted the Christian faith from Orthodox Constantinople as the national religion of the Ukraine, which was then known as the principality of Kievan Rus.

To commemorate this event, Ukrainian people are planning various projects the world over, Mr. Speaker. This week, the Ukrainian Orthodox faithful are gathering in the beautiful city of Saskatoon for a four-day millennium celebration.

This 1,000 anniversary celebration is of significance to over 500,000 Canadians of Ukrainian origin, and of particular interest to Saskatchewan, because it was in Saskatoon, 70 years ago, that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada was organized into an autonomous body.

Today marks the first day of the official celebration. There will be other celebrations throughout the year by both the Orthodox and Catholic church faithful. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I ask I seek leave from all members of the Legislative Assembly today to move the following motion. The motion reads:

That this Assembly hereby joins with all of those in Saskatchewan and Canada who are this week commemorating the one thousandth anniversary of the advent of Christianity to the Ukraine.

I therefore ask for leave to move the motion, and invite all members to join with me in supporting it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Leave granted.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll just speak very briefly in support of the motion for which I know that members on this side thank the government members for granting leave. I can't add very much to the .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Excuse me, I'm sorry, I don't like to interrupt the speaker, but apparently, according to the *Rules and Procedures* of the House, the motion must be moved, which we haven't actually done.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the hon. members for leave to move this motion. I would like to make a few remarks prior to the moving of the motion at which time I will move the motion, seconded by the member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

By recognizing and allowing leave, members, you are

recognizing more than the 500,000 Canadians of Ukrainian origin who are proud to call Canada their native country, and the Ukraine the country of their forefathers. Over half of these Canadians of Ukrainian origin live in the prairie provinces. Their history parallels the formation, the growth, and achievement of the three prairie provinces. The first official Ukrainian immigrant came to Canada in 1891, nearly 100 years ago.

Canada experienced three waves of Ukrainian immigration: 170,000 before the First World War — and my grandparents were among these — 68,000 during the inter-war period, and 33,000 after the second war. Over the past 100 years, the Ukrainian people have overcome the problems of integration and Canadian citizenship. The descendants of immigrants two, three, and four generations removed continue to retain the values, the traditions, and a language which have become a part of a way of life in Canada. I am one of these descendants, as are the members for Saskatoon Riversdale, Regina North West, and Canora. It is likely that there are other members whose spouses and relatives have a Ukrainian heritage.

Today the situation of Ukrainian Canadians as an ethnocultural minority is a special one. The original community is undergoing tremendous change while faced with assimilation at home and statelessness overseas. They understand the problems of the past and wish to devise strategies to safeguard their culture, language, and identity within Canada's mosaic.

Canadians of Ukrainian origin have contributed much to the social, the cultural, economic, and linguistic diversity of Canada. They have struggled to maintain self-determination, self-respect, and to be self-reliant without seeking any special favour among equals. It was this desire for freedom that brought the Ukrainian immigrants to Canada, the desire to be free of both economic domination and totalitarian domination. We believe in Canada as a multicultural nation with aboriginal people, two founding peoples, two official languages. We strive for trilingualism as a way of preserving and enhancing the cultural heritage of our community and to strengthen Canada.

Both the Orthodox and the Catholic churches have played a central role in preserving the Ukrainian language, the culture, and identity here in Canada. Their influences on matters spiritual and educational remains strong to this day — 10 centuries after the acceptance of Christianity by Prince Volodymyr of Kiev. As I said, earlier, in 988 A.D. the people of the Ukraine accepted Christianity officially through a mass baptism in the Dnieper River.

To commemorate this event and its influence on all aspects of history of Ukrainians and their descendants, various events and projects are being sponsored. This week, the Ukrainian Orthodox faithful of Canada are gathering in Saskatoon for a four-day, all-Canada millennium celebration. In addition to liturgical services, displays, concerts, the focal event of the celebration will be a special council, called a Sobor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, under his headship of His Beatitude, Metropolitan Wasyly of Winnipeg. At this celebration in Saskatoon, a statue of St. Volodymyr will

be unveiled on Saturday. Our Premier has been invited to attend this event.

Other celebrations are planned for 1988, including that by the Ukrainian Catholic faithful in Saskatoon in May, and an all-world Orthodox celebration in Toronto next summer.

Mr. Speaker, this is a golden opportunity for this Assembly to join with Canadians of Ukrainian origin as they celebrate their heritage, their faith, and prepare for the next 1,000 years.

I therefore move the following motion, seconded by the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, and invite unanimous support. And the motion reads:

That this Assembly hereby joins with all of those in Saskatchewan and Canada who are this week commemorating the 1,000th anniversary of the advent of Christianity to the Ukraine.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I finally made it. I finally made it on this motion, I mean. And who knows, maybe some day I really will make it. I keep trying. When you're in my position, you have to keep trying.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll just speak very briefly to this issue, and to welcome and to thank the government members for granting leave to this very important motion on what is obviously a very important day for . . . an important celebration for Ukrainian Canadians.

I note that the member from Prince Albert overlooked, by accident I'm sure, in mentioning at least one person of Ukrainian descent, in addition to the member from Canora, and that is the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the member from Maple Creek, who also comes from Ukrainian background.

And all of us who practise and preach politics in Saskatchewan and western Canada know the significance of this motion, because there isn't hardly a community anywhere in Saskatchewan that isn't marked on the landscape by a beautiful church, either of the Greek Orthodox faith or my religion, the Greek Catholic faith — their celebrations are going to start a little bit later. But this landscape, the church, is really one of the significant, in my view, aspects of Saskatchewan, almost like the country grain elevator — you see it in so many places.

And that's because right from the very early days when our fathers and our mothers and grandfathers came from the old country, coming here to Saskatchewan, or to the West of Canada, not knowing the language, not knowing the laws or the culture, the one thing that they absolutely demanded as the first thing of civilization and community building was that church. And they devoted their last dollar, and they devoted their extra sweat and hard work to the establishment of the churches.

(1445)

In fact, parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, there's an excellent book which has been prepared by Mrs. Maria Baran from Saskatoon, with photographs of everybody . . . of every church in Saskatchewan that has been constructed over this period.

And my point being that the history of the thousand year millennium, the celebration, has been transferred . . . transported here to the Canadian north-American way of life. It's become part of the cultural mosaic that everybody talks about.

And so you see this string of Ukrainian contact centred around the church from Ukraine in Manitoba to Tarnopol in Saskatchewan to Shandro in Alberta. You can name hundreds of communities. Because they came here in pursuit of land, they came here in pursuit of freedom, and they came here in pursuit of religious freedom. And it's Christianity, but it's something in addition to that.

It contains all those values — all those beautiful values of freedom and growth and land and opportunity. And I think it's therefore very important for all of us to endorse this motion unanimously, and to wish the Orthodox Ukrainians, and later on the Catholic Ukrainians, congratulations, if that's the correct word. We're with you, and we very much honour the place that you have played and fulfilled in Canadian life and the thousand year millennium.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kopelchuk:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to rise and speak in support of the motion, and I commend the member from Prince Albert for bringing it to the attention of the legislature.

I have a great heritage in the Ukrainian history of this country. My grandparents came first of all to the great state of Pennsylvania in the United States in the late 1800s, and moved to Canada in the early 1900s, and settled in what is called the Donwell district of Saskatchewan. We have areas there that are so notable as being parts of the old country, and I refer to communities such as Mazeppa and Dnieper which form part of our area of Saskatchewan, and are just so deeply entrenched in the Ukrainian culture and history.

I'm extremely proud, first of all, to be a Ukrainian, and secondly, to be a Ukrainian from Canora. I believe if there is a community within Saskatchewan that is known for its Ukrainian tradition, it is Canora. Canora has, first of all, the majority is of Slavic origin. We have provided the executives for so many, many provincial and federal executives and associations that deal with the Ukrainian people and culture that I couldn't start to name all of them.

What is unique also in Canora, and is known now throughout all of Canada, is a welcome statue that we have in Canora, built by all of the community — not by the Ukrainian people, Mr. Speaker. It is a beautiful young lady dressed in Ukrainian traditional costume and dress, and she greets visitors at the entrance of the south end of Canora. She has the traditional welcome of the towel with

the bread and salt. And we feel that that is so much a tradition that is received by all visitors to our town.

We also have within our community two churches, both the Ukrainian Orthodox and the Ukrainian Catholic, which are beautiful structures and represent Ukrainian architecture at its best. And I would invite any member of the legislature or any citizen of Saskatchewan to visit these churches. They are what Ukrainian people are all about.

I would also like, before I sit down, to acknowledge some people of Ukrainian and Slavic origin that are parts of my constituency and have represented Ukrainian people so well, in not only Saskatchewan but in all of western Canada. And I'm referring to people like the Ukrainian Orthodox Bishop Stinka who is now, I believe, serving the people in the Alberta region with his headquarters in Edmonton who is originally a citizen of the village of Buchanan.

I would also like to acknowledge other Ukrainian notables such as the Hon. Alex Kuziak, who represented Canora in this legislature for many years. We'll claim also, because he is of Slavic origin . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Hon. Adolph Matsalla. Yes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll tell him you said so, hon. member.

I would also like to pay recognition to Walter Mysak who, while he was mayor of the town of Canora, happened to rise up in the ranks and become president of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), an organization we all respect. And one other gentleman who is . . . or two other gentlemen who have now — one who has passed away — and that's the Dr. Danylchuk who was president of many, many provincial and federal Ukrainian associations and organizations — and Dr. Danylchuk has now passed away; and also the very famous Nicholas Lewchuk who, at 87 years of age, not only designed but helped build that welcome statue that I talked about earlier in my few remarks.

So with that, I would like to join with the motion in support of this motion, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McLaren:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to speak to the motion presented by the member opposite and to congratulate the Ukrainian community on the 1,000th birthday of their Christianity advent into the Ukraine. You might wonder why someone with a last name starting with "Mc" would get up and talk about the Ukrainian people, but I grew up in the Yorkton area and spent all my public school and high school with class-mates from the Ukrainian background, and I consider them some of my best friends today.

