

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**May 4, 1978**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Bill No. 58 - An Act to amend the Urban Municipality Act, 1970**

**Clause 5, New Section 151**

**Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Before we agree, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle raised a question on this clause with respect to any contact with the architects on the increase from \$35,000 to \$75,000 before the approval of an architect or an engineer is provided. There has been contact through SUMA with the Architects' Association and they think it is fine.

Clause 5, new section 151 agreed.

**Clause 6, Section 153 amended**

**Mr. Chairman:** — The House amended is, amend subsection 11(a) of section 153 of the act as being enacted by subsection (2) of section 6 of the printed bill by striking out Clause (c) and substituting the following:

(c) Is determined by a resolution of the council to require immediate measures to secure it from being an imminent danger to the public safety. The council may direct at any preliminary measures that it considers necessary to be taken immediately to secure that building and the council shall proceed to have the work done and the cost of that work shall be added to and form part of the taxes on the land on which the work is done.

**Mr. MacMurchy:** — the wording is the same. It is just a printing mistake. It moves, starting with the council, out to the margin.

Clause 6, section 153 as amended agreed.

7, section 177 as amended agreed.

8, new section 198(b) to 198(2) agreed.

9, section 203 as amended agreed.

10, section 205 as amended agreed.

11, strike out, agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 55 - An Act to amend The Highways Act**

**Item 6**

Section 1 agreed.

2, new section 63, agreed.

3, section 65 as amended agreed.

4, strike out, agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 8 - An Act to amend The Water Supply Board Act, 1972**

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

**Bill No. 60 - An Act to amend The Provincial Parks, Protected Areas, Recreation Sites and Antiquities Act**

Section 1 agreed.

**Section 2**

**Mr. J.G. Lane (Qu'Appelle):** — I would like to ask the minister, does that in fact mean that you can begin to duplicate parks? In other words, the parks can be a provincial park; they can also be designated as well a wilderness park, which increases the possibility of grants and thirdly it could also be designated as an historical park or a national environment park or sections of a provincial park could be designated these various other types of parks. Will it lead to a duplication?

**Hon. A.S. Matsalla (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Chairman, these are all provincial parks and, therefore, there would not be any special grants available to them, they would be . . . the assistance, of course, would be provided for totally by the provincial government as all provincial parks are. And with regard to your second question regarding wilderness or scenic parks, or cultural parks and so on, these would only be as classifications.

Section 2 agreed.

Clause 3 agreed.

Clause 4:5 amended agreed.

Clause 5:6 amended agreed.

Clause 6:10 amended agreed.

Clause 7:20 amended agreed.

**Section 8**

**Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap):** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, the amendment to section 8 subject to the vehicles act, would you not be better off making the Vehicles Act applicable to the provincial parks rather than attempting to do this. I am not so sure whether . . . exactly what you had charged them, you charged them with a breach of the regulations or a

breach of The Provincial Parks Act. Are you going to charge them with the breach of The Vehicles Act and I don't think you can do that the way it reads?

**Mr. Matsalla:** — Mr. Chairman, the enforcement of this section will be done by our own enforcement people in the parks, the conservation officers and the park superintendent.

**Mr. Lane (Qu'Ap):** — Well, that was my question. What is the penalty if an individual, what are the maximums and minimums if an individual fails to follow a route that's set up under the regulations?

**Mr. Matsalla:** — The penalties are under The Parks Act, section 23 and the maximum amount of penalty here is \$500 and in default imprisonment of not exceeding six months.

Section 8 agreed.

Section 9 deleted.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **Second Readings**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Smishek that **Bill No. 47 - An Act to amend the Senior Citizens Home Repair Assistance Act, 1973** be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a second time.

### **COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — Education Vote 8**

**Mr. Chairman:** — We are dealing with the estimates on Education, page 32, and I'll ask the minister to introduce his staff please.

**Mr. Faris:** — Mr. Chairman, first of all beside me is my Deputy Minister, Ian Wilson, beside me here is Liz Dowdeswell, special assistant to the Deputy Minister. Where's John? Right behind me is John Hurnard, executive director of the development division. In front of me is the director of regional services division. Right at the back, behind John is Art Myer, executive director of administrative and support services division. Right over here is John Moneo, director of financial management. This is Jake Volk, who I think some of you know, director of educational administration. Les Barrett, school grants administration, is right directly behind John. Wally Sawchuk of teachers' superannuation is over on the side there. Steve Senyk, principal of the Correspondence School is right over here in the blue. I think now I will allow the hon. members to ask questions.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order.

### **Item 1**

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just a few opening remarks before we get into the estimates proper.

The Minister of Finance, when he originally presented the budget to the legislature a couple of months ago, indicated that the grant to education should be substantial enough that school boards within the province of Saskatchewan would not have to raise their mill rates. Since that time, the March 30 deadline has passed and we have found that there are certainly numerous school boards within the province of Saskatchewan that did, in fact, raise their mill rates.

More alarming probably are some of the things that are happening in rural Saskatchewan because of a declining enrolment. I would just like to indicate one of the things that has happened in the constituency which I represent, namely the Leader School Unit. The Leader School Unit, I believe, has a staff this year of almost 80 teachers and they have been holding a number of meetings throughout their centres within their school unit. They say because of a lack of funds they have to make some drastic cuts in the services that are provided to the people in the Leader School Unit. To give you an example, of the staff of approximately 80 teachers, they have indicated that they are cutting 10.5 this coming year. There will be 10.5 teachers cut out of that particular staff.

Now what are they doing in cutting 10.5 teachers? Well, basically, if you start looking at the line, almost every school within the unit is going to be losing at least some staff members but more important than that is they are also this year closing a high school; a high school in Mendham is going to be closed. The children are going to be conveyed to the school in Leader. They are also removing some of the grades in the separate school. They have told the people in Prelate that next year their high school will be closed. They are also making some changes and want to close the school in Lancer. These are just some of the things that are happening because of a lack of funding. I know the minister is probably going to say that the decision to close these schools was made by the board itself but if the board certainly had funding, it wouldn't be necessary to make such decisions.

Being in the neighbouring unit and knowing the communities and also being the member representing the area, I am aware of the extreme difficulty that the administrative people in that area have had during the course of the last couple of months. I am also aware of the anxiety of the people living within the Leader School Unit and the number of so-called local meetings that have been held and the pressures that have been put on. The unit boards make the changes. I am also aware of some of the problems that they had in communication with the Department of Education in relationship to the mill rate and establishing and changing mill rates after March 31 when they had been set.

We do have indeed a problem that I think is probably going to spread to other parts of Saskatchewan as well. There is no doubt, if you look at the school enrolment figures in Saskatchewan, the bulge is about grade seven and during the next six years we are going to see a declining enrolment in our high schools in rural Saskatchewan. As the declining enrolment comes, boards are going to be faced to make a number of decisions and this leads me to the point that I want to make.

As a rural member I am also knowledgeable about the fact that in the case of the comprehensive schools in the province of Saskatchewan that when it comes to the foundation grant formula there is an extra allowance for student ratio or per student figure in the comprehensive schools, an amount above that paid to high school students who attend school in the composite schools or in the small rural schools in Saskatchewan. Now these comprehensive schools often have, in Division IV where you

need 21 credits for graduation, 120 or 130 or even more options for the students. In order for students to have this many options available, of course, the extra funding was provided.

My point is, we in rural Saskatchewan in some of these small high schools, the ones we want to retain - I think it is going to be essential that some extra money be given to them in the same fashion that extra money is given to the comprehensive schools within the foundation grant formula. There is no doubt in my mind that the minister again is probably going to say that we have an enrolment and a sparsity variable that is incorporated into the existing foundation grant formula. The problem with that is that that applies to the entire school system and I feel there is some advantage to labelling the amount that would be spent or could be considered for these small high schools, to encourage the communities to try and keep their high schools.

Members opposite have often indicated that they want to keep rural Saskatchewan and they are particularly interested in having programs that will help these communities survive. I would like to say, you know, we worry about the railroad going into a small community, we worry about the electors being in the small community but really if you remove the schools, that is going to have a much more drastic effect on a community than either the removal of an elevator or the removal of a rail line. If we are going to keep rural Saskatchewan, keep these communities and keep these high schools, I believe that you are going to have to incorporate within your formula in the next year or two some sort of a variable which will make provision for these small high schools, just like you did for the comprehensive school. If the comprehensive school, you might say, is entitled to additional funding I don't see how you can argue that the small rural high school is not also entitled to additional funding.

All we are asking is that we can exist. We are not asking for an elaborate program; we are just asking for a program that can take care of the basic needs of these people in rural Saskatchewan. I, myself, happen to be a graduate of one of those high schools. I have taught in one of those high schools and I do not feel that the students who are in the high school - I should say that there are certain advantages to this school. I realize that you probably can't service the needs of everyone as you can in a comprehensive school but you still can take care of the needs of many of the people in this area. So I would ask that when the minister and his advisors next year are considering the foundation grant formula that one of the things that they do is to try to find some mechanism whereby they can supply extra funding to these small high schools. I think it should be labelled as such so that boards can be held accountable for the amount of money, that there can be an indication by ratepayers who can say, now look, you have money available for the small high school and if you don't provide the necessary funds, of course, then, you are going to centralize and you won't receive the necessary funding.

I would just like the minister to comment on the suggestion that I have made.

**Mr. Faris:** — First of all I would say that I have some concern about building conditions into the unconditional granting of funds, to tie them to high schools and so on. I do want to deal with the situation you raise in regard to Leader because it's an interesting example. I noticed the member didn't mention the percentage grant increase in the unit in which he is the superintendent. You know, you are in Maple Creek and I believe your unit, for instance, under the formula this year received a 16 per cent or 17 per cent grant increase. Quite enough, that's right. I think the member for Saskatoon Eastview got a similar amount in his unit.

