

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Nineteenth Legislature**

**Tuesday, April 10, 1979**

**EVENING SESSION**

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION — VOTE 8**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order! If the committee is ready, it is time to proceed and I will ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Shillington) to please introduce his staff.

**HON. E.B. SHILLINGTON (Minister of Education):** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To you, and to the House, I would like to introduce the staff who are here. Sitting on my immediate left is the deputy minister, Ian Wilson. Immediately in front of me is John Hurnard, executive director of program development. In front of me and to my left is Jake Volk, who is director of educational administration. Behind the deputy minister is John Moneo, director of financial administration. Immediately behind me is Art Meier, executive director of administration services. On my right is Les Barrett who is chief of school grants administration. We have Bob Livingston in the back, who is chief of special education.

**ITEM 1**

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — I have a few general comments that I'd like to address to the minister. As you are well aware, I have been speaking on many educational topics and have expressed many of the views I have but there's a few here I'd just like to draw to your attention and to the attention of your departmental officials.

I would start off by first discussing the innovative grants program. I noted this program has been in place for some time. I must say the school of which I was the principal had one of the first ones in the field of physical education. I think the impact from that innovative grant has had a considerable effect upon the Division III physical education programs in Saskatchewan. I can only say that we, in the jurisdiction I represent were happy to receive that grant.

However, since that time I have been in the habit of applying for various other innovative grants. I must say that perhaps the experience hasn't been quite as complementary as in the first situation. Of two other grants we applied for, one in the field of biological sciences in regard to establishing a greenhouse (which I think would be a fine addition to any biology program) was refused on the grounds that it was not innovative, which may have been the case. However, being undaunted by defeat, we applied for an innovative grant a year ago which, as you probably know, was a first for Saskatchewan in the field of Division IV physical education. The strange thing about this innovative grant on the third application was that we were granted some moneys, but not the full allotment that we asked for which again can be understandable. What made me question at all was come the end of this year our regional superintendent made it known there were still moneys in the innovative grant pool, and that we should reapply and that we should put in some moneys for, shall I say secretarial help and things of that nature, in which we did get some moneys.

My questions were if the proposal wasn't good enough in the first place, how come with a few minor adjustments was it acceptable and why was this money not all given out in innovative grants? Now, I don't want to be too critical of you, but I followed the innovative grants program pretty closely and I must go back to the first grant that we

applied for. And in that grant the physical education teacher I had at that time and myself, we tried to conduct for the province of Saskatchewan what I would call a scientific experiment. We tried to control the variables. We tried to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that what we were doing was scientifically justifiable. Now, I must admit that we were unsuccessful in controlling every variable, but when we went to make our interim submissions, we were told well, don't worry too much about that, just give us kind of an idea of how it went. Now to me that isn't scientific research, and that isn't innovative development in education at all. When I see and I have followed these closely, Mr. Minister, some of the projects that have been funded in some of the various geographical areas, I'm inclined to believe that some of these may be more motivated by political considerations than by documented scientific educational research and if that is true, I think that's a rather serious thing. Randy, I don't think you would understand it so don't get into the argument.

The second thing that I would like to put on is that in many cases, and I think this is a serious consideration (and you are our new Minister of Education, Mr. Shillington, and I think a good one) is that we should be looking . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I agree with that. I'll give him a pat on the back. I'll give the dirty cut where it's deserved and I'll give the pat on the back where it's deserved and I don't mind saying that I think he's a good minister to date. Remember, I said to date. However, I think we have to look a bit at, Mr. Minister, the problem of change in education for change sake. I think we, as teachers, as administrators, and as bureaucratic officials are all a bit guilty of this thing and I think it's dangerous and something that I would ask you, as the Minister of Education, to keep an eye on in this regard. Also I believe in the innovative grants program. I would like you, when we come to answering the questions, to tell me at what state it's at now, if it's still going on, and so on. I think it's a good program, but I did get that feeling about it, and I wanted to convey that to you.

Now, the next thing I would like to go on to is the budget review that is undertaken by the regional superintendents of education. I understand as well as anyone else in this province that we just can't let the costs in education run unchecked. I believe that. But on the other hand, when I hear regional superintendents of schools coming around to school boards and say, Taylor, you're spending too much money on people, you should be spending more money on other things, then I start to question the wisdom of those decisions. Because you know as well as I know that it is people that teach people. Those are statements that have been made in our jurisdiction. I wonder where are the priorities at that point in time? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . now you come on out and see about it then. We'll check . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . at least they got beyond a Grade 8 teacher in Humboldt. Let's move on then.

The other thing I would question is the concept of big is better. I come from a small rural school, as you well know. We're proud of these things. I heard one of your members (I think it was the fellow over here who's reading the book) question this big is better idea, too. I think we have to realize the size of the wine bottle doesn't always indicate the sweetness of the wine. I think in our school systems we have to look at these sort of things. The concept of the big school is not always the best school. I go back to the fall educational conferences of about three years ago, which the deputy minister will be well aware of, where it came out very loud and clear in those sittings taken in the rural areas, that they said to the department to take it easy. We don't want any more consolidation. We question driving our kids three-quarters or half an hour on a bus. We wonder what they're getting at the end. Is it justifiable?

Another thing I'd like to comment on is curriculum change. I make reference, for

example, to the new English courses. When I started teaching high school, we had composition and literature. For some reason, these fell into disfavour, so that we looked at the integrated English approach, the multi textbook approach. We called it English. I understand now that we've cut it back to English A and English B, which to me is something similar to composition and literature again. I talked to a teacher today (and we are looking at being fiscally responsible in education) who is designing a course for the new English in Grade 12 in which you have to cover 30 short stories and 26 essays. He had gone through three of your recommended books on the departmental list and was still 11 essays and 8 short stories short, following the recommended titles. Now to me, that doesn't make sense. In the first book there were 40. If that's an anthology of short stories, then why are we forcing school boards to buy three or four or five copies to satisfy the needs of the curriculum?

The other thing is the proliferation of courses. I have hinted about this before, and I go back again to the fall conferences of 1976 or about 1975 (I stand to be corrected) when an evaluation was made of the comprehensive schools. I am not against the comprehensive schools, but the actual facts shown at that time were that the majority of students in comprehensive schools were electing about eight or ten subjects. Those were the popular ones. There were many other broad offerings but the number of students who were taking those were fewer.

