

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
29th Day

Thursday, March 31, 1977.

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, if I can take a minute, I'd like through you to introduce to Members of the Legislative Assembly, the Grade Eight students from Grant Road School which is in my seat. They are in the company of Mr. Short and Mr. Freitag. I am sure Members will want to welcome them to the Assembly this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, to you and through you to this Assembly, I should like to introduce a group of 25 Grade Eight students from the Rosetown Division III School. This is the third group, Mr. Speaker, that has come through from the Rosetown Division III School and I know that all of the Assembly will join with me today in welcoming them here.

They are accompanied by Mr. DeBois and Mrs. Berntson, who happens to be the aunt of the Member from Souris-Cannington and also the wife of a very good friend of mine who shares the superintendency role in Rosetown. I will be meeting with them later this afternoon, a few minutes after Question Period. I ask everyone to welcome them here and I am sure you join with me in wishing them a very safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and the Members of the Assembly, a group of 22 students from Allan School with their teacher, Don Federko, sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. I know we all hope they have a good day and an enjoyable time in the Session and I will meet with them later.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to include my welcome to that of Mr. Cameron to the students from Grant Road School. It is very close to my constituency and I know the families of some of the children who are here and the teachers, and I am sure the Members would welcome them on my behalf as well.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to welcome the 22 Grade Twelve students from Allan School who are accompanied by one of the best physical education teachers in the province,

Mr. Don Federko. I understand that they came in last night; I presume they had an enjoyable evening. I understand that they have been, or will be visiting various places of interest in Regina, and I think it fits in very nicely, their coming to visit the Legislature, with their Grade Twelve social studies course. It is my wish that you enjoy yourselves and that you have a good trip on your way home. I too, will be meeting with them when they leave the Speaker's Gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. M. DYCK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to this Legislature, 47 Grade Seven students from St. Edwards School. I believe they are sitting in the west gallery and they are accompanied by their teachers, if I can pronounce this correctly, and I apologize if I don't, Mr. Drabyk and Mrs. Mertworth. I can tell by the sounds in the gallery that perhaps I didn't pronounce them correctly. I hope you have a very enjoyable afternoon in the Legislature and that you find it informative. I look forward to meeting you later on in the afternoon in the rotunda area.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. N. E. BYERS (Kelvington-Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the welcome to the teachers and students from the Allan School and Grant Road School. Both of the teachers, Mr. Freitag and Mr. Federko, are former students of mine. I am very pleased that they have brought their students here to the Legislature to see the democratic process in action.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. H. LANGE (Bengough-Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of 25 Grade Eight students seated in the west gallery. They are from St. Oliver School in Radville, Saskatchewan, which is about the centre of my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Reifferscheid, and their bus driver, Mr. Holzer.

On behalf of the Members, I should like to welcome them to the Chamber this afternoon. I hope that they enjoy their stay and we will be meeting with them when they leave the gallery.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. LANGE: — With the indulgence of the House, I should like also to introduce a group seated in the Speaker's Gallery immediately above me. They are the unit board from Radville School Unit, Radville, Saskatchewan, who have come to Regina today to meet with myself and the Minister of Education to try and ameliorate some problems that we have in the Radville unit.

In the gallery are board members, Mr. William Tatarliou, Mr. Feldon Lowse, vice-chairman, Mr. Jack Scott, chairman of the board, Mr. Bill Kozak, school superintendent, Mr. Jim MacIntosh

and board secretary, Mr. Ken Tebb.

I would like to welcome them.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SASKATCHEWAN-JAPANESE TRADE

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Industry and Commerce regarding remarks that he made to a Saskatchewan-Japanese joint meeting when he expressed interest in increasing Japanese trade. I wonder if the Minister would comment on the fact that we continue to maintain a Pacific Rim office in Regina at a cost far less than the cost of maintaining the European trade office, though we do massively more trade to the Pacific Rim countries than we do trade with European countries. I wonder if the Minister would agree that the European office should perhaps be closed and a meaningful office opened in Japan.

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with the Member for Regina Wascana. The European office serves more than the purpose of looking for trade from Europe; it looks at other countries as well. I think it has a meaningful place in that area.

MR. MERCHANT: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to table in the House at some later time, the trade figures. I believe the Minister would agree that the trade figures would show that the \$66,000 that we spent on the Japanese Office represents far more trade than the amount in the European Offices.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order: The Member for Kindersley.

PRIVATE OIL COMPANIES

MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I as well would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He is aware that the Government has announced new initiatives to encourage oil and gas exploration and the Ministry of Industry and Commerce is somewhat involved in the SaskPower and other development fields for energy, gas exploration particularly. Would the Minister indicate whether any changes are proposed to overcome the problem that private companies have in competing with Government operations in that the private companies pay both provincial and federal taxes and it is difficult for them to compete with organizations such as SaskPower? Are you prepared to announce any changes?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I think that is a question that would have to be directed to the Minister of Saskatchewan Power.

MR. McMILLAN: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister not

consider it in the best business interest of the province to have a healthy industry and in that light is it not a problem that concerns your particular departments?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister will have a change in some policy later on, and I think maybe something may be announced. But I think he should direct that question to the Minister.

JUVENILES IN NORTHERN CAMPS

MR. H. W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — A question for the Minister in charge of northern services. I have with me a document purporting to be a photocopy of an internal memo within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, based on an investigation by one Lynda Hope and Verna Peidt, dated February 2nd, 1977. The document raises new allegations over and above those found in the police report. My question is this. You said yesterday, Mr. Minister, that your department is to set standards and licensing and this document indicates that Camp Ehrlo was not in compliance with your regulations. How do you explain the failure to ensure that this camp was not even in compliance with your own regulations?

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that the Conservative Members pursue this line of questioning. This item was publicized and publicly dealt with almost one month ago. The information in the press and available to the public on that occasion was that there were certain conditions existing in the northern camps that required investigation by the RCMP and the department. We closed the camp under instructions from the department upon investigation of those situations. Now it has been closed for about a month and here the Conservative Members are raising the issue now in the House. Investigations by the RCMP have been undertaken and they will be reporting their findings to the Attorney General. The only conceivable reason why the Conservatives raise this issue now is to try and gain some cheap politics out of the sad situation which exists with boys who are sent to those camps in the north rather than go to the penitentiary. There is no other reason, no other logical reason why the Conservative Members now raise those questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, the final paragraph of the report filed in your department says, "Indeed, the boys would be better off in penitentiaries," but be that as it may. Yesterday you told this House that, and I quote, in relation to these camps referred to;

They are both privately owned, operated and financed. There is no relationship to the DNS.

I refer this Assembly and the Minister to the Public Accounts for 1976, in which Klahonie got \$116,916. Those are your records, Mr. Minister, and Ranch Erhlo — \$150,000. Do you still tell this House that you have nothing to do with the funding of these camps?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, again all the Member is attempting to do

is to gain some cheap politics. That is the only reason why he is raising this line of questioning now. It is evident that where we have youthful persons who have committed some criminal offences or some criminal acts, who would otherwise be sent to the penitentiaries or to jails, there are these wilderness camps which do, at the time of the court hearing, make a plea to the judge that they take the boys and try to work with them. On that basis, we pay if these youthful offenders go to these camps under the auspices of Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, we then pay the daily rate. Otherwise we have no relationship so far as the ownership or the operation of the camps is concerned. It is unfortunate, indeed. There are in this community, in this city, very honourable citizens who donate their time to the boards of these various camps, who are now being criticized by the Conservative Members opposite.

It is unfortunate that because of one or two unfortunate situations arising because of hired staff, that these people now want to drag around through the public, both the students and the people who donate their time in assisting young men in being rehabilitated in some other way than through the penitentiary system.

BRIQUETTE PLANT AT MOOSE JAW

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Minister in charge of SEDCO.

He was asked a question the other day on the announcement of the briquette plant at Moose Jaw. What security had been taken for SEDCO in respect of its loan of some \$200,000 and I wonder if the Minister has that information for us now?

In addition, would the Minister indicate whether SEDCO took an equity position in the company, and if so, to what extent?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, to answer the second question first, the equity question, no. To answer the first question, I am sorry that is confidential information and if you put that on notice of question, I will get the information.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would indicate to us at what interest rate the funds were loaned to the company and what is the amortization period of the loan?

MR. VICKAR: — I don't have that; that will come up in Crown Corporations.

MR. CAMERON: — My last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why did SEDCO not take an equity position in this company?

MR. VICKAR: — Well, Mr. Speaker, SEDCO doesn't take an equity position in every company that they help out and they loan money to.

EXPORT OF CATTLE TO PACIFIC RIM COUNTRIES

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like

to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Industry and Commerce, specifically in charge of Sask Trading Corporation.

I am sure that the Minister is aware that last year in a very highly publicized trip, Sask Trading Corporation sent the director and quite an entourage to the Pacific Rim countries, specifically China. At that time it was indicated that within a year there would be very significant results in terms of exports of beef cattle and other products to the Pacific Rim countries, specifically to China.

In that many of our breeders are preparing to sell these cattle, would the Minister tell us what progress has been made?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Hon. Member that I can't give him any of that information at this time because I just don't have it.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Might I very respectfully ask the Minister why he doesn't have that information and is he, in fact, aware that Sask Trading Corporation is under his jurisdiction?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I am very well aware that Sask Trade is under my jurisdiction but I don't have that information.

JUVENILES IN NORTHERN CAMPS

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

You indicated yesterday with regard to the police report that basically you had nothing to do with it and the department had nothing to do with these so-called wilderness camps. And at the same time you said that it was being investigated by the Government; the Attorney General would answer. The police reports indicate that there was one child seriously injured a year ago last January. Can you tell us when you turned the matter over to the Department of the Attorney General for investigation?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Members can pursue this questioning if they wish. It is indeed unfortunate. He said in his question the information he is seeking happened over a year or one year and a half ago; I believe that is what you said.

Here you are supposed to be addressing a current question on a current issue. I am saying that when the information comes in from the RCMP, regarding the Wilderness Challenge Camp operated by Ranch Ehrlo, that when that information came in on the 1st of February, 1977, that on February 2, 1977, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan dispatched to that camp its officials and they remained at that camp until it was closed short days thereafter. I will be investigating the allegations which have been made. The RCMP will be making their report to the Attorney General.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if they continue to do this, they are simply casting reflections on those honourable people who are

the members of the boards of those camps, who are attempting to do a job on behalf of boys who need some assistance, those who come from divided homes or no homes at all. All that they are attempting to do is drag around through the public, those people who are attempting to do a job on behalf of the boys.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I think the Minister is aware that Ranch Ehrlo was very concerned about the allegations made in the admissions of beatings and brutality. But in November of 1975 the Human Rights Commission of the Province of Saskatchewan, after investigating Camp Klahonie, licensed by your department, suggested and recommended that set standards for disciplinary action be established. Can you advise this Assembly when those set standards for disciplinary action were established by your department and the basic terms of those disciplinary standards?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the Member is now talking about a different camp entirely. He is talking about Camp Klahonie which some six, or eight, or ten months, or a year previous to this issue, was raised publicly and dealt with publicly and reported on publicly and Camp Klahonie's licence was also suspended. It was not re-issued and it has only been re-issued on a temporary basis, when they met with the criteria or the policy relating to the operation of the camp. I can table for the Member, if he wants the policy and the guidelines governing the camp operations. They didn't reopen Camp Klahonie until those provisions were met.

BRIQUETTE PLANT AT MOOSE JAW

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, additional question of the Minister in charge of SEDCO. You indicated a moment ago, Mr. Minister, that the loan arrangement between SEDCO and the briquette plant in Moose Jaw as to security you took, is confidential. Can you tell us whether you intend to register your security documents in the Land Titles Office and in the Corporate Securities Registration Office, in which event documents would then become public?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, if that is the policy of SEDCO, that is probably what will happen.

MR. CAMERON: — Well, may I ask you by way of supplementary, how else do you intend to protect your interest and your security if you don't register in Land Titles and in Corporation Securities Registration?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, again, if that is the policy of SEDCO, that is what will happen.

CENTRAL VEHICLE AGENCY

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Shillington) in charge of the Central Vehicle Agency. Is the department presently engaged

in studies or a survey related to the operation of the Central Vehicle Agency vehicles in Saskatchewan?

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services): — The answer to that is No.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Minister not deem it advisable in the current costs of operation per mile of vehicles, not only government vehicles but private vehicles as well, that it would be a wise procedure on the part of your department to probably look at some savings. And the question is, is your department considering the purchasing of the smaller compact car for the various operations in the province?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asked two questions. Would a survey be advisable? The answer to that lies in the fact that we have already done a study of Central Vehicle Agency. We have had the report in and are on the way to implementing it. There have been some problems with Central Vehicle Agency, by and large, problems which we inherited from the administration previous to ours. However, we do have a report, we are implementing it and within a few weeks it will be fully implemented and I think our problems will be in hand with Central Vehicle Agency.

You ask if we are considering buying more cars. We are getting rid of cars rather than buying them. We won't be buying cars for awhile.

MR. BAILEY: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. My question was the smaller compact car. The final question I have for you, Mr. Minister, is there not some possibility or something in your report that will lead this Assembly, and indeed the people of Saskatchewan, to assume there could be some sharing in the cars in the operation of the cars by the various departments?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, they do now. It is a fairly complex operation. Some cars are assigned to a department, some are shared, and that process goes on now.

BRIQUETTE PLANT AT MOOSE JAW

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Vickar). There has been a kind of confusion on this side of the House in relation to your answers. Could you please tell me what is the policy of SEDCO in protecting the taxpayers' money in relation to the security it takes? Could you tell me, do you take a debenture, do you not register, do you have a private concern in case of bankruptcy? What is the policy of SEDCO?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

WARMAN LAND DEVELOPMENT

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — I should like to direct a question as well to the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar). I asked the

Minister of Industry some time ago, some questions about the Warman Land Development and whether Eldorado was proceeding and I asked those questions, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the announcement that the Minister, who just made an announcement to the House from his seat, where he said that probably Amok would be allowed to proceed with their development notwithstanding the findings of the Bayda Inquiry. I ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether the Eldorado Development is proceeding and whether any papers have been signed to allow Eldorado in a preliminary way to proceed with their development in the Warman area?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any signatures, any signing of documents at all.

MR. MERCHANT: — Supplementary, has Eldorado been advised that it is unlikely that they will be able to proceed at the Warman area or has Eldorado been told that if they wait until this formality of the Bayda Inquiry is resolved you are sure things will go ahead? What is the state of your negotiations? I can't imagine that Eldorado is just sitting waiting hopefully.

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, there has been no dialogue whatsoever with Eldorado at this time.

JUVENILES IN NORTHERN CAMPS

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). I wonder if the Minister considers it incidental that the Government of Manitoba sent four children to these camps in 1976, and inside of two months they received only two of those children back. One had committed suicide and one has never been found, disappeared and has never been found. They were so concerned that they brought these people back to Manitoba; their population was decreasing so fast. I wonder would you call this incidental?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order

BRIQUETTE PLANT AT MOOSE JAW

MR. S. J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have an additional question of the Minister in charge of SEDCO (Mr. Vickar) with respect to the briquette plant located in Moose Jaw. We will see if we can get some additional information. You indicated that when the plant was opened a day or two ago that SEDCO had sold that land to the company for \$45,000. Can you tell us whether you have an appraisal of the land or whether any other department or agency of Government has an appraisal of the land that you sold to the briquette company?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — I can't truthfully answer that question as to whether SEDCO had had an appraisal on that property before it was sold. I think that was the question.

MR. CAMERON: — Well, by way of supplementary, would you undertake to determine whether there was an appraisal done by your department for SEDCO?

MR. VICKAR: — Yes, I will see that that is done for you.

SEDCO — MEANING OF

MR. W. C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar) and in charge of SEDCO. Since the Minister has assumed the position of Minister in charge of SEDCO, I wonder if the Minister has had consultation with his staff, that he may possibly have learned what the letters SEDCO may possibly stand for.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

IPSCO'S DISSATISFACTION WITH OPERATION RECYCLE

MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar). It has very recently come to my attention that IPSCO is dissatisfied with their involvement in Operation Recycle, because of the cost involved in picking up the cars as they get further out from Regina, and I would ask the Minister whether IPSCO has expressed those concerns to his department?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — If I get the question right, Mr. Speaker, you are suggesting that IPSCO was not happy with the Recycle Program. From the information I get, I don't think that is quite true. I understand that IPSCO is quite happy with Operation Recycle.

MR. ANDERSON: — Supplementary, would the Minister not agree that IPSCO has expressed concern about the cost involved in picking these vehicles out when they come in from more than 200 or 300 miles away? They feel that the cost is too high in picking them up.

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, I think for the benefit of the Member in asking that question, in a short time there will be an announcement made with reference to that particular question, which might prove to the Member that his assumptions are completely out of order. It is not true.

JUVENILES IN NORTHERN CAMPS

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Question to the Minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). You have been evading the earlier questions and I wonder why your department failed to implement the recommendations of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission which were made after their investigation of another camp, of which we are well aware, Camp Klahonie?

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, the department did not fail to implement the recommendations as far as I know in Camp Klahonie. I want,

Mr. Speaker, to read for the benefit of the Members across the way a part of the letter which was tabled yesterday, which they tabled yesterday, because he chose only to read those parts of it that were the depreciating part. Let me read from the letter by Maxwell, Inspector Maxwell. I quote from the letter which he tabled yesterday:

No charges are contemplated at this time because of the difficulty of providing proof to the satisfaction of the court. Many of the boys who were subject to assault are no longer inmates of the camp and may no longer be in the province. Some of the counsellors have been discharged and their whereabouts are unknown. Additionally, these boys are committed to these camps as a last resort. They have been involved with criminal law and may in some cases be beyond rehabilitation. Their memories of dates and events are uncertain and their credibility as witnesses may be very low.

But I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that when the information came to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan they acted immediately and the camp almost one month ago has been closed and the license suspended until they can meet the provisions of the guidelines which govern the camp.

POTASH EXPORT SALES

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — I should like to direct one final question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. MESSER: — Order, order, he had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — What is the Point of Order?

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, you know when you start calling Points of Order, Mr. Minister, we will listen to you.

The department's annual report indicated that potash sales were up \$10 million, potash exports, and I think that is very misleading information because everyone in your department, everyone in the Province of Saskatchewan knows that potash sales are very dramatically down in 1976. Could you please inform the House what is the extent of the decrease in the export of potash for the last fiscal year?

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Speaker, that question again, will have to go to the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation as I am not aware of that.

STATEMENTS

COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE IN EDMONTON

HON. E. B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement to the House on the Communications Conference which took place yesterday in Edmonton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to begin by saying, Mr. Speaker, that the tone that this particular conference was, I think, largely accurately reported in the press. It was much more conciliatory than certainly was the case with the last Communications Ministers Conference. I think the Federal Government came to the conference in a much more conciliatory mood. They, I think, took pains to reach a consensus with the provinces. The provinces were, I think, Mr. Speaker, accordingly less strident in demands.

I can only say about the position of the Federal Government that I congratulate them for it. I wish it had come a few years earlier and we might not have some of the difficulties we do now, but nevertheless it is welcome when it comes.

We discussed Phase Two legislation, Mr. Speaker. The legislation, in the view of virtually all of the provinces, had the effect of extending federal jurisdiction and we each took a turn at pointing out how we thought that was occurring. The Federal Government, in turn, undertook to make amendments where it was necessary to clarify the legislation. They made it quite clear that it was not their intention to extend federal jurisdiction.

I have a couple of comments on their approach to Phase Two legislation apart from the fact that it was rather poorly drafted. The comment is that if they keep their undertakings, many of our concerns about the legislation will be satisfied. If they don't, and frankly they don't have a perfect track record in keeping undertakings to the provinces, then there will be some difficulty with a number of provinces, this one included.

We discussed, in addition, Mr. Speaker, cable television, a subject of direct interest to this province. It is apparent now that there is no disagreement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government on cable television.