I just wanted to point out that the grant formula is done in an impartial sort of way. We really had no special intention of granting funds to your particular unit. We try to do it in a way that is fair throughout the province. My officials inform me that with the changes we made in the grant formula this year, they have not had one official protest from any unit board about the distribution of funds this year. There was less criticism than any time in their experience. I think that is understandable because I think really we did a pretty good job in trying to relate the funds to where they should be on a fair and equitable basis. All in all the grant increases this year were to the province, in excess of 10 per cent, 10.8 per cent as a matter of fact - 10.8, now that is an interesting figure when you compare it to other provinces in Canada. Manitoba at 6 per cent, Ontario at 4.7 per cent. Our grant increases to the school boards through the province are all approximately double that of the Canadian average, this year. Now, I think that is very good, but in addition, we strengthened very much the sparsity factor; we strengthened the enrolment drop factor. In regard to Leader unit, I was told by one of the unit board members from Leader unit that, to their surprise, they got this year an extra \$120,000 they had not expected. You know the sparsity factor alone gave that unit this year \$184,000. The enrolment drop factor gave them another \$120,000. Those two factors alone gave that unit over \$300,000 they would not have had if we had not made that kind of adjustment. I may say, that in addition to that their overall grant increase this year, despite falling enrolments, was 10 per cent and that is a very good grant, double as I say the Canadian average. More than that, they have in that unit a very low mill rate. They have a mill rate which is considerably below that of the provincial average for rural areas. They chose this year not to increase their mill rate at all. Not at all. Now, I think that shows quite clearly where the responsibility was. They did not raise their mill rate at all, they did not protest to us about not getting enough money because one of the unit board members said to me, look we got at least \$120,000 we didn't expect, and that is worth what, another six teachers or so right there. Despite that extra grant they got they held their mill rate, despite the fact again that the property improvement grant this year was enough to cover an additional three mills. There was plenty of room for them to make the kinds of decisions they have to make, but if we are going to respect local autonomy, if this is going to be made a meaningful thing in this province, then I think we have done everything we could and the decision making is up to them. I am not saying they don't have tough decisions. They do have tough decisions to make but when they make that kind of a decision they should take the responsibility for it, particularly in view of all the factors I have enumerated.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — But I think they're taking the responsibility for it. All you have to do is go out and attend some of the meetings that are being held throughout the area. The point I made though and I don't think you answered it, is this: — that in the future this is going to become more crucial. It is the next five or six years that we are going to have these errors. You mentioned you did not want, you know, to have variable things within the grant formula. They are there already. In the case of the Division IV school it's there. You know, you pay an extra allowance there. I don't know; it is just a suggestion. I work at this day in and day out and I have a strong feeling that in the next five or six years, we are going to be having to make some very difficult decisions and I think it would have been easier for the people in the area around Leader, if they are dealing with the board at that time, that they could have identified that there was a special factor there for these small schools. It might have given them a tool in which they could have approached the board and said now, look, you have that amount of money, it is only available if you keep the school operating; it is not available if you don't. That is the

idea. Now, I don't know again, about all the mechanics and you people have the experts in your department, but I certainly think it is something worth looking into.

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes, I appreciate the hon. member bringing up this kind of concern. It is out of this kind of concern that we picked up from meeting unit boards throughout the province that we made the adjustments we did to the formula this year, in regard to the sparsity factor, the enrolment drop, transportation costs and so on. I am very proud of the work the department did in the adjustments to the formula this year and certainly you know, we are willing to examine this kind of thing. But we do really want to do this with the trustees of the province so that, for instance, they don't feel we are building in factors that really remove their autonomy and their responsibility for decision making. I think the hon. member would agree that that is where the responsibility should be and if we sort of build in some factors that they feel constrain them in certain ways, we may end up with a very unhappy situation.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested and I must say, amused, by the remarks made by the minister when he said that it is very important that they respect local autonomy, in answer to the questions which the member for Maple Creek made. He also mentioned that local autonomy is a meaningful thing with the province of Saskatchewan - a statement which I agree with but I think that if there is any department in this government that does not respect local autonomy, it is the Department of Education. And let me just give an example of this, Mr. Chairman, let me give just one example of this and I relate to the Herbert School Unit. Last fall, the Herbert School Unit asked for permission, in their capital construction program, to enlarge their gymnasium. They also asked for other capital projects to expand some of the schools within their school unit. The Department of Education O.K.'d those capital expansions. They O.K.'d the capital expansion for the Herbert High School gymnasium. But what they said to that local school unit board is, fine, we will give you a grant for your capital construction as long as you build within our guidelines. So the local school unit came back to the Department of Education and said, look, the grant that you are providing according to your guidelines is good enough for us but what we want to do is we want to build that gymnasium 22 feet larger because we feel that for future projections the need of that school is for 22 feet larger. All we are asking for is not an additional grant to take care of the extra 22 feet, give us the regular grant according to stipulations. We will be able to look after the rest in terms of our budget. The Department of Education then came back to the Herbert School Unit and said, you either build that gymnasium according to our stipulations or you get no grant whatsoever.

So the decision was then left up to the Herbert School Unit as to whether to go ahead with the gymnasium that did meet their requirements or not build one at all. I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the local school trustees within the town of Herbert recommended to the school unit that they not go ahead and waste the money in building a gymnasium that would not meet the future requirements, with the result that they decided not to go ahead with that construction.

I think it's time, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Education make some changes in regard to that particular program. And if the local school unit through its own mill rate is willing to take the majority of the costs and construct a gymnasium that is going to meet the future needs of that particular community and to meet the needs which that community has right now, is a decision which they in turn make themselves. And if we want to protect local autonomy, why did your department not allow the local autonomy

within the Herbert School Unit to go ahead with that particular construction?

**Mr. Faris:** — I want to thank the hon. member for raising this question because he's quite clearly dealing with the area of capital financing as opposed to operating grants. I think it should be said quite clearly and acknowledged by hon. members, who are knowledgeable, that in the operating grants side we have gone a long, long way in regard to local autonomy. In regard to that sector, I can say that when I and my officials visited boards throughout the province, we felt that they were a happy with that side. We did find that there are problems in regard to the capital financing side and I'm glad you raised the question. This year, there was of course no request from the Herbert unit for the gymnasium in Herbert, rather there was a request concerning the gymnasium in Chaplin. That gymnasium requested by the board was approved by the department just a few weeks ago. I don't know if the hon. member has been informed of that by his board but the one for Chaplin has been approved. That's one piece of information.

Secondly, I want to say and this maybe the first time this hon. member has heard it but I have said on other occasions that we are at present reviewing the guidelines and approach to capital financing in consultation with the trustees in the province. As a result of the meetings we held through the province, we informed the Trustees' Association executive that we intended to undertake this study with their input. And we want to move more in the kind of direction which has been suggested by the member and we are presently looking at our guidelines and consulting. I'm hopeful that for next year we'll have this new approach for capital funding in place.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — I hope that that will be in place by next year and I'll keep my fingers crossed but in regard to Chaplin it was not a change in policy. What happened was the grant was approved, I think through co-operation with the Department of Culture and Youth and through the co-operation of the town itself. That was the only reason that addition was made. It was not construction costs completely borne by the Herbert School Unit. There were funds coming from outside the Herbert School Unit that would be applied towards that particular case.

Now, if the minister is serious about the fact that there will be local autonomy in terms of capital construction and that they will not abide by their guidelines, hopefully, the Herbert School Unit can then reapply and be treated with a little bit more local autonomy next year than they were last year.

**Mr. Faris:** — I'm quite hopeful that we'll have those guidelines in place for next year and the kind of thing that you are suggesting will take place. But I do want to say that the department heartedly welcomes and encourages the kind of co-operation with the local community through using grants from Culture and Youth and so on to build multipurpose facilities. We do encourage that wherever possible. We do intend to modify our guidelines and approach in the general direction suggested by the member.

**Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Chairman, I think the strategy in bringing education back before the House tonight is probably a wise one from at least the minister's point of view because most of us, I think, are reasonably drained and not particularly interested in talking very much more about education after Bill 22. I understand that if Toronto is tied, it is now 2-2 and that's just got to be super news.

A couple of things that I would like to comment upon. When the Minister of Finance announced in the budget an intention for the government to get itself involved in



construction programs, capital construction programs, I have to say that it was my thinking at the time that it would likely mean that there would be appropriations through municipal affairs for example and through the Department of Education for increased funding that would be more under the control of local government than the provincial government. And I was therefore rather surprised to note that the capital construction program in terms of overall dollars this year for the Department of Education is down over what it was over a year ago. I would be interested in having the minister comment on that fact. The amount of money appropriated this year for capital construction is down over what it was a year ago.

The whole question of local autonomy is one which we can debate philosophically for a long while. The minister indicated that there is a great deal of local autonomy is so far as the operating portion of a school unit budget is concerned. Of course the minister doesn't comment about the fact that the greatest single expenditure that school boards have is beyond their control, and I'm talking about teachers salaries. Teachers salaries which make up between 65 and 72 per cent of a school board's operation. It is out of their control and not only is it out of their control locally, but it's out of trustees' control provincially because of the makeup of the bargaining team. Direct government control no matter how you want to cut it of the greatest single expenditure that school boards have in education in Saskatchewan. I think it's important that we understand that. I think that we can all take a look at that kind of thing and tie it back into the legislation which we gave third reading to tonight. Not only in so far as that long list of duties in 372 or whatever it was, but also that concern that I still have - I hope I'm not paranoid about it - but that concern that I still have about 91(c); the entire question about where we are going with regard to regional offices in Saskatchewan, I know that we have more of them than we used to have, the role of the people in those offices. So the whole question of local control versus central control as I say, I think it is a debatable point and still open to a philosophical debate that maybe would go on and on.

I'm interested to note on another point before I take my seat that the question of special education which has been mandated in Saskatchewan for children who have learning disabilities and I think those of us who are involved would say that's good, shows in this year's estimates a cut by 50 per cent in the staff in the department for special education services, a cut from 12 to 6. That frankly surprises me. The whole question of dealing with youngsters who have learning disabilities and learning problems is one which we have begun to grapple with in Saskatchewan, but one where we still have a long way to go. The entire question of the formula which students must meet, in order to get additional funding, requires a tremendous amount of expertise on the part of people who are trained in testing youngsters, both at the local level and at the regional level or at the provincial level. And so I'm surprised that that's the case particularly when we have just adopted a piece of legislation which begins to move into the area of gifted children. While we are not in a position of being mandated in that area, we are in a position where there is some emphasis being given to it, emphasis that ought to be given to it and recognition that there is another whole area where special education in the broad sense becomes more important rather than less important.

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes, if I might begin with your first question in regard to capital construction. In fact the square footage being built this year is higher than last year. We are in the situation where the unit costs are lower, we are also in a situation where in fact this year there are not any really big projects; there are lots of little projects throughout the province but square footage too is in fact higher this year. I think that we can say that no school unit will go without facilities or improved facilities because of a lack of capital grants. We have had sufficient money to meet the needs.

Secondly, in regard to the decision in regard to teachers salaries. We had 10.8 per cent grant increases but the teachers salaries were brought in at, I think, a very just and reasonable settlement, a figure of about 7 per cent. And that is a decision which was reached by that joint government-trustee team on a consensus basis and I may say that relating that to salary increases in items that are under control and so it is somewhat lower. I know in some of the cities where monetary items related to their local bargaining came in at 9 per cent and so on or I can think of some areas where locally employed superintendents got increases far in excess of that.

In regard to the question concerning special education in regarding the question of special education, perhaps more detail can be given under the item but I would say that what we have done in fact is move some people from that branch out to regions. We have seven additional consultants in regional offices and educational consultants added from core services. So there are, in fact, more people but it is just under different votes. And that can be explained when we get to the votes.

**Mr. Penner:** — Just a couple of points if I may. It doesn't matter how you want to cut the teachers salary component, Mr. Minister, you still are in a position where the greatest percentage of the school board's budget is determined outside of the control of the local authority. The minister talked about the fact that we have had great increases in our grants and I think if we are going to be fair we have to say that grants have increased but at the same time mill rates have increased dramatically in the last four or five years. And you can take all kinds of school jurisdictions around the province and show where, in fact, that has happened, where mill rates are up 30, 40, 50 per cent in that four year period. So you know, it is not just a question of the big brother, the Department of Education, throwing more money in. There have been tremendous increases in costs right across the board for no other reason than inflation, that it hit school districts hard. While there have been increased grants, there have been significant increases in taxation at the local level as well.