As well as that, my constituency is 60 per cent Ukrainian origin, and I have had a number of years with working with the Ukrainian people there. A lot of my fellow employees at the Morris Rod-Weeder plant were Ukrainian people, and the numbers of them in that area are very large indeed.

I think the one thing that I will remember in my first term of office as an MLA was working with the Ukrainian Business Men's Association of Yorkton, and across Canada, in helping them endorse and get the funding for the second edition of the Ukrainian Encyclopedia, where they are working very hard in Canada to list the origin of the Ukraine and the movement of them across to Canada.

And it was a real pleasure to be in Edmonton at their national convention to announce that we would endorse the second edition of their encyclopedia, and then to attend the banquet in Yorkton, Saskatchewan, where we presented the cheque for \$250,000 to help them fund their encyclopedia.

They are a very hard-working and dedicated group of people — the St. Mary's cultural centre in Yorkton that has been built strictly by their own efforts — they never came to government for funding, they just did it on their own, which is indicative of their dedication to get the job done.

We also enjoy attending their malanka — their New Year's celebrations, and have done so for a number of years. And they certainly respect their culture, and we congratulate them for that. And I certainly will be supporting the motion presented by the member opposite.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Goodale:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would want to join with the member for Prince Albert, the member for Riversdale, the member for Canora, and the member for Yorkton, in expressing support for the motion that is before us at the moment.

In my 20 years of political involvement in Saskatchewan, it has been my great privilege during that period of time to become associated and to work with a large number of Ukrainian-Canadians in some of their religious and cultural occasions, and in other ways.

And I have been, Mr. Speaker, very grateful and very honoured to be so included and so involved. Ukrainian-Canadians, as we have sensed, I think, this afternoon in the House, are intensely proud of their heritage their culture, their faith, their freedom, and the contributions which they have made to Saskatchewan, to Canada, and indeed to the world.

Equally, Mr. Speaker, all other Canadians share that pride. And as a respectful non-Ukrainian, but as an MLA, and on behalf of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party, I would indeed want to endorse the sentiment in the motion before us this afternoon and indicate my fully support for it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise to speak in support of this motion this afternoon. I will have the privilege of attending the celebrations in Saskatoon on Saturday evening and representing the Premier of this province and the government. I'm very pleased that this particular



event is being held in the city of Saskatoon.

This millennium is a kind of nostalgic journey, I am sure, for the members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. It will not only give them an opportunity to remember the times that they've had in settling in this country and also renewing acquaintances, but it also gives them an opportunity to explore their heritage and renew their faith.

What gave meaning to their lives was certainly their deep religious nature, their pride, and their devotion to family. I am sure that many people don't realize the large number of Ukrainian people that live in the province of Saskatchewan and, in particular, the area around Saskatoon.

I know that the Ukrainian people have played a very important role in the settling of this province, and indeed of this country. They are very proud people, hard workers, and very strong supporters of their communities and of each other. We see examples of the Vesna Festival and the Folkfest in Saskatoon that offer opportunities for people to find out more about the Ukrainian culture and customs, and also to appreciate and enjoy some of that fine Ukrainian hospitality.

I am certainly very pleased that the member opposite has raised this motion this afternoon, and I would like to extend my congratulations to the Ukrainian people and indicate that I certainly will be supporting the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to rise this afternoon and participate in this debate ... and certainly I support the motion put forward by my desk-mate, the member for Prince Albert.

I am very proud to also be of Ukrainian extraction. I am also proud to inform people, whoever ask, that both sets of my grandparents came from the Ukraine. My grandfather on my father's side and his wife, my grandmother, came over in the late 1890s in the first wave and homesteaded in a community called ... actually three miles south of a community called Fork River, Manitoba. And my mother's parents came from the Ukraine in the ... just the pre-First World War era; their names were Burtiak, and they as well settled in the Fork River district and were in business in that community.

But I think what is really important with respect to the celebration of the millennium that we were talking about today, is that the Ukrainian population in this country are celebrating not just the millennium of Christianity; in my view they're also celebrating, in this country in particular, the major contributions that Ukrainians have made to this country and this province.

They're celebrating the building of the western part of the country, in my view. They're celebrating living through the suffering of the climatic conditions that they endured when they came in the late 1890s to communities around Canora and Yorkton, where they spent harsh winters in handmade, very primitive shelter. They're celebrating, in my view, the endurance and longevity of the Ukrainian

stock of people. And it really is important for all Canadians to understand the contribution of Ukrainian people to the building of this country. So I join with my colleagues in this Assembly in supporting the motion and I extend my best wishes for a very successful celebration in Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too would like to join the members of this Assembly as we congratulate our friends and acquaintances of Ukrainian heritage.

We all are familiar with this hard-working, dedicated, proud people, and there is no question that they helped establish this great province of Saskatchewan. And through all their hard work and the severe tough times that they had as our province settled, there is no question that they were still able throughout all this, Mr. Speaker, to maintain their customs. And I think a lot of us are familiar with it.

(1500)

I know that as I grew up, contrary to my German name of Klein, I think most people are aware of the fact that my wife and I are Polish, and we carry a strong Polish heritage. But I can't help recalling my childhood on the east side of this city, and as we went to church and tossed about with all of our Ukrainian friends, me speaking Polish and they Ukrainian, but in the mean time, pretty close. And so we understood a little bit of what we were trying to tell each other and I can't help but reflect on some of the good times.

As I grew up in Regina, not much in height, but as I matured in my livelihood, I was fortunate enough with my wife to become very familiar with the leaders of the Ukrainian community. And I enjoy very much that special relationship that I feel that I have with them. And I know that as we travel Mosaic and visit both the Kiev and Poltava pavilions, we have ... the hospitality and friendship and customs that they display are simply outstanding.

And I know that in Regina South, although it isn't as ethnic as my childhood background was in the east side of this city, we too have a lot of Ukrainian acquaintances in the constituency of Regina South that are very active in the Ukrainian community. As I travel the province it's strange, really, I suppose, that ... But when you talk to the Ukrainians and they're so exuberant with their backgrounds — they maintain that probably about 50 per cent of everybody in this province has Ukrainian blood.

And as you travel this province as I am fortunate enough to do, it seems that they're very accurate because every community you visit, it seems that there's a Ukrainian person very, very active in that community. So I too join in supporting the motion and congratulating all of the people of Ukrainian descent as they celebrate this very special occasion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

## SECOND READINGS

### CONDOLENCE

**Hon. Mr Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I wonder if I might beg the indulgence of the House to make just a brief reference to a distinguished citizen of this province who has recently died, and I speak of Louis L. Lloyd, Louis Lloyd, who died last week and was buried in . . . or a service was held in Abbotsford, British Columbia, and whose burial was yesterday at Antelope.

I think members of this House will be aware of Louis Lloyd and his career. He was a pioneer co-operator in this province and in Canada. He was the brother of the late premier Woodrow Lloyd. He was for a period of years the president of Federated Co-operatives Ltd., a ceaseless apostle of the gospel of co-operation not only as a way of operating our economy but a way of ordering our lives.

I could say much more of Mr. Lloyd, but I will close by saying that he was one of those authentic rural statesmen and idealists which this province has produced in some small number. And he was a distinguished member of that group and we all regret his passing.

### STATEMENT BY Mr SPEAKER

#### Ruling on a Point of Order

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before orders of the day I'd like to read a brief statement regarding a point of order which was raised on August 10. It was raised by the member for Regina Centre stating that the answer of the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation in question period did not relate to the question asked, but really was an answer to another question asked by another member on an earlier date.

I have now had the opportunity to review the verbatim record of the question period. I wish to remind all members and the minister, of a previous ruling of the Chair dated May 13, 1983 as follows:

I would like to advise all (members) that if they wish to present answers to questions for which they have taken notice, they should seek to be recognized by the chair for that (specific) purpose. This will prevent the member's line of questioning from being interrupted and will facilitate the more orderly question period.

While I wish to make the point that it was out of order for the minister to attempt to answer at this time a previous question of which he had taken notice, I am also aware that the member for Regina Centre did refer to the credit union lease issue in his preamble. This incident serves to demonstrate what happens when members introduce material in their preamble that goes beyond the scope of their question.

I therefore urge members to keep preambles brief and factual, and urge ministers to ensure that their replies deal with the matter raised.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

### Bill No. 31 — An Act to amend The Local Government Election Act

**Hon. Mr Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill No. 31, an Act to amend The Local Government Election Act.

Members of this Assembly may be aware that votes on whether or not to incorporate resort areas into resort villages are proposed for later this summer. These votes are to be held in the resort areas of Cochin and Aquadeo Beach which are located on Jackfish Lake.

Informational meetings were held in these resorts last summer regarding the proposals to form resort villages, and at these meetings the majority of cottagers protested that they were ineligible to vote because they lease the land their cottages were situated on. In Aquadeo Beach, for instance, 90 per cent of cottage owners lease their land.

The current criteria in The Local Government Election Act allows residents and owners of land to vote in resorts, but not lessees of land. The proposed amendment will simply allow lessees and their spouses to vote on incorporation of resort villages and subsequent resort village elections. They must be Canadian citizens, at least 18 years of age, and Saskatchewan residents for at least six months.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill requires the urgent attention of this House to allow preparation to take place for the incorporation votes, which have been planned in consultation with community representatives and are to occur September 5, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to support this Bill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Van Mulligen:** — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would agree with the minister that this is a matter that requires the urgent attention of the House. I can only wonder why it's taken so long to bring this Bill before us.

But basically this side of the House supports the principle that lessees who have lived in a resort village for a period of . . . or have leased property for a period of six months, and are residents of Saskatchewan, should have the right to participate fully in resort village elections.

There are some aspects of the Bill before us that give us cause for concern, particularly as these pertain to qualifications to be a candidate. Although the Bill allows . . . or puts lessees on the same footing as those who own properties in resort villages, it draws a very clear distinction between those who own property and those who are lessees, in that those who are lessees are specifically excluded from qualifying as candidates for resort village councils.