Another thing is, how much do we expect the schools to do? I think that is a question we have to look at. We are in driver education; there is pressure for family life. I'm not saying these courses are wrong but I am saying to you, and I think every other educator of Saskatchewan is saying the same thing, is that we have five hours of the day and how many ingredients do you pour into the jar? I think we have to take a look at that.

I have talked about special education in this House before. I have pointed out that I think you should be complimented on some of the special education programs that are taking place for people with learning disabilities. I do feel and I have told you, Mr. Minister, and the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. Rolfes) that we are remiss in what I would call the students with superior learning capabilities. I don't call that the gifted students because that is very hard to define, but I say the student with superior learning capabilities.

I am very proud to see in this newspaper headline that the Regina Separate School Board shares my concern and is instigating a program for these type of individuals. I think they deserve to be congratulated and I think you members of the Department of Education should follow that lead. I refer you specifically to the proposal that I have put before the Minister of Education (Mr. Shillington) and the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. Rolfes).

I want to come to the area of consultants. I was involved quite extensively with the consultants in the field of physical education, and I must say with all degree of sincerity and fairness, that I think Saskatchewan deserves to be congratulated in the strides it has made in implementing physical education in our schools.

I feel that the consultants that were provided to me were of immense help, however I wonder about consultants in other areas, in the fields of science, and the fields of mathematics. I know we have consultants in English but, when there is a hue and cry amongst the general population for perhaps a back to the basics movement, should we be looking at consultants in the field of these basic subjects?

**April 10, 1979**

Now I want to make one thing real straight before somebody in the back row misconstrues it like they usually do, and that is a little later on I'm going to be questioning the number of bureaucratic appointments. But you know my stand very well. I feel that closer to the source of the learning (the closer to the child) is where we should spend the money. I feel that the consultant falls into that range.

Another question which comes to my mind is guidance people. I have been told that on a per pupil basis we have fewer guidance people in Saskatchewan than they do in the province of Newfoundland.

And then I come to the area that is perhaps, I feel, the most important in the whole educational chain, and that is the teachers. I have talked about the cuts in school grants. I would just like to bring another issue to your attention, a clipping regarding the Rosetown teachers in which it is stated that a decrease in provincial grants and problems with declining enrolments is causing a cut in staff. Quoting the principal, he said that the school would be forced to curtail programs, but he would not say which programs are in jeopardy.

Going on, we see that there is also, according to the principal, an enrolment rise, not a decline. I think that's a serious thing but that's the situation in a town the size of Rosetown, Saskatchewan. If we're having an increase in the student population, but due to a lack of funding the staff and resulting programs are going to have to be cut.

I pointed out to you that I believe it is teachers, and not hardware, who teach students. I believe that teachers who use the hardware can do their jobs better, but I like to go back to the situation of about four years ago when, all of a sudden, out of the clear blue sky every school in Saskatchewan had a Sony AV recorder or playback machine.

Now a recorder is of some value because you can tape record off the television. A playback machine, unless you can get the required video tapes from Sask Media, is of questionable value. As late as last spring I walked into a sizeable high school in Saskatchewan and they wanted to show an AV video tape. The machine was covered with a layer of dust. Neither the principal nor any of the staff knew how to run it. I say to you, is that the good use of educational dollars? And I don't think that was an exception. I think you can go around and find in many of the schools of Saskatchewan (some of you fellows on the other side know this) hardware that is doing little else but collecting dust.

Now, getting to teachers, there are a couple of things I want to point out here. I think we . . . maybe this falls into continuing education, but it certainly falls into education generally. I think one of the things that perhaps we have been a bit remiss in, in Saskatchewan is the screening of applicants to enter the teaching profession. About the only criterion that I have ever seen that indicates whether you should be a teacher or not is whether you have had a 65 average in Grade 12. In something as precious as teaching students, especially in the kindergarten and elementary fields, I think we need to have criteria other than just scholastic ability. I think, and we all know, that it's the interpersonal exchange that brings about effective education. I wonder if we should not take a look at some other type of screening mechanism that may indicate who has the warmth and rapport and these interpersonal skills that make for good teachers. I think we should be taking a look at that. I think that it would be a great service to the pupils of Saskatchewan if we could avoid bringing into the classroom some of these people who you know and I know just are not teachers. I think it would be a great help to those people if they realized early in their educational careers that perhaps the work in

the classroom was really not their piece of cake and they could be diverted into something where these interpersonal skills are not quite as important. I would ask you to consider that type of thing. I feel that with new teachers and with the type of students we have today, the degree of sophistication, the student who has come up in the television age, perhaps we are asking a lot for a young boy or girl of 21 or 22 years of age to step in and take over students in the Division III and Division IV levels. I don't know. I wonder often about this. Is this asking too much? Is it easier to start at Division I or Division II and then work up — as many of the people who are in this House did at one time? That's another consideration I ask you to look for. The other thing is the whole system of the teacher in the educational system today. I point out that education is probably the only type of profession where if you do well, you get more piled on you. Any of you who have been teachers or have been related with the teaching profession will know that time after time in the school staff, the principal delegates to the teacher who has the capability more and more duties because he knows the job will be done. At the same time, the less competent teacher, the one who is questionable, he avoids giving these extra responsibilities because he knows the job will not be done as well. That is the principal's decision, that is the way the system works. I'm not denying it's the principal who does this but this is the fact. Is this really rewarding to the good teacher? I would say to you of the Department of Education, that the good teacher is willing to do many of these things but here are ways of giving him a pat on the back which are very few in teaching.

I believe that the greatest thing that you can do for competent teachers (and we have thousands of them in the province of Saskatchewan) is to encourage boards to take these people and say to them go and have some in-service; go to a high level conference. We've appreciated what you have done in our school system. I think as the Department of Education that that is an avenue, Mr. Minister, where you can get really good mileage out of the best teachers in Saskatchewan. I think there's a case rewarding the person who has really been putting forth and we've got many of them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . it is good. It works. If you study educational research (which I think you have studied some) you will find that the best dollar spent in education is in inservice — not in hardware — in inservice and in rewarding the competent teacher by sending him to a high level thing where he charges his battery and comes back to that classroom as an excited individual and he spreads it to his colleagues. You know that as well as I do.