With regard to the capital program, I am interested in your comments that the unit cost is lower and I suppose we have to say that that is, in the long run that is good. I wonder if the minister would indicate whether in the total amount of money that is appropriated for capital construction there is any of that that is kept in abeyance for emergencies and, if the answer to that is yes, what kind of a figure do you use to sort of hold back for emergency situations?

**Mr. Faris:** — Virtually all of the money is assigned. There is not this certain percentage holdback for emergencies that was suggested. So you can't have it.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Mr. Chairman, just one final comment. The minister indicated the foundation grant formula and the general acceptance that boards have with the formula, I think that is correct. I would just like to inform the minister that I believe the program was around in 1971.

**Mr. Faris:** — I would like to inform the gentleman there is considerably a different program from 1971 which is considerably improved. Furthermore, I'd like to point out that in 1971 approximately 48 per cent of the cost of operating the school system in the province was directly borne by the provincial government. That percentage increase is up to 58 per cent now and if you add in the property improvement grants which are often ignored which now this year will be covering 25 mills, that is to a farmer with a \$15,000 assessed value, the dollar value of \$375, the province is now bearing

close to 75 per cent of the school cost in the province. That is less than 50 per cent to close to 75 per cent and that is a pretty good change in a seven year period. So I am sure the hon. members will agree it has been a terrific improvement over the last seven years.

Item 1 agreed.

## Item 2

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just one or two questions on the correspondence school. I believe it is a year ago we had a change in the operation of the correspondence school and that the grades one to eight instruction was removed from the correspondence school and we had to make arrangements out of province, particularly with the province of Alberta. Can the minister give us some sort of an indication what the demand was for those services, the correspondence course services for people who are unable to attend schools from grades one to eight and how the arrangement with the province of Alberta is working. I know that initially there was some problem with the province of Alberta in getting them to accept students and it took quite a length of time until you went through all that red tape that they had.

**Mr. Faris:** — One the year before last; none in the last year.

Item 2 agreed.

Items 3 and 4 agreed.

## Item 5

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just one question, Mr. Minister. I noticed that you are almost doubling the budget here. Your staff is not increasing relative to the size of that portion or section within the department. Would the minister indicate what his intentions are?

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes, the cost increases in this section are that we have centralized our printing costs; that is one factor. The other factor is that, as I announced to the trustees at their convention earlier this year, I am going to try to take some steps to improve communications with the education world. One project that we are looking at very seriously is to have some sort of magazine or information piece directly for parents, to inform parents about what is going on in education in the province. We feel this is sort of a missing link. This is a new project that we are proposing.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I am rather interested in that last proposition that you have. How did you intend to circulate such a pamphlet to parents in the \$50,000 or \$60,000? Also, within the department, I think on two or three occasions in the past you started to have sort of newsletters that were supposed to come out on a regular basis and then they seemed to fade away and seldom, if ever, came. I do not know what happened. Maybe the minister could comment on that. Were they not successful and you decided to phase them out? Then again, would you elaborate on this business of communication with parents? We hope that it is not going to be sort of a political arm for the department in which you can communicate a lot of niceties and such.

**Mr. Faris:** — We really have not determined yet how we are going to do the distribution of that parental magazine but I can assure you that if it is of a political

nature it would be resented by everyone concerned. Certainly that will not be the approach at all. I think the members will agree that there is sort of an information gap between the parents and the education system and we want to overcome that.

In regard to the other matter, I have raised with my officials this problem which you have indicated, the off and on again sort of communication. It seems to me, to give an example, that there is a very good information piece which comes out in regard to educational matters from the Department of Education in Ontario. I do not know whether the hon. members know that information piece but I would really like to see something like that go on so that people within the educational world, superintendents, teachers, trustees and the department could sort of keep up with new developments. I am looking at that. I do feel there has been a problem of a failure of communication in this area.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I would just like to agree and I hope that the minister and his staff are able to devise something.

I think something on a more regular basis is much more satisfactory. You sort of expect it to come and if it is well done you keep track of it. On the other hand, if you get one one year and then the next one is six months down and the next one is a year and a half away, you just do not keep in memory what you have been receiving.

Item 5 agreed.

Items 6 to 8 agreed.

## **Item 9**

**Mr. Penner:** — Mr. Chairman, just a minute here. I hope I'm in an area where the minister will discuss the point with me. It has to do with curriculums that have been coming out in mass to the point that people can't possibly cope with understanding what's in them and I'm referring specifically to the area of physical education. We have had more physical education stuff perpetrated on the schools in Saskatchewan in the last year and one half than I ever thought would be possible to get so much of it. Now nobody can argue that physical education is not important. Nobody can argue that it's not extremely important that we develop positive attitudes in children in terms of physical activity and it's regularly understood to be important. I want to say to the minister that I think there is an area where he can save some money. Don't send out any more curriculums on phys ed and give us an opportunity to allow the thousands and thousands of pages that have already been distributed to be read and understood by people in the classroom. Because there has been so much of it, nobody has even had a change to . . . You know what the staff is like, you can take the phys ed curriculum and study guides and all the rest of it, you'd have a stock like that. I would suggest to the minister that he ask his people to leave it alone for a while.

**Mr. Romanow:** — No, never.

**Mr. Faris:** — The member for Riversdale is assisting me. Thank you very much member. One of the very positive and exciting thrusts of this department over the past few years since the hon. member for Last Mountain started a study into the phys ed area is a really positive emphasis on phys ed in our schools in the province. Something that I am just 100 per cent behind. I think it would be fair to say that we are five or ten years ahead of other provinces in the phys ed area because of the initiative taken by the

minister. In regard to curriculum, I don't think there is a lot of curriculum. There is material, which is of a teach aid or lesson plan sort of nature, which is an optional kind of material and I think that's what the member is criticizing. My officials inform me that for everybody that criticizes that material, there are others who praise it. I'm sure that the member for Riversdale will want to rise to his feet and defend this material.

**Mr. Penner:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, nobody can argue about the importance of the activity. I want to say that. The minister talks about Saskatchewan being 25 years ahead of the time. I don't know, or ten years or five years, five years is it, five to ten? Well, you are 25 to 30 in material supply. That's my point. I think it's great that in terms of the kind of program we've got in the school, that it's there. I think it's great that kids are involved. If we can get more kids involved in learning life long material with skills in school, the better off we are going to be as a society. No question about that. But please, let's let ourselves catch up to that stack of material and cease and desist from any more of it for a while so that we can, in fact, you know, materialize some of the material that has come. I think we're getting to the point where people are just starting to groan, not because they don't think that phys ed is good, but they are starting to groan because here's another one and here's another one and that's the only point I make.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I would just like to add to this. I had the experience this year of accompanying one of the physical education consultants as he went around to meet with some of the elementary school teachers in the jurisdiction in which I worked and he took the reams of material and brought it into each one of them and I had the very strong feeling, in fact I am sure that because of the large volume of it, much of it isn't even read. His very first task was to identify the grade level at which the teacher was operating, take the book and rip out a section here, take another book and rip out a section there, take another book, rip out a section there, take another one, rip it out there and then put the staples to it. As he was doing this and getting that thing down from this huge pile down to this, you could just see the teacher's eyes start to lighten up. They finally had some sort of a tool in which they were going to be used. One other comment I would like to make is this. After we've been in the program for about five years or four years, I'm not quite sure how many years it is, but when you start something like this, there comes a time when you should evaluate it. I'm wondering if you haven't reached that stage now and I would like to suggest though if it's going to be an evaluation, you're probably going to have to do this evaluation from somebody outside of the department. I don't think you can get a real good evaluation by using a lot of the people that are within the program and were responsible for implementing the program. If you are going to get evaluation that is really worth something I think you have to have somebody, who comes in and does the evaluation, that wasn't part of the sort of the pilot project to get it going. You know there is an old saying, 'Can you find a pilot project that fails?' They all seem to succeed at first. I think we are really at a period now when there should be some evaluation. I don't want to be a sceptic, but I do feel that it really hasn't caught on as well as it should.

**Mr. Faris:** — There is ongoing evaluation and the lighthouse project is part of this. We are not satisfied that the whole program has been picked up; it hasn't throughout the whole province and the lighthouse project and evaluations built into that are part of our ongoing evaluation. I share your concern.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I know there are some people who are working very hard in order to get this program going and they really started with a new concept and a new idea of physical education and it is going to take a lot of years in order to get it going. But,

again, as I said earlier, I think that we should be doing some sort of an independent evaluation by somebody who wasn't really responsible for introducing the program and see just how far we have come.

Item 9 agreed.

Items 10 and 11 agreed.

## **Item 12**

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just a couple of comments here. First of all I would like the minister to just outline the consultants, where they are. I know you might not be able to identify all the consultants that are going to be appointed next year because there is some control at the regional level as to the type of consultant that they are going to employ. But could you just give me a rundown of where these 13 consultants are located?

**Mr. Faris:** — These are provincial consultants?

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Pardon me, are these the ones who are working out of Regina? Are they not the ones that are attached to the regional offices?

**Mr. Faris:** — The ones working out of regional offices are under the superintendent's vote, vote 14.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Could you outline the 13 provincial ones, please?

**Mr. Faris:** — O.K. There is one director, one chief physical education, six educational consultants, two in French, one in driver education, one in guidance, one in industrial arts, one with the Saskatchewan High School Athletic Association and there are five clerical and stenographic positions.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Will there be any change in the next year, or are you intending to keep these people in the same areas? For instance, there have been demands for home economic consultants and the likes like that. That is going to be the same group that you are keeping this coming year?

**Mr. Faris:** — Those are for next year.

Item 12 agreed.

## **Item 13**

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Would the minister explain, please, the drop from 12 to 6?

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes, there were seven education consultants who went out to regional offices. That is a drop of seven. There was a gain of one to deal with severely handicapped from core services and that makes the drop of six.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I didn't quite follow you in the explanation you gave. There were 12 people that were attached last year and there are six that apparently going to be attached in the year. Are you eliminating six positions?

**Mr. Faris:** — There were 12 positions last year. This year there are six in head office

and seven have moved out to the regional offices so they are not in this vote. One has moved in, but there is more people but they are just in different votes.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Is it your intention to have an educational psychologist or a similar person attached to each one of the regional offices?

**Mr. Faris:** — We have an educational co-ordinator in each office, a special education co-ordinator in each office in the future.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Is that an objective that you are going to be trying to accomplish this coming year? You know I think of one of the regions that I am familiar with and we haven't a special education co-ordinator attached to this one here. I think my friend here, from Saskatoon, indicated earlier that some of the problems you have in these areas now are identifying people and working with people in the special education category and I believe at one time there was a statement made that even one of these offices and it was the intention to have one of these people attached to one of the regional offices and would the minister indicate, does each regional office have one of these special education consultants attached to it and if not which ones and are the other ones going to receive them?

**Mr. Faris:** — We do intent to have it in all areas. Two of the regions will not have it this year. We are still striving to reach that goal.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Would the minister identify the two regions?