We have said from the beginning that the only rational way to bring cable television into this province, is for Sask Tel to own the hardware. It is apparent now that the Federal Government agrees with that position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The question that arises then is: did we sign the agreement with them? No, for a couple of reasons. The most important one of them is that the Federal Government takes the position that we can't have cable television until we settle the issue of pay television. We think that to be grossly unfair. The Province of Ontario now licenses pay television and they have cable television. What is so special about Saskatchewan not being able to agree on the disposition of pay television?

We then went on to discuss pay television. I think it is fair to say the Federal Government hoped that pay television would be a federal undertaking. Saskatchewan took the position, as did all the provinces west of the Maritimes, that pay television is a provincial responsibility. While there are federal aspects to it, it is primarily a provincial responsibility. We, therefore, took the step of setting up an interprovincial committee, composed of officials from each province, which will develop, hopefully, a structure for pay television.

The question that is always asked of me and the one that I will finish on is: when are we going to have cable television in Saskatchewan? To some extent that depends on whether or not the Federal Government is now willing to reconsider their position, that we can't have cable television until pay TV is settled, because that ball is no longer in their court. I think they had hoped that it would be, but it isn't. We now call upon them to re-examine that position.

I think, more to the point though, is that there is some misunderstanding in the province about cable television. There will not be sufficient cable in place to bring cable television to the people of Regina or Saskatoon for another six months, it is true that parts of the city are wired and that creates the confusion. The problem is that the main trunks which lead to the back alleys into your local head end and your studio are not in place and won't be for a period of several months, six months at the minimum.

I am confident, that long before those six months are up, we will have an agreement with the Federal Government and that cable television will be here as soon as the hardware is in place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, let me say that clearly having given to the Minister a fair amount of latitude, indeed, to make some political comments under the guise of a Ministerial Statement that I trust the Speaker will give to me the same amount of latitude, although I don't think I will be as long as the Minister was.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have been telling the Minister for the past six months that the Manitoba agreement is available to Saskatchewan. Everything indicated that, that a settlement was easily available to this province and I am pleased that finally the Minister has been told by so many people, from so many different quarters, that he is starting to realize that the matter, in fact, can be settled if this Provincial Government stops taking the niggling approach that it has been taking these past months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MERCHANT: — I indicated, Mr. Speaker, not long ago that as a result of conversations with Mr. Boyle and other people involved with him, it was clear that the Government was in a position to settle in accordance with their wishes. Whether that is good or bad is another question, but that is the state of affairs that, in fact, the Provincial Government has now got 98 per cent of their wishes and I hope that now they will stop delaying and proceed as quickly as possible.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I know that the Minister isn't, at this point, going to be able to indicate these matters, but perhaps he can indicate to the press. He is quoted in some publications, including The Financial Times, as saying that the plant will be in by the end of 1977 and that is close to being true, as I understand it from the Minister in charge of Sask Tel. Saskatoon and Regina will certainly be ready by the end of 1977 and I suggest to him, from the information that I have received from the industry, that in Saskatoon and to a lesser extent in

Regina, they are ready immediately to proceed. I know that in North Battleford they are ready immediately to proceed. The indication from the Minister that six or eight months will go by before they will sign an agreement and begin moving towards bringing cable, concerns us somewhat.

There are two last things. First, I wonder whether the Minister, when he deals with the matter further with the press, might be prepared to indicate to them whether this Government is prepared to have the current licensees proceed as the cable operators. If he is not prepared to do that, and the Minister is nodding that he is, if he is not prepared to do that I suggest to the House that it would clearly indicate that the Government has a bias towards having the co-ops in operation. If he is prepared to proceed with these licensees, I consider that good news and Members on this side welcome that.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that the federal authorities have said that they cannot proceed with cable until pay is settled. I take issue with that, that is not my interpretation and that is not what I am advised. Indeed, I am advised that the federal authorities have said, pay is a long way away; why don't you proceed with cable and we will resolve pay as it comes on-stream.

I suggest that the Minister, perhaps, has misunderstood some of the communications that he has received in that regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): — Mr. Speaker, very briefly as a Conservative caucus, we welcome the announcement by the Minister that eventually one of the two warring parties has collapsed and that we will now be able to proceed with cable television somewhat in the near future. We think that, perhaps, this Government is then doing the right thing to continually adopt a stance of confrontation with the Federal Government. Perhaps sometimes you win your case. The unfortunate thing is that when the Provincial Government decides to nitpick with the federal and the federal with the provincial, the people of Saskatchewan go for months and then years without a service such as cable television.

Mr. Speaker, in particular we are looking at the situation where Saskatoon Telecable now has been waiting since last July to implement their licence and, of course, they would welcome at this point in time, some indication from the Minister that he will now get Saskatchewan corporations under the Government, and in particular Sask Tel, to open negotiations immediately with respect to how they are going to deal with the hardware and what sort of arrangements will be made.

I would ask the Minister to give the assurance at this time that negotiations will commence forthwith with respect to how the cable is going to be used.

QUESTION PERIOD — POINT OF ORDER

MR. A. N. McMILLAN (Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, my point to be forwarded as a Point of Order and I was interested in knowing whether Mr. Speaker was going to continue the practice in the future during the Question Period of recognizing the same Member several times during the half hour

Question Period while another Member who is anxious to put a question is never recognized at all? I should like to know if that is going to be the procedure in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: — I think the Member raises a point which is sometimes valid. I note that the Member, today, got the second question and I don't assume that you are speaking for yourself, but you are just making a general comment.

I realize that it is sometimes difficult to recognize the Members evenly when a Member who wants to ask a question is aggressively on his feet well ahead of another Member. As a result, I am put in the position that I have to recognize the Member who is on his feet first. It creates a problem sometimes and I realize that I may, sometime, make an error in judgment as to which Member should come first.

MR. McMILLAN: — Speaking to the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Surely Mr. Speaker doesn't intend to discriminate against our caucus because of the quiet dignity and manner in which we present our questions.

I should like to point out only for your edification that there could be some geographic problem with the location of our seats, in this corner, and I should like to point out that we are always available for putting questions to the floor, Mr. Speaker, if you would direct your attention in our direction.

MR. J. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, on the Point of Order, I am wondering if Mr. Speaker is attempting to be swayed to a ruling presented by the Members to my right that should a caucus decision be made as to the individuals asking questions in a particular day, that the Speaker is to overrule any caucus decision. If those are the wishes of the Members to the right, I think that is an unwarranted interference in the operation of a political party. I am a little surprised. Mr. Speaker, can you show me the rules as to the questions again? We had the petty objection yesterday as to tabling documents and I am wondering if you could advise me of the rules as to one Member asking questions.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think that I can settle this matter quite simply.

If some group in the House decides that some person should ask questions on behalf of their group, they can quite easily get my eye for that person, by that being the only person in that group to stand up, and I will recognize that person. No problem.

I think the Member for Qu'Appelle, in starting off his comments was attempting to ascribe motives to another Member in his Point of Order and I don't think that is quite proper. I attempt to get a balance between the groupings in this House as much as possible and I think the record will show that. However, I am unable to give any guarantees on that. Sometimes it may appear, from day to day, that one caucus gets more questions than the other, but I think on balance it works out approximately proportionately.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, could I just say something about the Point of

Order.

Clearly the Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle has not bothered to check the rules of your Honour's paper on this matter which clearly indicates that in order to ensure that one Member doesn't dominate the Question Period, that you will give preference to a Member who has not been previously recognized. I realize that creates some problems for a party which works on one cylinder, but I can only suggest that it is a very interesting book and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I think the Member for Regina Wascana may have invalidated any Point of Order that he had.

MR. LANE: — I think the Member recognizes on the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, that one cylinder in overdrive seems to have won a couple of by-elections.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION — VOTE 8

HON. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Education): — Mr. Chairman, I should be most pleased to introduce the staff that is here with me. First of all, Ian Wilson who is the Deputy Minister of Education, seated beside me; Mr. Jeff Bugera, Executive Director of Administration, behind me; Dr. Lawrence Ready, Associate Deputy Minister; Hugh Thompson, Executive Director of Regional Services; directly in front of me, Dr. John Kinard, Development Division, Executive Director; beside Mr. Thompson, Mr. Ray Clayton, Executive Director of Administration; and Mr. Wally Sawchuk, Teacher Superannuation Commission.

ITEM 1

MR. E. F. A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Chairman, could I ask one brief question before I get out of the way and allow people who went to high school and university to handle this matter. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might direct a question to the Minister about something which Dr. Ready will be familiar with, the question of entrance scholarships for people who are graduates from the Lester B. Pearson Pacific College. I am sure the Minister is aware of that college, named after the eminent Prime Minister Lester Bowles Pearson. It is an international college which gives an international degree. The result, however, for people who go from Regina to take their concluding years of high school there is that they are then not eligible for the entrance scholarships to the University of Saskatchewan. As I understand it there is, by and large, agreement that this is an unfortunate situation. I think Dr. Ready is trying to do something about that; I think the university is trying to do something about it and it seems to me that interceding at the ministerial level may well be the simplest way to resolve the difficulty immediately. In this particular circumstance there are two students, both of whom come from the constituency that I have the pleasure to represent, who are not able to get those kinds of entrance scholarships, one of whom needs the scholarship if he is to go to university. The result may well be that though they want to go to university here, that one may find himself going to university at McGill simply because he can't get the assistance that he would otherwise have been entitled to. They are extremely well qualified students or they wouldn't have gotten into the Lester Bowles Pearson College in the first place.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, I am aware of the College. We do help in the selection of students; the department is involved in that. We have been in touch with both of the presidents at the universities and the proposal that you make is something that we are unable, at the present time, to accommodate because there is no specific assistance available, but we are having this proposal presently under review and the scholarship committee is scheduled to be dealing with it at their next meeting. So I think it may be in hand.

MR. W. H. STODALKA (Maple Creek): — Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to welcome the staff of the Minister of Education to the Chambers. I believe I know most of them on a personal basis and I am sure this afternoon will not be a very difficult afternoon for you people. We will move along co-operatively and possibly finish before too late in the day.

First of all before we start, I think the Minister indicated in his initial statement or his speech on the Budget that the Department of Education this year intended to keep the percentage of the provincial share of the education costs at approximately 58 per cent. I believe he also indicated that this was the percentage that the province absorbed last year, namely 58 per cent of the total cost. To keep the education cost, the province's share, at 58 per cent, the Minister felt that an increase in provincial grants of ten per cent would be sufficient. We still don't have all the figures, Mr. Chairman, but unit boards and school boards around the Province of Saskatchewan have presently been setting their mill rates. They have until tomorrow before they complete setting their mill rates but the nearest indication, the Minister indicated this yesterday in the Legislature, is that it looks like there is going to be a possible increase of between six and seven mills in the levy on the local taxpayers within their jurisdiction. If we have a levy of six or seven mills or average that out to about 6.5 mills, if that is the case for the units of the Province of Saskatchewan, 6.5 mill increase I believe would probably indicate that this is about an increase of 13 per cent. I believe last year the figures that I was able to obtain were that the school units in the Province of Saskatchewan had an average mill rate of 49.1 mills. And if such is the case then a 6.5 increase in mill rate would represent an increase of approximately 13.23 per cent. Now these, of course, are not, I suppose, you might say, statistically sound at the present time because we don't have all the information in from all of the boards in the province. The Minister may have more information than I was able to gather and when he wishes to comment on this he may be able to indicate whether or not the figures I gave are accurate or are not accurate.

The point that I should like to raise, Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that 58 per cent was the portion that was paid by the province last year and he again indicated that 58 per cent would be the proportion paid by the Province again this year and I would wonder if the Minister would not feel that probably this year because, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, we have had declining wheat prices and cattle prices have been poor for a couple or three years that certainly at that level people are not as financially well off as they were a couple of years ago and possibly this 58 per cent was not a figure that the province should have retained. I should also like the Minister, when he comments on what I have to say as to whether or not this 58 per cent figure that we have, is sort of a magic figure that

the province now feels it has arrived at, the percentage that they think should be contributed towards the education in the province or can we expect in a future year that the province may decide to pay 70 per cent or 65 per cent. The fact that this year, this 58 per cent becomes a constant in comparison with last year, seemed to indicate some arriving, you might say, at a maximum point.

I have a few things I should like to say a little later on and if the Member for Rosetown and I can co-operate, we will be shuttling back and forth here this afternoon. Would the Minister comment on what I had to say?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, briefly. I should like to make some comments on what the Member for Maple Creek is saying.

It is true there are indications as he said, tentative indications at the present time that there is, on the average, about a six mill rate increase on property taxes. It is also true that we are maintaining the provincial share of direct operating grants to the operation of schools at 58 per cent. There is nothing magic at all about 58 per cent. We don't consider it to be something that is enshrined in stone. We certainly are serious about maintaining at least that level, but it is not to say that at some point in time it may not be deemed advisable that that share be increased from the point of view of the operating costs.

It is not quite accurate only to say though, and I know that's not what the Member was trying to get at, that the province- takes up 58 per cent of the total operating grant of the schools because it is closer to 70 per cent if you consider the Property Improvement Grant rebate for educational property taxes to homeowners, small businesses and farms. I indicated in my Budget speech during the Budget Debate that if you look at the figures across Saskatchewan from the point of view of school taxes, you will find that, in fact, in 1976, the latest figures I have, that the amount of taxes paid for education from property is less after you take away the Property Improvement Grant rebate, it is less in 1976 than it was in 1971. So even though the mill rate obviously has been going up, the burden on the property taxpayer, in fact, has been decreased. And even with the six mill rate increase average that seems to be developing across Saskatchewan this year, obviously the spread between 1971 and 1976 will be narrower, but there will be, in most cases, a spread so that the tax for school costs that property owners pay in 1977 will in most cases still be less than they paid in 1971 in dollar terms.

So I wanted to comment on that and I don't think that there is anything else that you raised that I want now to be commenting on, but you naturally will have other questions.

MR. STODALKA: — Yes, I have a couple more, Mr. Chairman. First and foremost, the business of trying to calculate what the homeowners savings grant or whatever you wish to call it, will be, is, in fact, a rather difficult one. The fact that there was no increase this year in that particular grant would indicate that for this year, at the present time, there definitely is an additional burden placed on the local property owner.

I was looking through some of the Estimates for the previous three or four years and took a look at some of the grant increases

and I think the pattern would probably run something like this, that in 1975 your increase in the operational grant portion to school boards is about 18 per cent. Then in 1976, your increase was about 22 per cent. In 1977, your increase was about 20 per cent. If you take those three years previous to this year, then the grants that were given to school boards in terms of operational grants increased on the average, over the three-year period, approximately 20 per cent. Now if you take this particular year, the year that we are now considering the Estimates for, your decision is that the operational grants should increase by only ten per cent. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on that change?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Your figures are reasonably correct; your years are out of place. You said 1977 — 20 per cent and it is 1976. You are not talking about this fiscal year. The reasons why the increases in those years were greater in percentage terms than they are this year, are basically two. One, during those years we were picking up in each year, in most cases, a larger share of the direct operating costs — of the provincial operating costs. If you look at 1971 or if you look at 1973 or 1972 or in the 1960s you will find that of operating costs, the provincial share was considerably less than 58 per cent. In those years we were increasing that share and naturally some of the increases were greater.

Secondly, if you take a year like last year, the increases in the cost of school operations certainly were much more dramatic than it is anticipated they will be this year. Teacher salary increases last year were settled at a substantially higher level than they may settle this year. The indications seem to be that the initial request by the teachers was ten per cent this year; it was higher than that last year. Keeping those things in mind, I think that the ten per cent that is being allocated this year is a reasonable figure. In 1971, the provincial share of operating costs, direct operating costs was 45.8 per cent. We all know that today it is 58.1 per cent and it has gradually been increasing each of the years since then.

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, I realize what the Minister is saying, but still, if we do arrive at an increase of 6.5 mills there is going to be a greater contribution on the part of the school boards than there is on the Department of Education and the level will not be retained at 58 per cent and, of course, as I said earlier, the point is whether or not it should be retained at 58 per cent.

The comment I will make will be about the period of time since your own Government has been in power, since the year 1971. I was also doing some further calculations on the total amounts in Estimates. If you eliminate that portion of the Estimates that has gone to the Department of Continuing Education, your technical institutes in this group, I find that as it related to the entire budget of the Province of Saskatchewan in the year 1973, the Department of Education at that time, for the regular school system, the one to twelve system, was receiving about 19.8 per cent of the provincial pie. In other words, the priority of the Government at that time indicated that about \$1 out of every \$5 should be spent on education. In 1977 they are now paying 15.1 per cent, that's the year past; these figures are coming from the Estimates. Simply taking the total budget of the province and taking the amount spent on education, I think you will find it works out to 15.1 per cent, but I am using the Member for

Kindersley's calculator which has sometimes been known to make the odd decimal error. In 1978, if you take the total figure allocated for the education program, I believe it probably works out to about 14.8 per cent.

What I am saying, is that in the five years in which your Government has been in power, there has been a decrease in the amount the Provincial Government is allocating towards education. Now if that increase is five per cent, and I realize the 1973 figure might be questionable to the extent of removing those parts of the Estimates that are devoted to the Department of Continuing Education, there might be a little weakness there. But I think it is clearly indicated that when you look at the total amount spent by the province and relate it back to education, there is a smaller percentage of the total provincial budget being spent on education than in the first Estimates that your own Government prepared back in 1972-73. Is that not correct?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to say that figures are made to be worked with and you can develop any kind of argument you want with them. The fact of the matter is, that the priority of our Government on education is clearly indicated by a number of initiatives. I am not, at this time, going to go into the program of initiatives that have been taken. But if you look at the allocations of funds to schools and at the same time, you know, school boards have also been raising more money. That is why we have the Property Improvement Grant Program, so that it makes it possible for them to do that better. The SSTA, and School Trustees in general, argue that. And I don't argue against that; that they need, and want to be able to raise some of those funds at the local level, and that is fair enough. The fact is that the amount of money provided through the Department of Education in grants to school boards, has been increasing dramatically over the years that we have been in government. You can also find that by looking at Blues over the years, and you are not arguing that. I don't think it is completely accurate to simply take those figures and say that the priority of the government on education has been reduced because the percentage of the total budget is less. Somehow I don't think that that is the way to evaluate this kind of a thing. The fact of the matter is that in government there are other things that have developed which, at one time, did not exist program-wise and so, therefore, you are actually considering many more items when you are working on this kind of a percentage basis. I can't accept the argument on the percentage part; I think if you look at the figures alone and the increases, it clearly shows that the priorities in education have not in any way become less.

MR. STODALKA: — I just want to make a comment. The Minister indicated kindergartens and some of these programs. I should just like to remind him that those programs came in later; they were not included in the original Estimates to which I refer. So, clearly, there is less support for education than there was back then. Mr. Minister, I would suggest, this year in particular when we have a depressed agricultural economy in the Province of Saskatchewan, there should have been a greater proportion of that provincial pie devoted to education.

MR. R. H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — I too, should like to welcome the staff of the Minister.

I can assure the Minister that I'll be as co-operative as I always am. Maybe you are not as fortunate as the Minister of Continuing Education, who happened to catch me away for a day on a very important assignment, but I can assure the Minister of Continuing Education that there will be other opportunities within the Estimates and that he will be hearing from me.

Mr. Minister, no matter what way you want to cut your cake — you can talk about your Home Owner Improvement Grant, or whatever you like — the fact of the matter is that education is costing us a great deal more money than it ever did. I know that the Minister will try to point out that we've increased the grants, but there's one distorting figure there, Mr. Minister, which is a distortion, as far as the press is concerned, as to how people read it. I'll take my own particular budget, which I helped prepare, and the budgets of those school units that happen to be in my constituency. I'm talking about an overall ten per cent increase. What you were talking about in my own particular case, and I can go to the other school units, you're talking about a 6.4 per cent increase in grants in my own particular school unit. That's not a 6.4 per cent increase in the total cost of operation, as sometimes is the misleading thing that goes out to the public; you're talking about a 6.4 per cent increase in the some 30 per cent grant that the unit board actually gets. So if you really want to take a look at it, Mr. Minister, and no matter which way you want to cut it, the local taxpayers are facing a tremendous amount of increase in the cost of education. You can handle figures all you like and you can throw figures out, but the figures that really count are when the people get the envelopes and open them up and they take a look at what the total taxes are. Those are the figures that count.