That is a matter that this side of the House will want to take a few hours to examine further. And having said that,

Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn debate at this time.

Debate adjourned.

## COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

### Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Education Ordinary Expenditure - Vote 5

#### Item 1 (continued)

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make a very brief intervention. I would like to ask the minister through you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not he has received a request from a group in the city of North Battleford for the minister to exercise his powers under, I believe it's section 12 of The Education Act in which this group is calling for a ministerial inquiry into the North Battleford (Public) School Division.

I would ask the minister whether or not, first off, he has received such a formal request, and secondly, what the status of that request is in fact at this point in time — whether or not he's taking it under consideration or whether he's ruled it out. And I suppose whether or not he's going to answer the communication that came to him requesting the ministerial inquiry under his powers, as I believe I've said, under section 10 of The Education Act.

As I was home on the weekend in The Battlefords, it had been mentioned to me that the organization that had requested the ministerial inquiry has not, in fact, yet received a response from the minister.

So just to reiterate my very brief questions. First off, does the minister acknowledge that he has received a request for a ministerial inquiry into the North Battleford (Public) School Division, and secondly, as to what the status of that request is?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — I'm of the view . . . the understanding that yes, the department has received some correspondence relevant to section 10 which empowers an inquiry, I suspect, among other things. The official who may have dealt with that isn't here in this legislature. I personally can't recall a letter to myself, but that doesn't mean to say I haven't had one. But I can't give you much more information than that at this very moment, given the resources we have here, and as you can appreciate, we get a number of pieces of correspondence but we . . . I think the department, whether it's myself or somebody else in the department that's had the letter, we are advised that there has been one and I can't tell you what's transpired since that time. I could endeavour to get more details for you even perhaps yet this afternoon, if that would suit. I'm not trying to be evasive, it's just that there were not . . . with those who we have here we're not aware of all the circumstances.

(1515)

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, I would appreciate it if you would give me

your undertaking that you will either get the information I've requested today, or failing that, if you could either communicate with me or have an official of your department communicate with me as to the exact nature of the correspondence and what the exact status of it is. If you give me that undertaking it would please me a great deal, Mr. Minister.

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Yes I would, and we'll in fact try and even accommodate you by 5 o'clock today.

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Minister, on August 6 of this year of 1987, the member from Saskatoon University asked you a question or made some statements with respect to his concern that many of the cuts at the technical institutes directly affected women, and that women were very severely hurt by the cuts in programs to the technical institutes. And your response to that, Mr. Minister, was as follows, and I'm going to read from Hansard right now at page 1585:

And their idea (their — referring to the New Democrats) of somehow being the sugar-daddy to women, somehow being the sugar-daddy to all the women in this province, Mr. Speaker, is their . . . Their idea of that is to have them engage in courses and training, have them spend a couple of years of their life, and maybe 10 or \$20,000, and then when they come out and look for those jobs, they aren't there.

Now, Mr. Minister, there is a very real concern in Saskatchewan society, and it's been expressed to me on a number of occasions, that the cuts in programs to the technical institutes are by and large affecting women — seriously. In other words, these programs are not available.

And the term sugar-daddy, Mr. Minister, is a pejorative term. And it's derogatory towards women because it conjures up the notion of kept women. But it's your term, Mr. Minister, and your description of policies to further the advancement of women in education.

Now your government, Mr. Minister, has paid lip-service to affirmative action for women, and we know it's acceptable knowledge in Saskatchewan that we need to implement programs, make training programs available for women, and natives, and the physically disabled in order to give them opportunities to get into the labour market. And one would hardly say that that is being sugar-daddy.

But you have made cuts to education programs at the Wascana Institute, for example, that are devastating to women. And some of the statistics that I have been provided with are as follows. Dental therapy — cut. The percentage of students in that program are 98 per cent women. Barbering and hair-styling — cut. The percentage of students in that program that are women is 88 per cent. Aesthetician — cut. The percentage of students in that program are 90 per cent women. And then, occupational choices — I'm not sure exactly what falls in there, but that's what it's been labelled — 45 per cent of the students in that program are women.

Now these figures are pretty telling, Mr. Minister, and I think this creates a very serious situation for women in Saskatchewan. And I'm wondering whether these programs that have been cut is your idea of being sugar-daddy to women. And I'm wondering, is affirmative action ensuring women's participation in education and the labour force your idea of the government being sugar-daddy to women?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — The first point I would make, and I would want to be particularly clear on this, is first of all the term, sugar-daddy, that you referred to. In the context I used it was absolutely and in no way meant to be a slur, or derogatory towards women in this province.

What I was talking about was the NDP's rather condescending approach of constantly categorizing women in traditional roles when it comes to training. And I think we went through things like nursing assistants, and diploma nursing. And I was making the point that I don't think anyone is well served by clinging to the notion that women should be focused on those job training areas when, for example in the nursing assistant area, 63 per cent of the women last year couldn't get full-time jobs in their training specialty. Or in the case of diploma nursing, I think the numbers for last year were 58 per cent.

What I was talking about is making sure — unlike the NDP, who want to categorize and slot women into certain occupational roles — that we do give the women of Saskatchewan, whether they be single parents, or whether it comes to our student aid programs, or the women in rural Saskatchewan who now through the extension programs access institute courses and university courses through our regional college network — which is an innovation that's come to be since . . . to the degree it is today since our government, under our Premier, came to be in 1982.

I talked about the accommodation of women in the dental auxiliaries with the flexible curriculum at Wascana here in Regina, and how, by having and making available evening classes, and more flexibility in terms of the class times, that it gives access not only to all of society, but certainly . . . all who work in society, but certainly working women as well. And it's worth noting that there are more women students in our institutes today than there are male.

However, having said all of that, if some have interpreted it differently and, I might add, wrongly, and are somehow offended, I would absolutely and unequivocally apologize to them. But certainly the reference was to the NDP and their condescending approach.

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Chairman, the NDP have always supported the concept of affirmative action, and this particular government's record in that area isn't particularly admirable.

And another point that I wish to make on the area of affirmative action and the idea that you don't want to create jobs or continue programs that are traditionally female oriented — women should not have to move into non-traditional jobs in order to obtain a job. If they want

to, they should; if they don't want to, they shouldn't have to. So your elimination of traditional female courses is a direct attack against women in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — And with respect to the technical institutes, that's what's been occurring. So I want a commitment from this minister, Mr. Chairman, that he will move on an affirmative action program in education in this province to ensure that more women have access to all types of jobs, just non-traditional . . . not only non-traditional female jobs, but traditional and non-traditional female jobs in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Well I would only say again that, first of all, I wouldn't want to see opportunities for the women in this province . . . I wouldn't want to see them focused merely in these traditional areas. I would like to see them have an opportunity in areas such as the CAD-CAM (Computer Aided Design — Computer Aided Manufacturing) computer assisted design and manufacturing courses in Saskatoon and the bio-sciences technology and mechanical engineering.

And I still . . . I don't understand all the member's logic. Why would you, whether it's a male or female, why would you cling to the concept that . . . of forcing people or having people go into courses where two out of three, after they've invested 10 or \$20,000 and two years of their lifetime, two out of three can't get jobs? Now can the hon. member explain that logic to me, and who are they doing the favour to, whether it be male or female?

And I want to read into the record, Mr. Chairman, relative to affirmative action . . . Under the NDP in March of '81 in this province, in the civil service of this province, there were 7.7 per cent women in management — under the NDP, Mr. Chairman — 7.7 per cent. Do you know what the same number today is, Mr. Chairman? And it's going to get higher — 17.2 per cent, well over twice.

Mr. Chairman, you know, that's where the rhetoric flies in face of the record. Under the NDP, 7.7 per cent of the women were in management roles in the civil service of Saskatchewan. In March of '86, Mr. Chairman, the same number was 17.2 per cent. And, Mr. Chairman, better than that, in July of '87 that number is 21.3 per cent — three times — three times what it was under the NDP.

Now you ask me, Mr. Chairman, you ask me: who has had more opportunities for assuming management roles in this province's civil service, whether it's been women under an NDP government or women under a Progressive Conservative government? And I'll tell you, these numbers are even going to get better, Mr. Chairman. We're very proud of them, and the civil service is very proud of the management role and the management leadership provided by these women.

**Ms. Smart:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Minister, women in Saskatchewan are very proud of the traditional work that they've done in the health field. You've mentioned the

nursing assistants; you've cut out that program, eliminated that program at Kelsey. You've eliminated five . . . Five of the six programs that you eliminated were programs that were mainly women students, if not entirely women students. The women instructors have also lost their jobs at Kelsey because those programs were eliminated. So you have eliminated programs for women to learn, and programs for women to teach.

The nursing assistant program cannot . . . the nursing assistants can't get jobs because your government is not funding the staff to work in the nursing positions. You have quoted the survey that was done, "The Utilizations of Certified Nursing Assistants in Saskatchewan," and I will quote it, as well — because recommendation six says:

That the nursing assistants should develop, in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Advanced Education and Manpower, certified post-basic courses in gerontology and compassionate care, to enable CNA's to develop sound and marketable skills for the long-term care nursing market.

If you were funding it, that market would be there. I don't see any plans in your education program for the future to have those post-basic courses. And a post-basic course in place, a course which has been eliminated at Kelsey. And you, yourself, said, in the budget speech, in June 26, in *Hansard* . . . No, excuse me, in July 23, you said:

It seems to me as we move into the information age — the knowledge-based economy — the more appropriate questions that you should be asking are, where are the programs that will match the jobs of the future?

It seems to me that you should be asking: where are those people who can work in gerontology as our population ages? The people that can work in gerontology are the nursing assistants and the diploma nurses — those are the people that can work. Those are the jobs that women have done, socially-useful work, very valuable work, work that you're cutting down because you cut those programs, and eliminated those programs, and denied women the opportunity to have that kind of traditional training. Not only that, you have cut the pre-trades program from 22 spaces to 13 spaces — those were programs for women in pre-trades. Those are cut.