**Mr. Faris:** — Swift Current and North Battleford.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — We have been without one down in that Swift Current area ever since you appointed the assistant regional superintendent as regional superintendent and then he was the assistant regional superintendent. He was also assuming the role at that time of special education. So this, really I was wondering why that particular area is the one that is chosen again to be without somebody in this area. This is going on now even before if you assume the previous assistant regional superintendent was a quarter time educational consultant and three-quarter time assistant regional superintendent. Certainly he was doing both jobs, and you can't call him a full time special education consultant. Why isn't there some emphasis given to the Swift Current area to clear up a problem that has come about over the last few years and the fact that we have never had anybody in that area?

**Mr. Faris:** — Our regional superintendent down in that area has considerable expertise and will try to fill in. There is no question about it, we have excellent men in that area like Mr. Volk and they do the work of 10 men. We also have such good superintendents in that area. They don't need as much assistance.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — None of that, but I think the regional superintendent's role is as such, and I'm sure that it's a full time occupation or a full time position in itself and the minister is playing with words. What I would ask the minister to do is to treat us fairly down there in Region 2. How about having another consultant, finding one, advertising it and appointing it. We want to be on the same basis as everyone else.

**Mr. Faris:** — Well, it's nice of the hon. member to take this approach. We are anxious of course to get these positions filled as quickly as we can, but unfortunately we do get considerable criticism from the opposition for having too many civil servants. If you will

just tell the people of Saskatchewan that you don't mind if we increase the number of civil servants it would take a lot of pressure off us in this regard.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Well, you might be able to reduce one here, take one here, take one out of Regina out of your administrative staff here and give us one and transfer that person and the amount of money down to the Swift Current area. We would certainly be much more pleased with that type of an arrangement.

**Mr. Faris:** — The hon. member can see we have already moved six positions out of Regina, so we certainly are doing everything we can to get these services out to the country.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Will the minister please reconsider then and see if we can find somebody down in that area. I think you can find the amount of money. Somebody said today you have \$6 million or was it \$12 million more for selling oil leases today. Maybe you can talk to Mr. Messer and get some of the money from him.

Item 13 agreed.

#### **Item 14**

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Before I begin my questioning I'd like to make sure that the next series of questions that I'm going to ask does not affect the three superintendents in this legislature because we are all locally employed, so we are not arguing and talking about money that will be paid to any of the superintendents that are in this session or in this legislature.

But we had a position or a peculiarity I guess you might say in the last few years, the two or three years in which we did have superintendents that worked for the Department of Education who were out in rural Saskatchewan who were in fact the superintendents over a unit and had principals under the superintendent and the superintendent himself was being paid considerably less money than the principals whom he was supervising.

Now, surely that's a bad administrative practice. One of the things that you should be doing and I think any administrative manual or any administrative course would indicate that if the person was going to be up the hierarchy, up the line in his superior position, there is no reason why that person should not be on a superior salary schedule. This has been going on, for two or three years or four years, I am not sure of the history, that we have gone into the background. Now last year when we talked about this, the minister said that the problem was the negotiations with SGEA and they were the ones that were the real bad guys and if it were not for those problems you would be willing to pay these people the amounts of money. Now, I suggest that is just a bunch of pure hogwash. That if you want to pay these people, you can go to your bargaining committee, your team of people who are negotiating with the civil service. Now, I would like to ask the minister, is it a fact, does this situation still exist where you have superintendents in the field who are paid less money than the principals whom they supervise?

**Mr. Faris:** — Well my deputy tells me that can be indeed the situation now and he reflects that it was the situation 20 years ago. That is not a new situation. But in regard to this, I find it a rather strange position for the member to say, well, this is none of the responsibility of the SGEA, who bargain for these people. That is a very strange position



indeed. It is a real cop-out of responsibility on the part of the people who are supposed to be taking part in free collective bargaining. It is fine for us to say, as employers, that we would like this sort of thing but in the total context of collective bargaining, they have to take some responsibility. I will say too that there is just no way that we can expect our provincially employed superintendents to keep up with some of the salaries of locally employed superintendents. When some of the locally employed superintendents are receiving far more than the Minister of Education, it does sort of throw things out of whack.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Mr. Minister, when you start resorting to arguments that say, ‘it was that way 20 years ago and therefore should remain that way’, that is absolutely ridiculous. Those arguments are just not valid at this time. You know, this is an inequality that I think you should be trying to do something about. It is a morale problem amongst the people who work for you, there is no doubt about it. It is a form of discrimination and your other argument about what locally employed superintendents get is not related to this one. We are talking about the fact of the relationship that exists between the principal, and the superintendent who is supervising. That is the situation we are talking about. Now I would like to know, have you at any time gone to the people who bargain for the government and asked them to take care of this situation?

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes we have. We have told them from our side but then there is the other side to a free collective bargaining agreement; if the SGEA in its negotiations takes this or that tact and so on, that is not our responsibility. But quite obviously, every department is concerned about that sort of thing. The fact is, it is not widely recognized, but this certainly is not discrimination against this group. With regard to the entire provincial salary scale, regional superintendents, people in the department and so on, are all in a sort of a relationship and in relation to people who are privately employed, like locally employed superintendents or people in private industry, the salary scales are relatively low. That must be granted. They are low in regard to other provinces and we do lose good people to other provinces because of that. But I don’t hear the opposition in general arguing that we should hire more civil servants, unless they happen to want some in their particular area and I don’t really hear them arguing we should pay them more. In fact, I hear a lot of criticisms that we pay them too much!

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Mr. Minister, are you saying that the problem lies right within SGEA and their bargaining team?

**Mr. Faris:** — No, I did not say that. That is simply one of the factors in the situation. I have explained a lot of factors. I have said one of the problems lies within the opposition.

**Mr. Penner:** — Well, in what way . . . go on to this question. Would you agree that your assistant regional superintendents out to be out of scope?

**Mr. Faris:** — I won’t express a view on that.

**Mr. Penner:** — I did not hear your reply.

**Mr. Faris:** — I am not going to express a view on that.

**Mr. Penner:** — You are not prepared to express a view on that?

**Mr. Faris:** — No.

**Mr. Penner:** — What I hear the minister saying then is, that as minister in charge of the Department of Education, he is not prepared to express a view with regard to assistant regional superintendents and their function, and their being out of scope. Is that correct?

**Mr. Faris:** — I can express a question as to their function, as to their function. You changed your question.

**Mr. Penner:** — Let's get at the function aspect of it then. What do you consider the function of the assistant regional superintendent to be?

**Mr. Faris:** — This kind of decision whether in scope or out of scope and so on, is a decision of the Public Service Commission, not of my department. We have a certain amount of input but you know, we can argue the case back and forth. I don't think that is a crucial question in education.

**Mr. Penner:** — Would you care to indicate what, in your opinion, is the significance or the importance of the role of the assistant regional superintendent?

**Mr. Faris:** — There are simply scores of ways of entering into this problem but his major function is to see that there is sound program development within his region. You could define in another way his job is to assist the regional superintendent. But I find it a very nebulous kind of question.

**Mr. Penner:** — Does the minister view the role of the assistant regional superintendent as being significant in the overall administrative organization of the Department of Education?

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes.

**Mr. Penner:** — Would the minister not agree that the only reason that he is not prepared to go to bat for having assistant regional superintendents out of scope is because he is concerned that it may, in fact, force the salary scale of superintendents employed by the Department of Education up into a realistic position when one looks at other salaries paid in the field of education in this province and elsewhere?

**Mr. Faris:** — There are lots of explanations, the simple answer is simply no. The Public Service Commission is in this whole area.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I would like to make one more comment in this area with regard to the superintendent's salary. I feel probably there is a reluctance on the part of the minister to make adjustments to these people who are out in the field because the minute that he makes these adjustments he knows that within his own department that all the people within the department will also be related and there will be salary adjustments within the department and it is because he is afraid of this mushrooming effect and giving people within his own department raises then that he is reluctant to pay these people in the field when what is really a justifiable wage in relation to what the principal is earning.

**Mr. Faris:** — Well, I can only say the member doesn't seem to understand the way this whole system operates. That is not a decision of the minister. That is a decision that is

arrived at between the Public Service Commission and the SGEA and the minister does not establish that level.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I just can't be convinced that if you wanted to use your influence that adjustments could be made and I am sorry.

Item 14 agreed.

## Item 15

**Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Conservative Opposition):** — Mr. Chairman, what jobs make up the \$20,000 a year or \$20,000 a piece on an average, what jobs make up these this education administration personal services?

**Mr. Faris:** — The staff includes a director, two analysts, a consultant on school administration, a chief of facilities planning, two facilities planners, both of whom are architects, the chief of school grants, the senior negotiator, the research officer, and nine clerical and stenographic positions.

**Mr. Collver:** — So this particular item would include the cost of the architects who presumably design the schools that are allocated under grants to schools, capital under the next item that we are coming to - item 17. Is that what these two architects do?

**Mr. Faris:** — They don't design the schools, they offer advice and evaluate the plans and they are the people who help develop guidelines to the policy and so on.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, it is our understanding that the change in the structures of the schools around the province of Saskatchewan has diminished substantially, in other words, the capital expenditures relative to inflation have gone down. I am sure that the minister can recognize a \$300,000 drop in the allocation in the next item is in fact given inflation and especially in the construction industry is, in fact, quite a substantial drop in the allocation to grants for schools.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Another nightmare!

**Mr. Collver:** — Another nightmare. Goodness gracious. From \$9,400,000 when there has been in the last year in the construction industry at least a 20 per cent inflation factor is not a drop.

**Mr. Faris:** — I want to thank the Minister of Finance for his assistance . . . the member obviously was not in the House when we discussed this earlier. We are building more square footage this year than last year. The per unit cost has dropped.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, that may have been true on a per unit basis, I do not think the minister would suggest that on a per square footage basis that the per square footage cost has dropped from one year in the construction, has actually dropped. Is that what you are saying to me?

**Mr. Faris:** — The tenders are down on the square footage basis this year.

**Mr. Collver:** — Is that the good work of the two architects in the department, Mr. Minister? Is that what they have done to make the contribution, is by redesigning the

schools, because I don't think anyone, even the Minister of Finance responsible for Saskatchewan Housing, would suggest that it cost less today to build today than it did a year ago.

**An Hon. Member:** — You get your information . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Oh, no. No, no.

**Mr. Faris:** — On a rough average, my officials inform me that last year the cost was \$42 per square foot and it is down this year to \$37, on the average. This was undoubtedly due to the good work of the architects in the department, my deputy minister, the minister, and also has something to do with the situation in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, it might also have something to do with the building of buildings that you are building, too, Mr. Minister, and, perhaps, if you are building technical schools in the city, the size of which and the kind of facilities in which increase the cost per square foot, then I don't think you can compare it. What I am getting at is, and that is why I was asking questions under this item 15, these two architects that sit in your department, there has been criticism around the province in the last year or so that some of the plans that are coming out are very, very utilitarian, to put it mildly, in terms of . . . No, but they are the ones who are there to give the advice.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, if these two architects - and we realize they don't draw the plans - do they advise on the specifications desired by the Department of Education in the compilation of the kind of plans that should be drawn by private architects, in the building of schools? Yes or no.