The next role I would like to go to is the role of superintendents. I'll be questioning in some detail, Mr. Minister, as we go through the subvotes. I see that there is an increase in the number of superintendents and I'll give you some time to think of that and tell me where they are and why there is that increase. I would like to mention another little example regarding superintendents and education as a whole. That is that I think we're often inclined to imitate and to adopt and to ride on the backs of the educational research that takes place in the United States. I don't say that all of that is bad, but I don't think we should be buying all of their ideas lock, stock and barrel. I quote a man, whom some of you may know, a Doctor Gordon Campbell from the University of Lethbridge who was talking in Edmonton to the Alberta superintendents. He said this, 'The public is paying to have the system well managed. This is done but the public is also paying for something it is not always getting — creative courageous leadership in the investigation of ideas.'

I have been associated with a number of superintendents and I must say the calibre of these men is high, they are acceptable. However, you know and I know that the

**April 10, 1979**

superintendents in Saskatchewan and especially the government employed superintendents have very little time to do the type of things that Doctor Campbell is talking about. They have very little time to give educational leadership. In fact, they spend a lot of their time delivering the government's mail and running around checking to see if the system is going. They have very little time for real educational leadership, real innovative development and I think that is another area we should improve. We have these men. I know many of them, and they are men with good ideas but I tell you, frankly, that they are burdened with Joe-jobs that are of very little . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you don't know what you are talking about Mr. Garner . . . indication and of very little impact. I would say to you, Mr. Minister, take a look at the duties of the superintendent and let him provide true educational leadership.

I see we have the research department here, and I would like to know just what independent research is going on within the province? I would like to ask this question, too. As we have declining enrolments in Saskatchewan it would seem logical to me that at the upper bureaucratic levels we might be also having a decline. If there are less students, then we need less at the top to manage that system.

Finally, the last thing I am going to ask you in my preamble here, Mr. Minister, refers to the fall education tests. When can we expect the answer? I have had the results from my school since January. We were not one of the select schools, we did it as an option. However, if the results have been run through the computer, is there a reason why these results of the tests comparing the educational standards of 1978 with 1958 are not made public? I should hope that the results of these tests prove conducive, but I charge you, Mr. Minister, whether they are conducive to what we are doing or not, to not dilly-dally and get these out to the people of Saskatchewan because the educators in Saskatchewan are itching to know the results.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, let me comment on some of the remarks made by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley — some I think he did not particularly expect a response to but was stating a position of his own, which isn't necessarily different from ours or necessarily a criticism.

Innovative grants — I cannot respond specifically to the grant which the member raised. I can only say and say unequivocally that so long as I am minister, the dispensing of the innovative grants will not be based on who represents the riding that the grant was requested from, if that is what is being suggested. Frankly knowing the integrity of my predecessors, I would be surprised if that were the case in the past either. I think by and large these have been equitably administered. There may have been some degree, I suppose, of sloppiness in the administration, I don't know, in one or two grants. I would be surprised, in a sense, if the administration was always 100 per cent in something which is this large and unwieldy. Don't forget that in the innovative grants there are two portions. There is \$5,000 allocated to each region and that's divided up for an innovative grant in the region and then the schools may apply directly to the department for approval as well. It becomes fairly complex in its administration because the regions may give out a grant and the department may give out a grant and that they add to some of the complexity.

I could go through the list of innovative grants for last year and point out all the grants that were in opposition ridings. I think that's unnecessary unless you specifically want it. I suppose I could table the list of innovative grants for you. Suffice it to say that my

reading of this list suggest that politics had really nothing to do with how it was divided up.

The member for Indian Head-Wolseley also referred to the importance of a teacher in the classroom and I couldn't agree more. I have had some discussions with teachers and I have had some discussions with members of the media who have said to me with declining enrolment, isn't this an ideal opportunity to decrease the number of students in a classroom? My response to that has always been that I don't think there is any evidence that within reasonable limits the size of the classroom is a major factor in how well the student learns. Obviously, if you went down to five students in a classroom that would probably be an improvement. If you went to an average of 75 students in a classroom that would probably be a detriment. But within reasonable limits, 25 to 15 sort of thing, I'm not sure it makes a lot of difference. I recall the classes in which I learned a lot. Regarding most of them I can vividly remember the name of the teacher and his face and I can remember the subject matter as being one I was interested in. I think the quality of the teacher and the motivation of the student has a lot more to do with it than how many desks are seated inside the room.

I am cognizant of what the member said about the necessity to screen teachers and do as good a job of this as we can. It is not an easy task in any field where you are dealing with personnel, Mr. Chairman, to weed out the incompetent and pick only the competent. The unfortunate fact of life is that whether we are dealing with deputy ministers or whether we are dealing with teachers, or whether the public is trying to elect their MLAs, they normally find out after they have been in service for a while whether or not they are going to do a good job, but not beforehand. And that is as true of elected members as it is of teachers. It is not easy to tell in advance.

The member made some comments about the English curriculum. Suffice it to say, I have, by and large, stayed out of the area of curriculums. The system we have is that we have curriculum committees which represent the teachers; we have representatives of the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation) on it and some parents as well. They draw up the curriculums without much guidance from the political masters of the day. That has been the case for a long time. I have to make appointments to the curriculum committees, but I automatically approve them. I never know who is going on and who is going off. And that system hasn't worked badly. By and large, curriculums in this province have reflected the popular mood of the day, when the progressivism of the province have reflected the popular mood of the day, when the progressivism of the '50s and '60s was in vogue, our curriculums reflected that. I think they also reflected back to the basic mood that is prevalent today. I think the curriculum committees that we have, which are free from control by the department, by and large reflect the public mood.

I thank the member for his comments on special ed. We are proud of the job we are doing on special education. I say again, as I said at the Kinsmen TeleMiracle — special education, for the benefit of any one who is not wrapped up in the field of education, deals with handicapped students — I think it is to be expected, the province which would do the best job of dealing with handicapped and disadvantaged students is Saskatchewan. I think it goes back to our background, a rural background of people who learn to help each other, learn to help the less fortunate neighbours in the district, and also come out and help the handicapped students. So, I think it is typical of the Saskatchewan experience, if I may say so.

The member referred, as well, to the education of the gifted. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the concerns of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) are the

**April 10, 1979**

concerns of the member for Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington) as well. I think I can say that we are probably doing as good a job in dealing with gifted children as are other provinces. But that has never been the mark beside which we tested ourselves in education in Saskatchewan.

In the past, in various areas and I could name them, we have sought not to equal other provinces but we have sought excellence. We have achieved that in special education; achieved that in the area of libraries and so on. I could name three or four areas we have done pretty well in.