One-third of the program of the budget for the bridging program at the Regina Plains Community College was cut. And let me tell you what that program was. That program began two years ago and was the first of its kind in Canada . . . and you want to promote new and innovative programs. Here was one that started up just two years ago, designed to help women enter or re-enter the work-force by providing counselling, pre-trades, and pre-technology courses, and skills upgrading classes. Since then 500 women have participated in Regina, and similar programs have been established across Canada. But without provincial assistance about one-third of the 250 women served by the program will be unable to attend college in the up-coming year — another example of the cuts that you've made to women.

And I join my colleague in expressing my very great disappointment that this is what you're doing. My commitment is to seeing that we will work to reinstate programs for women, and that we will provide women both with traditional opportunities and non-traditional opportunities, opportunities in management, and opportunities in rank and file work, opportunity in the health fields, where women have been very strong care-givers for time immemorial, plus all the other job opportunities that should be open to women. There's no point in saying that the jobs aren't there if the government isn't going to fund them in the public service. We need that planning. We need that work for women. We need that commitment, and I for one will certainly work for it, as we will on this side of the House. If you're not going to do anything, just wait till the next election.

(1530)

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — The first point that the hon. member made was relative to instructors that were laid off, whether male or female. I would tell the hon. member again, I would apprise her of this fact, that every instructor that was laid off who wanted a job, with one exception, has been offered a job. So how does the hon. member square that fact which was read into the record here before, with her remarks about all these instructors being laid off?

Now we have no desire to lay off people unnecessarily. We've always tried to approach this restructuring whether it be the Public Service Commission as a whole, or advanced education, in a humane, sensitive, and reasonable way. And I would suggest the fact that all instructors who want employment have had the opportunity to have an offer, except one, flies in the face of what you have said. And I think the hon. member will acknowledge that she was inaccurate in her statements.

As it relates to the health sciences and the needs and the opportunities in the future, certainly geriatric care is important, and I have no doubt that we will meet in the future, as we have in the past, the needs.

But I would as well advise the hon. member that certainly the preventative aspect of gerontology are as important or maybe even more important. And I think of things like what can be done with nutrition. I think of what research in the area of kinesiology can do as relates to the implications of the demographics of an ageing population. I'm advised that in fact there is an advisory committee report coming forward on that very issue of gerontology, and I will be giving it serious consideration when I have an opportunity to look at it.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Yes, Mr. Chairperson, thank you. I have some questions for the Minister as it pertains to the elimination of the dental therapy program here in Wascana, as a result of the lay-offs of 411 dental workers that were laid off because of the government's cut to the dental plan.

My question to the Minister is this: I would be interested in knowing, and dental therapists in this province would be interested in knowing, how many additional spaces

have been created at the Wascana Institute in the dental hygiene program.

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Twenty-four, Mr. Chairman.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Chairperson, can the minister advise me how long the courses are for the dental therapists that are going to be retrained in dental hygiene? How long is the duration of the course?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: Mr. Chairman, seven months.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Chairperson, with a course seven months in duration with 24 additional spaces, can the minister advise me how long it will take to retrain the dental therapists in the dental hygiene course?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware that all 411 people that the hon. member — if in fact that's the right number — that were laid off, in fact wanted to be retrained in that area.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Chairperson, it's very difficult for dental therapists at this stage to be retrained when there are only 24 additional spaces that have been created, when the course is seven months in duration. I understand that there are over 200 dental therapists, and let's take a hypothetical possibility that all 200 dental therapists wanted to be retrained in the field of dental hygiene, how long would it take the provincial government to retrain those laid-off workers?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — We don't have to deal with hypothetical cases and what ifs, so we can deal with facts.

I'm advised that something in the order of 50 dental therapists have applied. We're hopeful that we could accommodate all in 14 months. We're anxious to accommodate as best we can; that's why there was some additional moneys allocated. We want to try and do right by these people as best we can.

At the same time I don't think we are doing anybody a favour, once again, if we jam 400 people, and as you suggested to take a course whereafter they take and spend 10 or \$20,000, and to find no job at the end of the day.

I mean, I know that's a typical sort of NDP approach, and it's been a characteristic trademark of the mentality of your government . . . or of your government . . . or your party when it was in government. But it's not our approach, and it's inconsistent with the reality of what is happening today, and it's inconsistent with the research data that we have, and it's inconsistent with the desires of every reasoned citizen out there when they look at the thing and examine facts as opposed to hypothetical situations.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Deputy Chairperson, as I understand the situation, people are being taken into the program on the basis of seniority, and many people are not applying to those 24 positions because they have not had extensive years of services to the plan. And it would be fruitless at this stage to apply for entrance into the program because they wouldn't get in this year, next year, or the year after.

And I'd like to just go back a few minutes to what the minister said. He talked about, it may not make any sense to retrain all of these dental therapists. That being the case, I'm wondering what kind of alternate training programs, besides the dental hygienist program, the government is offering to all of the laid-off workers who had very specific skills in the field of children's dental care. What sort of alternate training positions will be available, and will the government be funding those alternate training positions?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — I would advise the hon. member as well, that at Wascana campus we are working on a new bridging program to assist certified dental assistants to upgrade to dental hygienists as well. I think the point is, whether it be this or the additional training spaces and the fact that we would try and gear up the program to accommodate people as often and as quickly as possible over and above the new training spaces, is that we're trying to help these people if they want to continue in the health sciences area, to have the appropriate training for where the jobs are, point number one.

And point number two, as I read into this record some days ago for one of the other critics from the NDP opposition, just virtually dozens of new initiatives and new programs either under way, or soon to be under way, that they may well wish to take a look at as well.

And if you're trying to suggest that somehow we are insensitive or aren't understanding of their plight, nothing could be further from the truth. I mean that's never an easy situation. And if you're trying to suggest that we take some delight in doing this kind of thing where people, whether it's dental therapists or anybody else that has to be laid off, I can assure you that the opposite is absolutely true. It's never a pleasant task, but it's a matter of, you know, it comes with the responsibility of governing. And we can't shirk those responsibilities. At the same time, we've tried to be very understanding and sensitive to the needs of those who were laid off, whether they be therapists or others.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I just want to remind you that it was your government that fired more than 411 dental workers in this province — it was your government. It's your government that isn't providing training spaces to retrain those workers, most of whom are women. It's your government, your Premier, that has said dentists are better than dental therapists or dental workers. Dentists tend to be men; dental workers tend to be women. So where's the sexism in this whole operation?

We've had example after example in this budget, and in estimates, and in the newspaper, of women who've been fired by your government, and as a consequence of that, we no longer have training positions in our technical institutes because there's no jobs for those women to go to, because you people are underfunding things like health care and special care nursing homes, hospitals, and now you've done in the children's dental plan.

And my question to you is simply this. Let's talk about the 21st century. You now say that we don't want to have all

of these dental hygienists on the market, so you're only going to have 24 training spaces per year. Fair enough. If those dental therapists and dental workers have to wait, they will be waiting 10 years to be retrained on the basis of 200-odd people being dental therapists alone.

So my question to you is simply this — it's a very simple question, Mr. Minister: are you prepared to train them in other positions that will take them into the 21st century which you regularly talk about in this legislature? Are you prepared to do that?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — A couple of points I would like to make in response to the hon. member. First of all, I think she underestimates anybody's intelligence when she suggests that somehow people will wait for 10 years. I think that's a nonsensical statement for the most part.

The second point was the hon. member tried to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that somehow we don't have a record that we can be proud of as a government when it comes to training spaces. What I would say to you is this. You're so proud of the NDP legacy. Are you then equally proud of what our government has done in terms of, we now, today, this very day in this province, despite all the rhetoric that you talked about in terms of cut-backs, despite all your rhetoric due to changes and slashing and decimation and all those overstated, over-inflated bits of rhetoric that you engage in, the reality is this.

Point number one and fact number one — and I've read it in this record many times before, and I'll read it again. There are 1,200 more training spaces in the institutes today than there were when the NDP were in office. Point number two, when the NDP were in office there were virtually no extension programs at the institute level for all of Saskatchewan, and this year we have budgeted for 2,600 students to take programs, institute programs, in the country, across this province.

That program, Mr. Chairman, didn't even exist when the wonderful NDP were in government — 1,200 more spaces at the institutes, 2,600 students will take programs across this province and, Mr. Chairman, 34 per cent more spaces and enrolments at our universities. Now that's what I call performance, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman. My question to the minister is to do with the Humboldt school district, and the public school. First of all, has the funding formula for concession grants been changed?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Yes, the formula now . . . Whereas in the past, school boards would ante up something in the order of 10 per cent, now, on average, that same number will be closer to 20 per cent, but it does vary somewhat. And certainly we recognize that there'll be a greater expectation there on behalf of the local school board. That's the down side, I suspect, from their side.

(1545)

However, because when my department held some meetings across the province with school boards last winter, a number of points were raised with them relative

to the unfairness of the system as it was presently. And one of those unfairnesses or hardships of the present system was that school boards had to come up with their down payment all in one year.

So although we have asked for a greater share from the local school board, we have said now that you can amortize it out over 10 years, and hence in any one year, avoid an overly large drain on the local burgesses. And I think, for the most part, people aren't terribly unhappy with the new funding formula.

There were some other changes, too, relative to roof construction or repairing of roofs. There was an unfairness raised by some school boards wherein the situation like this could develop, or did develop in some instances, that some school boards religiously repaired their roofs and made sure they were kept in good shape, and hence never got into a major repair. And I think the cut-off was \$50,000 before you'd get assistance from the provincial government.

Others, they argued, unfairly took advantage of the provincial taxpayer, let their roofs go until they were a large project and then eligible for provincial funding. So those who looked after their roofs regularly felt they were being penalized unfairly for being good custodians, and so we made some changes there as well.