**Mr. Faris:** — I am sorry I can't answer yes or no; it is such an interesting question.

The boards get their own architects and they come up with the plans and so on. There have been guidelines developed that - again I am sorry the member wasn't here earlier, because in regard to a question from the member for Morse. I indicated that these guidelines are going to be examined and the question of more local flexibility in regard to capital projects is being examined in consultation with the SSTA and I hope we will have a new program with more flexibility in place for next year.

**Mr. Collver:** — That is, of course, one of the things we are getting at, but the other thing we are getting at is, if that is true, if there is a plan to bring about a dramatic increase in the flexibilities to local boards, can the architects design the kind of plans for the kind of schools that they would like to see in the area, given certain cost restraints? What is going to be the function of the two architects in the department under this particular arrangement? If architects are going to do the job at say a 6 per cent fee, which is normal, or I suppose it has gone in some areas to 7 per cent, if the architects are going to do the job of designing the schools, if the local boards are going to make the kind of input that they are going to do, or supposed to do, what are these two architects that are employed by the Department of Education going to do with reference to building schools in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Faris:** — We expect them still to be involved in the general assessment and evaluation of plans and the offering of advice. Quite frankly, the input that I get from boards around the province is that they are very grateful for that sort of advice. They will be involved, for instance, in giving advice on renovations; they are involved in the

question of energy conservation, which is recently important for public buildings as well as private dwellings. But I get the feedback from the boards around the province that they are very pleased about the advisory capacity. They question the regulatory role and we are going to be moving them, quite frankly, out of the regulatory role and more into the positive advisory kind of role and I think this will be very much appreciated throughout the province.

**Mr. Collver:** — That is a very interesting concept and I am glad the minister suggested that, that the department is moving into an advisory role.

Would the minister not agree, therefore, that in order to get the best possible advice for the Department of Education in the building of schools across the province, that perhaps private architects in private practice, might offer the minister more flexibility in being able to provide different kinds of advice from various areas, rather than full time employed architects with the department, who might perhaps develop a narrow view of the problem? Would you not think that perhaps the department might be further ahead to not expend - and I don't know what the portion is, perhaps the minister would like to tell us what the total cost of architectural services, under this item 15 is - but does the minister think that it might be possible that you get more flexibility by engaging, from time to time on the request of boards, privately employed and private consulting architects?

**Mr. Faris:** — The architects of the province are very busy on school projects all the time. The fact is though that they're not expert in this area. That's just part of their overall business. These men that we have are more knowledgeable, more expert because they're spending all of their time in this area and they're able for instance to gather information from other parts of Canada, North America and become real experts and give advice which is not available from people who are not specialists in this area. So, the private people are fully occupied but they do not have the expertise of the men we have.

**Mr. Collver:** — Is the minister suggesting in his comments now, that by employing private architects in private practice that they don't have the expertise in the construction and design of schools that the architects that are employed by the Department of Education have? Is that what the minister basically is saying, that these men have recognized qualifications above those in private practice in terms of the design of schools, is that what he's trying to say?

**Mr. Faris:** — I didn't say anything about qualifications. I'm just saying the amount of time these gentlemen spend in this area, the amount of time they spend on research, the ability they have to draw together information from all over the province . . . that's not applicable to private architects. They simply have too wide a range of work and they don't have the time to specialize in this area.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, there are a number of architectural firms in the province of Saskatchewan of that great experience in terms of the construction of schools. They've also had far more experience in terms of the construction industry itself. They have far more experience in terms of keeping costs down as an example than would architects employed by the Department of Education. Now, my question basically to you is this. Again, I repeat, the architects who are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan and the Department of Education, you say are there to

compile information. Now surely, you don't take an architect's training and pay an architect's salary to compile information. Surely that could be done by a research officer or someone of that nature in terms of compiling information from around the province. You say they don't actually design the schools or design the renovations themselves. They provide advice, you say, from this compilation of information around the schools, but the local boards of education are going to employ a private architectural firm to actually do the construction or the renovating work. You say that from now on they are not going to be involved in a regulatory fashion over the school boards, that they are going to be there in an advisory position. You say, furthermore, that you are not saying that their qualifications are greater than those architects in private practice.

The question I am asking you, therefore, is, since they are moving out of the regulatory role; since they are not involved in the drawing of plans for local school boards and for schools - those are done by the architects themselves who are in the private industry - would it not be better to get a wider range of expertise in the Department of Education to make it available for advice, through the Department of Education, to local school boards rather than have full time employed architects in the department? And, furthermore, would it not be better and more meaningful with reference to what the member for Morse suggested and you agreed was about to happen, and that is that the department is moving out of the regulatory role and into the advisory role, would you not suggest that the school boards would perceive the department as less regulatory if you didn't have actual architects on staff, appearing to regulate the building of schools?

**Mr. Faris:** — No.

Item 15 agreed.

#### **Item 16**

**Mr. Bailey:** — I suppose this is the one area of the Education estimates which produces the most interest, at least, at one time of the year, generally speaking the later part of March.

It is always with great anticipation that the various boards across the province take a look at the grant structure. I have said before and I will repeat again, that in my time that I have been in education I have said that the present grant formula, the format, is probably the best format that I have seen and I am not saying that it is not without some discrepancies. I don't suppose there is a chance of even producing a perfect grant, that is a grant that would satisfy all people at least.

Mr. Minister, there are a few areas in the province that I do know that your people in Finance are taking a look at and I would like to open up a few of these questions, tonight, in regard to the grants to the schools.

As you know the grants regulated to Division I vary from Division IV and a built-in low-cost factor and so on. But one of the greatest discrepancies, Mr. Minister, that exists in the province is that between the comprehensive school grant and that of the composite school grant. In effect, you do not recognize the composite school as such. Now here we are in rural Saskatchewan attempting to provide a variety of subjects in which you would have four or five of the different subjects which at one time were not normally

considered part of the program. Then we go to the comprehensive school and because of the unique structure there there is a great variance in the grant per student.

Now, I know that the comprehensive people will argue that they require this because of the great variety of programs and I guess that is a good argument. But the stronger argument, I suggest to you, comes from the fact that in the units of Saskatchewan, in the rural areas where they operate a composite school, there is no additional grant available, no matter how hard they may try to increase their programs to make it comparable to the comprehensive school.

I know that you people have looked at this problem in the past and I would like to know if you have done any further study on it. I would appreciate your answer, Mr. Minister.

**Mr. Faris:** — This is a difficult area as the member has, I think, indicated in his question. It is undergoing sort of constant study. I do not think we have any particularly brilliant insights into it. There do seem to be some additional costs in regard to programming; that is, if you compare them across the piece, perhaps a higher level of programming in the comprehensives, but the costs also very clearly related to the difference in the maintenance and operating costs of the plant.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Am I not correct, Mr. Minister, in saying that when the heyday of the comprehensives hit the province we went out building. Most of the comprehensive schools in the province are certainly not filled to their capacity. Some of them are, I imagine, but most of them are running on 60 to 70 per cent at the present time. Am I not correct in stating that one of the reasons why the grant structure of the comprehensive high schools in Saskatchewan is higher is because of the renegeing of the federal government in the operating grants which they promised at the original operation of these schools?

**Mr. Faris:** — I think the hon. member must be referring to the withdrawal from the cost sharing kinds of arrangements we have had in the past. There is no doubt about it, that is a problem. Perhaps we are better off now, really. Maybe we would have been better off if they had never done that; in many areas, I think of education, I think of continuing education, social services and so on, where they started programs off on a cost sharing basis and then withdrew, we have to pick up the pieces. Health is another example. It does present difficulties.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Just a refresher now. What is the grant to a Division IV student at a regular high school (per student) and the grant to a Division IV student at a comprehensive school? Division IV - just simply the difference right now.

**Mr. Faris:** — In the rural area the figure for the Division IV student would be \$1,634; the figure for the comprehensive student would be \$1,801.

**Mr. Bailey:** — That is the point I am trying to make, Mr. Minister. I am sure that my colleague for Maple Creek could give you the same example. I will take the smallest high school which is in my superintendency, in which I am trying to opt for the following programs which are quite above the regular stream where there are no industrial arts, commercial, or typing, to name three. We will have other subjects as well such as home economics and so on. Really, in effect, what is happening here is that when a student attends a rural composite high school where we have great difficulty in maintaining and keeping all these programs going, we are getting a grant of \$1,634 for that Division IV student whereas for the student who is going some 70 miles away they are getting

\$167 more, per student taking the same subjects, Mr. Minister, exactly the same subjects! I think we have to work out this discrepancy. I don't have a comprehensive school in my area and I'm not condemning the comprehensive schools. What I am saying is when you have equal facilities, you know, offering equal programs, then there should be an equal grant structure.

**Mr. Faris:** — The trouble with that one is the problem of plant cost. I think the member suggested some of the history of that and it's unfortunate we can't undo it at this time. I think, in general I would again have to say though that the comprehensives as a group, compared to the composites, would be offering a wider variety of courses still.

**Mr. Bailey:** — I want to get onto another topic on grants, Mr. Minister, and that's something which is brand new to the province, brand new to the point that many boards in many areas of the province are going to be struggling with it. Certainly, if they haven't been touched with it in the last few months, they will be in the immediate years ahead and that's in the developmental centres. Now, these will be recognized by grants, admittedly. I have, myself, established the first in my area, the first developmental centre, with three students involved. Now the grant structure for the students is a great deal higher than the grant per student, say at Division IV.

Here is the situation, Mr. Minister. As we take over the responsibility which formerly rested with the Department of Social Services - I mean what we are doing, in effect, is taking over the responsibility and the cost of the operation totally from the Department of Social Services. Now let me give you an example. In the one classroom that I am operating we have three students involved and the cost of that room, that is beyond the grant structure for those three students, is somewhere in the neighbourhood, I think, of about \$10,000 in addition. Now, that makes the Department of Social Services look pretty good because we, in fact, have taken over their responsibility and their cost.

I'm saying I agree with the philosophy; if the student can be provided with the service then we should have them in their own town. They should be with their parents. They should not be out in some boarding house. We should not force parents to have to move and give up a business in a given district because of the unfortunate circumstances of a deaf child. I agree with that totally. But at the same time we are running a little fiction here, Mr. Minister, because in the high cost of education at the present time, when a board takes a look at providing services for three students and they will have a deficit over and above the grant structure - you know, \$10,000 - it becomes very difficult to accept the new role of the Department of Education and it is a new role, Mr. Minister. I would like to have your comment on that.