In my own particular case, Mr. Minister, the increase of the government grant amounted to about \$57,000; \$57,000 out of a total budget of some \$2,700,000. When you take this 57 per cent and you take a look at how the budget was arrived at and some of the factors which bring the budget up to the amount of \$2,700,000 — over 50 per cent of the increase, over 50 per cent of this \$57,000 goes to the increase in fuel, cost of heating our schools, increase in the lights, increase in the telephone bills; that alone, Mr. Minister, takes care of 50 per cent of the increase in the grant.

Now, if you want to take a look at teachers' increments without an increase in salary, the grant was minus; it wouldn't have looked after those. We would still have had to go out and try to gather up two mills without any increase in salary or anything else.

It's fine for you to come and say that the people aren't paying anything more. Is the Home Owners' Grant and the rebate on the Home Owners' Grant, solely for education, or is it solely for municipal? What's it solely for, simply to offset education? I hope the Minister makes that clear, because if that be the case, then of course, the municipal people are going to be asking a few questions too.

Mr. Minister, I have a number of things that I should like to discuss a little later on, but I want to deal with a few points right now which, I think, are important to the people of Saskatchewan, and I think are important to school boards of this province. It would appear that education, basically, has done a tremendous job over the years in this province. It would appear that our educational system, from the very beginning, has been a

highly respected system and for that reason boards of education at the present time are facing a number of dilemmas, you might say; they are facing a number of unanswered questions.

Last fall a brief was sent out to us from another department of the Government. Hearings were held, and while these hearings may be the advisable things to have, I think the Minister and the entire department had better ask themselves these very basic, fundamental questions: What is the purpose of our schools? What purpose are they designed to serve? Are we going to get into and take over part of the program of the Social Services Department? If we are, I think the educators and the school boards across this province should know the answers now, so they can properly prepare for that.

I see too, in a few years, that somebody is going to come up with the idea that the day-care centres across Saskatchewan should also be attached to schools. Now, Mr. Minister, these are concerns that boards have across the province. If education has done such a good job, then perhaps we should start attaching other services to it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to just mention a few other things, in passing, to the Department of Education. We have fewer students attending our schools today than we have ever had and when you look at the Estimates over the next ten years you will see that we have a drastic decline again, as well. The individual cost per student is rising at such a significant rate that it almost staggers one's imagination as to what it will be in a few years. There are some rural boards surrounding the cities that are facing increases in enrolment, but basically most of rural Saskatchewan is facing a rather rapid decline and the dilemma that they are in at the present time is that they cannot reduce costs and they cannot reduce staff at the same rate as the student enrolment, and therefore, they are getting caught in the pinch the way the grant system is allocated.

We have this problem in that while we administer the same given area in the province, the cost per individual student is a staggering cost.

Very quickly, Mr. Minister, and without using exact figures and given a 200-day school year, if you take the total budget — I know that there are some debt debentures in there and so on, but it's the total amount of money being spent — and divide that by the number of students who are in attendance at schools, in my own particular case it comes close to \$1,800 a year per student. Now divide that, in turn, by 200 days and that means that for every child who goes to school for one day, we are spending a sum of some \$9. Now it's true that the kindergarten students will not be recipients of that much expenditure, whereas the Division IV student could well be as high as \$15 to \$16 per day.

I think what we have to do, Mr. Minister, is take a closer look at some of the pressure groups, some of the lobby groups, that are coming to the Department of Education today. Somebody said it's the school's responsibility to teach a student to drive. I don't know whether it is or not, but it's obviously the most logical place for them to take driver training and now every time an issue comes up in society, such as students who don't know how to spend their money, therefore, we should bring in consumer education, or that students need to be aware of family life and sex education, and therefore, it becomes the

school's responsibility. Now I'm not arguing the point whether it is or whether it isn't. The point I'm bringing up, Mr. Minister, is that boards of education across the province are continually being bombarded with requests, not just to maintain services, but rather to increase them, to answer all the questions of society within the school system.

Getting back to my original question, I think it's time now we ask, "What's the purpose of the school? Why are schools operated?" Is it to bend to every lobby group that comes around? Are we going to get back to the cry that has come up in the last five years and say, "Look, we have become deficient in some of those things that we once had expertise in, and maybe we are lacking in something, so let's get back to some pretty basic teachings and some pretty basic understanding by the students?"

Your office has expanded, Mr. Minister, into eight regional offices; eight from six. I must say that I want to make it abundantly clear to the Minister that I am not criticizing in any way, shape, or form, the regional men and their assistants who man these offices. I know them all personally; they are all very fine gentlemen, but that in itself does not justify the operations of eight regional offices in Saskatchewan. If you take a look at the regional offices in other provinces in Canada, you will find that one regional office in Ontario will handle as many students as we have in the entire Province of Saskatchewan. If you take a look at the regional offices in Manitoba or go to Alberta, you will see that the regional offices are designed for one point, one function, and that is to provide a consultative function to the various regions under their control.

I want to assure the Minister that at this point in time I don't think that Saskatchewan needs these regional offices. I'm convinced that they don't need the eight regional offices and until they begin functioning in the way that it was originally deemed that they should function, I think that we are not really providing any educational service with the regional office and I'm saying that, with all respect to the men who man the regional offices.

I want to bring up a point on curriculum, Mr. Minister. I don't think that the school system has ever been in such a hubbub and a hubbub in curriculum, as at the present time. If you don't believe me, go and ask the people who have to work, or try to sort it out. It's in a complete mess. We've had curriculum committees working on some subjects for as long as six years and we still don't have, unless it has come within the last four days, recommended text books in some subjects. I think this is deplorable. I can remember the days when Hank Jensen was almost a one-man curriculum committee in this province. Maybe that's longer than the Minister can remember, but I can remember that. We did, in fact, have more stability; we had more direction and the teachers knew more about where they were going in a particular matter than we have today, and I would hope, Mr. Minister, that eventually we get a grip on this thing so that the boards and the administrators' staffs can start looking and planning programs with a little more efficiency than we've had in the past few years.

I have a number of other points, Mr. Chairman, that I should like to raise, and I'll be raising them as we go through the budget on education.

There's one last comment that I should like to make and it's

the thing that bothers me a great deal, Mr. Minister. The movement to locally employed superintendents is something which has spread very quickly and I'm not criticizing that. I happen to be a locally employed superintendent myself. But, I am criticizing the way the department has handled recognition of their own superintendents. I'm not talking about the regional superintendent, but when you have department men out in the field and you are expecting them to accept less salary, in many cases, than the principals and the teachers which they are called upon to supervise, I think that that's a deplorable situation. These men have been loyal men to the department; they've been with the department for years and the salary which they get and the recognition for years and years of service, yes, today in 1977, is a shameful thing for the Department of Education. These are fine men, many of them having given many long years of service, and you recognize them in a way that is truly discriminatory when their salary in many cases, is \$2,000 and \$3,000 less than the people they are required to supervise, by the Department of Education.

I will have more to say as we go through the budget.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, if I may make a few comments on the comments of the Member opposite. When he talks about the percentages of grant increases to his school district, I think you have to keep in mind, and we must keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that when I talk about 58 per cent of total school operating costs I'm talking about the provincial level, I'm not talking about the local school district level. It has to be clearly understood that one of the greatest merits of the foundation grant formula is that it recognizes the ability of each individual school district to generate or raise its own funding and so, therefore, in areas where there is more wealth, it is only reasonable that maybe the portion or the percentage of the provincial grant may not be as great as in areas where the school district is much poorer and that's why it's not a straight ten per cent increase in grants for all of the school districts across the province. I don't think there's anything unfair about that. I think if we believe in equal opportunity, we always have to recognize that principle and we have done it and we will continue to do it.

The Member wants to know whether the Property Improvement Grant is solely for the purposes of covering education taxes. We have always said that that was the case, Mr. Chairman. We continue to say it and it's unfortunate that some people haven't either listened, or don't understand, but those are the facts. I don't know how many times I have to say it, but I hope I've made it clear now, so that the Member will understand.

The Member talks about dilemmas that are faced by boards. I want to make one thing clear, and that is, I don't think there is anything wrong with the approach that we are taking in dealing with questions like the question of the developmental centres. I have met with all of the superintendents in Saskatchewan during the past year at the regional level. We have discussed this, as well as many other items. I have met with school boards individually; I have met regularly with representatives of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association. As a matter of fact, I meet with the chairman every month. And, it has clearly been stated that those were only proposals and that we certainly are not sold on any of them at this point in time. But, they are proposals on which we want the views and the opinions of school boards, because they would affect them quite strongly. And that's

the process through which we are going. I think that everybody understands that and the school boards certainly understand it. As a matter of fact, it was only on Thursday that Mr. Wilson, the deputy, met with a committee of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association to pursue this thing. And until we have given an opportunity for all those school boards and the SSTA to be able to consider this subject carefully, as we will with any other major proposals, we are not about to make any set of decisions, and say, "Folks here is the way it's going to be." I hope that I have clarified that.

I recognize the problem that the Member talks about when he refers to declining enrolments. We attempt to assist the boards to some extent with the sparsity factor that is included in the grant formula so that when the enrolment of a school district declines, there is some accommodation made through the sparsity factor. This is always under review, and right now it is very seriously under review because of the kind of dramatic changes that are happening right now, so we may in the future, and probably in the near future, be making some adjustments to that. But the mechanism is already there because several years ago when we established the formula, we foresaw this kind of a problem. I don't argue that it's a problem.

The boards, you say, are being bombarded and the department is being bombarded by what the Member refers to as pressure groups. Well, I don't object to that at all. I think that when a school board is elected to serve a school unit or a school district, the ratepayers of that school district should have every opportunity in the world open to them to express to their school board what they think they want to see happening in their school, from the point of view of programming. And then the board or the department, whichever it may be, or together, have to make same basic decisions on those kinds of representations. The Member complains about these lobby groups and I don't want to be in agreement with him. I hope that they are always there. I hope that when an organization of parents feels that it is important to have a family life education course in their school, in Humboldt or Rosetown or in Maple Creek, I hope that they will go to their board and say, gentlemen and ladies we think that it's important to have family life education in our school, and here's the way we think it ought to be. Will you please consider implementing it in our school? That kind of opportunity should exist and we will continue to encourage it to exist.

The interesting thing about the Member's comments, Mr. Chairman, was that he raised a lot of issues, and that's fair enough. But not once did he indicate what his position was on those issues. If he's going to do that, I will be most happy because I am interested in knowing what it is. As a matter of fact, if we know maybe we will be able to accommodate some of them, because I just might happen to agree with some of them and take them under advisement. So, if he's going to get around to that, that's great. There is an insinuation in what he says about somehow in our educational system in Saskatchewan, there being a de-emphasis or a breaking down of the teaching of the basics. No, that's not the word that was used, but that's essentially, I think, what he meant. I don't want to agree to that. I want to qualify my disagreement by saying, yes, obviously we have to revise what we are doing, and if we can improve our methods of dealing with individual students so that we can meet their individual needs, then we'd better be making those improvements. But all of the statistics and studies that have been made by the SSTA, by individual school boards, indicate that the quality of

the basics taught in our schools today is as high and as good as it ever was. I don't accept that argument at all. I don't accept either, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Education and as an educator, that the basics can necessarily be defined today only on the basis of reading, writing, and arithmetic. They are absolutely essential. Society today is much more complex than it was in those days, the so-called good old days that some people seem to be talking about, and therefore, our educational system must be preparing our students and our young people to be able to cope with that society. And therefore, we need to have more than those good old days type of education systems. Let's keep in mind that in those good old days, Mr. Chairman, there were only a small portion of the students who went all the way through school and graduated from high school. Today, a very large portion of them do. Let's keep in mind that in those good old days we really had an elitist education system. We had an education system that did a good job for a few, and didn't do very much for the large majority. And, I don't think we want to go back to those kinds of good old days. We'd be going down the wrong track if we did.

One more point, or maybe a couple, but another point that I wanted to comment on — sorry I'm taking so long, I have to keep up with his time. The Member mentioned regional offices and that's right, we increased the number of regional offices, but I think it is unfair to compare them to Alberta and Ontario. If you look at the situations in Alberta and Ontario, they have dozens of people, in Ontario maybe 100 or so, in the regional centralized office. We have eight regions in which we have two full-time people, a regional superintendent and his assistant. And then we have provisions for contracting consultant services to the school districts in that region. So, I don't think it's accurate to say that it is more efficient or more effective in Alberta or Ontario because I think that their approach is wrong. They are top-heavy with personnel because they have so many. They don't have the flexibility because of that, of utilizing existing professional staff that is in the field already. We do, with our kind of decentralized approach to providing regional services.

One last comment — I don't want to be here for three days — on the curriculum — it being a mess. Let me say that maybe the Member can be helped by my clarifying it, but every year there is a circular that goes out — it's entitled "1976 Text Books Circular." This one is 1976. And pretty soon there will be one for 1977. So the work of the curriculum committees is being done. I think it is being done well, and I think that the fact that we do have them on a continuing basis has helped keep the standards of our educational system at a very high level, and so we don't have to use the panic approach that they are having to use in British Columbia, where they are having to make complete turn-arounds because they may have gone overboard one way or the other, in the past.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, I want to get away from the philosophical aspect and get into something rather more mundane. And, I think I'm going to ask the Minister some questions about the teachers' pension plan, which are rather frightening. And one of the general concerns about pension plans across Canada, and across the United States, is the lack of funding.

Many people are beginning to question how non-funded plans

are eroding the education or the dollar of an individual service department to the extent that it is staggering. And, I am going to give the Minister some figures, and I am going to go back just five years. In 1972, in the Department of Education, the teachers' pension and cost of living bonus was \$1,300,000. In other words, the consolidated general revenues of the province put in \$1,300,000 for teachers' pensions. Of course, you and I know that teachers' pensions are not funded. Now we are here five years later, and pensions and the cost of living bonus has risen to \$20,036,920. Let me give you a summary of what has occurred in the last five years, with the teachers' pension plan.

In 1972, as I indicated, it was \$1,300,000. In 1973 the same; in 1974 it jumped to \$4,890,000. In 1975 it jumped to \$8,853,000. In 1976 it jumped to \$10,828,000. Last year — to \$13,581,930 — and this year to \$20,036,000. In a five-year period, Mr. Chairman, up 1,500 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is frightening, and I don't blame the Minister and I don't blame the current officials in the Department of Education. This has been the way the teachers' plan has been financed and negotiated years and years ago. But, all of a sudden a few years ago, the cost of living bonus was put in, and all of a sudden inflation took off, and all of a sudden \$20,000,000 of our taxpayers' money that should be going in to help education, is now being used to pay teachers' pensions. And it has gone, I want to repeat, from \$1,300,000 in 1972 to \$20,000,000 this year. Now I should like to ask the Minister and the department if you give it another five years and another 1,500 per cent, there will be absolutely no money for teachers' grants, or for ordinary expenditures for education. There will be nothing for school grants. There won't be anything for anybody.

What does the department foresee in the future for teachers' pensions; what kind of a drain do they see on the general revenues of the province? What kind of a drain do all the non-funded pension plans — do they foresee as a drain, and how many more are there, I wonder? Because, all of a sudden we're talking, when we start talking, about these astronomical increases, and the astronomical drain on the service of that department that it has ill forebodings for the future, and it is certainly incumbent on your department and your Government, to consider what is going to happen in the future and what kinds of changes are going to be made. There are a lot of questions that can be asked.

The teachers put in a good portion. The Government just uses the general revenues to match it. Are the assessments enough on individual teachers? Should the Government be matching it or doubling it and putting it aside in a special fund and investing it properly? What are the questions and what are the solutions? But this particular pension plan has jumped 1,500 per cent in five years, and you know that there is a steady movement to lower the age of retirement for teachers. You know that it is based on the maximum five years of their salary. Salaries are continuing to go up at a pretty steady rate and a pretty high rate. Last year, what was it, an average of 21 per cent increase in teachers' salaries or 18 per cent? I'm not going to quote — you can tell me what the exact figure was — I forget; I could dig it out. And with this kind of inflation and with this kind of an increase each year, and based on the top five years of teachers' pensions or salaries, or six is it, and the movement to lower the age of retirement, the numbers of years to contribute, this situation is not going to get any better, it's going to get much worse. And if the last five years are any indication of what has happened, my God, the taxpayers in this province and the taxpayers right

across Canada, and all non-funded pension plans are in for a serious jolt. And it's time, right now, that your department and your Government stopped and took a look at this. And I say that, not as a critic or as a Member of the Opposition, but as a Member of this Legislature and a citizen of the province and as a taxpayer. Because, my God, we are in for serious trouble. But what is even more important, education is in for a serious problem if this drain continues to take the dollars that should be tunnelled into the education of children in order to pay pensions.

And I would like to ask the Minister and the department officials, and I know that those department officials including the Deputy Ministers, are well aware that this pension plan has jumped from \$1,300,000 to \$20 million since 1972, what are their concerns? What are their fears? What have they recommended? What is the Government as a whole doing? And this well may be the most important single issue of the entire Budget in Saskatchewan, or of the entire Estimates. And it's one that perhaps everybody in this province and this country should be zeroing into, because when you start talking about what's happening in the Federal Government with its indexed pension plans, you know what they are saying, that now that people are retiring in the federal field at minimum retirement age and are taking their pensions, and if they live to be about 70, they are going to make far more in their pension than they did at the top of their earning year, because of the index and because of inflation. It is a frightening drain on the federal tax dollar. All of a sudden federal officials are becoming very, very frightened about the prospect of indexing pension plans, and I am sure that you people are too.

So I throw these thoughts out in an honest concern. I hope the Government is concerned. I hope that your department has begun to look at it, because there is no more dramatic example of what has happened in the last five years than with the teachers' pension plan and the drain on the general revenues of the consolidated fund of the Province of Saskatchewan, because it is a non-funded pension plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please. I think I have been quite lenient here and I know that we are dealing with Item 1 and I think that is the overall administration of the Department. I think the Honourable Member will realize that Item 21 is dealing with pensions and the cost of living bonus. I am just drawing it to your attention that I think as closely as possible, we can adhere to these Items and I will give the Minister an opportunity to reply to you now, but I should like to refer back to the administration again after that please.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing with the Member raising it here, although I was going to bring the point up with you that you just mentioned. I certainly would like to make some brief comments on what the Member has mentioned. I want to say that because there is a greater need for providing from the consolidated fund for teachers' pension under the provisions in the Blues under Section 21, that does not in any way mean that there is a drain of the funds that are being provided or will be provided in the future for education proper — if I may define it in that way, certainly not as long as we are the Government of Saskatchewan. The funds are coming from the general revenues of the province. And, we consider education to be too important an

investment in our people, to de-emphasize it. But the Member raises some good issues; I think he's not alone in his concern on the overall bigger question, that is the overall bigger question of pensions, not just the teachers' superannuation commission in the teachers' plan, the question is a lot bigger than that. He alluded to the national situation with respect to pension plans. We have heard, I have been reading in the press sometime ago and still now, about some concerns in the city of Saskatoon and other places, about pensions. We, as a government, are concerned about the pension plans and are interested in the future of plans. There is, as is well known, provision for an actuarial study in this year's budget of the teachers' superannuation plan. The Government presently, through the Department of Finance and through the policy planning branch, is undertaking a complete over-all study of the pension plans in Saskatchewan. And so we are dealing with this question very aggressively, because it is certainly something which should not, and is not, going to be avoided. It is too important to do that. I don't think I need to say much more than that. I think basically what the Member was asking was whether, in fact, we recognize that there are some things that we have to be doing about the pension plans. And my answer is, yes, we recognize that there are some problems or difficulties in the plans that exist now, in the longer-run period, and because we do recognize it, we are aggressively now reviewing all of the plans and trying to identify what some of those solutions might be.