All of these have been in the interest of fairness and being as reasonable as possible, and recognizing sometimes the hardship of a large increase and the impact of a large increase in mill rates in any one given year.

**Mr. Upshall:** — According to a newspaper clipping from Wednesday, August 5 in the Humboldt Journal, the board chairman says that when the negotiations for this project that they have in mind, of enlarging the space at the Humboldt public school, when it started it was a 2 per cent a couple of years ago, and now, under the new formula, it's up to nearly 17 per cent.

That amounts to \$275,000, or a 47 mill increase. I don't think, Mr. Minister, in these times when the taxpayers of the rural areas are overburdened already, that they should be asked to pick up this extra tab, especially when you drag your feet on the negotiations from the time when it was 2 per cent until now when it's about 17 per cent.

I would like to ask specifically about the project going . . . At the request of the Humboldt public school board, with regard to the public school, I would like to ask what stage this is at and why it has not yet been finalized.

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Inceptual approval has been given for that project. That would be point number one. So our approval has been given to go ahead with it. And there is active and ongoing negotiations in so far as details of final cost of project and that sort of thing.

I recognize the point the hon. member is making, and I am sympathetic to the board's point in that, you know, if we go back to the old rule, so to speak, there was less cost involved to them than in the new rules. But I would argue, I suppose, that if we had gone the other way, they wouldn't . . . if we'd have gone from a situation where

their cost under the new rules was half as much, they wouldn't have wanted to hold to the old rules.

And I remind you again, of course, that if, one, they now have the ability to amortize this out over 10 years, which substantially dampens the effect . . . and I think you would recognize that yourself. It's like . . . you don't try to pay for farm land that you or I might buy, all in one year. I think what we've applied is the same kind of logic here for school boards.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, the problem that I find with that is that, sure, you can put it over 10 years, but it still comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of that area who can ill afford to be taxed any more, in the fact that, you know, when it started it was 2 per cent. Is there any way that you will rearrange or adjust the formula in this specific case to a level at which it should have been at if this project have gone ahead, let's say a year ago?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well as I said earlier, there has been consultations and discussions with school board members and my officials. What you're asking me for is to make a special deal for Humboldt. And I guess I would say this: I would love to make a special deal for them. However, I think you will also recognize that what I do for Humboldt, I must be able to do for all school boards across this province in support of the argument of fairness. I think people expect nothing less than that from government — to be fair.

And so what you do for one school board, you should do for others. And that's why we have these formulas in the first place, to make sure that we reflect fairness in society in so far as what the assessments are and what enrolments are and those kinds of things. I'm very hesitant to tamper with the formula. Because then one other member there might stand up and say, well . . . The member from Saskatoon who was questioning me about a school project there, he might stand up and say, well, you did this special deal for Humboldt, now will you do that for Saskatoon. And the hon. member for North Battleford will say, well you did that for Humboldt.

I think the point that you ought to recognize here . . . because sometimes governments are criticized wrongly, unfortunately, for not building schools in opposition ridings. I think you will recognize a number of projects that have been raised here, and not one of them with a view to "haven't you approved the project: with that one exception, I think. But the point is, if the projects are approved and I think you should be . . . that speaks well for the evaluation process and the non-political nature of the valuation and prioritization process that we have in this province. But I'm reluctant to interfere with the formula because then the issue becomes one of setting a precedent, a dangerous precedent, and the issue then becomes one of fairness.

**Mr. Upshall:** — Mr. Chairman, I'm very glad, Mr. Minister, that you brought up the issue of fairness. Because I could go on here for hours about the unfairness of this government. You deny the people of, in this case, of Humboldt, a facility unless they put out up front \$275,000, approximately, out of their pockets, in a community, in a

rural community where we know that there are many hardships because of the agricultural sector. You talk about fairness in that respect and you turn around and you've given \$300 million a year to the oil companies for a royalty holiday. Is that the kind of fairness that the people of this province should come to expect in your books?

You've given George Hill \$200,000 a year to be chairman of PCS. Is that fair when you ask the people of the Humboldt area to dig deep into their pockets to shell out for a school for their kids? That's the type of fairness that we should be talking about here.

Mr. Minister, the department — your Department of Education — you should be well advised to think about fairness and talk a little less about it. Because the situation we have today, you have no fairness in your department or in any other department in this government.

So I would just like to say that I'm disappointed that the process hasn't come quicker to enable the school board to get this facility going at a time when the rates were less. I'm disappointed you've dragged your feet on it and now asking them to have to dig into their pockets and pull out a whole bunch more money, money that should have come from other sectors instead of giving them tax holidays and patronization.

So I would say to you, Mr. Minister, I wish you'd think about fairness a little more and do a little less talking about it.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister a number of specific questions about the University of Saskatchewan, and the first one relates to tuition rates at the university. In the last five years, Mr. Minister, tuition rates at the University of Saskatchewan were up 43 per cent, from \$870 to \$1,254. A 43 per cent increase, Mr. Minister, in the last five years.

At the same time, Mr. Minister, the operating grant from your government to the University of Saskatchewan is up only 20 per cent during the same time. What is in effect happening, sir, is that students are being asked to pay tuition rates double that of the rate of inflation and double that of the increase of your operating grant.

And I ask you: do you not acknowledge that your underfunding to the University of Saskatchewan is in effect resulting in this very, very unfair and substantial increase in tuition rates, and that this increase in tuition rates of 43 per cent in five years represents a very real obstacle for many students to be able to obtain a post-secondary education?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well as it relates to tuition fees, and really what we're talking about, we talked tuition fees or the cost of books or the cost of housing, or anything else that impacts on a student's pocket book, it impacts on his accessibility to . . . or his opportunity to go to an institution. And that's what we're really talking about here, and we want to make sure that that accessibility is maintained and enhanced at every opportunity we get — every opportunity we have.



Now whether the board of governors, in their wisdom, are too high or too low or whatever, relative to their number that they've chosen this year for a tuition fee increase, I'm not about to second guess it. Certainly I'm aware of what they are. In the case of the U of R, it's 9.41 per cent, I think it is; at the U of S, it's something in the order of 9.9 or 10 per cent.

Now I think any student would just as soon not be faced with any increase, but I think for the most part students didn't see those as unreasonable particularly. I think if one looks across western Canada, we're lower than British Columbia, for example, probably about the same as Manitoba. But I think interprovincially we stack up very well.

I've read into this record many, many times as the hon. member would know, our track record on funding. And I don't think when he talks about our government underfunding universities that he's being particularly accurate there, or maybe not necessarily wanting to be particularly accurate.

I think the other index that's useful to look at here that backs up the fact that whatever is happening at our universities, accessibility is not being denied. And the reason I say that is if you look at the last four or five years, the number of full-time equivalent students attending universities is up — is up to 14 per cent and more. So by every measure, I think the laws and the rationale and the reasoning that's been applied here, ahs been the laws of reasoning and compassion and sympathy and understanding for the students' plight.

But as I said to you in this House before in a particular question period, it's not much use for us to sit there and argue about the problem of accessibility unless you're prepared to do something. And that's exactly why our government and our party under our Premier is interested in delivering, whether it be institute programming or university programming, more and more programming across rural Saskatchewan so that people can stay in their communities for at least some of the job training; in the case of those who have jobs, maybe all of their training if they want to be upgraded.

Because as much as we can focus — and the headlines tend most often to be focused on tuition fees — the big costs for every student that I run into, that has to go to an institution and leave his home and go into the cities to take a course or courses, the big cost is not his tuition fee, it's a significant cost, but it's not his biggest cost. His biggest cost is the room and board bill. And that's why we are putting a lot of effort into the distance education, the community outreach, and our new regional college network. We want to do something about accessibility, not merely talk about it. And I'm sure that you applaud that initiative.

We saw a story in the *Leader-Post* the other day — 14 communities across this province going to get University of Saskatchewan, I think it was English and history, fed across this province. Now those people that will be able to take that course in Weyburn or Meadow Lake, or wherever it's being offered, will save that \$6,000 or \$10,000 a year in room and board cost.

(1600)

And sure, a tuition fee of \$1,185, which is what it is for a U of S agriculture student this upcoming year, is significant. It's significant. But the 6 or \$7,000 that it costs him for room and board is also very significant. And if he can take some of that, or a first year of that, at home, he's very, very much . . . his pocket-book is very, very much ahead.

So what I'm trying to say to the hon. member is the board of governors gives very serious consideration to these. I, myself, have consulted with students where it made . . . where we have some jurisdiction, for example at the institutes. They've been minimized to the degree that they can be minimized, and they're very fair when you compare them with the rest of western Canada, certainly.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Minister, let me just say briefly that I don't think students at the University of Regina or the University of Saskatchewan consider a 10 per cent tuition rate increase this year to be reasonable. That increase is not the fault of the board of governors at those two institutions. That increase is the fault of your government and your government's underfunding.

And, Mr. Minister, I say to you that when there has been tuition rate increases over the last five years under your government that are double the rate of inflation, that is an unfair burden on students and a burden that is uncalled for.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a number . . . a related question. You will be aware that full-time student enrolment at the University of Saskatchewan has been increasing very steadily and significantly, from 10,818 students in 1981-82 to 13,766 students in fiscal year 1986-87. And you'll also be aware that most of this increase has taken place in the College of Arts and Science. In fact, that college now has 3,000 additional students to what it had a decade ago.

Now, Mr. Minister, I would point out to you that the College of Arts and Science operating budget, despite that very substantial increase in student numbers, has only increased in real terms three-quarters of 1 per cent in the last five years. During that time, Mr. Minister, that very real lack of funding has resulted, first of all, in major increases in class size, and you could see it, for instance, in introductory classes. First year history classes up from 40 students to 100 students over the last six years. Economics, 40 students five or six years ago; average introductory class size now, 100 students. In French, up from 25 students to 40 students in the average size of an introductory class. Mr. Minister, in some cases, such as in psychology, we're looking at class sizes now of 350.