**Mr. Faris:** — I want to point out the grant level. I point out to the hon. member that the grant level is very, very high. The grant level is \$4,570. Under Social Services the grant schedule average was under \$3,000 and that's up to \$4,570. We are getting full co-operation from the boards throughout the province. The boards were given the opportunity to opt out if they didn't want to go along with this. They weren't forced into the program. They had a number of options and up to now, I am informed, nobody has opted out and taken that other route. So I can say that compared to the Social Services funding, ours is very attractive but, you know, it is under constant review to see whether this fits. But certainly at this point there seems to be considerable satisfaction.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, let's make sure we are talking about the same thing here. We are not talking about the boards opting out. Under the new legislation, the boards are responsible for the education of these students at a much



younger age than they have ever been before. I don't think it's a case of a board opting out but you just quoted for me that there is approximately, in grant structure, Mr. Minister, for the classrooms not the supplies or anything else - we receive approximately \$13,800 where it is costing in excess of \$23,000, of course, to operate the classroom. Now, while they would be recognized as expenditures in the grant structure, what I am saying, Mr. Minister, is this. It would be cheaper for the board to contract services for these students. It would be cheaper for the board to do so. Now, I want you to follow this very carefully and follow my reasoning for such. Let us say that the three students to which I am referring, I contract their services in Saskatoon, O.K.? And the total bill, everything that the board spends on them, is recognized expenditure on the grant structure, O.K., have you got that? Now, I keep the students at home and provide a service for them so they don't have to be shipped away, so that they can live with their parents, so that the parents don't have to leave their jobs. Now the point is, that you recognize the expenditures per nose, per student, of about \$13,800 and my expense for keeping them at home is \$10,000 greater, because your grant does not cover the total cost of the developmental centre. Now the point I am making, Mr. Minister, is this. If we are going to do this and if you are going to see developmental centres for that type of student (and I hope we do see more), I think you are going to have to recognize the work of the unit boards in the way of a monetary recognition, otherwise you are going to find in the high cost of education that they will continue to want to purchase services under contract outside their jurisdiction.

**Mr. Faris:** — In any particular situation the board has a number of options, that is, they can decide to purchase services locally, like from a developmental centre board which can operate the program rather than have the board operate the program, or the board itself can operate the program locally, or they could, as you suggest, purchase services in a distant community which, as you point out, has a great number of disadvantages. But we feel that the level of funding (and we seem to be getting a fairly good response to this), is quite realistic. If there is an extremely small number of students in any particular local, there is no question there are great difficulties. But there is that kind of break point you know, in any situation. I don't see how we can avoid that.

**Mr. Bailey:** — All right, I can appreciate this and like you know you can't go to a small hospital and demand open heart surgery. You cannot expect in every small centre across the province to get the type of education that is sometimes required for these young people who are very definitely handicapped. But, Mr. Minister, what I am saying (and I want to make this abundantly clear) I think in areas which there is a need and the numbers are there, I don't think boards should be opting out and kind of purchasing service on a piecemeal within the community. I think it then becomes the responsibility of the board of education to provide these services and as long, you know, you are going to have three or four students going to be the maximum in many centres and all I am saying is, it is going to be a very costly thing for the boards to do. I wish that you would recognize it because there may come a time when somebody is going to take a negative view of something which I consider to be very positive.

**Mr. Faris:** — I agree it is a very difficult situation and we have to wrestle with the question of the fact that there are only, what, 135? No, there are about 235 students, possible students in this category, spread throughout the entire province and I think the member has a good point but we have to try to give the boards the autonomy to wrestle with those difficult decisions.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Mr. Chairman, under the operating grants to schools . . . Here we go again, Mr. Minister, to the private schools that operate within the province. I

understand you give a grant by the number of students, not by operating grant or anything, \$800 or something per student. Is that correct?

**Mr. Faris:** — No. They are funded differently. There are no grants for private schools at the elementary level. At the secondary level, we give 53.1 per cent of the regular school grants or \$700 per student for a private high school student.

**Mr. Katzman:** — I believe the minister said \$700 and 53.1 per cent of the operating, is that correct?

**Mr. Faris:** — I said, 'or', \$700 or 53.1 per cent.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Is it which is greater or which is the least.

**Mr. Faris:** — I'm just giving you averages there.

**Mr. Katzman:** — Now in the other schools, it's up as high as \$1,600 or \$1,800 per student . . . 85 per cent. Is there any figures you can use to compare them?

**Mr. Faris:** — There are different figures for kindergarten, Division I and II, Division III, Division IV, comprehensive and then the different levels of handicap.

**Mr. Katzman:** — I think that first of all, I would like to thank the minister for . . . I understand you've doubled your grant in the last few years to the private schools and my only concern is it the intention to stay with that 53.1 as the costs go up, the grant will continue to rise in that proportion?

**Mr. Faris:** — It will be at 58 per cent so it will be an increasing percentage.

**Mr. Katzman:** — When you say 58, is there a formula you have within your department to bring it up to what the others get . . . that you're suggesting another raise next year?

**Mr. Faris:** — It will be in line with the percentage of funding from the province to other schools next year.

Item 16 agreed.

## **Item 17**

**Mr. Bailey:** — I want to get to the minister with a very severe problem which is facing practically every school board in Saskatchewan. The former minister of Education when he announced a grant in this House and I was sitting listening to it, and that was a grant to repair roofs. And at the time I heard that, I thought, thank goodness something is coming through. And when I got home and read what the grant was all about it really didn't do much good because it had to be applied to one given building and it had to be related to a mill and so on . . . it really wasn't of too much value.

Mr. Minister, most of the schools that we have in rural Saskatchewan were built in the '50s and they were very poorly built in many respects. We had some architects that came in here and then flew the country. I think the hon. member will agree to that. We got left with some real dandies. I don't think that there's a flat roof any school jurisdiction

that I know of that isn't pouring through with every rain . . . deteriorating the walls, the tile on the floor and, Mr. Minister, it's the one area which is causing more problems in the maintenance of the structure of school buildings than all of the other problems put together. Now, you announced a grant structure last year and if I can remember correctly, the grant structure had to equal the equivalent of one mill. Now, when you go to repair a roof of a school and a gymnasium all built in one structure, you are taking a look at an expenditure in the neighbourhood of \$50,000. Now, you've got Eston in my own particular case, it would take in the neighbourhood of \$300,000 to get our roofs in shape.

Now, the grant formula which you have really doesn't help very much. I'm not saying it's of no value, I'm saying it really doesn't help very much. Now, another problem with this, and I want to get back to the point that it's the biggest single problem in building maintenance that we have. So what does a board do? They've had people coming out over the last ten years and throwing a bit of tar around and patching and putting some membrane on, and sprinkling a little gravel and that's all right for two rains but after the third rain, it's leaking again. Boards all over the province are calling in so-called experts, not only from this province but from Alberta and Manitoba to take a look at this big serious problem facing rural Saskatchewan.

I have a suggestion, Mr. Minister, that the department should take up. Those boards out there are just guessing as to what may be the best remedy. They're just guessing, and they're guessing with a lot of money, Mr. Minister. Now I have heard that if the bearing walls will hold up you cover this whole area with steel, or take and strip a 2 x 10 on a gradual basis and get some slope to it, but nobody seems to have an answer. Every expert who comes in to discuss it has a different way of solving the problem and we boards out there need the help of the Department of Education.

**An Hon. Member:** — Burn the school.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Well if we burned the school we would be better off because at the present time we would probably get some kind of a grant to rebuilt and we wouldn't build them that way again.

What I'm saying, Mr. Minister, is that I think the time is ripe for the Department of Education to do a bit of a study on this so that you can get some information out to the boards as to how to proceed, and certainly to caution boards about proceeding if it is only going to be a temporary 18-month deal after they have spent many thousands of dollars. I would appreciate your comment on that problem, Mr. Minister.

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes, the member is certainly right that this has been a problem and this is one of the problems that we do have under study now by the architects that we have in our department. It is quite true that in the past, many buildings did have poorly designed roofs and our architects are right now, in fact, advising school boards against flat roofs. Unfortunately, some boards still insist on building them but they are getting advice from us not to do that.

In terms of repairing the situation, this is under study right now and my officials tell me that they think maybe some of the answers are coming out of that study. The present policy as I understand it is that to qualify the repairs must exceed one-half of a mill or \$50,000, the lesser of the two.

A new policy has just gone out as of last Wednesday to the school boards which will

allow them to add their schools together to reach this figure. The hon. member will be pleased to hear that. It just shows that the government does listen to sensible advice.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. I'm glad that you did listen because that was part of the problem that we were having with the capital grants to schools. I think Mr. Minister realizes that as soon as this problem is remedied, then of course we are saving a great deal on other items of damage within the schools themselves.

I just have one more comment to make under this section. I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Minister, that the reason why The School Act says that boards must carry insurance on all of their buildings is not so much for the board itself but for the Department of Education. I have reasons to believe that that is true. I have spent some time in the last month taking a look at this and as you know the requirements are in the act that we must carry insurance on these buildings.

Now the problem that has come up in Crown corporations is the fact that the major insurance claim is not the old tradition one. You know the old traditional claim was fire where the major claim now coming in is vandalism. As I mentioned earlier and I would like to mention it now, that in 1976 vandalism, the cost of vandalism in British Columbia schools in one year would have operated the Outlook School Unit, the Eston-Elrose School Unit, the Rosetown School Unit and the Kindersley School Unit, just in one year. Now our vandalism, admittedly, is a great deal less than in some other provinces and I think we can be very thankful about that.

It seems to me that we should be taking a look at two types of insurance. Now when I see our insurance policy go from \$14,000 for the same coverage, Mr. Minister, go from \$14,078 to \$27,000 all in one year, then of course we have to ask ourselves some questions, and to get these questions answered like we got in Crown corporations the other day, this was a basic factor. Now I understand that there are some experiments going on within the various departments of education of the detecting devices, warning devices, to protect this valuable property from vandalism. My concern is in centres where you do not have a detachment. It may be some time before officials come there. I really believe, Mr. Minister, that your department should be now taking a look at this number one cause of insurance which is vandalism and getting the information from the study that's in Manitoba at the present time, and securing these facilities within the various schools. Even if it went to the janitor's residence, it would at least be a device to ward off this escalation cost of vandalism. We can't buy insurance that way, you understand, you can't buy just fire insurance. You can't just buy vandalism insurance because companies just put the two together. Do you have any information, Mr. Minister, of any studies currently going on as to how to protect the schools? Are you going to make this information available? What recommendations do you have at the present time?

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes, I can inform the hon. member that the SSTA and the department have together undertaken a joint study on the question of school insurance. As a first step they have made a thorough study of the Manitoba system; so this is under active study at this time and the various aspects of the problem that you have indicated will be studied.

Item 17 agreed.

## **Item 18**

**Mr. Katzman:** — Just one question on capital construction. Once again re the private schools, I understand there is no funding for private school construction. Is that correct?

**Mr. Faris:** — The present policy involves 10 per cent funding for capital purposes.

Item 18 agreed.

#### **Item 19**

**Mr. Collver:** — I wonder if the minister could advise me under this item or whether it was under the item, two or three items up, whether or not any potential grants to students or parents for children, who happen to attend private educational institutions or specialized schools, are included in this item or the one just above?

**Mr. Faris:** — The question was raised by your member for Rosthern under the operating grant section.

**Mr. Collver:** — No, the question that was raised by the member for Rosthern was, what were the grants to private schools and that answer was 10 per cent, as I understand the minister's comments.

**Mr. Faris:** — That's capital. He just asked that under capital. He asked another question in regard to operating . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — And the answer is that you make the grant to the school but do you make any grants to the parents or to the organization or association of parents, that form schools? Let me give you an example; no that hasn't been gone through . . .