MR. MacDONALD: — Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to comment very briefly on this and I appreciate your comments even though I have always understood that Item 1, because of the broad general nature of the question, relates to pension plans.

First of all, I think the Minister knows that what he says is nonsense, about the fact that no matter where the pension plan of the teachers goes, it is not going to have any impact on the education dollar. If the teachers' pension plan drains \$100 million from the consolidated revenue of this province, that \$100 million dollars is not available for education or health or anything else. Please don't give me the sanctimonious 'we think it's too important.' Please come out to my school unit and tell them about it when they have a \$15,000 increase and a deficit last year and a drastic increase in mill rate this year. See if you can convince them of that statement. So all I am saying to you is let's get away from the beautiful phrases and get down to reality. I also want to say that I know that the Government has a pension study. They announced it about four years ago. But I am losing all confidence in this Government. They are so frightened to take a stand. The NDP is supposed to be proud that they were going to be the ones that are fighting the causes. You fellows are even afraid to put in compulsory seat belt legislation in this Session. You don't want to rock the boat. You have a by-election coming up. You are scared stiff. You tell me of one little single item of controversy that you have brought in this Session. You have just brought Bill after Bill that has two lines. All you want to do is get in here and get out. So all I am saying is that I don't have much confidence, Mr. Minister. I think we need a little stronger statement than that. I can assure you that I am going to be directing some questions on pensions to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Smishek), with a hope that he can give me something more concrete, but please don't pass this over by saying we are starting a study. The study, the figures are obvious, the facts are obvious, the implications are obvious and the results are

going to be disastrous if you don't do something about it and do something about it pretty quick.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I want to once again reiterate that the study has been under way and something will be done. That should be clear. I just wanted to ask the Member whether he will support the seat belt legislation when it comes into the House, if it comes into the House. He obviously indicated that he thinks it is a good idea by his comments and we will see what he is going to do when the vote comes up, if the legislation shows up in the House.

MR. MacDONALD: — I would be glad to give my answer if you sit down.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Just a minute, I want to hear. I just want to also say that I don't agree there is not a great deal of legislation in this House. There is. I think the Estimates are equally as important as the legislation and we are giving all the consideration that the Opposition wants given to all of the matters before this House. Those are the rules of the game and that's the way we are going to play them.

MR. MacDONALD: — Just one little comment . . .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — . . . seat belts side . . .

MR. MacDONALD: — I would like to serve notice right now that I'm going to vote against the seat belt legislation ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please; I can't see how seat belts should be entering into Item 1.

MR. MacDONALD: — No, Mr. Chairman, and I can't accept that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Neither can I; then let's go back to Item 1.

Mr. MacDONALD: — I reserve the right to answer him. I don't like you telling me what to do, and I serve notice right now . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, please: I acknowledge the Member for Elrose.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, this question I have for the Minister is very definitely on Item 1, even though it may be related to the Member's question for Indian Head-Wolseley.

It seems to me, Mr. Minister, that we have reached a time, the time is now here, when we are going to have to, and Ministers opposite are going to have to, follow the thinking, very logical thinking, of the Minister who sits in front of you, the Honourable Minister of Health. We are going to have to take a look at items which are commonly known as superannuation or pensions as really being deferred salary. Does the Minister agree in the present, say teacher negotiations, that the amount

of money that is being submitted from other sources to the welfare of an individual should not be considered as salary? Did you get my question, Mr. Minister? All right let's look at it this way. A certain percentage of a teacher's salary is deducted at source and that is sent by the employing boards to the Superannuation Commission. On top of that, we have other funds coming from the Government to build up, or support the superannuation fund. Now, should not all funds being contributed towards an individual—be they a teacher, policeman, whatever — should they not be considered as salary for the purposes of salary negotiation?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That's not the case in any sector that I'm aware of at the present time. It's a cost, obviously, but it's not considered salary.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think he meant to try to hedge the question. I'm asking you, as the Minister of Education, who has a very large number of people on superannuation — contributing to the teachers' superannuation — all I'm saying is this, "Have we not reached a point in time — 1977 — when individuals should have the pension fund classified as a deferred salary payment and consider any other funds that go to support that as part of their salaries?" Does the Minister not agree that that is part of the salary?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — . . . cost obviously to the employer, but there in pension plans, not in this plan, but, well indirectly I guess there is, where there is the employee and employer contributions and I think clearly the employer contribution is obviously a cost that should be recognized, but in my view it is not and it should not be considered as salary.

MR. BAILEY: — In other words then, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that regardless of how much may be contributed from taxation to the welfare of an individual's salary, which he is going to pick up when he retires, that it should not be considered as salary? What if somebody upped it, say 20 per cent, and you still don't consider that salary? Mr. Minister, I am going to suggest to you if that isn't considered salary, and if we don't change our way of thinking in the way of using a proper term for this — deferred payments — you know these pension schemes could easily break the province in time. And I am very disappointed that the Minister will not support that concept because that's a concept which has to be taken. Otherwise we could well go down the road and find ourselves in the position where we won't have any funds left for the operation of our schools, that rather, they'll be eaten up in pensions and superannuation plans, not just for teachers, but for other groups as well.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It's a strange kind of double accounting logic that the Conservative Party seems to have, Mr. Chairman. I stand behind what I said. First of all, at the time that the contribution is made into the fund by the employer, it is not salary. At the time that it comes out in the form of a pension to the employee, when he or she retires, it is then salary. I don't think you can have it both ways.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, it is the Minister who is providing the

double talk . . . double talk. If the employer is matching a pension in any amount, the individual will eventually become the recipient of that amount of money. Therefore, whether it's salary in 1977 or in 1987 or 1997, when he retires, it's still a deferred salary payment. You can't get around that. You can talk and call it all kinds of names and it is part of salary. If my employer today is, in fact, contributing \$50 a month on my behalf and eventually if I live long enough that I'm a recipient of that money, that's part of my salary. It's deferred for 20 years, or 10 years, whatever the case may be.

Now, Mr. Minister, you're the one that's using the double talk in this, not myself. Not myself. That's money that is being put away on my behalf. It's salary, there's no question about it.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — What the Member is asking for then, Mr. Chairman, and I think that that point has to be made very clearly, he is asking, for example, that when the employer puts into a pension plan this fringe benefit, it's a fringe benefit, just like coffee breaks, to oversimplify the issue. He is asking that when the employer puts that into the fund, that the employee has it considered as salary, and therefore, he should pay tax, income tax, on it. You'd have to. You can't avoid it, if you count it as salary. He is then saying that when the employee retires and receives his pension, he should, once again, pay income tax on it. That's in fact how it would happen. And that doesn't make any sense to me.

To say that you should consider this one fringe benefit as a salary item is the same thing as saying that you should consider all other fringe benefits as a salary item. If you have, in an employer-employee contract, that the employer must provide during every coffee break, coffee to the employees at his cost, that obviously should be included as part of salary, and once again I know that I am oversimplifying it by using that kind of an example, but it's basically the same kind of an argument.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, please! I drew to the attention of the Honourable Members earlier, that there is an Item covering this. The Honourable Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, I think, stated that he didn't think that my ruling was proper. I would like to refer you to Beauschesne, page 201, Chapter 239

The whole management of a department may be discussed in a general way when the Committee of Supply is considering in a first resolution of the Estimates of that department. But the discussion must not be extended to any particular item mentioned in the Estimates of that department.

That was the basis of my ruling. I should like to ask you again to try to adhere to it, because again may I explain – the Members who are in here at present, perhaps you are going to get the answers and so forth that you want, but I know when we get to Item 21 or 22 again, this same thing is going to come up again. And we have to go through it all and I do not think this is fair to the House and that's why I ask you to try and relate back to Item 1 and I will acknowledge that.

MR. BAILEY: — Let me clarify this and I respect your ruling and I know

from what you are reading. What I am talking about is something which is currently going on in the Province of Saskatchewan and that is not in the item. There is no Item to cover this. I'm talking about teachers' salaries and the way in which they are computed. That's what I'm talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Pensions . . .

MR. BAILEY: — No, I'm not talking about pensions. I'm talking about teachers' salaries.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You don't know what you're talking about.

MR. BAILEY: — Oh yes I do. It's you people that can't understand because you're so involved with some other kind of ideological thinking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order, please: I find it difficult to see where the subject that you are talking about refers to Item 1. But I would again ask you to relate back to Item 1 and try to proceed in that way.

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, I should like to move back to Item 1.

Just to go back to one of the problems I think many school boards have been faced with during the last two or three weeks, having gone through the exercise myself, I can assure the Minister that there was no surplus of funds and there, indeed, had to be some cutting here and cutting there. The thing that bothers me, when you start cutting one of these educational or school unit budgets or school board budgets, is that many things are fixed. Your services on buildings and your debt charges are things that you can do very, very little about.

When it comes to taking out the knife, I suppose there are two sections that you can work on. One of the sections, again, is also very difficult and that's transportation, depending on the lay of your unit and the miles that you have and the location of your students. It becomes very difficult at times to start cutting bus routes. I know in the particular situation that I'm working in, we have children getting on busses at ten minutes after seven in the morning and travelling 180 miles in a day, the total length of the bus route, so you can't do much there.

So, the next area you move into, of course, is the instructional area of the budget. And so it usually means that either you have to start cutting teachers, and if you start cutting teachers, you start cutting program, or if you start cutting program, you start eventually working back towards teachers.

Then the other area, of course, is the area of supplies and equipment. This is another area which you come back to. This is the area that, when you are short of money, really seems to receive the crunch. This is the area from where money can most easily be taken, and if you are involved in education and arguing for that particular portion, it's where you have to be most forceful in trying to get as many dollars as you can.

I understand, and I've been told in trying to contact some of the people in the business of education, that because of shortages

of money in this next year, we are going to be running into school units and we are going to be phasing out their Industrial Arts and their Home Economics programs. We are going to run into other school units, in which we are going to be phasing out their band programs. We've run into other school units, and I have a list here I believe that, two or three or four of them have deficits of \$103,000, \$104,000 and \$91,000, \$184,000 — figures that were given to me.

Mr. Chairman, no doubt there definitely is a shortage of money. When we start looking into the future, I think it is going to become even more critical. I was very happy to hear you say that something may have to be done with the formula that you presently have under the grant program. I realize you do make some allowances for sparsity variables and enrolment decline that is serious, but you also, I am sure, are aware of the bulge in our educational enrolment in Grade VII, Grade VIII and the Grade IX area. When you move down into Grades VI and below, you have fewer students. It was much easier to consolidate and to establish multiple-grade classrooms in Grades I, II, III, IV, V, and VI. in Grades VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, and XII, what is going to be happening is, not only are we going to, in some of our smaller centres, see the establishment of multiple grades, no doubt, but we are going to have to be eliminating some programs in some of these. And, I am sure if the Minister takes the time to have his officials check, he will find that there are many schools that are going to have to make alterations in programming.

The Member for Rosetown mentioned the large number of different programs that have been developed during the past few years. It is true that boards don't have to implement those programs, but really what often happens is the creation of these programs has a tendency to whet the appetite for some of these. And after they are introduced and they 'bought a bomb,' then you come to the period of contraction, and you start eliminating — this is where our problem comes. I suppose you would rightly say that those are tough decisions and you are paid to make them. There is no doubt about it; we have to make them. But then, of course, what I am saying is that there was this creation of desire to offer these programs. They have been there for maybe a year or two years and then you have to eliminate them because of the drop in enrolment. You only have one alternative when you start moving into a decrease in enrolments. You can centralize further.

Now, everybody knows what happens when you start centralizing or closing down high schools and moving them elsewhere. It has a definite impact on the community. People are withdrawn from the community — are taken out of the community. New people don't want to go into the community.

Now, your Government has a statement right in the budget. They say that nowhere in Saskatchewan will we close a hospital. Now, I come from an area in which there are three hospitals in the entire area, and I could probably argue with you that I should be like the Member for Rosetown and have seven hospitals in my area — hospitals that are 12 miles apart. I suppose we should be coming to you and saying we should build some more hospitals so that the people in the area around Maple Creek have the same opportunity for services as the people in another area. The hospitals, maybe, are necessary. You are also very concerned about the elevators and the effect of transportation. I hope that you will have the same concern when it comes to

schools. School units can, of course, close schools — Grades VII, VIII, IX, X, XI and XII — there are special regulations. But, when it comes to closing down an elementary school, you of course, are going to be really the fellow who is going to call the decision as Minister of Education, because no one can phase out an elementary school at those lower grades without getting your permission.

And I would hope that in the future you are going to get requests to close these — requests from villages. I can name you one particular unit which is on a programmed computer budget that has gone around and has been holding meetings in the last while with villages of populations of 200 and larger, and indicating to them that if they don't get in more funds, they are going to be closing the schools — they are going to centralize further.

My suggestion is this, and this is where I get to be sort of positive; you are going to have to get some of the people within your department to do something about those smaller schools if we are going to keep them. And that school is more essential to the small town than either your elevator or your hospital. You take the school out and you take the life and the blood and the heart of the community. It has to stay there. Somehow, and in some way, you are going to have to adjust your formula to enable these small towns to keep, or small villages to keep, the schools that they've got, so that they don't have to close, and I hope the Minister will find some way of doing it.

One fellow came to me, living in an RM that is a very highly-assessed one, and he said if you have an assessment of \$4 million, the school unit is presently charging you a mill rate of 50 mills. He said, "They are taking \$200,000 from our RM in the form of a local levy, and now they are suggesting that we should not even have one school" — one school in that area from which that \$200,000 is subtracted. If that school closes, the children are already conveyed — the IXs, Xs, XIs, and XIIs — to another centre. And I would just hope that the Minister could give us some assurance that he is going to try to provide some special assistance for the small village schools which will have to be phased out unless there is special help given to them.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, Mr. Chairman, briefly I certainly want to acknowledge the legitimate concerns of the Member for Maple Creek. But, I also want to say this. We are now, as I have said several times already this afternoon, carrying 58 per cent of direct cost of schools through operating grants — 70 per cent with property improvement grants. And, I guess we have to basically decide, and I would wonder what your position is, what level do you think the province should carry — 40 per cent, 80 per cent, 100 per cent? The Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association tells us that in their view we should not be carrying 100 per cent, because in their view they want to be raising some of the money locally, to give them that flexibility to be able to meet local needs, as identified by the school boards, by the teachers, and by the parents who live in their communities.

I also want to say that the state of our school jurisdiction in Saskatchewan, financially, is a very healthy one. For example, in 1969 the revenue fund surpluses of school boards in Saskatchewan was \$22 million. In 1975 that revenue fund surplus for Saskatchewan for school boards was \$30 million. So, overall, that is an indication of a pretty healthy state that our school jurisdictions are in, generally. True, there are some school jurisdictions that, last year, ran a deficit and they are going to have to accommodate that in some way in their budgeting for this year. That's what they have superintendents, other consultants,

secretary-treasurers for — to work out their budgets so that they are able to operate within them. I am not arguing against the concerns that you raise, that the Member raises. Mr. Chairman, we do have the sparsity factor that we have in the formula. It is under review. Circumstances change as years move along. Maybe enrolment depletions have been rather rapid in the last couple of years, and so therefore, maybe we will have to make some adjustments. The Member asks, and I can assure him, that we are making this kind of a consideration. But what I am saying is, yes, the foundation grant formula is under review every year and we are making a point, particularly, of reviewing the sparsity factor component of it.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I would just comment on the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. W. H. Stodalka), as well as the response from the Minister.

I think that the Minister well remembers, and if he doesn't I will say it again, that in my time, which is over a quarter of a century, the present grant formula is probably the best grant formula we have ever had in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I am certainly not quarrelling with it. I agree that it is a very difficult thing to come up with a grant formula for the various school boards across the province, to which everybody will agree. It is also difficult to come up with a grant formula without some imperfection. I will reiterate what I had said before, that I think that the grant formula itself that is devised, has been probably the fairest and the most consistent way of getting money out to the various school boards across the province.

There is one thing, Mr. Minister, however, that we are moving down in use. When you first established this particular grant formula, your department recognized some of the things which the Member for Maple Creek was talking about. Therefore, you have drafted into that, a sparsity factor covering that particular school unit or school board jurisdiction.

I want to suggest to you and your advisors this afternoon, Mr. Minister, that perhaps it is now time that we take another approach, or perhaps a different approach to the budget and to the grant formula so that the situations such as the Member mentioned can be averted. I am not simply talking, Mr. Minister, about the two-room schools that are left, or the three-room school, which if they are withdrawn from a community, kills the community — there is no question about that.

I am talking about that, as well as the smaller high school. What do you do, Mr. Minister, when you have reached the smaller high school and there is getting to be more of them in rural Saskatchewan, for which there is no further centralization possible, and yet in order to maintain a high school there and in order to maintain the service, the grant formula, based on how many noses go to school, simply doesn't make sense anymore? I think you are going to have to go, as the song goes, "We've gone about as far as we can go." Boards have gone about as far as they can go in the reduction of staff, and you are going to have to look at a new aspect in the formula, the grant formula, which recognizes that small schools — no further centralization — and the grant formula at the present time, simply will not be adequate for the operation of that school.

So, I would hope that while you have made an attempt through the sparsity factor in the grant, you take a new look now. Some

jurisdictions are losing a hundred students a year. You are getting down to the situation where you have a kindergarten to Grade XII and you have 11 teachers or 12 teachers, and to withdraw a teacher from that staff simply means that you are going to deprive the people of services in subject areas in rural Saskatchewan, and I don't think that's right. I think you have to take a look at the small high schools that have completed centralization, and come up with something different in the formula, a different way to recognize the need that the people want those high schools there. I can think of one in my own area. I am sure that the Member for Maple Creek can; there are getting to be more of them in the province. But, if the grant formula continues as at the present time, boards are going to face the most difficult task in the world in trying — not further centralization — but rather, a complete closure and finding some other means of providing education which will be very distasteful, indeed, to the communities and to the citizens of this province.

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on a couple of things that were . . . Sorry.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I am not going to repeat what I have already said. I have indicated that we are reviewing the question of the sparsity factor as it is in the formula, to meet those kinds of situations. I would not want the impression left that we are encouraging the mass closing of schools as once happened in Saskatchewan a few years ago. We certainly are not. We believe that schools should be close to the community and that, certainly, is the philosophy that we have adhered to and that we intend to adhere to, and that as time goes on and the circumstances change, obviously, we will have to look at ways of assisting school boards to be able to also accommodate that position that we take, and I know that most school boards take.

MR. STODALKA: — Just a couple of comments. I guess maybe the Member for Rosetown and I are a little bit more sensitive at this time of year than we might be at any other time of the year, about such an issue as that. I would like to hope, I suppose, that the Minister will consider the things that we have said this afternoon. It gives us an opportunity when the Minister is here with all of his officials, to indicate what we feel are some of the problems in rural Saskatchewan.

A couple of things I should like to talk about. This matter that was raised by the Member for Rosetown which I raised in the Assembly last year, and I know you have had a difficult time handling because of the Compensation Board down the street, and that's the salaries of superintendents within your jurisdiction. I can only hope and trust that after the controls are lifted they can be put into their proper perspective.

I just hope that you will consider that as soon as you have the available — I suppose you might say, the legal right to do so. About developmental centres, the only comment I would make about those is, in my own mind, I wasn't able to attend the one hearing that was in Swift Current. I was in another meeting at that time. I only begin to worry sometimes where you separate learning from training. Now, there is sort of a difference in there, just when pretty well anything that you can train a person to do can be classified as learning. And when we talk about the educational program within the schools, is it really responsible for training as well as learning? I haven't made up my own mind on this

particular matter, but it is one of the things that sort of bothers me, as to where does training leave off and learning start?