With respect to the gifted, I think as I say, we are doing as well as other provinces, but we are not satisfied with that. We have an internal committee working on the education of the gifted and with deference to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley I will use the word gifted, rather than superior learning abilities, which I think is the word he used. We are trying to propose a working definition and that is a key problem. We are trying to identify programming options for schools and we are supporting some special programs with extra funds this year. I too was encouraged by what was going on in Regina. I think I am correct in saying that we are not supporting that project. They have been doing that with their own resources. I believe we are funding a pilot project in Prince Albert, which seeks to develop a program for the education of the gifted.

Going on with some of the other comments of the member for Indian Head-Wolseley — he raised the question as to whether or not teachers should start in elementary school for Divisions one and two and then graduate into the high school. This raises a nice question as to whether or not Divisions I and II present, in fact, a simpler role and whether or not that is where you learn. I think there are educators around who would dispute that, and who would say that the elementary school is every bit as difficult and demanding as the high school. So I say to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley, while I suppose his point of view that the high schools are harder to teach than the elementary schools, that has probably dominated educational thought in Saskatchewan since the inception.

For years we have had higher requirements in high schools and so on. I think there are many who would say that that is a misconception and a myth and that elementary schools are every bit as demanding and in many ways, more important because it is in the elementary school that the child's basic attitudes towards education are formed. So I say to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley that his point of view is not universal.

He mentioned the increase in the number of superintendents. I will point out later, I think, under that particular heading that that is an internal transfer within government educational psychologist who were doing much the same work in the Department of Health and we thought it administratively tidier to move them into the Department of Education — so there are no new bodies on the tax roll. There were two new special education consultants to bring the number up to eight, so there is a special education consultant in each region. That is the other two.

I was interested in the member's comments on the need for leadership by superintendents. This is something that we try to stress to them but they do have a role in developing educational goals and providing leadership in the broadest sense within that school division. Admittedly, many of them are overworked and I think many school boards might be encouraged to hire assistant superintendents and to hire staff for the superintendents. I am not sure, if you take the view that the act does, that the director of



education is the chief administrative officer — that you can relieve him of a lot of that work; but you can, I think provide him with assistance and I think many school boards should be encouraged to do that. Again, that is something of a local decision. I would point out that only a third of the superintendents are provincially employed. By and large there are exceptions. Mr. Chairman, those superintendents tend to be in the smaller division. The larger divisions obviously impose more work on a superintendent or a director of education as it is now called, but by and large, those are locally employed people, and that is a local decision.

This is the final item that I've made note of. The member raised the issue of the fall education tests, and what we have called the testing results for the province. I hope it's out very soon. Indeed, I hope it's out long before the end of this session. I hope it's out this month. Much of the research has been finalized, and it's been put into a final form, and I hope it's out, as I say, very, very soon. We all look for it with eager anticipation.

We have a partnership of the teachers, the boards of education, and the Department of Education. I think the testing results are going to show that the partnership is doing a much better job in 1978 than it did in 1958. I don't think that's any reason particularly, for a great deal of self-congratulation and complacency, because I think there are far greater demands on our educational system in 1978 than there were in 1958. Much more is being demanded of the school and much more is being demanded of those students when they graduate. But, I'm convinced that we will fare pretty well vis-à-vis 1958, and I'm hopeful that we will fare pretty well vis-à-vis other provinces in Canada.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'd just like to mention a couple of things concerning your remarks. You misinterpreted a bit what I meant by a little political patronage. I didn't mean that certain constituencies got certain grants. What I did mean, and what I was alluding to, was that it looked to me to be becoming kind of a way of handling it around the province on a basis of, these ones haven't had anything, so maybe we should give them something, and it would be a good advertisement, rather than people who are coming up with really hard documented cases for what I call scientific educational research. Now, I may have the intention of the innovative grants program all wrong, but that's what I was led to believe it was.

Regarding your comments on classroom size, Mr. Minister, I think I would have to agree with you, and I agree in this way. I agree with you that you can lecture to 25 as effectively as you can lecture to 10. But, if you're going to change your method to where you have more individual instruction, more two-way interaction, that's when class size becomes a factor.

Another comment I wanted to make on curriculum that I would like you to give some thought to is are we inclined to push too much downwards? I get this from parents sometimes. They say that in some of these cases we are pushing it downwards. I mean down the grade levels, that our expectations of some of the students at say the Grade 2 or 3 level are quite demanding in view of the type of academic material we're asking them to digest. You misconstrued my remarks a bit or else I didn't present them correctly on teaching in Division II as a start. I was mainly referring to the discipline aspect and I think that there is quite a demand in Divisions III and IV for strong discipline in many cases. Where as you go lower and I grant you and I've always said that the most important teacher and the good teacher was needed with that little person who's starting his educational career. But I think you must agree that students are more receptive and warmer and easier, I would say, to handle at a little younger age and maybe that's what I was indicating.

**April 10, 1979**

Now, going to your number of people, and I think we could discuss this here while we're on subvote 1 and then we won't have to hold up. With your permission (he's alluded to and so have I) and I'm looking, Mr. Chairman, at No. 9 under Superintendents and I'd just like clarification. We've both talked about it, so with your permission, could we clear that one now?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — I don't like to stray from the pattern that I have, but if . . .

**MR. TAYLOR:** — That's fine. That's all, we'll go on subvotes then.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Just let me respond to one comment very briefly. I suppose one might make an argument in some ways, and I'm referring to the disposition of innovative grants. I suppose one might make an argument for ensuring that all parts of the province get one innovative grant. Apart from that portion of the grant which is given to the region to disperse. I'm assured by the officials that there is no effort to ensure that the grants go evenly to various areas of the province. What may have appeared as that must have been something else. I'm assured there's no such effort on the part of the administration.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — In keeping with what we have been asking, Mr. Minister, regarding salaries. I would like this information and you don't have to give it all to me verbally. You can provide it to me — and that is your top three officials in each of your departments under each subvote — what we want was their estimated salaries for '78-79, their actual salary and their estimated salary for '79-80. Can you provide that for us — the top three officials in each of these, say executive, administration and program development and so on?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, I thank the member for his courtesy in allowing us to provide that over the floor and my officials are writing it out and I'll be sending it over in a very few moments — I've got it right with us.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I have one other question (and I must assure the deputy minister and the officials here that I'm in no way on a witch hunt concerning you individuals), but it's a question that has come up in other departments and it's a question of merit pay. We all understand the general negotiated increases and also, I would like an indication if there has been any merit pay. Also, Mr. Minister, what officials are provided with cars? I imagine the rate is the same as any other department; 1 per cent of the value. I will accept that.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'll answer the latter question and I'll undertake the matter that relates to the car. The deputy minister is provided with a car as are all deputies and none of the other top three are. The questions about merit increases I'll undertake to provide across the floor in writing just as soon as it can be written down back here.

**MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose):** — I just would like to pose a question or two. To begin with, I notice under executive administration, you have a drop in personnel and I was wondering if that's a restructuring of the department or for what reason is there that drop of three people?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Well, it reflects an actual reduction in staff. It is the tail end, if I may say so, of a reorganization that began some years ago, long before I was minister. It

represents an actual reduction in staff. One of the positions (and two of them are senior positions I might add) is the position of associate deputy minister which was not filled. One of them is the position as special advisor to the minister which is now filled and notice has been given. The other is the clerk-steno IV which is filled but the occupant of that position will be reassigned to another vacant position in the department.

**MR. SWAN:** — The other question I would like to ask you is if you are taking a new look at your grant structure as it relates to rural Saskatchewan? I notice as I watched the papers for the urbans, and the mill rate increases are very modest in most of the urbans and yet, many of the rurals are informing me that their mill rate is increasing five and six mills. It seems that something is going out of balance in that grant formula. I'm wondering if you have been taking a look at it and can give us some reasons for this?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I can only say to the member that the intention of the formula was that the burden of taxation would fall, in a sense, equally on rural and urban people. I think the member is aware that there's always been a 15 to 20 mill higher rate in the urbans than in the rurals; that's intentional. That has always been there and it has always been intentional, and we admit that education is a more expensive proposition in rural areas. It's that simple; however, we certainly don't intend in our recent grants to see mill rates rising faster in rural areas than in the urban areas. The intention is if they rise at all they should rise the same. I have before me an initial indication of increases in mill rates. It's very initial. I have perhaps 20 or so estimated mill rates for 1979. This document does not suggest that there's any faster increase in rural areas than the urban area, and I think I can tell the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) if that were to occur another year we would readjust the granting formula to take care of it. If somehow or other it should happen that rates increase faster in rural areas than in urban areas, we would adjust the grants another year to correct for that. It certainly isn't the intention of the foundation grant formula.

**MR. SWAN:** — Mr. Minister, I understand by what you are saying that you don't have at this point in time a list of the mill rates that have been struck for the year. I would appreciate receiving a copy of that list when you have it because the information I am getting, and I have talked to many school boards . . . They keep phoning because I think they feel that we could have some influence and get them a little more money, but there doesn't seem to be any more around. I would like to know what your findings are. The information I received from many points in the province is that rural mill rates are increasing five or six mills and that the cities are averaging somewhere around 2.5 mills, so I would like to have that watched fairly closely.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I could bore the member by reading these that I have, but I think that's not going to be very useful. Certainly, Mr. . . . (inaudible) . . . has made a note of it and as soon as those mill rate increases are in, he'll be providing them through the member for Rosetown-Elrose.

**MR. SWAN:** — One other question that I would like to ask before we move on and that is, in your regional office structure . . . I don't see the listing here in the educational area unless I am reading it wrong. I don't see the listing of the staff for your regional offices. I was wondering if that figure is missing somewhere or am I just not picking it up?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I refer the member to two subvotes. One is item no. 6 which lists as I understand it the head office sort of personnel. The field staff are in item no. 9 under the title of Superintendents and that's the one where there has been a 10 person increase that we are going to get to in a moment. I think you will find the staff list under subvote 9

**April 10, 1979**

not under subvote 6.

**MR. SWAN:** — That includes all of the staff then for the regional offices in the province, all of the regional offices.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There are some people on contractual services and there are some on temporary which aren't part of the blue book and of course, never are in any subvote. But apart from contractual and temporary people that includes them all; that's right.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Under the other expenses in item 1 — they went up somewhat. Could you explain that please?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is a number of, Mr. Chairman, small increases and I could go through them all if you want. The major increase here is an item of \$30,000 for the International Year of the Child, which is a one time shot only. That's what inflates this figure for this year. Another year it will drop down and I, or whoever is Minister of Education, will have the job of explaining why it has gone down. That's the reason. That accounts for all the increase actually; it's International year of the Child.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — What are you planning to do?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — You know the one year project. We won't be having that money in that subvote another year.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I realize that. But, you know, for \$30,000 in the International Year of the Child, just what are you doing with it, that's what I want to know?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, the House has to keep in mind that most of the money for International Year of the Child is in the estimates of my colleague from Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) of the social services department. That's where most of the money is. Our money is, by and large, money to host conferences and we are at this point in time working on some conferences that we might hold. Our money will, by and large, host conferences, that's really all. All of the program money is in the social services.

Item 1 agreed.

## **ITEM 2**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I know that you go from \$14,840 up to \$37,490 under other personnel services. You are hiring someone else, what are they doing?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — That is a temporary information officer to assist in the information section of the department.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — The person has been hired?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, Mr. Chairman, on temporary.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Who is this person?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I'm told his name is Greg McLean.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Why is there a temporary information officer? Is there something you are going to be supplying information for, for a little while, and then no longer?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The explanation is that there was a request for a part-time information officer and a part-time commercial artist. That was thought not to be feasible, I gather, by the budget analyst in the treasury bureau so, instead, we are hiring a temporary information officer. If it works out, as we hope it does, that position may be permanent, but until we see that that is, in fact, the help we need, we are not making the position permanent. It may well be that this may be a permanent position next year when we decide that that's what we need. I gather there was some disagreement as to exactly who we need down there.

Item 2 agreed.

Items 3 to 5 agreed.

## ITEM 6

**MR. TAYLOR:** — How many regions do you have, Mr. Minister?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Eight.

Item 6 agreed.