**Mr. Faris:** — The answer is no.

**Mr. Collver:** — Is there any grant made available at all in any way, shape or form in the way of a return of the educational cost to the Government of Saskatchewan and to the local school boards, for example, the French school in Saskatoon?

**Mr. Faris:** — The French school in Saskatoon receives funding via the separate system in Saskatoon.

**Mr. Collver:** — Yes, but it doesn't achieve full funding as the minister . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** — The question that is now being answered is covered under the subvote, the subvote which took place three votes ago. If the member for Nipawin is interested in Education estimates, I am sure it's better for him to sit in his seat and listen to what's going on than sit behind the rail and visit for the rest of the afternoon. I would suggest that we keep to the subvotes that we are on.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that the member for Morse, an eminently qualified educator in the province of Saskatchewan, would make a comment about whether or not an association under a subvote that says grants to associations for education would receive a grant of any kind for the provision of education to specialized education, such as the French school in Saskatoon, whether that association receives a grant from the Government of Saskatchewan is of some

considerable important to the parents who are educating their children in that school system for the benefit of the member for Morse.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order! I'd just like to say on this, it seems to me that if you want to talk about grants to schools, French schools or otherwise, those questions should come under grants to schools and if you wish to revert to that, you can ask permission of the committee. If you want to talk I suppose about grants to French associations that might have children in schools, French schools, I suppose you could ask a question about that.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, and furthermore, it might interest Mr. Chairman, I'm sure in his eminent wisdom about these matters, it might interest him to know that the associations in Saskatchewan are formed for the specific purpose of creating schools and for the specific purpose of providing education, through those associations, to those private schools. So, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I might be allowed to continue with my line of questioning to find out if the minister has any intention of providing to associations, created for the purpose of providing education in a different fashion, such as the French school system in Saskatoon, of providing any grants to them or to organizations like that for the provision of that specialized kind of education.

**Mr. Faris:** — The answer is, that the Saskatoon French school students are recognized as regular Saskatoon Catholic system students.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, then why would the French school parents in Saskatoon be charged a tuition over and above the regular cost of education?

**Mr. Faris:** — Because they don't have a tax base. We provide the provincial share, but the local input is raised by their fee rather than through the separate system.

**Mr. Collver:** — Precisely! Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that they are not treated the same as students in the ordinary school system, in any way, shape or form, because a specialized structure is given to those students in accordance with their presumed ability to pay. But in addition to that, the parents of those children, who are providing their children with a specialized form of education that is in keeping with - for what it is worth to the member for Morse - the stated policy of the present Government of Canada for which the Department of Education receives great and large grants from the federal government, those parents are charged a fee and at the same time they must pay the normal property tax, education based tax to the local school boards.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order, order! Your line of questions is best served under 16, grants to schools operating. We have been through that . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is not best served under grants to schools operating, for this reason. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain my point of order. For this reason, that an association is formed to provide this education to the students and they do not operate through the regular school system.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Order! I have ruled that it should be under 16. If you want to revert you can ask the committee to do that, but that is my ruling. I would ask you to cease that line of questioning under 19.

**Mr. Collver:** — To cease the line of questioning on the associations to provide specialized education? Is that correct, Mr. Chairman? And whether the government is going to give them any grants?

**Mr. Chairman:** — Well, grants to schools, separate or otherwise come under . . . I am not going to argue with you. I am saying that you are out of order. Next question.

**Mr. Collver:** — I challenge the Chair.

**Mr. Chairman:** — Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the estimates for the Department of Education I ruled that the questions of the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) were not relevant to the subvote under consideration. My ruling was challenged.

Ruling of the Chair sustained.

**Mr. Collver:** — . . . and the amounts please.

**Mr. Faris:** — \$19,390; Canadian Council of Research and Education . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Minister, would you repeat the first one. Your microphone wasn't on when you started talking.

**Mr. Faris:** — Canadian Education Associations, \$19,390; Canadian Council for Research and Education, \$4,860; Council of Ministers of Education, \$51,100 . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — Council of Ministers?

**Mr. Faris:** — Council of Ministers, yes. Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, \$3,000; Saskatchewan Federal of Home and Schools, \$7,500; University of Saskatchewan Principals' Short Course, \$750; Saskatchewan Education Week Committee, \$300; Council for Exceptional Children, \$300; Overseas Book Centre, \$200; French Language Education Association, \$600; Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, \$1,000; Guidance Counsellors' Association, \$200; Advisory Committee on Indian Education, \$1,500; Family Life Saskatchewan, \$1,500; Summer Workshops of the STF, \$2,000; Canadian Association of Health, \$3,000; Association of School Business Officials of Saskatchewan (ASBOS), \$750; ACFC, \$55,000 . . .

**Mr. Collver:** — What is ACFC?

**Mr. Faris:** — L'Association Culturelle Franco-Canadienne. And Interchange on Canadian Studies, \$15,000.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Minister, the Metis Association, the \$19,000 grant, could you tell us what that grant is for?

**Mr. Faris:** — Which one?

**Mr. Collver:** — I'll give you them all, that I would like to know. The Metis Association, \$19,000; the Council of Ministers, \$51,000 . . .

**Mr. Faris:** — Metis?

**Mr. Collver:** — That was the second one, you had Family Life and Metis Association. A \$19,000 grant, Metis Association?

**Mr. Faris:** — No.

**Mr. Collver:** — What was it, that \$19,000?

**Mr. Faris:** — Canadian Education Association.

**Mr. Collver:** — Canadian Education Association. What is that for?

**Mr. Faris:** — For the operation of the Canadian Educational Association. They have a lot of functions.

**Mr. Collver:** — Council of Ministers then, \$51,000?

**Mr. Faris:** — General operating purposes.

**Mr. Collver:** — For the actual association? Is that correct?

**Mr. Faris:** — Yes.

**Mr. Collver:** — And the ACFC, the actual operation of the association?

**Mr. Faris:** — That's for the work of the developmental office.

**Mr. Collver:** — Would you repeat that, Mr. Minister, your mike wasn't on again.

**Mr. Faris:** — That's for the work of the developmental officer.

**Mr. Collver:** — I can't hear you if you don't speak up.

**Mr. Faris:** — That's for the work of the developmental officer. I'm not going to say it again.

**Mr. Collver:** — That's for the work of the developmental officer, the \$55,000 grant to the Association Franco-Canadienne? Is that what you are saying to me, that there is no educational portion at all of that grant?

**Mr. Faris:** — Community education.

**Mr. Collver:** — Community education. Could you explain to me what program is involved in the community education of that particular association?

**Mr. Faris:** — The association is developing the program, not us.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, I'm sure that the minister doesn't make a grant unless the association presents the program to the minister. I am asking for an outline of the program as presented to the minister in order to obtain a \$55,000 grant.

**Mr. Faris:** — We don't have that with us. If you want any details we can get it for you. That will be recovered in due course from the federal government.

**Mr. Collver:** — Is the entire grant, the \$55,000 recoverable from the federal government?



**Mr. Faris:** — Yes.

**Mr. Collver:** — Is that the total of the educational grant to that association or are there other grants to other associations made through the Department of Education in any other subvote or made for education purposes in any other agency of government to your knowledge?

**Mr. Faris:** — That is the total from this department.

Item 19 agreed.

## **Item 20**

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Chairman, the history behind the Teachers' Superannuation Commission is not exactly one of any glory. We have some difficulty of course. If we were to take a look at the number of people who are now staying in the profession compared to what it was 20 years ago, the average life within the profession, the amount of money that is necessary to keep the fund going from year to year is not - Are we on item 20?

**Mr. Chairman:** — We are talking about the administration of the . . .

**Mr. Bailey:** — Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I will pick that up then.

Item 20 agreed.

## **Item 21**

**Mr. Bailey:** — Sorry, Mr. Chairman. This is the one I was supposed to be in.

I want to get to the point and I will get to it very quickly because I am sure my colleague for Maple Creek has some questions as well.

If we take a look in projection, and I would hope that the commission has done the projection, say a 10 year project - That will include both the member for Maple Creek and myself by that time. Now, what we are looking at here, Mr. Minister, is a rather shaky superannuation commission. I am not talking about the administration as such; I am talking about funds being available. One only has to go back to the fiasco that happened in the city of New York to see that indeed, while this is on a much smaller scale, in 10 years time this particular pension fund could have some very serious problems, simply because the amount of government input will have to increase rather drastically in the next 10 years. Do we have figures to state as to how many people will be pensioning off by the year 1988 and how many will be on pension by that time in your projection compared to the number of people who are recipients of pension in 1978?

**Mr. Faris:** — That kind of thing is being studied. The whole picture is being studied right now by the commission. Part of the collective agreement this year was that there would be a study of the superannuation plan and the member will be aware that part of the agreement was also that the teachers' portion of the contribution would increase this year. There is an awareness of this problem as there is indeed a problem with most pension plans across Canada. One of the problems, as the member is aware, of course, is that, going way back in history, which the member alluded to, the plan was not

funded. Because of that we have gotten into a situation where, depending on what sort of actuarial assumptions are made, there are varying levels of concern. But this whole area of making different kinds of actuarial assumptions, trying to look at those kinds of figures, projecting those figures that you are suggesting, is all under way at this time and with the active co-operation of the people participating in the collective bargaining agreement.

**Mr. Bailey:** — Mr. Minister, you know sooner or later this particular pension plan is going to have to fall under I think it was Bill No. 105, wasn't it? What was the name of the bill? I do not know the exact number. This was excluded from the other pension plans by the now Minister of Revenue and there was a good reason for it. What I am saying, Mr. Minister, is that in all likelihood, and this is just a round guess at this particular time, you are going to have double the number of people on pensions by 1988 as you have now at greatly increased pensions, meaning that somewhere the whole thing is going to be looking for huge sums of money. The time to get this pension on the right track is now. I think we have to do this very quickly. You know, when I started paying into the pension plan I think the average life of the teacher was about 1.8 years. That is no longer true. Wages are much higher, people are staying within the profession, and because of that the amount of money that they are going to be receiving at pension time is just a whole lot more than it used to be. Given those facts, this pension scheme is on a very shaky basis because of the projection, maybe not right now, but we well could be in 10 years time and I think we are going to have to take some immediate steps to correct this situation or there are going to be a few thousand people who are going to feel like they are, you know, they are completely dependent upon the provincial government revenue and as happened in the city of New York, it was not there to meet it. I would hope that that would never happen here but it could happen, unless we get the pension scheme on the right track.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just a comment on the subvote. I think the member for Rosetown indicated of course that this particular plan was not brought under the pension plan last year and the reason for that is rather obvious, because this is the one plan in which we had to, it is a legal requirement by law, under the collective bargaining plan for the teachers of Saskatchewan, that you have to negotiate with the teachers before you can change any of the terms of the plans. This is probably the biggest deterrent as to why this one did not become part of that group last year. The question I would like to ask the minister is, this year I believe, there was an increase in the contributions by teachers, from 6.35 per cent to about 7 per cent. I think those are the figures. Now your budget estimates were prepared earlier before that agreement and I noticed that you are going to have to take some \$22 million out of the public purse, in order to make the payments that are due to the teachers who are superannuated at the present time, during the course of the coming year. My question is, how will that increase from 6.35 per cent to 7 per cent effect that \$22 million? Certainly, it is going to be a lower amount by how much?