And those increases in class sizes, Mr. Minister, have resulted in a very real decline in the quality of education in the College of Arts and Science. In a lot of cases, Mr. Minister, term assignments had to be seriously decreased because the faculty members are simply not able to handle the marking load any further. And students are being examined with multiple choice questions, graded by a computer, instead of comprehensive final examination questioning. Well, Mr. Minister, in my view

this is not what students have in mind by a quality university education.

Now, Mr. Minister, my question to you is: in light of the very substantial enrolment increases that have taken place at the University of Saskatchewan over the past number of years, why has your funding, since you've been in government in this past 5 years, not taken account of these very, very substantial enrolment increases?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — The hon. member raises a question relative to the whole issue of enrolments. And much as the increasing enrolments, on one hand, can be seen to be a problem, my view is what increasing enrolments tell us is that we're a — That's something we should be proud of. A number of our adult population, and our young people coming out of high schools, are having the opportunity to go to university. And I think, what a tremendous stride forward over the last 10, 20, 30, 40 years!

And you accused our government of somehow not keeping up our expenditures; our allocations to universities haven't kept up with the enrolments. And I will read a widely distributed document — the one I handed around in this House a couple, three nights ago — *the Preparing for the Year 2000*.

And what does it say on page 8? I mean what are the facts? What are the facts, hon. member? It says in there on page 8, and I'll read briefly from it.

... enrollment has risen 35 per cent since 1980. And government funding has been increased by more than 60 per cent.

So you know you can't ... your logic, it defies the facts. But as I read into the ... I talked about it the other night. It's not good enough to dismiss it just by my data supports that we are. Because that gets around the real thing that we're both interested in, and that is making sure that people have the opportunity.

And in the university's own paper, Issues and Options, some of the numbers there that I thought were particularly interesting ... And it's a mark of a civilized society; we've gone from a situation before 1920 where 3 per cent or less of our young people attended university to where, in 1985, that number now is up to 15 per cent. And even from one Saskatoon — where you come from — school board division, 25 to 35 per cent of the high school graduates there go on to university.

And I say, what a tremendous stride forward — 25 to 35 per cent in the late '80s as opposed to 3 per cent 50 years ago. I say, what a tremendous stride forward. And although some people look at increasing enrolments as a problem, I look upon them positively as saying to us that a number of young people are having the opportunity in gaining accessibility to our post-secondary institutions.

Now the same number, of course, for rural Saskatchewan it isn't as high. And that's one of the reasons why we're bolstering the role of regional colleges to try and give opportunity and accessibility in the North and in rural Saskatchewan.

And one other point that the Issues and Options paper made, Mr. Chairman, that's worthy of note here, especially given what the Regina Lakeview member talked about earlier, and as well the Health critic — a relative number of women have an accessibility to universities. In 1970, 37 per cent of the enrolment were females. In 1985, it was just 1 per cent short of 50 per cent. That is to say, one out of two enrolled were women. And I say, what another mark of accomplishment and one we should look upon with pride that that statistic is, Mr. Chairman.

So, much as the issue you raise has got a positive side and a negative side, certainly, in terms of the challenges that our system face, I think we should be proud of what these numbers tell us in that more and more of our young people and our adults — young adults and old adults alike — are getting upgrading and retraining, what these numbers tell us in terms of the enrolments. And I would say to you once again that you can factor in inflation, you can factor in enrolments, but the money has kept pace.

Now if you're asking me, could we use more at universities? Certainly, we could always use more. But don't try and give me the line that we're not keeping pace, because it's simply not true. I've made that point in this House before. It's for all the public to see in that document, and I stand by it.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I beg to differ. I would argue that your funding has not kept pace with inflation and has certainly not taken account of increased student enrolment.

And I simply give you — I give you the figures, sir. In 1983, your funding to the University of Saskatchewan was \$85,645,000; in 1988, it's \$104,256,000. By my calculation, sir, that's only a funding increase over the five-year period of 20.3 per cent. That is not only below the rate of inflation, but it certainly does not take account of the very substantive increase in enrolment at the University of Saskatchewan during that time.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want to move to a related topic, and that is the question of your failure, the failure of your government to pass along the funds that you have received from the Government of Canada for university and technical school education to the universities and technical schools of this province.

As you will be aware, Mr. Minister, on March 14, 1985, Mr. Alan Johnson tabled a report to the House of Commons representing a detailed study of federal financing for post-secondary education in Canada. And one of the major points that Mr. Johnson makes in his report is that provincial governments across the country have been steadily reducing their spending on post-secondary education, while the federal government's contribution to post-secondary education represents a bigger and bigger portion of university and technical institute budgets.

Simply put, Mr. Minister, find that Ottawa is allocating to universities and technical institutes are not getting to those post-secondary education institutes. According to

Mr. Johnson, federal funds and tax points from Ottawa constituted 90.3 per cent of Saskatchewan operating grants to universities and technical institutes. Could you confirm that fact, sir?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — Three points I would make here as quickly as I can. I sympathize with the hon. member who's a little bit under the weather today, I take it.

As it relates to established programs' financing, in terms of the history of that . . . As you well know . . . Block funding approach. That didn't distinguish between money that should go to health versus money that should go to education. What the federal government's view might have been would have been entirely arbitrary and not accepted by the provinces in so far as what should go where, etc., etc.

But having said all of that, Saskatchewan's expenditures on post-secondary education, whether it's that report you refer to or one other from the federal secretary of the state, pointed out that Saskatchewan's expenditure on post-secondary education increased by 17.1 per cent from '83-84 to '85-86. And what makes that particularly notable, Mr. Deputy Chairman, is that's the highest, the highest rate of increases among the provinces.

The hon. member doesn't have to accept my numbers for what we've been doing in terms of support for universities; there is the federal Secretary of State. And I would further go on to add that the numbers that they have there . . . that they use, Mr. Chairman, underestimated our expenditures in '85-86 by an additional 35 millions of dollars.

So look how good the story would have been if they'd have had the proper numbers . . . if the federal government had the proper numbers.

(1615)

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, I would point out to you that Mr. Alan Johnson's study was done prior to your two-year budget freeze on university funding in this province.

And I think, Mr. Minister, that we are rapidly moving towards a situation where the provincial government is putting in a minuscule amount of the funding that is going to our universities and technical institutes. The large bulk of that is being put in by the Government of Canada.

In effect, sir, what's happening is that you are failing to pass along, to the universities of this province, the funding that is being provided to your government from Ottawa for post-secondary education.

And my question to you, sir, is this. Would you be prepared to advocate a policy long put forward by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, namely that federal transfers intended for post-secondary education should be spent in that sector and should be matched by the provinces?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — I would reiterate, Mr. Deputy Chairman, and hon. member, that we do not accept the

arbitrary, very arbitrary division that the federal government makes on those expenditures. The second point is that once again they have underestimated the expenditure.

But having said all of that, Saskatchewan's expenditures on post-secondary education have risen by 50 per cent in the last five years, while total EPF (established program of financing) entitlements rose by only 35 per cent during the same period.

So dissect it every which way you like, and the bottom line is that we more than made up for what was coming from . . . We exceeded our contributions to post-secondary education by far, in so far as what we were getting from the federal government, if one did accept some kind of arbitrary allocation.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it's our view on this side of the House, that education, and spending on education should be seen as an investment in the future of the young people of this province, and you've talked a lot in this Assembly about preparing for the information age, preparing for the year 2000, preparing for the high-technology society.

It's obvious that we have very different interpretations of your funding policies for the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina, and we seriously question many of the figures that you've put forward. But it should be obvious to you that we will never have an adequate base for science and technology in Saskatchewan if we curtail university funding. If there's to be a future for high tech and for science in this province, it requires a strong university base.

Now, Mr. Minister, it's obvious to me that your funding provisions since you assumed office, for universities, have not kept pace with increased university enrolment. It's also obvious that you are not passing along the funds that you are receiving from Ottawa for post-secondary education to our university institutions.

And the question that I want to ask you is this: would you be prepared to change your funding policies and to undertake an initiative in which you adopt a five-year funding plan for the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina that fully takes into account their inflationary costs? Will you sit down with the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan and work out a formula for funding over the next five years that accurately measures their real rate of inflation, that builds in provisions for offsetting the decline in the quality of education that's taken place over the past few years; that builds in provisions for rebuilding the quality of education at our university campuses. Would you be prepared to support that kind of a five-year funding plan?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — For the very reasons the hon. member has talked about, I think we are already out of the chute on this one. That's exactly why we set up the university renewal and development fund, to allow for that five-year planning. It's gone very well, and things like the new agriculture college, the library acquisitions, just to name a couple of projects in recent days that have been given the green lights, I think that approach, the five-year

planning approach, has been working well.

As it relates to my meetings with the board of governors, that was exactly what was behind that brief, was to give the university board of governors some thinking, as best as one can ever guess the future, in so far as what they could expect and plan around over the next four years.

So I think . . . You say five. I guess we gave some indication for the next four years. I don't think we're very far apart on that. And I think that process is well under way, and at the same time it respects their autonomy and their right to make decisions relative to their universities. But the windows and the process . . . or not the window, but the process is there — five years on the RDF (renewal and development fund) side and four year on the other side.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, we're pleased with your renewal and development fund initiative, but that's not what we're talking about here. We're talking about operating grant funds. It's that that I'm suggesting ought to be on a five-year plan, and not simply your renewal and development funding.

Now, Mr. Minister, as you're aware, the University of Saskatchewan has had to take two unprecedented actions as a result of your underfunding to that university. First, it's been forced to impose an enrolment quota in the College of Arts and Science. If one simply assumes that enrolments in that college were going to be the same as last year, at least 300 students will be turned away. All indications are, however, that the number of students who will need to be turned away will be far higher than that. It'll likely end up being in the range of 500 students, Mr. Minister.

And second, in large part again because of the financial pressures that you've placed on the University of Saskatchewan, the university will be closing it's College of Home Economics. This is the first time in the history of the university that the university has had to close down an entire college. That college had an enviable record of service to the people of Saskatchewan. It was the first college in Canada to grant a degree in home economics, and it's got an enrolment of 265 students and 11 faculty members.