## ITEM 7

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I see you have increased \$100,000 in your other personal services, consultative services. Would you tell me what positions these are, Mr. Minister?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — This entire increase, Mr. Chairman, comes about in one area and that's the driving while intoxicated program. Our expenditures under the driving while intoxicated program have increased from \$64,000 last year to \$168,200 in the upcoming fiscal year.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Your driving while intoxicated program I hope fits into the driver training. I want you to explain this driving while intoxicated program, where it's being offered. I hope it's part of the driver training.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It's being offered in 17 jurisdictions. It was piloted, I think it is fair to say, in Prince Albert. It has achieved extremely good results in other jurisdictions where it has been operating longer. It was really pioneered in Arizona. I think Alberta had it some time before we did and now we're into it in a fairly major way.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — This is one of our firsts.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, I'm afraid this is not one of our firsts; it's an area where we're catching up to some other provinces which we don't always admit are ahead of us. It is an attempt to rehabilitate drivers who have been drinking and who have been convicted under the criminal Code for drinking offences. They take this course and it is in lieu of a driver suspension. That's the basic philosophy of the program. Instead of having their driver's licence suspended for six months, they may get by with a suspension for one or two months. They have to take the course as well. It has achieved excellent results

where it has been used. The rate of recidivism among drinking drivers is extremely high. Of the various crimes one can think of, the various sort of personal crimes, the rate of recidivism among drinking drivers is as high as it is with any other major crime. It's a serious problem. In an attempt to get these drivers off the bottle we set up the DWI (driving while impaired) program, again copying a program pioneered in Arizona and in widespread use in at least Alberta. Initially the initiative came for the AG's department. I know a little bit about it because I was in the AG's department when the thing began, when we set the thing up in Prince Albert.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — My concern though is, who is taking this. You say there are 17 jurisdictions. It must break down to about \$10,000 a jurisdiction. Who is taking this course? Are these adults? Why is this not the Department of Continuing Education?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It happens to relate, I say to the House, to personnel. We have, in the Department of Education, a guy by the name of Gordon McGregor. He's a real dynamo in the area of highway traffic and safety.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — He happens to feel for the program and have an understanding of it and he does a lot of work with respect to school safety. He's developed a program, which you may be aware of, called the human preservation program. He puts some 50,000 miles a year on this car whipping around the province getting this into the schools.

We also have given to him, because of his specialized knowledge in administration, the DWI (Driving While Impaired) program. It might be in the Attorney General's department (which is where it started out because I was there when it started) or it might be in continuing education because it relates to the education of adults. It relates precious little to the elementary and secondary schools but we just happen to have the personnel to do the job properly and as a matter of personnel convenience it's in our department.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Yes, I'm aware of Gordon McGregor. As you well know, earlier today I was mentioning your human preservation program K to 6. I think it's a good program but I'm mystified why this is in education, why it didn't stay with the Attorney General's department and why it isn't over in continuing education? I realize this fellow probably has the expertise and I know he's a dynamic individual and I think he's doing good work. But I would suggest that it is a little bit misrepresentative being in the department that to me is the education of basically people who fall within the school system.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I can only say to the member for Indian Head-Wolseley that it mystified me when I first saw it in the estimates. I think the answer provided, which is not completely illogical, is that we use the same personnel, the McGregor team, for the human preservation program (which does belong in the schools and is aimed directly at students) as we do for the DWI program. You could shift the whole lot of it over into the Attorney General's department but then you would have in the Attorney General's subvotes an expenditure for the human preservation program, and that wouldn't make any sense. Because we use the same personnel for both programs it is put in education. It could just as easily be in the Attorney General's department, or more logically, I suppose, in the continuing education department.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — O.K., you've given a reasonable explanation. However, is there

consideration (and I think there's need) for your DWI program, and maybe even certain components of this program (I don't know the whole program, but I suggest this is a consideration) to be put right into the driver education program also?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is a unit within driver education which seeks to give driving students facts about alcohol and driving so they know that 50 per cent of accidents involve alcohol, etc., and they know the dangers when they drive and drink. So, we attempt to provide the students with that information in the driver education. It is already built into that component. This does not seek to deal with students, as I have explained it. It deals with law offenders. It is a little like the fine-option program or one of those things. It has nothing to do with the schools or elementary schools.

Item 7 agreed.

### ITEM 8

**MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Minister, I believe this would be the subvote where I would like to ask a question about the status of the developmental centres which have now come under the Department of Education. Just where does that stand now in terms of the numbers that have been taken over? I am speaking mainly of the children who are under what we would normally think of as school age.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think I introduced Mr. Livingston earlier, but if I didn't this is Bob Livingston, chief of special ed. Most of you probably know him anyway.

I am informed that there are 70 students within the developmental centre who are pre-school age and there are 70 pre-school age children who are receiving help. I am informed 60 of those are in developmental centres and 10 are in programs for the hearing impaired. So, 60 of them are in the developmental centres.

**MR. McLEOD:** — What stage does this put this at? Are you anticipating quite an increase in different jurisdictions around the province? Have you pretty well taken over all of the developmental centres and these multi-handicapped kids who are under school age now, under jurisdiction of the Department of Education?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am informed in these terms the program is reasonably mature. Most of them are in the developmental centres now. We don't anticipate any giant increase.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Just one question for information on these developmental centres. What is the minimum age in which you can be admitted to these? Is it three?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Three years.

Item 8 agreed.

### ITEM 9

**MR. SWAN:** — I would like to ask, under this subvote, why would you call it superintendence? Now the regional offices, you do have regional superintendents, but you have more consultants and other staff in those offices than you have superintendents. That is why I was having difficulty finding this particular one. Here it looked more to me like you were going back to the provincial employment of

superintendents than anything else. I was wondering why the heading and could it possibly be changed to really identify it?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, it probably should be. The heading, in a sense, is educational jargon because the word superintendence refer to superintendency consulting, field services and so on. I agree it's not very descriptive and perhaps for another blue book, we might change that name. I think the name is largely historical. At one point in time (as the member will be aware) there were a lot of superintendents in there. Now, there are a lot of consultants and people who provide us with services and perhaps the name should be changed. It is education jargon, I think.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — This was the one we were going to discuss earlier, the increase of ten employees. I think you said the educational psychologists had been moved over into education from health which is a fine move. Could you tell me who the other ones are? How many educational psychologists there are, just account for the ten people, Mr. Minister?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There are two education consultants; of the ten two were co-ordinators of special education. This brought the number of special education consultants from six to eight so that there is one in each region. So that we can fairly say no matter which region you are in, there is a special education consultant to work with the teachers and the parents and the boards of education when the need arises. Those two consultants went into regions two and six. The other eight were educational psychologists who had long been in the Department of Health (I think they've been in there virtually since the war) and their role became more and more specialized until they were dealing almost entirely with education. At that point in time, it made sense to get them out of the Department of Health into the Department of Education. I gather there was some jurisdictional dispute about whether they ought to be doing this or that. So in its wisdom the Treasury Board moved these eight positions into the Department of Education.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Now, if I follow you correctly then, eight of these people are educational psychologists and two of them are consultants in the field of special education.