About the regional offices of the education — no particular criticism there, except it seems you have a chief and a sub-chief and a few Indians in these regional offices. You have, and I think I said last year, that the business of seconding consultants into the regional offices is fine and it works well. My only worry about this, and this is talking to some people who have taken this particular task on, is they tell me that they wouldn't go back for a second time because of the demand that is made on them — being away from home, staying away from home and the small remuneration of what the consultant's fee is. I am not sure whether it was \$1,000 — it seems to me it is related to whatever your particular jurisdiction pays. But, I know just recently I have had a person come back on my staff who, according to other superintendents, did a very good job, but she said it was very demanding and I have been told this by other people as well. I do hope that in the future this turns out right, that you won't have problems seconding these people. I am a little bit afraid that you may have.

I notice, a little later on, that you have made some provision with one of the other items under Special Education. I don't know how that's going to relate to these consultants. You do, or have had, I guess maybe, what, one consultant at each one of the regional offices, plus some of these seconded people, which probably adds up to one or two? I asked last year to get a copy of the specifications of the Assistant Regional Superintendent's particular tasks because, personally, I've never quite been able to decipher the difference between what the Assistant Regional Superintendent is doing and what the Regional Superintendent is doing. So, I have no particular qualms, you might say, about the regional offices as such. But, as I say, you seem to have a chief and a sub-chief and a few Indians.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, I can first of all assure the Member that those specifications of the duties of the people in the regional offices are available, and we will make a point of seeing that you get them so that you can take a look at them and understand what they are.

I regret the speculation you make about the consultants in the region. I think they do a tremendous job, and I know that that's not what the Member said, but he did say that some of them are indicating that it's not a job they would want to do and that they will never take it on again. I don't think that that's a general feeling. I just don't think it is. Records will show that most of the people who have taken on those responsibilities, of course, first of all know what those responsibilities entail when they take them. And many of them have stayed on for two — three years.

MR. STODALKA: — Those are the full-time ones.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Not the full-time ones — on contract. And, they have the same kind of duties to perform as a full-time consultant would have anyway. That is a part of the job. I want to support the work that is done through the regional offices by the consultants who are hired on contract from the field. I am quite confident, and I know the department is, and I am sure that most teachers

in school jurisdictions are confident that they do a pretty good job and should be commended for it.

MR. STODALKA: — I certainly did not want to convey the idea that these people are not doing good work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I just want to caution Members that the questions are once again varying on a number of Items and I would ask you to try to base your questions on the Items in question.

MR. STODALKA: — I think this relates to Item 1. They have a little technique here this afternoon. If it refers to any other, rather specifically, the ruling was we can't go on to it.

MR. E. C. MALONE (Leader of the Opposition): On a Point of Order, Mr. Chairman — I believe the tradition in this Chamber is to allow a great deal of latitude on Item 1, even if it does infringe upon other topics in the Items. Now, I am sorry I wasn't here when you made your ruling, but are you suggesting that you are going to keep us to Item 1 in our questioning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I believe the Chairman in the Chair read the regulations to the Members earlier. If you want I can repeat from 239 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms that whole management of a department may be discussed in a general way when the Committee of Supply is considering the first resolution of the Estimates in that department, which reads as follows:

General administration (amount stated) but the discussion must not be extended to any particular item mentioned in the Estimates of that Department.

I believe this was the ruling earlier, and I think we have given the Members a lot of latitude in going from Item to Item and I ask you to consider Item 1.

MR. STODALKA: — This is a false impression. I did not indicate that these people were not doing good work. In fact, I have yet to find one whose work wasn't praised. But I still say the people who are seconded on a full-time basis are different from those on a part-time basis, and to my knowledge I don't know of any people who have gone back two or three or four years running on part-time basis. I stand to be corrected on that issue; maybe there were some, but I would say that the vast majority of those who were on a part-time basis were not the same as those on the full-time basis. I don't know whether I'm right or not.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, if I may just make a comment on the statement that you just made and the Member who occupied that Chair before him. It's my understanding that you could question Item No. 1 in any particular part of the Government Estimates. There are a number of questions, that if you don't ask them in Item No. 1, you have no other opportunity in which you can ask them, because once we move from Item No. 1, then we are very definitely restricted to that particular item. I have a number of questions yet I would like to ask, simply because I'll have no other

opportunity to ask them except in this particular Item. Is that agreed, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, I think you can ask any general question on Item No. 1. I think the number of questions have been asked in particular Items where I have called you to order.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I should like to address a couple of questions to the Minister with regards to his department. I'm not asking this question to embarrass any of the gentlemen that the Minister brought with him, in any way. I'm asking a question for some straight information from the Minister with regards to, not only the figures in Item No. 1, but in some of the other Items coming again. It has been a common tradition, Mr. Minister, along with, not only the Minister of Education, but also other portfolios as well, that the Deputy Minister be selected, and I think that's generally agreed by everyone.

You have a third level, Mr. Minister, in your department. These people who are now in this so-called third level, I think you understand what I mean, were tendered or you bid for them from other members within the department. We have some senior members in the department; I know them very well. Did they have an opportunity, with their background and experience, to bid for these particular positions?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — At the executive director level, Mr. Chairman, and that is the case in any department, the people have been selected. They are very qualified people. They do an outstanding job for the Government and the Department of Education and education overall in Saskatchewan, and therefore, going directly to the question that you asked, they are not positioned; they are advertised on that kind of basis, as you indicated.

MR. BAILEY: — I agree with the Minister that they are very competent people. I'm not quarrelling with that, but I'm quarrelling with what appeared to be no opportunity for senior members of the Department of Education, with many years of long-standing service, to be looked at for these positions, in a way in which we traditionally look at senior positions within a department. Does the Minister not agree that perhaps these positions should be ones of competition? I'd like to have his opinion on that.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — No, I don't agree. Senior people in the department, as other people without the department, are considered in the selections for positions the Member talked about. That has been the case and that is going to continue to be the case.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, another question I should like to direct to the Minister, I alluded to before and I should like to get his opinion on it before we pass on Item No. 1, because I'm very concerned about it.

How did it happen, Mr. Minister, that your own people, your own district superintendents of education out in the field, that you or someone within your department was neglectful in not seeing that their remuneration did not keep up to, and fell behind, those people which they supervised?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, the Member obviously is suggesting that we ought to interfere with the collective bargaining process. We are not prepared to interfere with the collective bargaining process because that is not the way it ought to go. Salary negotiations take place between the SGEA, which is the bargaining agent for those people. I don't deny there is some difficulty with salary relationships between the principals, in some cases, and the locally-employed superintendents, but I would hope that down the road, through negotiations which is the right way to go, that will get rectified.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear the Minister say that he believes that the Government should not become involved in the salary negotiation process. I hope that that particular statement is underlined a thousand times in this House.

The Government does not particularly want to become involved with the salary negotiation process. Can the Minister explain, having just made that statement, why at the provincial level he would support a five-man government team with four trustees in this provincial team, if you are not concerned with salary negotiations? Let it have its due process! Why then would your Government load up the negotiation team with five government men and only four trustees?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, now the Member is twisting the issue. He was asking, under the other question, for the Government to directly interfere in the negotiations that take place between SGEA and the Public Service Commission. I said, "We are not prepared to do that, nor are we going to be prepared to do that." He is now taking that and applying it to the case of the provincial negotiations and teachers, trustees and the Government of Saskatchewan. It's a different question altogether. We feel that the Government has a role, along with the trustees, in a co-operative manner, and that's the way it has worked to be involved in the negotiations. The Government pays a great portion of the costs of education and I think that's one of the arguments.

And, secondly, when the legislation was being introduced into this House a couple of years ago, we asked the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association whether they would accept complete negotiations provincially between trustees and teachers, and at that time they said no.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. You make the statement that because you have such a major input in dollars and cents into the operation of the schools, therefore, you should have the majority vote in determining salaries. Let me suggest to you, sir, that you make a far greater contribution to the operation of the hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan, percentage-wise. Would you then agree that you should also be the determining factor in settling the wages of the nurses which staff the hospitals?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It's a different set of negotiations, different circumstances. I want to point out that the Member says, "Why shouldn't the Government be involved; why is the Government not involved in the negotiations with PSC and SGEA?" On the non-political level,

I guess the Government is involved, because essentially the SGEA negotiates with the Public Service Commission, which is a government agency.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I want to get back to another topic which I feel has to come in on Item 1.

Not too long ago you tabled in this House, the White Paper on Education, which is now being discussed at length, I hope, throughout the province, and I don't want to bring in any detailed discussions on the White Paper on Education at this time, by any means. One of the things that is of concern, and it's on the minds of every board across this province at the present time, both rural and urban, is a suggestion made within the White Paper that we have a different approach to what is commonly known as the tenure policy among teachers. Does the Minister — and he doesn't have to answer this if he doesn't want to — does the Minister agree with the proposal in the White Paper on this item?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, if we, as a government, or I a Minister, had decided precisely that we were going to do certain things by legislation, we wouldn't have a White Paper. Mr. Chairman, we have a White Paper after 18 months of study and consultation with an awful lot of people throughout Saskatchewan. I indicated then we would have some further consultation opportunities as requested by the school trustees and many other people, and therefore, we did decide to use the White Paper approach and raise all of the issues — the consolidation issue, the issues that were brought forward to us by teachers' organizations, by trustees' organizations, by principals' groups, by superintendents' associations, by parents — and put them in a form of a White Paper to which is attached in the appendix, some indication of what a Bill might look like, and I am not in the position to indicate what we are going to do, precisely, with them. I think it would be unfair, and I really think you would agree it would be — somebody used the word once today 'farcical' — for me to say, "Here is a White Paper folks," and say to the superintendent from the Elrose School Unit, "Here is a White Paper. Tell us what you think, but here is what we are going to do." I am not going to do that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STODALKA: — I commended you on using this White Paper approach before, and do so again. You made mention of 18 months, I believe, in what you just said here a short time ago. Can you give us some sort of an indication then, if it is your intention — this next sitting of the Legislature in the fall or the spring sitting — to bring back the Bill and to present it to the Legislature for approval?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — My personal desire would be to do that, but the decision has not been made on that. Once again, that will depend on the kinds of discussions we have and all the work that's done, and it will be a decision of the Government, so we have not decided precisely that we are going to do that. If you are asking me what I would like to do as one individual, I would like to introduce it in the next session, yes.

We have been studying school law in Saskatchewan for 20 years. When I was in university in 1962, when I started, I remember people talking about the need for consolidation of school

law and bringing it up to date. We looked at some of the legislation that had certain things in it that I thought were out of date by 30 years, then. We now finally have done it and I am rather proud that we have, and I just don't think we want to take another 20 years to finish the job.

MR. STODALKA: — How are you going to gather up the different opinions from different groups? Are you going to have some meetings of your own or are you just expecting the School Trustees' Association and other bodies to send in written submissions to you, as to what their suggested changes are? Do you intend to go around the province, holding regional meetings; what are your intentions?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We have sent out something like 4,000 copies. I think every school jurisdiction has numbers of copies. We are getting letters now, requesting more copies, and we will be accommodating those requests. We want as many people who are interested, and I hope many people will be interested, to get involved in the consideration of these proposals. I will, personally, be making an effort, along with some of my staff, to attend — and I have already taken on some commitments — school trustee regional meetings, some of which are being scheduled for April. As a matter of fact, I received an invitation from your region and I am trying to cancel some other appointments so that I can get out there. Certainly, we will be doing that. I, my officials, or all of us will be meeting with people like the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, STF, and so on, so there will be a very extensive consultation mechanism that we will have. We will, of course, also be accepting the written submissions which obviously will be made.

MR. BAILEY: — I see in Item 1, Mr. Minister, that you have reduced the number of permanent positions by one, and yet the total expense under the Executive Administration is up some \$70,000 — a fairly high percentage. Perhaps the Minister could explain that \$70,000.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The reason is the Item doesn't, to a large extent, relate to salaries only. Previous to this indication of the budget in these Blues, things like the School Law Review Committee and the Educational Council and the Fine Arts Committee, which we have been operating in the province, now were funded under another Item — under Development Division. They are now funded in this item. They are, essentially, Ministers' committees. So we have decided in the allocation of the information in the Blues, to put them where we thought they ought to legitimately belong, and that's why it seems like an inflated figure.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, then that would explain the increase in other personal services by 100 per cent. Is that what you are saying? That would explain the increase under other personal services from \$27,000 to \$53,000.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Part of it is explained that way, in fact, I think the largest amount, but there are other items in there. Mr. Bergstrom, who works for me as a special advisor, is included in that. He will be retiring in about three months, or he is due for retirement, and there are payments that are made; that's all worked in there, so it's not just totally the three items that I mentioned but that as well. There is also a provision for an extension of Mr. Bergstrom's services, which I anticipate I will need because

of the work that we will continue to do on the School Law White Paper.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, are you saying then, Mr. Minister, that the number which is shown here has been reduced from ten to nine? In fact, is it true that it's really no reduction, you've just taken the one and put it under other personal services?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It's a reduction of the position of the special advisor position. As I indicated, that period of that position expires at the end of the year. We have provided some money for extending that, but not on an on-going, permanent basis. But the reason for the deletion is because of the reduction of that position on a permanent basis.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, if that position is going to be extended, and it appears that it would cover most of the year under review, should you not have left it as ten and ten and not shown it as a ten and a nine?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The position is not extended. We will be keeping on the person who is now occupying that position which is going on for a short period of time; we're looking at something like three months at the present, and there is provision of money for that period of time.

Item 1 agreed.

ITEM 2

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions about correspondence schools. Last year you phased out the operation of the section of the correspondence schools that provided programs, I believe, for Grades I through VIII, and made some sort of an arrangement with the Province of Alberta. I was just wondering with regard to this particular arrangement and the effect of it, did the number of students enrolled in this type of a program go down, or was there an increase when you compare last year to the previous year in which you operated your own program from Grades I through VIII?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — First of all, I am told that there are only one or two that are being served through Alberta. Last year there were 80 children in that category that you are talking about, who were at home; now there are 25 children who are at home. I read from that, that really there is a net benefit that is gained because we are finding that those children are in school and, quite frankly, although I appreciate the importance of having correspondence service in cases where attending school is just not possible, still I think it is better, where it is possible, for the student to be in school. If you look and compare the 80 to the 25, then I think there is actually a major benefit that is proof.

MR. STODALKA: — Have you made provision to continue the arrangement with the Province of Alberta or any other body, to take care of those people who cannot attend school and have to take some form of

correspondence course? What arrangements have you made in the coming year?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, it keeps on . . .

MR. STODALKA: — Another question, I notice under the correspondence school for high schools, that the number of students that enrolled I believe, in your Type A service, was something like 7,268. I am reading this from your annual report, from page 66. One of the things I have always wondered about was the difference between the actual enrolment and the number of people who completed the correspondence course. I have had the feeling over the years that there were many people who started the program and then had a tendency to drop out. I wonder if we can get some sort of a relationship between that 7,268 and the number who successfully completed the course.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We will find that right away. I don't know whether it was raised when we attended the regional meeting in your area. If it was, I was thinking I was going to send you the information, and I don't know whether I have, but we will get it right away. The 7,000 obviously, that register initially, don't go all the way through the system and finish it; there are some drop-outs in the process during the year. We will get the precise figure for you.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I should like to tell the Minister, and I would hope that he would take back to the people at the correspondence school the very positive attitude that I have towards the Government Correspondence School. I want to say, Mr. Minister, that if all the branches of the department, of any department, were as effective as the branch — the Correspondence School branch — I feel that there would be very, very few complaints within the Province of Saskatchewan. Over the years, in working with these people, I find that the service which they provide is second to none. I want you to, and I wish the Minister would take that remark back to the people at the Correspondence School, because I really feel that one phone call and the action and the immediate attention that they give to people like myself out in the field, has to be absolutely superb. I wish you would take that back to the Correspondence School, the work that they are doing and have done over the years is tremendous and I should like to make this comment — that not having worked with other provinces at all, but I am sure that there is no other province in Canada that has as fine a correspondence school service as do the students of Saskatchewan.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I might just say I want to thank the Member for those comments. I certainly agree with him. I just want to say that all the branches of the department, and the personnel in them, do an excellent job, but his specific reference to the Correspondence School is noted. I have an answer, in a general way, to the question of the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka). I will give some examples and then will give you some details later on, because it takes too long to go through them. But, I will give you an example of the Grade IX Literature course. The number of students who registered, some people register and are not serious about it, was 65. The number of active students was 41, and the number that finally wrote the exam was 35. So it is really the figure from 41 to 35, that I think is the usual figure. You can take Arithmetic IX — the number of active

students is 6, the number who wrote the exam is 5. Literature 20 — the number of active students — 36, the number who wrote the exam — 32. Mathematics 20 — the number of active students — 13, the number of students who wrote the final exam — 11. I am trying to find a worse one for you, but I'm finding it tough; the record is pretty good. Social Studies 20 — 33 active students, 24 who wrote the final exam. That sort of runs the course. Here's one for Literature 30 — 103 active students but only 36 wrote the exam. So there is quite a spread, but if you like I will get this compiled and copied and get you the whole thing.

MR. BAILEY: — I want to make one further comment to the Minister. I have full confidence, as I stated earlier, in this branch of the department. I want to suggest to the Minister that although the amount of activity may show a slight decrease in the number of students being enrolled, I suspect Mr. Minister, and perhaps just a bit of forewarning, that in the years ahead with boards facing some of the difficulties they have, and are now facing, with the reduction that is going to be necessary in certain programs, of finances, that the amount of activity at the Correspondence School is going to increase. I think it is going to increase rather rapidly. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to meet that challenge at that particular time, because I can see more students being enrolled in some of the subjects offered by the correspondence schools. I think its activity is going to increase in the next few years.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am told that our budget this year maintains the present level. Actually, if enrolment increases, we have to take a look at the budget in future years. That is done with every sub-vote and every item.

MR. STODALKA: — One final question, I notice in the 26 employees, the number of employees is constant but there seems to be quite an increase in the total funds in the lines of permanent positions. If my mathematics is correct, I think it is almost a 40 per cent increase for the 26 people that are there. I wonder if you can tell us how a 40 per cent increase is justified.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There was a re-adjustment of \$12,000 because of deleted positions. Then there were adjustments of \$69,270 because of salary increases and another \$15,000 adjustment because of increment increases, which brings the adjustment to \$74,270.

MR. STODALKA: — It seems to me, if my mathematics is correct, that it is about a 40 per cent increase, and I just can't see how this is possible, with guidelines and all these things I hear about. I have been rolled back to six per cent myself, and I just wondered how somebody else did so much better than I did.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Let me clarify that. What you have here in that increase is the adjustment for increases for two years — 1975, October and 1976, October, yes, an adjustment for two years, plus the increments, plus a provision for anticipated salary adjustments in this year. Negotiations have not yet been completed, but there is some provision in here to accommodate that.

MR. STODALKA: — . . . guidelines I presume.

Item 2 agreed.

ITEM 3

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, we have here again, as the Member for Maple Creek raised the question, the same topic in Item No. 2. I find that you have 76 employees, dropped to 75 employees — permanent positions; yet we have an increase there, Mr. Chairman, of some one-quarter of a million dollars. That's a pretty healthy increase. I would like to have an explanation for that if you please?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Now the approved budget in 1976-77 was \$758,150. There were deletions that took place during the year, of \$7,970, leaving an adjustment base of \$750,180. There was a reclassification of a Child Care Attendants to Parental Care Supervisors, which brought an increase total of \$15,300. There were the negotiated increases of October 1, 1975, which were \$165,450. There were range adjustments — April, 1976 — of \$15,080, annual increments of \$26,330, and there is also a provision, as I indicated in the other Item, of \$77,790 for anticipated salary increases in this coming contract.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's reply, but an increase within a group of 75 people, in salary, of about a quarter of a million dollars, reclassification or no reclassification, you have one fewer employee, and yet the total salary goes up by a quarter of a million dollars, surely reclassification alone doesn't bring about that amount of salary increase. Is that what you are saying, that these people had a reclassification to end up with almost a quarter of a million dollars more in salary?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There was a reclassification of Child Care Attendants to Parental Care Supervisors, part of the reclassification that took place, and that accounted for \$15,300 of the increase that we see before us.