Mr. Minister, the crisis in funding to the University of Saskatchewan has gone beyond overcrowded class-rooms, a reduction in the quality of education, outmoded facilities and equipment, library services that are deteriorating. It's reached the point where the right of qualified students to a university education is being denied, and where major program cuts and in fact the shutting down of an entire college have had to be implemented.

My question to you is this: in light of the crisis in funding at the University of Saskatchewan, will you drop your two-year budget freeze on the University of Saskatchewan? And will you grant the University of Saskatchewan an increase in the range of at least five and a half to 6 per cent that reflects its inflationary costs in the year 1987-88?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Mr. Chairman, and hon. member, I think we're covering and re-covering some ground that we've gone over today and in the days previous, relative to the universities and funding and financing. But just for the hon. member's information again — and what he said we're talking about here is operating money and a five-year planning process, and perhaps he didn't hear me — in the brief that I presented to both boards, what we talked about there was some indication of what they might expect over the next four years. And we can quibble about whether it should be four or five. I think our objective is the same, and that's under control, if you like, or it's already been accomplished. We're out of the chute on that one already.

In so far as inflationary factors, I think arguments can be made, and quite rightly so, that the students aren't an inflationary factor. They're a source of revenue. So one has to be careful how one anticipates students; either they're a drag on the university or on the university's budget, or an asset to them. And I think the case can be made, and rightly so, that they are, you know, they generate revenue for the university.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, your answer is entirely unsatisfactory. I want to ask you two other specific questions about the University of Saskatchewan. One is a memo that you circulated there on March 17. And I find this memo, as I mentioned to you the other day, similar to the one at the University of Regina, very distressing. I find it a clear attempt by your government to interfere with the autonomy of the university.

I want to make one specific reference to the University of Saskatchewan memo. You talk in there about the University needing to address conditions of work on the campus. You say, and I quote:

There is also concern within society as a whole that academic staff enjoy some conditions of work that may be out of step with experience elsewhere in society.

You go on to say:

The government believes that it's important to address these issues at this time.

And finally, you suggest that:

The universities could use a joint report on terms and conditions of work to address the concern that some conditions of work may be outdated and in need of overhaul.

Mr. Minister, in my view this is clearly a veiled attack by your government on the basic principles of tenure and sabbatical. As in the case of the University of Regina memo, the whole tone of your memo interferes with university autonomy. And I ask you, sir: will you withdraw that memo?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, the hon. member, Mr. Deputy Chairman raises again in this House today, that somehow the briefs . . . and at the University of Regina's

request, I might add that they . . . The very first time I met with that board, they asked me to come and give them some vision as to where the province saw itself going over the next few years, and what it might mean to them. So it was almost at an invitation, although not explicit.

If he somehow is of the view that I've stepped on and encroached upon the autonomy of the universities, clearly he is the only person who is of that view, because neither president, nor chancellors, nor boards of governors, nor chairmans of boards of governors have raised the issue with me. And in fact, I would read into the record what president Chris Johnson had to say about this whole issue in the summer 1987 of the *Green and White*. And I quote:

The university recognizes the need for current budget restraints and must accept them at this time. However, it is equally important that government accept the autonomy of the university in arriving at its judgement about the trade-offs between program cuts and quality, as well as the priorities among the potential cuts identified. This autonomy, traditional in democratic societies, has been reconfirmed by the government in communications to the board of governors.

End of quotation, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I think I can say it no more clearly than what the president did.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it's still my contention that that memo . . . the minister says, "only my contention." I suggest that that contention that your memo interferes with university autonomy is widely held by faculty members at the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan.

I want to ask the minister a specific question with respect to capital planning at the University of Saskatchewan. Now that you've approved the College of Agriculture being constructed, Mr. Minister, the next facility on top of the University of Saskatchewan's priority list for capital construction is a new facility for the drama department at the University of Saskatchewan. This facility, Mr. Minister, is very urgently needed.

The drama department is currently housed in an old hangar building at the University of Saskatchewan campus, which was acquired as a temporary structure in 1945. It's deteriorated very badly since then, and has been subject to serious flooding in the last year. There is no good space for teaching and performing in the building, Mr. Minister. Enrolment over the last few years has risen dramatically from 138 in 1975-76 to 407 students in 1986-87.

(1630)

There is no space at all in the building to lecture to a class of more than 20 students. The electrical and the heating systems are not working properly. Storage space is totally inadequate.

Mr. Minister, the drama department is one of the places on the campus that's most frequented by the general public. And as you will well know, the work of the drama

department visibly extends into the city of Saskatoon and the province of Saskatchewan. We on this side of the House believe that fine arts is central to the life of the community and should be properly housed.

Now, Mr. Minister, the University of Saskatchewan founded the first drama department in the British commonwealth in 1945. That department has done a lot to foster the arts in Saskatchewan. And my question to you is this: will you now indicate your support for the work of that department by committing your government to funding a new facility for the drama department, and can you indicate when such funding will be made available?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, under the auspices of the university renewal and development fund established by our Premier and by the Progressive Conservative government of our Premier, many projects have gone forward, not the least of which was the green light and the approval given for the agricultural sciences building, the new Agriculture College at the University of Saskatchewan.

Now the member may raise a legitimate concern about another facility that, in his mind, should go forward. And I'm sure it'll receive fair consideration by all concerned.

I find it somewhat hypocritical for him to raise that and to talk about projects that are long overdue when it was his government, knowing full well that agriculture is the main economic engine in this province, that that project sat and sat and sat and sat and waited for approval, not for one or two or three or even ten years, Mr. Deputy Chairman, but for 25 long years before our Premier, a man who understands agriculture, came along and got a hold of the situation and gave that project a green light in conjunction with some very creative initiatives at the . . . by our president at the University of Saskatchewan.

And I could go on and list the projects, such as the administration building, a new administration build, heating plant projects, animal resource centre, computer system — a number of projects over \$100,000 — library acquisitions, waste management, pharmacy additions, high technology equipment, our general rehabilitation and equipment purchases, by themselves very important, and as well, other projects under way.

So our record is clear when it comes to: (a) first, recognizing that there needed to be a plan in establishing a university renewal and development plan, and then acting on it, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Minister, I have one final area of questioning for you, and that is with respect to the Canadian Jobs Strategy and apprenticeship programming in this province.

I've got, as I've mentioned to you in this Assembly before, I have a lot of very serious reservations about the Canadian Jobs Strategy program. This program, Mr. Minister, at the federal level has effectively brought together all previous job creation and training programs that existed at the federal level into six programs that operate under the heading of Canadian Jobs Strategy. And

what's become obvious to me is that the Canadian Jobs Strategy program is really not a job strategy at all. There are no job creation initiatives by government in that program, Mr. Minister, on a long-term basis, that I can see.

It seems to me that Canadian Jobs Strategy assumes that labour market planning is simply a matter of matching workers in available jobs. And there is, therefore, an implied acceptance of high regional unemployment rates, such as the high rates that we experience in many parts of Saskatchewan, particularly, northern Saskatchewan. By not having a job strategy integrated into your training strategy, all that's happening, Mr. Minister, is that the newly trained are often being sent out to non-existent jobs and are being replaced with another group of unemployed persons.

Now, Mr. Minister, it seems to me that the Canadian Jobs Strategy program has paved the way for you closing programs at the technical institutes like barbering, office education, the dental assistants program, truck driver training program, cosmetology, at the technical institutes.

Mr. Minister, will you acknowledge the fact that your cuts to these programs that I've just mentioned at Saskatchewan technical institutes are, in effect, directly tied into the Canadian Jobs Strategy program, and the fact that many of those training opportunities are going to be contracted out to employers in the private sector?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — The first point I would want to make is that CJS (Canadian Jobs Strategy program) — and that's a document or an agreement that we are just getting very close to signing with the federal government. The first one we should make very clear . . . because to make the assumption that the Canadian Jobs Strategy is somehow determined, and aimed us in the direction of where program changes would be made, is untrue. It's fair to say that their philosophy there, as is ours, is a shift away from make-work kind of projects, to making sure we have training for real, if you like, in quotation marks, "employment".

And I noticed the hon. member used the words "cuts" again. And I think you have to be very careful with your language, because when you use the word "cuts", that flies directly in the face of the fact, I once again would put into the record, that this very day there are 1,200 more training spaces than there were four or five years ago in this province, and 2,600 students, this next year, across rural Saskatchewan will have an opportunity to take extension programs — institute extension programs — across this entire province.

So you must be very careful there with your language. I think that . . . because to suggest that there are cuts when there are in fact 1,200 more spaces would be somewhat in error. Changes have been made, yes, for reasons we've debated earlier, but certainly there are more spaces.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you two very specific questions. As you know there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of people taking apprenticeship training in the province of Saskatchewan. I wonder if you could give this Assembly the figures for

the number of people who were taking apprenticeship training in 1982 as compared to the number of people who are taking apprenticeship training today? Could you give us those figures, sir?

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — I have provincial comparisons: number of indentured apprentices, '81-82 in Saskatchewan . . . now I won't get exact here, I'll give you some rough ideas. In '81-82 run in roughly 5,000-5,100; '83-84 it ran 46 to 4,400; '85 it was 4,000 roughly; '86, 3,500; '87, 3,500.

To give you some example of how Saskatchewan stacks up relatively to Alberta, they went from 28, 27,000, '81-82; down to 18,600, 18,100 in '86 and '87; British Columbia — the story even more dramatic there in some ways — 18,852 in '81; 16,990 in '82; down to '86 number 4,350.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, there's obviously been a very substantial drop in the number of people taking apprenticeship training, and that's of great concern to me because what that means is a significant drop in the number of journeymen available for work in this province, and that obviously means a significant reduction in the quality of work being done on construction sites in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister.