Item 9 agreed.

Item 10 agreed.

## ITEM 11

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister, I notice there are four employees for the School for the Deaf. Where do these employees come in? What four have they dropped from and why?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There are two fewer teachers and those were vacancies. They weren't staff cuts, they were vacancies. There are two fewer parental care supervisors and those are also vacancies.

I may say to the hon. member that there was a dramatic drop of enrollment in the School for the Deaf in the last year. It was quite dramatic. It went from 150 to 119, or some such figure and that accounts for the drop in the staff. We just can't keep the same staff busy with virtually 70 per cent of the number of students. That is where the cuts came



in. They were teaching staff and parental supervisors. That is the reason.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Minister, can you tell me if you have extended your total communication program? You were trying it out. There was an experiment in the first couple of grades.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I gather the answer to that is no. They still use the oral program and the priority and the others.

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Minister, I would just like to mention a few things about what is happening. It seems to me that the deaf people are being denied, by going to the School for the Deaf — and don't get me wrong. The School for the Deaf has been a wonderful school, but I think the students are being denied the chance to go on to university. There is probably only 10 per cent of any graduating class, maybe 15 per cent, that are able to go on to university from the School for the Deaf.

I think a good part of that, I think, has been proven out by returning students who graduate from Gallaudet college where they don't have any opportunities of teaching in the School for the Deaf at Saskatoon. They will not hire them as teachers no matter whether they have graduated or what they have graduated in and if they are capable of teaching these students at the School for the Deaf. They have to be house parents for the students and that is as far as these graduates from Gallaudet can go in Saskatchewan as far as working back at the school

By not going to total communication, as does Gallaudet college, I think you are denying some of these students the right to go on to university, the chance to go on to university, because you have to remember that there is only 15 or 20 per cent of all deaf people who learn to become good lip readers. And if they can't graduate on your oral type of teaching, only to go on to trade school, then they are denied this right to go to university.

Most of these students, a good percentage of these students, are very smart and if you give them the opportunity to total communication you will find that they will go on and they will compete with any student in Saskatchewan. I wonder if you would comment on that?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think it is apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) knows a fair amount about the School for the Deaf and I congratulate him on that. He obviously has more background on the thing than I do. I think my officials might respond by saying that the total communication program is used in all but the primary levels and I think they feel that there is a reasonable number of these people going on to post-secondary institutions.

I think the best response that I can give the member for Estevan is to say that we will take his comments under consideration and consider them during the year, because I think in a sense we are arguing about philosophies of education and what is the best way to educate students. You can carry on with that for quite awhile, I think, without being very decisive. I think it is fair to say that you have articulated one school of thought fairly well. Others might articulate another school of thought. All I can do is to undertake to consider the views that you have expressed here today.

**MR. LARTER:** — I would like to add a couple more things, Mr. Minister. I think the

**April 10, 1979**

Saskatchewan government has done a good job of educating deaf people throughout the years. In the case of blind people, they have to go to Brantford or Halifax or somewhere. In Saskatchewan, they have kept it right at home and this school has operated under many governments through the years and has done a real fine job. I am not too smart on anything but I had a daughter who graduated from there and that is the only reason I know. It is very, very frustrating to the students coming back from Gallaudet College, (this is the only liberal arts college in the world, as you know) to their own province, if they want to live here. None of them can work at the School for the Deaf and naturally, the first place they come is home if they have graduated from Gallaudet, if they specialize in some special training. They really would like to see that opportunity come to them. We have had many students come home and take jobs as houseparents, much to their parent's dissatisfaction. They hate to see their children go through college and then take a job looking after a lot of young children. I think it is below their educational level and I think they should have a chance.

Right now the students from there are going to Edmonton, I think, and they can graduate with the other course, they have to go the trade school way. I think the government is very good at hiring disabled people and I know there are quite a few deaf people working for the provincial government. I commend you for that. I just want to make sure that you do look into this because they are being denied the right to go on to college.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — You have my undertaking, Mr. Chairman. I assume the hon. member will effect to raise it next year, and we'll be prepared with an adequate response on the issue. It's kind of a new issue, but we'll be all ready for you next year.

Item 11 agreed.

## **ITEM 12**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I see that in the last estimates you had six posts there. I don't see any number of employees there and \$272,000. Could you explain this for me, please.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No change, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — What do you mean by no change?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Six last year, six this year.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Oh, you just didn't get it printed?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It's just a typographical error in the blue book.

Item 12 agreed.

Item 13 agreed.

## **ITEM 14**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — A reduction of \$2 million in the capital grants, what's the reason? Is there not the demand or what?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Obviously, Mr. Chairman, we anticipated the question. I've got

the answer written down; then we have trouble finding it. We probably could have given it faster and easier if we hadn't bothered. I think all members of the House, at least most members of the House, are aware of how the capital funding works. By direct grants, the province picks up somewhere between 25 per cent and 45 percent of the cost of a building, depending on a lot of factors too numerous to go into now. It probably averages about 30 per cent per school. Through debentures, the school is allowed to pay an additional 60 per cent, and they're allowed to pay those debentures out of their operating grant, and the foundation grant recognizes that. So, in sum total, the province picks up 90 per cent of the cost of school buildings. So we have a pretty direct interest in what is built. Let me make a number of comments, then I think one major comment which would address the issue. There are this year no major projects on the go, like the northeast Regina high school, and these things tend to be very spotty. We'll do a couple of major projects and then there won't be any, and then we'll pump up another couple. There are, so far, no emergency situation. That can happen. We can't control fire. There have been some rental arrangements made in lieu of building programs. There's more renovation work now being done than new work. I think candidly I would admit that we have sought restraint in this area. We are facing, in the urban areas, a shifting of students, from the downtown areas to the suburbs, and so on and so forth. And because so much of this money is provincial and so little is local, there is always great pressure by the parents, to have a school on the doorstep. Because so much of it is our money and so little of it is local money, some school boards, very few but some, request of us a new school whenever they get a request from the parents.

I have to say, in fairness, the vast majority of school boards, I think, would not be particularly critical of this figure. I think the vast majority of them see a need for restraint in all areas and this is one area where we need to exercise whatever efficiencies we can thus we have intentionally held the lid on this and we've intentionally been fairly tight with the capital money.