**Mr. Faris:** — The money that is contributed by the teachers is not reflected in these figures at all. That money is simply retained in the fund. This is our contribution to it and it is not affected by that change.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — O.K. The next question that I would like to ask the minister is relative to one of the comments made. You seemed to indicate in the course of your remarks that you were in favour of a funded plan. I got that feeling that a funded pension plan and

certainly that is not what this plan is right now . . . if there is a deficit, the province is required by law to pick up any deficit. Is that the minister's thinking, that probably that this pension plan should be moving toward a funded plan like the other plans that the government is operating?

**Mr. Faris:** — No, I don't have any firm views on that. I think there are places for formula plans, there are places for funded plans and so on. You know, they can be equally sound, depending on the basis. What I was referring to is, sometimes people are very critical of this plan, not taking into account that it is not a funded plan and you know, you must ask yourself if it had been a funded plan, what would its state be? I think the study will perhaps look at that kind of question and I am looking forward for their making recommendations as to the future.

Item 21 agreed.

## Item 22

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to just ask a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you very, very much. Mr. Minister, I would like to return to a discussion briefly, of the French school in Saskatoon, which is a private institution as you know, operated by an association in Saskatoon. It is granted by the Department of Education a sum of money, approximately equivalent to the cost to the Department of Education of the separate school system grants, as I understand it. But the difference, since they do not have a property tax base to work with, the difference is charged as tuition to the parents of that institution. In addition to that, however, the parents of that institution must pay either through their rentals or through their property taxes, an education portion of their property taxes, which means that the education in those schools is considerably more, approximately one-third more to those parents who are educating their children in that system, or in that private institution, as opposed to educating their children in the public educational system. Would the minister agree with that outline of the situation as it relates to the French school in Saskatoon?

**Mr. Faris:** — Well, that school is operated as the member suggested, as a private school and they, in fact, get more funding than other private schools in the province because they get the kind of funding level that would go to students in the separate school system which would include special grants which we have for designated schools and schools which are teaching French. Now, if they were to choose, if those parents were to choose to have that school as part of the separate or public system in Saskatoon, they could have that a designated school and have it entirely funded by provincial and local taxes. They have that option. If they choose not to and to be a private school they are, in fact, receiving more support than other private schools do in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Collver:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, but in the case of this particular institution in Saskatoon, which I think the minister will agree and admit, has offered to the school system in Saskatoon a very valuable difference in terms of showing both the public educational system and the separate educational system a different way of educating children and they have developed some very interesting and worthwhile results as a result of that particular school. I'm sure the minister will also agree that that particular school has a very real role to play in the education of those children and has been very successful. I might question the minister, it's quite simply this. You receive large amount of grants from the federal government for the promotion of bilingualism in the province of Saskatchewan. That's in the first place, the provincial government. A

private school system, a private association, develops a school system or a school in the city of Saskatoon that not only adds to this bilingualism program but also provides a different approach to education than the public educational system, yet the parents of that school system have to pay approximately one-third more for the education of those children than they would if the school were under the public educational system. Now the minister suggested that the school could, if they so desired, become a designated school under the public educational system. The minister knows full well that that would not be possible under the regulations and options of that particular private school and of the way it approaches the education of the children. He is fully aware, I'm sure, that they have a different approach to the educational system than have the public school system but, at the same time that they have this approach, they are succeeding in the efforts that are being designated by the federal government with references to bilingualism in our province.

Would the minister not agree that perhaps an effort by the provincial government to ensure that the parents who have to pay the tuition over and above the property tax load should somehow receive that money back in that system because of the money received from the federal government for the bilingual program in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Faris:** — Well, we spend more money on bilingual education in this province than we receive from the federal government. The federal government funding does not meet the amount we spend. So there are not extra dollars lying around. I will say this that that school, as far as the treatment from the provincial government, receives exceptional treatment. I agree it's a very fine school but it does receive exceptional treatment. As I pointed out in answering the question from the member for Rosthern, ordinarily a private elementary school would receive no funding. This school receives the same funding on a per student basis as the separate school system, the other school systems. So they're receiving generous assistance from the province, they have an option to work out an arrangement with the separate or public school system in Saskatoon. I'm sure that there is flexibility there. They could receive the entire funding. There are designated schools in 17 communities in Saskatchewan now. There is a concern, I know in Saskatoon, I know in Regina, from many people to improve the opportunities and the quality of opportunity for French education. If the people there have not been able to work out something with those boards, you know, if they really want to, I'd be very surprised. But if they want to be on their own and not work within the constraints of co-operation with those school systems that's their choice . . . but they are being treated very well by the province.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well Mr. Minister mentioned that the Department of Education spends more on bilingual education in Saskatchewan than it receives from the federal government. I wonder if the minister would mind providing the statistical data to back that up, please?

**Mr. Faris:** — Perhaps the member would like a more detailed breakdown, but my officials say we are spending approximately \$1,500,000 on account of bilingualism. That's including administration, program development, consultative services and grants. This is for the coming year. We expect to receive by way of federal funds approximately \$1.2 million. So my officials advise me we are spending \$1.5 million; we expect to receive about \$1.2 million.

**Mr. Collver:** — Mr. Chairman, is it approximately \$1.2 million or is it \$1,240,000 . . .

**Mr. Faris:** — I said approximately \$1.2 million.

**Mr. Collver:** — I know but that's the number we're talking about, is it, that you're getting from the federal government? Taking a round number of \$1.5 million, how would you go about defining that \$1,500,000? How would you go about finding out where that expenditure is in the Government of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Faris:** — If the member wants a detailed breakdown of that, we would have to provide that for him later. We would gladly do that.

**Mr. Collver:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, what I'm asking the minister for, is not necessarily a detailed formula. Would the \$1,500,000 other than the \$55,000 for the Franco-Canadienne Association . . . would the minister suggest that the \$1.5 million was mostly in the grants to schools operating on the \$204 million. Is that where most of the \$1.5 million is? If so, would he give us an approximate breakdown? I don't mind asking him for details.

**Mr. Faris:** — I think the member may be aware that there is a special grant for designated schools of \$200 for a full time equivalent student. There is also for second language instruction in French, again a \$200 grant on a full time equivalent student basis. In addition, there is administration money within the department. There is program development going on; there are consultative services; in-service education; special transportation grants and some grants to organizations.

**Mr. Collver:** — Yes, and that is pretty much, Mr. Minister, the fact that I was trying to get at. The fact is that there is a great deal of administrative money within your own department in the amount that is being expended by the Department of Education on the bilingual program. Would the minister not agree that rather than the administrative amounts that are spent within the department, that for example, a grant due to the parents of the students in Saskatoon who are becoming fluently bilingual after one or two years of education in that particular school, would be money much better spent if one is to look to the totality of the program from the federal government. In other words what you are saying to me is this. Approximately \$250,000 extra is being spent by the Government of Saskatchewan with reference to any bilingualism in the province of Saskatchewan, and that includes the grants to the Association Franco-Canadienne and it includes any extra additional moneys that are being spent by the Government of Saskatchewan with reference to the French school in Saskatoon - \$2.5 million.

Now the minister will know that that works out to approximately, roughly equivalent to, and I'm not knocking it, in terms of the granting structure, to the kinds of grants that are given to other cultural associations in the province. I think that is fine, but what I am asking the minister is this. There are a great deal of administrative costs in that \$1.5 million. Wouldn't you be farther ahead to pull out the administrative cost and help the parents in Saskatoon who are having a great deal of difficulty meeting both the property taxes they have to pay and also the tuition they have to pay at the French school?

**Mr. Faris:** — Part of the revenue - there is quite a complicated formula by which the federal government puts money into this area. Part of that is the 1.5 per cent formula which is intended to cover administrative costs and that is approximately \$175,000. If you look at just straight administration, that is - our figure here is \$165,000. That

doesn't add in consultative services and so on but their money is intended to cover administration so we use it in that way. I will say this, that my officials inform me that the Saskatoon French school has expressed to the department their satisfaction with our funding. They have the option. If they want to enter the designated school program and be 100 per cent funded by local government as well as provincial government, they have that choice. If they choose not to and they have chosen not to, then we are not going to compel them to make another choice.

**Mr. Collver:** — I accept that, Mr. Minister, and that is not what we are suggesting at all.

Just because the Government of Canada offers you \$175,000 in administrative money, surely that doesn't mean that you have to spend \$175,000 in administrative money. Surely the Government of Saskatchewan is more wise in its allocation of resources than the Government of Canada and surely it's not necessary to administer or have a great administrative burden attached to this program, when there are organizations like this private school that are doing a first class job in this area. All we are trying to suggest is this, can you not use a portion of that administrative money, to assist the parents who are having to pay extra for their children to go to that special, unique school? Could you not use some of that administrative money for that purpose and wouldn't that be better spent in terms of the bilingual program in Saskatchewan than on administration in the department?

**Mr. Faris:** — Administration money has to come from somewhere.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just a couple of questions. This grant of \$1,246,000 from the federal government, are there any stipulations as to what program the province has to use or has the province got the option to spend the money however they see fit?

**Mr. Faris:** — To fill up our own programs.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — The second question I would like to know the amount of money, how is the amount of money that the federal government pays to the province determined? Have they got some sort of a formula by the number of elementary students involved or what?

**Mr. Faris:** — It is a very complicated formula. There is a 1.5 per cent, a 5 per cent and 9 per cent formula and if the member would like the details of this, I'd be pleased to provide him with it. But it is quite complicated.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — I wouldn't mind if you would send it over. Now as far as the spending of the money, within the budget, the \$1,246,000 from the federal government, I suppose, then it's what? Is it incorporated into various sections of the budget? Is it part of the operating costs or where is that \$1,246,000, just throughout the budget in all programs?

**Mr. Faris:** — Through operating grants.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just one final question. I believe the minister made an announcement some time ago. I am aware of the program that you have, recognition now given for students in the regular French programs in all high schools in the province throughout Saskatchewan. I think you said that a million dollars more was going to be supplied this year and yet in the estimates there is an indication that there

was only \$426,000 more coming from the federal government. Where is the other \$560,000 coming from?

**Mr. Faris:** — The figure, a million, referred to about the half million spent last year and another half million this year.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — The total amount of money that was spent, that we're receiving from the federal government really then is being incorporated into the teaching of English school children the French language. Is this not correct or teaching the French program within the high schools and the elementary schools?

**Mr. Faris:** — The money is going towards second language education. We don't identify it by the background of the student. We just provide the program; the students can come in from an English-speaking background or Francophone background.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — That is not the designated schools. That's a separate program entirely.

**Mr. Faris:** — Even a designated school program is open to children of an English-speaking background.

Item 22 agreed.

**Mr. Stodalka:** — Just before we leave, I would like to thank the minister and his officials again. We had two sessions today and this finally completes our estimates. If some of the other departments follow the example here maybe we'll be out of here in a week or two.

Education vote 8 agreed.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:55 o'clock p.m.