MR. BAILEY: — But, Mr. Minister, that is only \$15,000 of this sum of \$250,000.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Let me go through it again for you then. That was one of the components of the increase that you see there. The negotiated salary increases accounted for \$165,450. In the negotiations, there were certain adjustments in the ranges, you know what they are, of \$15,080. There were the regular, annual increments, and that accounted for \$26,300. There is provision for \$77,790 — the anticipated increase for this year.

MR. STODALKA: — Just a question about the type of personnel. I identified a couple of different groups that I wasn't acquainted with. Would the Minister outline what type of teachers and other personnel you have working in the School for the Deaf? Give some sort of an indication.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — All teachers have to have a valid certificate, of course,

that's first of all. And then they are required to take certain special classes through the university, geared to the needs of teaching in this kind of a circumstance.

MR. STODALKA: — What was the enrolment of that school?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — One hundred, forty. Further on with teachers, let me give you an idea of the kind of staff. There is a principal; there is a supervising teacher; there is the Dean of Residence; there is a teacher psychologist; and then there is a regular teaching staff that I was outlining a minute ago; there is a Parental Care staff, of whom there are 39, and three clerical and one social worker.

MR. R. A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister how are the students being channelled for the School for the Deaf now? Are you strictly taking them in a vocational way? Are there any students going to Gallaudet College, or are they all channelled to higher education in Edmonton?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is a placement officer who tries counselling the students on further education. There are students in Gallaudet, Washington, yes. There are students who attend vocational training at Red River Community College in Manitoba. I am told that there are some students who come out of the program here and attend in Minnesota. So we do assist students in taking vocational training. They are 100 per cent funded; we provide that assistance, and we also assist in placement in occupations.

The Committee recessed from 5:00 o'clock to 7:00 o'clock p.m.

MR. LARTER: — I should just like to continue on a little bit with the Minister, regarding the School for the Deaf at Saskatoon. I asked before, if they were getting the proper training now, that they were giving them the opportunity to go on to university as they have been in the past, to go on to college and to become degree students. There used to be four or five students a year — some years more, some years less — coming out of Saskatoon, and I am wondering if the students of the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon still have the opportunity to come out and to go for a degree, other than vocational.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, certainly we prepare them. They have the opportunity if they can meet admission requirements of the university. The opportunity is there.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I am speaking specifically about Gallaudet. I don't think our teachings in western Canada, so far, have been brought along enough so that these students can be brought in to an accredited Saskatchewan university. I am talking about a simultaneous teaching university, where they teach sign language and oral at the same time.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am not sure what you are asking, but there have been in the past, and there now is — okay we are not sure of now, but in the past we have had students from here go to Gallaudet in

Washington, so I think the program obviously must prepare them.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I agree, in the past you have had this. In fact, I had a daughter graduate from Gallaudet College in Washington, as you know. But, I believe this opportunity is being taken away from the deaf students now, and I don't believe that you have deaf students leaving the Saskatoon School for the Deaf for Gallaudet College now. I believe you might have only one or two students in there now, and I understand the program is being phased out. And the reason I am taking this approach, is because the governments of the past have been just terrific in helping these students along, and you in your commitments to these students, say anybody who can't be educated in Saskatchewan will get the proper education elsewhere. The province has been very, very good at this. All past governments were. And, I wonder if now you are not trying to channel these people the vocational way, and this is what worries me.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I don't know where the Member gets that impression, Mr. Chairman. There is no lessening of emphasis on training to prepare students for going to a place like Gallaudet if they want to than there ever has been. But, it's a choice that the students have to make. Maybe in one year there may not be students who want to go to Gallaudet. We don't take them and put them there. We provide all the support that they can have. We will provide full support; we have in the past; we will continue to do that now. As a matter of fact, in the last two or three years there have been some major improvements in the programs of the School for the Deaf, and I think the Member may know something about that, and if anything, the program has improved.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, I agree with what you have done for the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon. I had my tongue in cheek when the Opposition Members were questioning the finances of the School for the Deaf because I have a soft spot in my heart for it naturally. But, we did see a reduction in students, and I am wondering when you mentioned they can go anyway they want if, at the same time, there was a program that was oriented and leaned to encourage students, when they had the qualifications, to go to Gallaudet. We have seen a falling-off of that. Now, are you encouraging this or are you letting it go its own way and let it slip?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There has been no change in policy at all; I can assure the Member of that. We have counselling services that are provided; they are there. All of the opportunities available are clearly brought to the students and there is just no change, I can assure you.

MR. LARTER: — Well, I am very happy to hear that. One other comment I should like to make and that is that in Saskatchewan the Government of Saskatchewan has spent many dollars on these students and many of these students are very, very intelligent students and have proven this. In many cases, the jobs they take on are done just as well, or even better than in some cases of hearing people, because of their concentration. But I think that the Government has been guilty, and I brought this up in the past, of wasting this talent. We are not giving them enough job opportunities in Saskatchewan to stay here, and as a result,

not only the graduates of the deaf colleges, but also people of other vocations, are having to go to other places to seek jobs or else they are put into too narrow a field, and this also concerns me. I think, even in the Deaf School at Saskatoon, the only place a graduate from the college, a degree graduate, can get a job, is supervising a dormitory for children. Now, I wonder if this is right.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There certainly is no attempt not to provide employment for students who come out of the School for the Deaf. For example, you take the School for the Deaf itself. Three of the House Parents are deaf people and two of the teachers are deaf people. Three of the domestic workers are deaf people. So, even within the system we have made, I think, a fair effort in finding employment. If you go, and I am just saying this now from experiences that I have had because I know a number of people who are deaf, there are quite a significant number of people who work within the regular Public Service of the Government of Saskatchewan. And, I agree they are just as capable as anyone else and I will also agree with the concentration argument that you provide. We have a staff placement officer, am I correct on that, in the School, who assists in this and goes out and tries to place students, not only in the public sector, but in the private sector as well.

I don't disagree at all with the importance of providing this kind of a service, and providing job opportunities.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear that some of the staff at the School for the Deaf are, in fact deaf, because this was one of the problems that graduates out of Gallaudet were having, coming back home and getting a job teaching with the Saskatoon School for the Deaf. At that time, a few years ago, they were rejected and only could get jobs as House Parents or other maybe less menial jobs. I am not belittling the House Parent job because it definitely helps mould these children, but I do hope you will take a close look at these graduates and encourage people to go on to Gallaudet College, because there are only a few of them that qualify to go on. I would hate to see anything happen to that program.

MR. BAILEY: — Before we had the supper break, I had mentioned that I would ask some questions regarding the some one-quarter of a million dollar increase, Mr. Minister, and you gave me some explanations in regard to classification, increments and so on.

No matter which way you want to cut the cake in giving the explanation, Mr. Minister, I find that it is about a \$3,000 raise per individual. It amounts to about \$3,000 and I am not saying they are not deserving of the raise at all, but I am saying that \$3,000 per individual is a fair raise in one year, and I think the Minister would have to agree.

There is one other question I have. Are there any federal funds going into the School for the Deaf?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am sorry, I was discussing something with my staff. You ended with a question and I didn't hear you.

MR. BAILEY: — I had two questions, Mr. Minister. The first

question was in regards to the staff increase in salary, no matter which way you want to cut it, and give me reasons for it, still is a salary increase of something like \$3,000 a staff member. The other question I asked — are there federal funds for the School for the Deaf?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, first to your latter question — no there are no federal funds that come directly; there are none. Indirectly, in this way, the Northwest Territories have some students who are in attendance and some Indian Affairs students who are in attendance, therefore, they pay the tuition fees. So indirectly in that way, that is the extent of the federal funding.

On the salary question, I have given you the breakdowns; I don't know if I can do any more to help you. And I want to clarify that you know we are looking at that increase over two stages — there was an adjustment in October; there was an adjustment in April, and don't leave out the fact that there were the increments and there also is provision in here for anticipated increases due to the presently-being-negotiated agreement. I don't know whether you included that in your average calculation, but you have to remember that.

MR. STODALKA: — Just one question. I was just wondering what sort of fees you charge the Federal Government for the students from Indian Affairs. I notice that if you take the total budget for the Deaf School, which is \$1,237,000, and if you divide through by the number of students enrolled, 104, you find that it is a rather expensive proposition — \$8,841 per student, compared to last year of \$6,800. I was just wondering, could the Minister outline what sort of services the students have. Is it a boarding school? I think maybe I heard the Minister indicate that it was. What sort of fees do you get from the Federal Government?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, there are resident students and there are about 120 students in residence. The tuition fee that is paid by the Federal Government for their students is \$22 per day. Sure it's an expensive program, but it is, I guess you can define it as a program for a special need, and it is obviously going to cost some money. I think we can economize or try to economize, but we shouldn't cut corners in this kind of a program. I think it is too important to do that.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Minister, just one more question. I wonder if your department is aware of the amount per capita spent on the blind in Canada, and the amount spent on deaf people in Canada. I wish you would look at those figures. It is just almost staggering; it's almost unbelievable. Just to show you why I think the School is a wonderful thing and just how much it is out of proportion — they are two handicaps and both very bad handicaps — but I wish you would look at those figures. They are just staggering.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am interested in them too and we will do some looking at them. I don't know the figures.

Item 3 agreed.

ITEM 4

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, just a question. Could I ask the Minister under which section we will be dealing with the future certification and the Director of Teachers' Services? Which section does that fall under — that of Personnel Services or under Administration? Where do we include this?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Either 8 or 9.

Item 4 agreed.

ITEM 5

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, looking at this particular section, we see a tremendous increase. We have the staff going down by one; we have the total amount budgeted for this particular Item at \$68,000, almost \$69,000. Mr. Minister, is that not a tremendous increase in one year, with a staff reduction of one?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Okay, not necessarily. Let me give you what the increases are. This is the salary component. The base was \$34,380 — 1976-77; but there were deletions of \$6,100 because of the deletion of a Clerk II, so the adjusted base is \$28,280. Negotiated increases in salaries on October 1, for 1975, were \$4,740. There was some reclassification which brought some adjustment in salary, which resulted in \$2,400 additional money. There are the annual increments which amount to \$1,160, giving you \$36,580, and then there is again, a provision for anticipated increases for the contract being negotiated and there is provision in here for \$2,930. That is the salary component. There are other increases, of course, that deal with just the cost of printing. The department does a considerable amount of printing within-house, and there is a substantial increase in printing costs and in the acquisition of graphic supplies, which to some extent, is not really controllable.

MR. BAILEY: — Why do we have this under 'Other Personal Services'; a sum of almost \$13,000 this year, and it didn't appear last year?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That is provision for a halftime publications coordinator and a half-time graphic artist. That is what that is for. It didn't exist prior to this.

MR. BAILEY: — Why wouldn't you keep that in 'Permanent Positions' then?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is not in 'Permanent Positions.' It is in 'Other Personal Services.' They are not permanent positions.

MR. BAILEY: — The question that I am getting at here is we have an Item in the Budget, Mr. Minister, that was not there last year, to the tune of almost \$13,000. Now does that involve the hiring of another individual?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Because of the cost saving of doing in-house graphics and

in-house printing we require some of the expertise that a publication coordinator and a graphic artist can provide. They are part-time people; they are half-time people. It is not on a full-time basis, and therefore, that is why it is under 'Other Personal Services'. If it were a full-time job with a fulltime person, it would show up in the category just above it.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, if the school systems, which are performing the same services, were to increase in proportion, we would be out of business in the province. You have increased this one particular item in the budget by some \$28,000, and at the same time you show the hiring of one less in the way of staff. That is a tremendous increase for one year, is it not? You have here the percentage that, to me, is a very high percentage. You are going from \$45,000 to almost \$69,000. Now, we are not allowed to do that. We would be out of business. The department, I think, is not setting much of an example for us here.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Your argument is incorrect because if you go further into Items 8 and 10, or 9 and 10, you will find out that there are decreases in spending on printing. That is reflected in the kind of work that we are going to do in this area that we are discussing right now. You can't take one isolated Item and say that there is excessive spending taking place; there is none. Sure, this particular Item has shown an increase in total from \$45,000 to \$68,000. But when we get to the other Items, which I mentioned, you will find that the reductions there, more than compensate for the increases that we have here.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — The other day when we were doing one of your other departments, you said that the increased amounts, and I am using your figures here of dropping four to three, were a 10 per cent basic increase before implementing the 5 per cent increment, and 10 per cent again for an increase. If that is the case in 1977, what was the case in 1976? You must have done the same thing again, when I look back and see the amounts rising.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You are talking about another Item in another department, right?

MR. KATZMAN:: — It reflects in this department as well.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — No, not necessarily, not because of the difference in the department, but because of the different kinds of employees who may be in the particular Item. When salary negotiations were completed, there was an average percentage increase of 10 per cent in some categories. There are 8 per cent increases in other categories; 50 per cent increases in other categories; so that 10 per cent figure, as it is applied there, may not apply here.

MR. KATZMAN: — The point is that the other day you said that there were two increases and an increment involved in all three things. If that is the case, then are you telling me that in your last year's Estimate there was no incremental increase, I mean no increases, sorry?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Once again, it depends on where you are. Where we were at the prior Item, there was a situation where there were two increases. There was one in October and then there were further adjustments in April. In this Item, that does not happen.

Item 5 agreed.

ITEM 6

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would tell us what is included under this particular Item? What services are we talking about here? We have 19 employees.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, in this area, the activity is responsible for the provision of all support services in the department, which includes personal and office services, the liaison with Government Services, Central Purchasing, printing, rentals and so on; that is really what the whole raison d'etre of this is.

MR. BAILEY: — Well, then let me ask you this question. You moved from the Ivory Towers down to College. Is this the result? Does it result in a savings to the Department of Education?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — In what way?

MR. BAILEY: — Obviously, you are renting space, right?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, the Department of Education . . .

MR. BAILEY: — You have certain funds you have had to pay. You now have located in Parkview Place on College and is there a savings by having the department there?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Department of Education does not rent the space. The Department of Government Services rents the space. So, I can't answer the question. No, you would have to ask the Department of Government Services.

Item 6 agreed.

Item 7 agreed.

ITEM 8

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a question to the Minister. I understand that there is a possibility that the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon is going to be changing the enrolment quotas for the College of Education. I believe this last year they enrolled something like 900 students in the first year. There is some talk right now that the enrolment this coming year will be drastically cut to, I think, the figure is around 450 students per year, rather than, say, the 900 students who were enrolled this year.

I was wondering whether the Minister would care to comment

on what effect this might have on teacher supply, three or four years down the road, when these people have finished their university training. I don't know whether they consulted you. Maybe the Minister can indicate that.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — This is a contemplated action. The Board of Teacher Certification and Education has had this; it has been directed to them by the universities. The board has expressed some concern about this contemplated action and there are some discussions that are taking place. It has been communicated to the . . .

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, I heard the people from the university indicate that they don't feel that there is going to be a shortage in three or four years down the line. It is hard to visualize, particularly now, in certain areas of the province. The thing that bothered me a bit more was the method of selection for admittance into the program. The people at the university indicated that they were going to use the Grade XII average. I have some concern that it is going to be rather hard under the present system of evaluation, to equate one school with another school. I have a feeling sometimes, that within one school it is just a little bit easier to get the 75 percentage than it is, possibly, in another school. The university is going to, according to what they have said, admit Grade XII students on the basis of their Grade XII average. This, I have some concern about. I was wondering whether they had taken this matter up with the Minister.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I agree with the Member's concern. We have expressed our reservations about the question which you mentioned before and about the method of selection which is being proposed. That is very clear. The board, on which we are represented as well as other education authorities, is certainly dealing with this and considers it a pretty high priority and important item.

MR. STODALKA: — I just want to say I think the university is moving in the right direction, but it disturbs me if this is going to be the primary method of selection. I wonder if the Minister indicated to them and gave them any ideas as to how he felt they might select students.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — First of all, we have to accept the correct base. The university can, in the final analysis, and does accept their system. We have, the board has directed its concern about the proposals and in these preliminary stages, that is as far as it has gone. Your question is, have we specifically said what method of selection should be used? No, at this point in time we have not.

MR. STODALKA: — I didn't mean specifically. I was just wondering whether you gave them any suggestions, and maybe while you are on your feet, I haven't heard of any similar move at the University of Regina. Is there such a move here?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am told that, yes, we have heard that it is being contemplated, but there has been no indication of that in any formal form to either the board or myself.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister and Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns that I think that I agree with the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Stodalka) in that something has to be done to regulate the number of students going into the College of Education, because I am quite sure that we are facing more of a surplus than many of us realize right now. There are a considerable number of young people who will not have teaching positions this fall, who would like to have teaching positions. This will be greatly increased over the next few years.

Mr. Minister, I want to share the same concern as the Member for Maple Creek. We have, on several occasions, discussed admittance based on the Grade XII average. I know, and you know, and everyone in the province who has anything to do with education knows, that what has happened in the last few years is not something which one can place too much validity in. And I am talking about the Grade XII marks. When the Minister, himself, left high school, the government bursaries were based on Grade XII standings, and they were allotted in zones. When our system of evaluation and grading changed, the percentage of average marks that the students received, particularly in some schools, greatly increased, so that some schools got all the bursaries. The department recognized this deficiency and in doing so, allotted them on a quota system to each school. I think, and let's be honest, that is the reason it was done in that way. There is no use kidding ourselves. Certainly you can make up all the excuses that you want, but that is basically the reason why it was done. Now, if you are going to take Grade XII averages only, you are going to find that the difference in two schools, 30 miles apart, could well vary by 20 per cent. So, I would suggest, in support of what the Member for Maple Creek has said, that you emphasize very strongly upon the College of Education that this is only one criteria, but marks in themselves, should very, very definitely not be the major criteria.

Item 8 agreed.

ITEM 9

MR. STODALKA: — Question. I noticed a drop in your department staff from 20 to 16. Does this mean there is going to be a change within the internal operation of some sort? Would you describe what these changes are going to be?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The reason is not because of a deletion of staff. It is a transfer from one area to another. For example, it is the transfer of three staff to Management Information Services and one to Consultant Services; that is why the reduction.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could you explain to me why Other Personal Services have taken such a drastic jump?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The answer is that there are three consultants who are now charged here and were charged to Contractual Services before, so therefore, it didn't show up that way.

MR. KATZMAN: — They will be shown missing in what other item?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The next one.

MR. KATZMAN: — If they are showing in the next one, there is only a \$20,000 drop there, where we are showing over a \$100,000 increase.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is a \$70,000 drop in the next one, in Other Expenses — from \$285,000 to \$215,000.

Item 9 agreed.

ITEM 10

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I would assume that this is the one area that the Minister said that he would show up as a savings; is that correct?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Items 8 and 9.

MR. BAILEY: — Pardon, 8 and 9.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I'm sorry; it is 9 and 10.

MR. BAILEY: — That is not much of a savings. I'm looking for a quarter-million dollars in savings here and it hasn't shown up here has it?

Item 10 agreed.

ITEM 11

MR. STODALKA: — Question. Would the Minister distinguish between Regional Services No.11, and I believe there is another entry a little later on — Regional Services again — I think it is probably No.15?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Regional Services is a divisional heading, and that is in No. 11. All the other consulting services, Special Education, superintendents, and so on, are part of that regional set-up. All that you have in No. 11 is sort of the heading of the whole branch.

MR. STODALKA: — That means that the ones in . 15 are people that are attached to the regional office, and the ones in No. 11 are attached to the department in here?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The regional offices are in No.14; superintendents and the districts are provincially-employed — that is in No. 14.