It used to be, five or six years ago when the NDP government was in, that construction companies would hire a carpenter or a millwright, in other words someone specifically trained and either apprenticing or having their journeyman's papers in a specific trade, to do a particular job. Now what you see around this province, instead, is general utility workers being hired to do the work that a specialized tradesman used to do.

And what's happening, Mr. Minister, is that the employers of this province in the construction industry imply aren't hiring indentured apprentices any more to do that work. And that's one of the reasons why there's been such a very substantial drop in the number of apprentices training at our technical institutes in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to have your assurance, given the fact that you're entering into a Canadian Jobs Strategy agreement with the Government of Canada, I want your commitment that Canadian Jobs Strategy funding will not replace the existing apprenticeship programs that are being conducted at our technical institutes.

In other words, sir, I want your assurance that we will not get into a situation in this province where employers are contracted with, through Canadian Jobs Strategy, to deliver apprenticeship training that rightly ought to be done at the technical institutes of this province.

**Hon. Mr Hepworth:** — A couple of points relative to apprenticeship. There is a study, either under way or soon to be undertaken, relative to apprenticeships as they result with federal/provincial co-operation on that study.

The second point I would make is that relative to

apprenticeship funding under Canadian Jobs Strategy, up until two years ago it has always been funded under the terms and conditions of the federal/provincial training agreement, and that's not dissimilar to the fact now that it falls under the Canadian Jobs Strategy.

A further point I would make — and I think the fact that we're into a study indicates that we have some concerns and want to make sure we're on the money here relative to apprenticeship and apprenticeship training. The other point I would like to read into the record for the hon. member — because I think it's worthy of note in terms of our commitment to journeymen and tradesmen across this province — is that one of the very big issues there, as you have rightly pointed out, is the training.

The other side, I also find that what they're saying is that I need the opportunity, I'm a tradesman or a journeyman, but I need the opportunity to be re-skilled or upgraded. And here we have some pretty startling numbers for you. Last year there was 70 updating and upgrading courses across the province for nearly 1,000 adults in the tradesman and journeyman area; and this year we're forecasting 287 programs for over 4,000 adults. That's a fair commitment. I mean I think if you stacked it up against the numbers I read into the record earlier, that's a real commitment to making sure those people have the tools and the knowledge and the skills for the new economy.

And I mean if there's an issue, I think, that what we're talking about here ... is what we're really talking about is the implications of the new economy, and what has its effect been on the numbers of indentured apprentices, and what does the implication of the new economy mean in terms of them being upgraded and retrained and reskilled. And I think you can see that we're trying to respond — in a respondent stage, I might add — to their concerns, and I think that that's a point well worth noting, and one that we take some fair degree of pride in.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, the figures about high enrolments that you're talking about, I suspect, are in the pre-employment training areas where generalists are trained, rather than specialized people in the trades.

I suggest to you, sir, that six years ago when the NDP was in government, that the courses for apprenticeship training in this province were overflowing, and today, on the basis of your own statistics, it's clear that a lot of those class-rooms are half empty. You talk about preparing for the year 2000. I say to you, that essentially, by cutting back on apprenticeship training in this province, what you are doing is leading us into a situation where you're de-skilling the work-force, where you're encouraging training that makes for a utility 1 or utility 2 employee on a construction site, but not for someone who's under apprenticeship training and ends up getting their journeyman certificate. And I think, Mr. Minister, that that's a very real mistake.

We're quickly heading into a situation in this province, sir, where we are going to have to begin importing skilled workers in the trades from outside of Saskatchewan because of your failure to maintain a sound apprenticeship training program in the province of

Saskatchewan.

(1645)

Now, Mr. Minister, for some time the trades have been pressing you to implement compulsory apprenticeship training in a number of areas beyond the three areas where it currently exists — in the plumbing field, the electrical field and sheet metal. Would you be prepared to support compulsory apprenticeship training for other trades as a means of upgrading the quality of workmanship in this province?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Just one point in terms of our commitment to apprenticeship. The budget, '86-87, was 4.2 million, and it's gone up by over 10 per cent this year — it's 4.75 million. So I think that should be a clear signal as to what our commitment and our intent is there, and it flies in the face of, I think, the member's observations.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you one final question in this area. I might say, Mr. Minister, that it's our view, by the way, that one of the things that you could do to substantially enhance the quality of workmanship on government-funded projects in this province is if you would use, primarily, certified journeymen and indentured apprentices on those projects.

But I have one more specific question for you, sir, and that is whether you'll give this House your assurance that the provincial apprenticeship board will not be disbanded?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Yes.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a few specific questions on the Canadian Jobs Strategy agreement that you are signing with the Government of Canada. And I've passed some of these questions over to your officials earlier. I hope they'll now have the answers for me.

The point that I specifically want to make about Canadian Jobs Strategy is that the Canadian Jobs Strategy program was essentially an attempt by the federal government to roll together the job creation and training programs offered by the federal government at the national level.

And what has in effect happened, Mr. Minister, is that the Canadian government was spending \$2.25 billion on job creation and training in 1984-85; then when the Canadian Jobs Strategy program came into effect, the amount that was budgeted for that and that was spent on training and job creation in Canada, dropped to \$1.4 billion. In 1986-87 it was only \$1.5 billion.

So obviously there was a cut of three-quarters of a billion dollars in job creation training and ... in job creation and training funds across Canada. And my specific question to you, sir, is how much did Saskatchewan lose as a result of that national cut-back with respect to the funding for job creation and training in the province of Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Two points here. First of all, the agreement that I hopefully ... we will sign shortly with the federal government — essentially we have a guarantee

that the dollars for skill training will not be less, but more.

And secondly, as the hon. member pointed out in the opening of his statement there, that he forwarded a number of questions to me a couple of hours ago, we'll endeavour to have those answers for you as quickly as we can. But given the short time, it may not be even yet today, but we'll handle them as best we can for you, and as quickly as we can.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Mr. Minister, I'll let those other questions go then. I'll ask you a specific question with respect to Canadian Jobs Strategy, under the agreement that you're signing with the Government of Canada.

As you know, Mr. Minister, the Canadian Jobs Strategy agreements that are being signed between various provinces and the Government of Canada make no provision for the private sector who receive contracts for training from the federal government. There's no provision under those contracts for any kind of monitoring to ensure that there are minimum quality educational standards maintained in that training.

My question to the minister is: in the agreement that you sign with the Government of Canada, is there going to be a provision for minimum training standards that the private sector will have to meet when it gets training contracts?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Well, we're satisfied that in the agreement that we hope will soon be signed, that quality will not be jeopardized, albeit that for, in our case and some instances it will be a monitoring role. I mean, I don't think there's anybody that has any interest in seeing standards decreased, or our graduates coming from institutions, private or public, where the credentials are somehow in question.

**Mr. Prebble:** — Well, Mr. Minister, it's clear then that there is going to be no provision for minimum quality standards for education in this agreement. In other words, we're going to be into a situation where employers in the private sector, whether it to be a truck driving company or a hairdressing salon, that choose to put on an educational program and get contracts from the Canadian Jobs Strategy, it appears are not going to have to meet any minimal quality standards for training as a result of the agreement that you've signed. And I think, sir, that that is very, very unfortunate.

One of the other concerns I have, Mr. Minister, about this agreement, is that the increased emphasis on private sector training usually means that the training is tailored to a specific employer at a specific task and isn't necessarily transferable to other jobs. This is a major shortcoming, it seems to me.

The advantage of education through publicly funded institutions is that it's comprehensive training. The graduate, when they complete the course can readily move from one employer to another. It's not job specific training, Mr. Minister. That's the kind of training we ought to be emphasizing in this province.

Will you acknowledge, sir, that the marketability of a

diploma or a certificate from a newly established private training school or private employer cannot hope to match the value of diplomas granted by reputable and long established public education institutions in this province?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — A couple of three things here. I mean, you just talked about no controls and you're clearly in error there. They'll be stronger controls than we've had in the past. I have a draft here and it talks and has language in it like this: that Saskatchewan agrees to attest to the soundness of all training plans developed under the skill shortages and skill investment proposed to the Canadian Job Strategy. All training plans developed to those which have a total value of \$50,000 or more

That's some of the language that's in it. And over and above that, I'm advised by my officials, and this is a testimony to the good job that they've done in negotiating this agreement, or soon to be agreement, that we've got the best quality control provisions of any agreement across Canada. Because, as I said earlier, nobody is interested in having our young people or our adults trained at institutions, public or private, where the training will be suspect or the skills will be suspect when they come out. Nobody is well served, neither they nor the institute, whether it's public or private. So there's a double-check in the system, if you like. And we're satisfied that the quality control monitoring, or whatever terms you want to use, are there in the agreement and we expect that we'll be well served by it.

**Mr. Prebble:** — One final question, Mr. Minister. As you will be well aware, through the technical institute programming that's been available in this province there was a course being put on in Esterhazy, Saskatchewan, in which the instructor, a Mr. Flanders, had in fact only . . . it's a shoe repair course, and I believe he had only one student in his course, name his daughter. My question to you is: is that shoe repair course at Esterhazy still being offered? Is Mr. Flanders the instructor? And how many students are currently in the course if it's still operating?

**Hon. Mr. Hepworth:** — Relative to the shoe repair course at Esterhazy, it's now finished and I'm advised that that program is undergoing an evaluation and a review. It's not the case, although it was perceptibly the view of some, that there was only one student left and it was the daughter of the instructor, etc., etc. And, quite frankly, in fairness to that instructor and to that daughter, there was some almost persecution there.

There was 12 students, something in the order of 12 students enrolled. It's a competency-based program. That is to say that each student moves along at their own speed, and as they learn and acquire the knowledge and the skills, they graduate. And so some might take this long to finish — if I was to signify time by some special relationship, Mr. Chairman — others might take this long, others might take that long. And as this course moved along, some finished earlier than others, and at one point, as there always would be, I suppose, only one or two graduates to complete the course. And that was the case, albeit in this instance it was the daughter. And I think optics are much worse than the true story here, Mr. Chairman.



The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 p.m.