Item 15 is — I think maybe I misled you a bit — Item 15 is a different area. It begins to deal with school administration, grants and this sort of thing. If you are looking at the regional offices and where the provision for the employment of superintendents is regional and our district superintendents — that is in Item 14.

Item 11 agreed.

ITEM 12

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, again I should like to point out to the Minister that we have here, in some of these sections, a tremendous increase. You have increased staff by two, only, and you have about a \$200,000 increase in this Item. Mr. Minister, there has to be more explanation than we have been getting for this tremendous increase in these various branches of the department. If the hundred-and-some school boards across the province were to follow this example, we wouldn't be in business.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Don't get confused or don't confuse the fact that there is a big increase to be related to salaries alone. This is the Item where there are some major things happening which entail an expenditure of new money. It is here that the increases relate to the expansion of the DWI counter-attack program which is going to be expanded this year. It now exists in three centres; it is going to be broadened out into a number of other centres in Saskatchewan. In here, also, is provided an increase for the Safety '77 program which the department is going to be undertaking as part of the total Government package on Safety '77 — the preparation of material for schools dealing with safety, the in-service training of teachers and superintendents, and a number of other things. That is why there is a bigger increase here from the point of view of increase alone.

MR. BAILEY: — Last year we found out that there was \$10,000, or something, to do with this dental program; we caught that up in Education some place. While this may be attached to the Department of Education, and while you may facilitate the schools and what have you, in the Safety '77 program, does it belong here or does it belong with the program itself? How much did Safety '77 cost the Government? We find some in Education; we find some in Highways; I question that, Mr. Minister, putting little dribbles in each department like this. You mentioned just that one.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We will determine at the end how it was spent by the Government by adding up the figures. I think we have a program that is coordinated; there is a coordinating committee that is established; there is a coordinated Minister's committee that is established, of which I am a member. Clearly, it only makes sense that there be a many-pronged approach to Safety '77 — highway safety.

One of the areas that has some responsibility is certainly, I think, the Department of Education — all of us who are involved in education — because that is one of the major ways in which to improve highway safety, is to change attitudes. The formation of attitude is a pretty important function that happens in the school. If we can help our teachers become more informed about the need for safety on highways and help them to help their students approach highway safety in a more positive way, then I think we will have made a major contribution.

MR. STODALKA: — Would the Minister indicate what branches these 11 consultants, or the staff, are going to work in? Could you give us a run-down please; that is 13 this year?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Can you repeat the question again?

MR. STODALKA: — I notice the figure calls for 13 — under Item 12 — consultant services — 13 permanent employees. Would the Minister just itemize what these 13 employees do?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The personnel that you see listed there are: one who is a director; there is a Chief Physical Education Officer; there are education consultants — six of them — two are French consultants, driver education, guidance, industrial arts, Saskatchewan High School Athletic Association; and then there are six clerical and stenographic staff.

MR. STODALKA: — I am trying to remember what was in the department last year and comparing it to what is in this year. Where did the two additional people go? Are they secretaries — clerical?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — You mean who the two extra ones are? Okay, there is the reinstatement of a French consultant, which was not included last year, and the transfer of a physical education consultant into this area.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, again we see something here. Mr. Minister, it is just too hard to pick up. You have an increase; you list an increase of two individuals from 11 to 13, with about \$106,000 difference. For two people, that is not good enough, just to have it there, \$106,000; you have increased your staff by two only.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Let me give it to you again. The approved Estimate in 1976-77 was \$156,380. There were positions transferred in, and that accounts for \$21,090. So there is a new adjusted base from which we work, and that is \$177,470. The negotiated increase as of October 1, 1975 was \$30,320; annual increments added another \$3,340. There was a reclassification of a driver education consultant, which added another \$21,080. There is a provision for a music consultant — \$9,170. There is provision for anticipated increases in the new agreement which is being negotiated. This gives you, step-by-step, what the increases are.

MR. G. N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake): — Did you say the DWI Course was in this Item? Can you tell me how much money you have set aside for the DWI Course in Saskatchewan?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — \$117,000.

MR. WIPF: — Can you tell me how much of that is for the Prince Albert area or the Prince Albert program?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We can get it; we don't have it broken down right here. If you want we can get it.

MR. WIPF: — Can you tell me how much money was spent on the DWI program last year and in what centres it was?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I can give you the gross figure. I can't give you, right now, the broken-down figure for each centre. The total figure last year was \$36,000. It is really a substantial increase to \$117,000.

MR. WIPF: — And you can't give me a figure on how many places it was held in last year — other than Prince Albert?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I think there were three centres, but once again I can't break down the \$36,000 right away, until we have had a chance to work it out on the basis of money. There were three centres.

MR. WIPF: — How much of that \$36,000 was on the trip to Qu'Appelle for the seminar sessions they had there last summer?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Once again, I guess that is more of a Public Accounts question than it is an Estimates question, for this coming fiscal year. We don't have that information with us. I can give you a 'guesstimate'. I don't want you to say that this is the final figure, but the fellows think it is around \$2,500.

MR. WIPF: — With this \$117,000, you plan on going into five centres this year. What plans do you have now for distributing this money to the centres? Is it to be like it was over the last couple of years, where you spent your own money, then waited for your money to come in, or is there going to be a special fund set up for these committees, so that the instructors will have some money? And, also, out of this \$117,000, are they going to buy projectors to run this course, or will the committees have to go around borrowing and begging projectors again?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — First of all, the Member raised this with me several days ago. The department indicated that there has been recognition to some of the difficulties with the funding part of it, or the method of funding, therefore, there will be some changes in that. The review is being undertaken. The other question was, will the department be buying projectors? The answer is, no. There is, we find, more than adequate equipment in the communities now. It doesn't seem to make sense to duplicate expenditures and duplicate this kind of equipment. It is a community program and we want to see the community involved. And I think it is more effective because of that. The answer is, no, we are not in here, budgeting for the purchase of equipment.

MR. WIPF: — As a community program then, can you advise me on where we will be able to pick up these projectors in a community?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Community colleges have this equipment; schools have this kind of equipment; other agencies I know, have this kind of equipment. Our consultant is more than ready and willing to help arrange for this equipment.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, I have been involved in this program ever

since its inception, in fact, I was one of the people that started this program in Saskatchewan. Your department, I think, and you are flying a kite there when you are saying you can get the equipment for this from the community colleges and all that. Our counsellors or instructors have spent evenings running around trying to pick this equipment up. I know that one of the requests for over a year has been to get a projector. I think the worst thing that could happen to this program is when the judge has sentenced 15 people to the course, then you don't have the equipment there. It is impossible, at least in the Prince Albert area, to get a projector from the community college or the schools, when they are tied up somewhere else. You have to return these projectors; if you borrow them at night, you have to return them. If you have a course running every night or every second night, it would be much more adequate to have an equipment budget worked into this. It is one of the real short- falls of the program.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — As I said, the consultant has done an outstanding job, and I know the Member agrees with me, because we have talked about it. If there is difficulty in a community because of timing and because of equipment being tied up, then I am sure that through the consultant, you can make arrangements to get equipment that the department already has. Instruction Resources has some equipment. It can be arranged easily and quickly. If we can help, we will.

MR. WIPF: — The Minister is then guaranteeing me that we can get equipment from your department for these courses at regional offices

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am not guaranteeing that you can get it on a permanent basis. I am saying the first priority and the first emphasis has to be at the community level. There is equipment at the community level. You have to go look for it, but once you identify where it is, most community organizations, and especially community colleges, are most happy to provide it. In cases where there are difficulties, I am saying, work with a consultant and I am sure that he will be able to try to arrange something from the department.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, you fail to understand. Your consultant is in Regina, and a telephone call to him at 2:00 p.m. in the afternoon saying we can't locate a projector — and this has happened — won't work. I have been involved in this for a long time. You have 15 people sitting there. If you can't put on the program, you are going to have breaches by them, and I think equipment is a real, necessary part. We are spending lots of money on this, hopefully to save lots of money in the future. The price of a projector will just make it that much easier. This projector can be used for other things. This program can be taken out and put into schools. We have tied it in with the Driver Education Program, and that is not bad because you can go into a school and get a projector. But this is one of the things that really disturbs us, and it is this problem of equipment. A thousand dollar investment is just going to make it a lot easier. It is one of the reasons why instructors are so frustrated about the whole thing. They end up with no material. We can't expect the consultant in Regina to drive up, even if your consultant would do it. He would leave here at 3:00 o'clock in

the afternoon, and be there in time, but that is a little difficult for him.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Surely, if you are putting together a course for September 22, you don't just realize at 2:00 o'clock in the morning of September 22 that you are going to have the course in the evening. I just don't believe that happens. I don't disagree that maybe there have been problems in getting equipment, but what I am telling you is, if there is a problem, we will assist as best we can. There is equipment in resource centres, and all you have to do is pick up the phone; but obviously, if you pick up the phone at 2:00 o'clock on a certain day and say you have to have it that evening, the logistics of that are a little difficult.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, I understand your feelings on that, but this has happened. You go and rent, or tell the community college, that you want a projector — then something else comes up and you can't get it. But what I am asking for is a simple \$1,000 outlay, probably. We've had a problem with this program right from the start. When we tried to get it going, first of all we had a problem with the Attorney General's Department; then we had a problem with other departments. I hope that you can do something about this and release \$1,000. There's a lot of money floating around, it seems anyway; if you can release \$1,000 that's \$5,000 this year to get a projector for these people.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I don't know whether the Member doesn't want to talk with people in the community, but every school has projectors and they are not utilized every night. In fact, they are seldom utilized at night and the availability is there, and when it is not, then we will help, okay?

MR. KATZMAN: — In other words, Mr. Minister, what you are saying to the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake is, that somewhere you can borrow equipment and if you arrange it three months ahead of time it should be there. That's what you are saying to him. Have you ever had the problem of borrowing equipment and had it turned down five minutes before you get there because the program has changed, the equipment breaks, that you borrow. He has a sound argument that you are totalling ignoring.

MR. WIPF: — Mr. Minister, I just want to add one more thing here. One of the plans of the program was to do some satellite work in the Prince Albert area, and have an instructor go out to Wakaw or up to Big River, and save these people from having to come in — they can't drive in anyway — and you can't borrow a projector from a school and yank it out and take it to Big River. They don't go for this. If you are in the school, okay, but it is very, very difficult in my area to get a location for this. We were in the Community College, in the School of Social Work, in many, many places; now we are located in the Court House in Prince Albert, and they don't have a projector there. They just don't seem to go for too many films, and they don't have a projector, so it is a case of bringing one in every night. If we had our own and, as the Member for Rosthern says, there have been several occasions when the projector was broken — we have received a broken projector from another department — if we had our own, we would maintain it, take care of it, and I think it would be one way to help this program get going. It's new and it's needed.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — All I can say is we will talk to our other consultant tomorrow or the day after, or next week, and if he can identify the problem, we will see what he has to say about it and if we can assist, I have already told you, we will assist as best we can.

MR. BAILEY: — Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to get into a topic here with the Minister, with regards to the relationship of the Department of Education with the community college, on a number of items. I don't know whether you would agree to have it at this particular time under Consultant Services. I don't think that is the particular topic and it has been mentioned, so I think, with the Minister's permission, I should like to direct a few questions to him.

Mr. Minister, there is some concern among school boards, and I am sure you have heard the concerns, about the availability of some of their community college courses to students attending school. I am not talking about a ceramics course in the evening or woodcrafts, or a wood class, whatever it may be; but rather, I am referring to the potential operation that looks inevitable in credit classes. I think you understand what I mean.

Students attend community college classes in the evening for 20 or 30 credits. Now, obviously, your department has looked at this. Have you given any guidelines as to the number of hours they must be in that class and whether they have permission from the school which they are attending, to enrol in that class? We are into a new area here, Mr. Minister, that I think is going to have to have some clarification, and it will have to come from the Department of Education.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is a continuing committee that exists and there is also a Minister's Committee which, when I was Minister of Continuing Education, we talked about in Estimates. It has made some recommendations, and the situation now is one in which the students are not entered into a credit class unless they have the permission of their principal and the board. Obviously, the superintendent is in the picture. The board then has to have some kind of an arrangement or an agreement with the community college; that's the policy.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister sees that particular policy changing. We are under some pressure that permission should not have to come from the principal of the school. The pressure is that the student is old enough to have a free choice and, therefore, that all that is required is, really, his permission to attend. I am afraid that there is some merit to that particular argument, that if a student wishes to take a class, it is up to that student, I suppose. The thing that concerns me, Mr. Minister, is a class being offered in a particular subject while that same subject is being offered in schools. You know, we could get into a duplication of services here, and it could be very costly, and it could be a demoralizing thing to the school as well.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That's why the policy is as it is and that's why, I guess you could say, it's restrictive in that sense. No, there is no intention at the present time to change it. I think there is

probably nobody better-qualified to decide, along with his board and his superintendent, than the principal. We certainly have no intention of changing.

MR. BAILEY: — What is the minimum number of hours required for a credit class being offered in the 30-level through the community college?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am told that in community colleges they are using about 60 to 70 hours.

MR. BAILEY: — That compares, Mr. Minister, to approximately 100 hours.

Item 12 agreed.

ITEM 13

MR. STODALKA: — A question, Mr. Chairman. I notice an increase from 7 to 12. Does this mean that the department is embarking on some new programs within the special education section? If you are, would you please outline them?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The major thing you see here and you speak about is, in fact, some anticipated new thrusts in special education. We have an increase in the number of regional special education coordinators and the purpose of this staff increase is to provide additional regional coordinators of special education services in more areas of the province.

I am trying to find a brief way of giving this to you, and here, in fact, is what is going to be happening. Here are the duties of these people: To assist in the organization and implementation of a special education planning committee at both the local school jurisdiction and the regional level; to organize and to engage in surveys and other information gathering strategies designed to identify the educational needs of handicapped children; co-ordinate the work activities of support personnel from other Government departments with which there are sometimes difficulties — the co-ordination aspect of it — and the Member smiles, so I think he knows what I am talking about; and private agencies as well, and to provide just more of major consultative and in-service assignments in the area of education of the handicapped; to help and assist local school superintendents in all matters pertaining to the designation of a student that is handicapped; participation in the orientation and planning meetings with the special education section, and so on. It is similar to the pilot project which has now been operating for a little while around the Weyburn-Estevan area; we are expanding that.

MR. STODALKA: — Are these people going to be attached to the regional offices, or are they going to be working out, and if they are going to be attached to the regional offices, does this mean that there will be one special education person working out of one office, or will there be one for two offices or..?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — We are moving towards one in each. They will be in the

regional offices. That's the most accessible place and I think it's the right place.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the Minister say that he is moving, because I go back about 15 years and, of course, we have the then-famous — we were going to establish the HEW Committee. That wasn't Hugh Thompson; that's Health, Education and Welfare. The conflict among these three departments has reigned supreme ever since, and it still does. I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that not only school superintendents, but school principals and parents themselves, are totally confused at times when they have people coming from Education, they have people coming from Health, and sometimes from Social Services as well. We are getting three different stories and they are confused and we sit back and wonder what is going on.

At the present time, one of the most confusing things to us in the field of education is that sometimes, unknown to us, the people from the Department of Health show up and they have this particular story. About a day later, the people from Core Services show up and they have this particular recommendation. It has been a period of long, long confusion in being able to deal in this field of special education. Mr. Minister, is there not a committee presently working within the province to try to, I hate to use the words 'HEW Program', but to try to revive a coordinating program? It seems to me that we've got something like this going, and if it is I would like to know something about it. I understand that we have a group working in the western part of the province to try to alleviate some of these problems we have had over the last number of years.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I agree that co-ordination is important and that is really one of the things that these experienced people are going to be doing. The pilot project, I find, is an excellent one. In the new regions where this is now going to be happening, the superintendents and teachers of schools will find it to be very useful. Yes, there is a committee in Government that is looking at the coordination of services and it has representatives from Health, Social Services, Core Services and other departments.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, this whole process of identification, I know is not a timely topic at this particular time, but I know that there are many, many people in the province who share this concern with me; it is designation of the handicapped, and I certainly will welcome, wholeheartedly welcome assistance in this particular area of education. I see that you have increased the staff by five, and hopefully, that will alleviate a lot of the problems that we have been facing.

However, Mr. Minister, as so often happens, people from other branches of the Government will go out to a special education case that is coming up and the information which they provide is not always accurate. Let me say that it is most always inaccurate. They tell the parents, and sometimes they come in without even acknowledging the fact that there is a local superintendent there. They often come and they tell the parent that this is what the Board of Education will do for you. I question, Mr. Minister, whether these people in other branches of Government have the right to come in and designate a policy outside of their own department.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The project in the southeast puts together a team that is involved with the designation and so on. I know the Member has a standing concern about the kind of thing you talk about and obviously, from time to time, there may be human error, but I would not want to leave the impression that I would be inclined to agree that it's a general thing that happens across the province, where the left hand says one thing and the right hand says the other. I happen to have a great deal of faith, which I have developed during my years on the Executive Council since 1972, a great deal of faith in the public service of this province. I think it is probably one of the — I can't compare it to other provinces, so I won't attempt to — but from the experience that I have had with the public service in Saskatchewan I think I can go anywhere in Canada and boast about it. I just wouldn't want to leave the impression that I would agree that there is a constant, nagging kind of a problem like you seem to portray to me.

MR. BAILEY: — No, no, Mr. Chairman, I am not criticizing individuals. I am simply stating the case that this co-ordination which you are talking about is long overdue, that's all I am stating. I am not blaming the individual from the Department of Health or the Department of Welfare. I am just saying that they are going about attempting to do their jobs, when you should be working together with the other department before individuals are going out on their own, not knowing what the other department is doing about this particular case. It is bound to cause confusion. Now don't tell me that this has only happened in my area. Nonsense! That has happened across the province and the Minister knows that it has happened across the province. All I am saying is that because it is a source of embarrassment, and I don't care about trying to embarrass the superintendent, but it is a source of embarrassment oftentimes to the families involved, and if we can get a coordinating effort going here, particularly the designation of these students, the better off we are going to be.

MR. STODALKA: — A question to the Minister. When you indicated that these people were going to be working in special education, I began to wonder if this wasn't already sort of indicating, or you might say accepting the fact, that developmental centres are going to be transferred to the school systems and these people would be there to help with that type of work.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — No, that's not . . .

MR. STODALKA: — That doesn't follow.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It's disconnected . . .

MR. STODALKA: — Will these people be working then, with Core Services and with the Department of Health officials, or is it a possibility that maybe Core Service people will no longer be in the field?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — These people are the coordinators. They do what the Member for Rosetown-Elrose essentially talks about. They bring it together, the people who are involved in this area, and provide the co-ordination that way. So, therefore, there is a team effort that is then put together. Our experience shows that it has some very excellent results.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, the Member for Maple Creek raised the very important question and the Minister answered, no, that that's not a movement towards the developmental centres. I want to suggest to him that more and more people are demanding — I think that is the right word, and I can sympathize with them — more and more parents who have students who would be designated to special education in very severe cases, are demanding that they have the services provided to them within their own schools. I think that is a very legitimate demand. Now the Minister is well aware that in order for any school to look after the severely handicapped, as we have in special education, that it often becomes an extremely expensive proposal because of the numbers factor alone, that these students in rural Saskatchewan stay within the confines of their local school. Now in many cases, Mr. Minister, this is not possible. It is not possible because of facilities; it is not possible because of staff, and therefore, arrangements are made by local boards to purchase services elsewhere. I think in rural Saskatchewan you will find that in the majority of cases the student is then provided with room and board and tuition by the sponsoring board, in order to meet that individual's rightful request for an education.

Mr. Minister, there is a group in Saskatchewan at the present time, which has come up with statements such as 25 per cent of all students attending school need special education. I suggest that is a highly exaggerated figure. It is making it extremely difficult in some areas to meet the demands, that is to be able to provide the type of education that particular child needs at that particular school. If you attempted to provide that type of instruction for them, it would almost mean a one- to-one situation.

I want to suggest to the Minister that we will continue to designate and make provisions for purchasing services elsewhere. The boards across the province are being pressured more and more every day that they must provide these services at the local level. If boards do attempt to provide these services at the local level, I want to assure the Minister that with the type of grant structure that is available, boards are going to find themselves in very, very difficult positions, in order to meet all of the demands at the local level.

In my own particular case, I know that we are setting up a type of development centre, because there are three or four students in one particular school. Now that is going to be extremely costly to the board. I think the Department should look at the cost of special education, because boards do not have their expenditures recognized. They are being recognized if you transport the students out, or purchase services elsewhere, but they fall far short when you attempt to provide this type of instruction within your local framework.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, the Member on several occasions, keeps talking about pressure on the school boards, pressure on the superintendents, pressure on teachers — so what? That is what democracy is all about. If there is an interest group that has something that they think is important to them, or important to society, then we ought to provide them the opportunity to make it heard. I make that point because I feel strongly about it. I realize that there are some difficulties and I agree with him about school jurisdictions with 1) the handicapped and 2) not being able to provide a program. And one of the things that the

regional coordinators would do, as has happened in the Estevan-Weyburn area, is to facilitate co-operative ventures in special education among school jurisdictions in the region. I think that we have to look at that kind of approach in some cases. I think you will find that they will do a very excellent job of that as experience has shown.

I recognize that it is a higher cost program. Last year we provided, I think, \$3,000 in 1975; this has now been adjusted so that in 1977 the grant will be \$4,140. So we are increasing the amount of assistance that we have been providing, in recognition of this greater cost factor.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I took a look at that and certainly that is one step in helping the situation, but in many instances, unless you provide this special education at home, for these individuals, and if you can't and the child has to attend someplace else, it simply means that the family has to pull up roots where they are because they are not going to let the child go on his or her own.

In effect, what happens within a school, is that you set up a classroom for three very special educational students; a grant will come through of approximately \$12,000 and immediately you are \$12,000 short in the operation of that classroom with only three students. I am saying that is making it very difficult for boards to look after the needs of that type of student at home. It is a very, very costly business and if we are going to encourage these people to stay at home, and I believe they should be at home, I think you are going to have to do a great deal more in the field of education by way of recognizing the cost, than the department does now.

Item 13 agreed.

ITEM 14

MR. STODALKA: — I notice the reduction in staff. Does this mean that you have a number of jurisdictions that are moving towards local employment in the coming year, and if you do would you give us an indication of the number and what jurisdictions they are?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — This figure is a reflection of what has already happened; school boards who have, in fact, since we last talked in Estimates, changed from provincially-employed to locally-employed.

MR. STODALKA: — Are the assistant regional superintendents included in this particular section?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes.

MR. STODALKA: — I understand that you are going to be making some change in the status of an assistant regional superintendent in comparison to past years; some different arrangement in the contract arrangement that they have with the Department of Education.

Would the Minister please outline how the employment status of these people is going to change?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — These people used to be district superintendents

attached to the regional office. They have now been reclassified. There is a step difference when reclassified, and therefore, they are in a different category.

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Minister, I understand that you have eight regional offices and I think you have six assistant regional superintendents. Am I correct in that statement? It has also been indicated to me that possibly the people who are in the positions at the present time may not necessarily be in -those positions next year, that the change of classification has opened up the positions for competition. Is this correct?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes.

MR. STODALKA: — Would the Minister please outline then, exactly what procedures will be used in selecting the people for these positions of assistant regional superintendents?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The normal Public Service Commission procedures will be used.

MR. STODALKA: — Would the Minister indicate whether or not these positions would be open for locally-employed people as well as his own people.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is in-service.

MR. STODALKA: — Is it the Minister's intention to keep the assistant regional positions in-service? I wonder why they would not be open to other superintendents who work within the Province of Saskatchewan. Why the closed shop?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — At some point in time, I think it is fair to say that circumstances will change. Right now there is some movement by some boards to locally employ superintendents. There is, there- fore, some priority given to people already employed in the Public Service who are the district superintendents. I think that is fair and reasonable that these in-service people be given some priority provided they meet the qualifications.

MR. STODALKA: — Just one other question. I think you indicated, and I think you said that the placement of these people or the appointment of these people would be run under the usual procedures used by the civil service. Would you please underline what the usual procedures are?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It is in the collective agreement and there is a bulletin that goes with in-service, and therefore, everybody has access and is notified accordingly and can apply in a normal way.

MR. BAILEY: — I find it a little bit difficult to believe that the assistant regional superintendent position would now come up for competition. When earlier I asked you about positions within your own department, you said that they weren't for competition but rather appointments. I know that you will say, "Oh, that is

a different ball game." I don't agree with you. I think that it is all within your department. All of a sudden your regional superintendents, who were appointed for the position and obviously they were appointed because they had certain expertise, they came up through the ranks, and now their positions are thrown open for competition in this reclassification.

I think there is no consistency within the department, Mr. Minister.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is no discrepancy at all. The positions that you talk about, which are executive positions, are out-of-scope positions — clear and simple. The positions of the assistant superintendents are in-scope positions and that is the difference. Nothing new; it's governed by the agreement which is negotiated and perfectly okay.

MR. BAILEY: — With that explanation, why don't you throw the regional superintendent, not just the assistant, why not throw these positions open for competition as well?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — They are. Where have you been? I am surprised that you never applied. They were advertised and they were filled on a competition basis.

MR. BAILEY: — I am talking about the existing positions. I am not talking about when a new position opens up. That was advertised, I will admit, but if the assistant regional superintendent position is now open for competition, why aren't the regional superintendent positions open for competition?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am informed that the regional positions, not only the new ones, but the existing ones were filled by competition.

MR. STODALKA: — Would the Minister indicate why the change in the procedure from last year? There must be some reason for changing this classification. Would you also indicate whether or not there was a pay raise involved? I understand that new classification has the effect really, of creating a new group, a new group whose salaries would be higher than the existing district superintendents .

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The reclassification is a result of the duties and the role. It is a service and the job entails a wider scope, a bigger region than a district superintendent.

In reply to your second question, there was a pay increase.

MR. STODALKA: — Would the Minister indicate the extent of this pay increase?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It was two and one-half increments.

MR. STODALKA: — In dollars that means?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I can't tell you precisely. We can get it. It would be pretty close to say that an increment is worth about five per cent.

MR. STODALKA: — I presume the Minister is aware the creation of such a position that pays five per cent more than existing positions creates a new sort of competition. I would like to assure you, from the people that I have talked to that have worked in this area, that you have a morale problem in this area. People are worried as to whether or not they are going to be located in the same position this year as they were last year, because your positions are now open. If you want to use the railway term, they feel that there may be a chance that they may be bumped and will have to leave.

Would the Minister care to comment on this?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The Member is right, Mr. Chairman, There is an opportunity for a challenge. In fact we have some challenge procedures that are taking place right now. There is an Appeal Committee that is dealing with some challenges in the working place. And, yes, there is a possibility of bidding.

MR. STODALKA: — I just want to make sure that the Minister is aware of some of the changes that are really existing. People feel that they are going to probably relocate after having lived in centres for some length of time. There is no guarantee that the job that they have been holding for the last two or three years is going to be theirs. They may have to move to a different area; they may be transplanted; they may have to dispose of their home. These are some of the things that these people are going to be faced with.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I must give the Minister a great deal of credit, because he has the ability to kind of get around some of these questions. We have eight regional superintendents, two of which have their positions by competition. The other six were appointed by the department.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — No.

MR. BAILEY: — They weren't appointed by the department? Are you saying that the other six regional superintendents received their positions by competition? Let me ask that question first.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Sorry, I have to disagree. My people tell me that those positions were filled by competition. You take the regional superintendent in the Weyburn area; that was a competition. That is not the two new ones. I guess maybe we are talking about two different things. I am talking about the regional superintendent. I am assuming that the Member is talking about the regional superintendent, Mr. Chairman. If we are talking about the same people, then the positions were filled by competition.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, let us get one thing straightened out here.

Were the existing, not the two new, but were the existing assistant regional superintendents' positions competition, or were they appointments?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That is the problem; we are not communicating. You, up until now, have talked about the regional superintendents; now you are talking about the assistants. Are you talking about the assistants? Okay, now we are talking about two different things.

MR. BAILEY: — Do regional assistant superintendents have their position by appointment or by competition?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It was a transfer; they were district superintendents.

MR. BAILEY: — They were in the regional office as assistants, and then, of course, they received that position by appointment. Is that correct?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — At that time, the position of an assistant regional superintendent did not exist in the classification. It was simply a transfer of work responsibility. It was a transfer from the district to the regional office.

That reclassification has now taken place and they have officially been designated as assistant regional superintendents within the appropriate classification category provided.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, we have it then at the present time, where the regional assistant superintendents' positions, those who came over, transferred from the department, their positions have changed so there is now a competition as to whether they will retain that position or not. That is correct, is it not?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There is something . . .

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, let me say this then; if their positions are now open for competition, the regional superintendent positions, those who were in before, they gained their position by competition — is that correct? The eight regional superintendents gained their positions by competition, and therefore, you are trying to get both the assistant regionals and the regionals so that both positions are by a competition.

Item 14 agreed.

Items 15 and 16 agreed.

ITEM 17

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, this Government was fortunate in a way, in that coming into office in 1971, they were not facing as the previous government had done, a tremendous building program throughout Saskatchewan. Admittedly, there are some extensive building programs taking place in the cities, where in most of the rural areas we are not faced with building programs. The problem is on the other side of the ledger now, trying to find

enough students now to make use of all of the building facilities we have.

Under grants to schools in capital, Mr. Minister, I want to suggest to you that there is one common problem throughout Saskatchewan in relationship to schools and that problem, of course, is a problem which the boards are facing large capital expenditures, mainly to the roofs of schools. This is running up almost to the cost of what the original school was when it was built and it is not being recognized by the department and the department is not recognizing these used expenditures in such a way. I'm wondering if the Minister can explain why these major renovations, which are necessary, are in fact not being recognized at this particular time?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I'm glad the Member asked the question, Mr. Chairman, because it provides me with an opportunity to make an announcement. We, in fact, recognize the problem with roofs in schools and therefore, shortly, those gentlemen will be getting, as superintendents for their school boards, a directive or a memorandum outlining what the policy is and it will meet this need which I agree with the Member wholeheartedly, is an important need and I'm most pleased that the Government of Saskatchewan, will in this year, be able to accommodate it.

MR. BAILEY: — I agreed with what he said, Mr. Chairman, because that's the best news, that's the best news that's come out of the Department of Education for a long time, I can assure you.

May I beg the indulgence of the Minister? Could you ask the gentleman to your left there, if he has any idea as to what this amount will be? I feel like running up and phoning and telling them to pull the pails out and let it rain. Let's hope it does rain, so that we don't have to put these pails out. Can I have some indication as to what these funds may be?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Obviously you wanted the rain sheet to find out where the holes are.

In a general sense you get the details, and I think that is a better way to do it, but it will be on the same basis as capital grant allocations are right now. There will be a one mill requirement in there, but it will generally be on the same basis as the capital grants provided for school construction and renovations.

Item 17 agreed.

ITEM 18

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, I notice this amount is not increasing that much. Eventually, of course, at one time this was a fairly large amount. Could you tell me how many are involved at the present time?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am told there are 15.

Item 18 agreed.

ITEM 19

MR. STODALKA: — Will the Minister outline who these agencies are, these organizations?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, Canadian Education Association, Canadian Council for Research and Education, Council of Ministers, Canadian Studies Foundation, Saskatchewan School Trustee Association, Saskatchewan Federation of Home and School, Superintendent Short Course, University of Saskatchewan, Principal Short Course, Saskatchewan Education Week Committee, Council for Exceptional Children, Overseas Book Centre, L'Association d'Education de Langue Francaise, Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, French Workshops, Youth Science Foundation, Guidance Counsellors' Association and Advisory Committee on Indian Education.

Item 19 agreed.

ITEM 20

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, the report from the Provincial Auditor, I believe it was No. 19 or 20 in his report, mentioned some difficulty with the auditing of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission. Could we perhaps have an explanation as to what the Provincial Auditor was talking about?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am lost. To the best of our knowledge there was no problem. We will check. I guess I am not quite correct in my reply. In the year previous there were some \$43,000 which were not precisely accounted for. The Auditor pointed it out to the Commission, and necessary steps have been taken and the Auditor has now indicated that there is no problem.

MR. STODALKA: — In the section of Other Expenses, there is a rather dramatic increase of \$65,000 to approximately \$124,000 under Item 20, and I wonder if you can indicate what that change is.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — . . . computer services have gone up. Obviously, this area of the department utilizes a great deal of computer services. Secondly, something which I mentioned earlier in the reply to the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley, there is provision here for an actuarial study that is being undertaken.

MR. MacDONALD: — No, just one moment, seeing the Minister brought up the actuarial study, I just have one comment.

A few years ago, the Government decided to ignore the Trustees and put in collective bargaining on a provincial basis with the majority of people excluded from the thing. But one of the moves that they did at that time was they put teachers' superannuation under collective bargaining at the provincial level, which has some very serious implications if you want to rectify the situation that you are talking about.

I can't see teachers deciding to increase their contribution on a negotiated level. Very rarely, have I ever heard of any individual going backwards on his or her fringe benefits.

Suppose the actuarial study comes up and says, "Yes, there is a very severe problem here; a severe problem for Saskatchewan as it is in the national level, on all non-funded pension plans." Does he not now see the error of his way, putting superannuation at a negotiable level, or does he see this creating any difficulty? To me, I see this as being a very, very difficult situation. I happen to be a former teacher, and I don't have pension benefits, and I probably never will. But I know that if I was a teacher, there would be no way that I would rectify or go backwards in that particular regard.

How does the Minister see this business of collective bargaining at the provincial level, with superannuation being a negotiable item affecting what may have to happen to solve this whole problem of pensions?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I guess I have more faith in reasonable people getting together over a table and discussing mutually the problems that they have, than the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley. There may be a negotiated increase in the contribution, but that is something that obviously he won't have to .. negotiation. There in fact, was in the first provincial agreement, a negotiated increase in the teachers' contributions. That was agreed upon around the table by all of the representatives there. There is give and take, of course; that is one of the procedures of negotiations. I don't discard the possibility out of hand.

MR. MacDONALD: — There is no question about it that teachers did negotiate an increase in their contributions, for good reason. They got the cost of living bonus and they got some of the other things that has caused the very problem that we are talking about.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, earlier we were talking about this very item. I want to straighten the Minister out just a little bit, in that he said earlier that you couldn't count on negotiations for an increase in pension, an increase in amounts of what I would call a deferred salary, as being salary; otherwise you would have to pay income tax, and that is nonsense. You pay the income tax on it when you take it out, like you do a personal registered retirement savings plan.

What I am saying, Mr. Minister, is that sooner or later we are going to have to agree to this, and not just with teachers but with other groups as well, that the amounts of money that are being contributed on the individual's behalf, are going to have to be considered as the total salary package. And until we do, we are not getting a true picture and an accurate picture of negotiations. After all, an individual could be facing an increase in salary of 5 or 6 per cent, and to get an increase of even 11 per cent in the contribution being made to his superannuation or pension, and you say that doesn't constitute an increase in salary.

Now, Mr. Minister, you can't have it both ways. You can't have money being spent on an individual, whether it be in a salary cheque now, or a salary cheque twenty years from now. It is very definitely salary and we are going to have to consider it as such.

Item 20 agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I should like to ask leave of this House and permission from the Minister to revert to Item 17. Apparently, I overlooked someone that would have liked to have asked a question on that.

ITEM 17

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, under the Capital Grants for schools, there is a grant given for construction. We have a specific problem in my constituency, of which your deputy is well aware.

My question is: why when you have to renovate school or change the classrooms over, you don't call that an expense under capital, yet when you build another school it is all in capital? For example, you are going to build a new public school, because you say that you cannot build a high school under the capital grant. If you are going to fix up the present school for a high school, and then build a public school because it requires less capital grant, why don't you put them in one package and say the cost to make the whole thing work — the high school and the public school — is so much, and allow that in the capital grant rather than different budgets?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — If it is realistic and it makes sense to use the approach you are using, if there is a major renovation involved, we recognize under capital assistance grants, or provide grants in the same way as we do for a major capital construction of a new facility. If there is a specific problem, I am not sure which one you are talking about.

MR. KATZMAN: — Yes, the Minister has a specific problem in mind, but unfortunately you didn't reply to our letter for over two and one-half months and the time lag has now beat us. That is my problem in that constituency with the school.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Chairman, that is just not good enough, for the Member to get up and make some insinuation about not replying to a letter for two months, and trying to hide behind some generality about a specific problem, which he is not prepared to identify and I just won't accept that. I want him to identify what the problem is so that I can look it up.

MR. KATZMAN: — As I said when I started, your deputy minister knows the whole total story.

Item 17 agreed.

Item 21 agreed.

ITEM 22

MR. BAILEY: — This increase that we see here amounts to the increase in the amount of coverage that the new insurance prevents. Is that correct?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am going to try to explain this; it is a little technical. I am told that the figure here is as large as it is, because of

the global accounting that is used. We have to pay the insurance company in advance. Then when it all sort of comes through the chute, it really costs the Government of Saskatchewan \$117,000.

Item 22 agreed.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, we have an increase here of \$300,000. I am assuming that the federal contributions to the bilingual program are for the designated French schools of the province. Am I correct in that assumption, Mr. Minister?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes, basically you are right, but it is not only designated for, it is for second language programs in general.

MR. BAILEY: — Has the Minister a break-down as to the various languages — for instance of this \$800,000, how much is going for, say, the Ukrainian instruction in Saskatchewan?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Out of this, none. There is no federal contribution to other second languages. The assistance we provide in the department is strictly provincial.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, then this sum is strictly for the French language in Saskatchewan.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes.

MR. BAILEY: — Can I ask a question then, in connection with this, Mr. Minister? When the Department of Education establishes a designated school, or say a designated kindergarten, in so doing are any of the funds which we see here, used once you've made the designation?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The answer is, yes.

MR. BAILEY: — Is the total voted fund, Mr. Minister, in the designated coming from this amount or does the Department of Education add something from their funds?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The provincial money is in the regular operating grant formula. The school boards get that. What this is, is a nine per cent thing; this is really extra money. It's special money designated for this special program, second language program. That's in addition to what the provincial component is, which is part of the formation grant formula.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister, when a school is designated, or one classroom is designated or a kindergarten is designated, and of course, they get the normal operating funds as an ordinary kindergarten in the province, you know so much per student that's there, and so on, why does it cost more money to have a kindergarten in French than it does to have a kindergarten in English?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I am told that there is the cost of special material that is required; it's not the sort of normal material that you buy for the whole system in an English kindergarten program, which is fairly standard. There are special material costs. There may be extra teacher, or extra instruction costs. So, there, in fact, are extra costs that are involved.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Minister, how many designated projects are there in Saskatchewan, that would be the recipients of this \$800,000?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Fourteen.

MR. BAILEY: — Mr. Chairman, there are 14. These are mainly, Mr. Minister, designated kindergartens, are they not?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — There are 14 designated school schools. Of this \$800,000, all of it doesn't go to the designated schools only. There are others. Some of the funds are utilized for the provision of a French consultant, provision of audio-visual material, so I would think maybe I misinformed you accidentally. I would not want to leave the impression that the full \$800,000 goes to the designated schools.

MR. BAILEY: — To save any further questions, I am wondering if the Minister could provide me with the break-down of the expenditure of this \$800,000, and give it to me within the next couple of days.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Yes.

Vote 8 agreed to.

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Chairman, I should just like, before the Minister and his staff leave, thank you for your co-operation this afternoon in the five hours we have been with you.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:03 o'clock p.m.