We asked them to explore renovation, rather than building a new school; we asked them to explore renting; we asked them to explore the transportation of students. That doesn't win many adherents in the urban areas. Rural students can ride a couple of hours on a school bus but that doesn't work in the urban areas. They don't like doing it, so we don't get as much of that as we might if we really clamped down on it.

But I think, in honesty, Mr. Chairman, intentionally we're keeping a tight lid on this because this figure could just balloon endlessly on us if we didn't. We are asking school boards to explore every other avenue and, by and large, they have been very co-operative. There were some exceptions. A number of school boards have come in to see me (who will go unnamed) who want more schools here and there and everywhere, but the vast majority of them have been very, very co-operative and I applaud them for it.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I was glad to hear your comment on renovations. I think this is probably one thing that should be looked at. To what extent do you look at and adopt portable classrooms in regard to your shifting patterns in urban population?

The other comment I would like to make is that this is one department — we've been questioning many of them and it seems that in many of the other departments there is a terrible reluctance to rent, especially in some of the Crown corporations, the name of the game is build. I'm glad to see that you don't follow the same procedure whole hog, as some of the others in your government do.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I don't think I can tell you, very quickly, how many portable

**April 10, 1979**

classrooms we have. We attempt to encourage school boards to use these wherever possible in many ways in fairness to the urban school boards (who again do not like to bus students). In many ways, in fairness, they are not much of a solution.

What happens in my riding is living proof of the problem. I'm one member who does not want another school in my riding. Why? Because virtually every school in my riding is under utilized, like in the downtown area of Regina. Virtually every school is under utilized. One school, Victoria School, has 60 some students in it. And that was a couple of years ago. There must be below 50 students in a school which was designed for 300.

The limitation on the portable classroom is that it doesn't solve that problem. What we need, if you don't want to bus students is . . . Students out in northwest, northeast, south or Lakeview or wherever, want the schools in the suburbs. We attempt to use the portable classrooms wherever possible. I am told there are 10 being bought by the Regina Public School Board this year and four for the Regina Separate School Board but they're not really a complete answer because that's not what they want to do. They want the schools to follow the people and the portable classrooms don't solve that.

**MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake):** — I've just got a question regarding a request that was made by the Meadow Lake School Unit Board for a capital grant for, I believe, an addition in the town of Meadow Lake. As the minister may or may not know, (I believe he would know) that's one area of the province where this decline in enrolment is not taking place. An increase in enrolment is the case there. I would just like to know some of the details behind your department's decision to refuse this request which I think everyone in that area would think to be a reasonable one.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think the best answer I can give you is the information I have and the one I'm looking at does not suggest that this is a grant being requested to handle additional students. The one I'm looking at is Father Cochin. The information I have before me suggests this request was not made to handle more students. What they wanted to do was replace some old schools. That's something very different. That's something we're not encouraging them to do. Obviously, the schools are eventually going to fall down and you got to rebuild them but the information I have before me suggests that that wasn't the reason for the application.

Items 14 and 15 agreed.

## **ITEM 16**

**MR. TAYLOR:** — I'd like to ask a question on this. This is the fund with your contributions to the teachers' superannuation and you're putting in matching amounts now? Would you explain this to me, Mr. Minister, please?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, we have never put in matching contributions. I'm not sure what the theory for that was because the decision was made, I gather, really after the war. I've asked why we didn't make matching contributions and the answer is we never did. Why did we never do it? Well, because the government of the day wanted to use that money to operate government programs. That was an effective way of borrowing against the future and we have never put in matching contributions. Each year we just put in the fund the amount that we're going to need to meet our obligations for that year, so that's just an amount we pour in every year to meet the current year's obligations to teachers' pensions and group life insurance.

**MR. SWAN:** — I wonder if the minister could tell us or give us some idea of the amount of the unfunded liability that we now have in teacher superannuation?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — If I were wrong in this figure I would not want the difference taken out of my salary. I'll tell you that. Again it depends on how much trust you put in actuaries. You can hire different actuaries who will give you different figures because they make different assumptions about interest rates and what the inflation rate is going to be and what the rate of the increase in the wage index is going to be. The last one we had done for the fund suggested that the unfunded liability — and that was done in 1976 — was \$500 million. It is undoubtedly larger than that now. I have asked that a recent study be done by a different actuary and his figure was \$675 million. There is no doubt that that is a source of deep concern to the government.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — This last study, the figure of \$675 million, when did you receive that, Mr. Minister?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Oh, about three weeks ago, Mr. Chairman.

Item 16 agreed.

Item 17 agreed.

### REVERT TO ITEM 11

**MR. LARTER:** — Do you mind if I just go back to item 11, just for one second? Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would have your officials look into the possibility of running an experimental classroom in history, math, or whatever, from one of the students who has graduated from Gallaudet. It could be run in conjunction with your school year to see what the students do in that class with total communication. I am talking about the later grades to see what they do in total communication as compared to a class where only oral teaching is going on in the School for the Deaf. I would appreciate if you would look at that?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — We will, Mr. Chairman, undertake to consider that and I say, no doubt the member will remember that in another year.

Education — Vote 8 agreed.

### PROVINCIAL LIBRARY — VOTE 29

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Would the minister introduce his staff, please.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Chairman, sitting on my left is the Provincial Librarian, Don Meadows; sitting directly behind Mr. Meadows is the Director of Administration, Marcel J. de Laforest.

### ITEM 1

**MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley):** — The same question on the salaries, Mr. Minister, as in the Department of Education: the top three under each vote, O.K.?

**April 10, 1979**

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I was handed a document but it doesn't include quite all of the information you want because you want the actual and the estimated for last year and the estimated for the next year. We'll have to supply that to you and again, I thank you for your courtesy in allowing us to do it in writing.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2 agreed.

### **ITEM 3**

**MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):** — Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask are your local libraries, regional libraries funded under there?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Subvote 4.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — There are 52 employees. Where are they if they're not in the regional library branch? Are they all here in the provincial library?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, they're all in the provincial library.

Item 3 agreed.

### **ITEM 4**

**MR. LARTER:** — Mr. Minister, I wonder if your department has ironed out the communication problems or the differences between the Estevan Regional Library? I think you know there is a running battle going on at the present time. I wonder if you've ironed that out yet?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I think the best answer I can give the member for Estevan is that we did not get involved in that dispute. I know the one he is referring to. We stayed out of it as we try to stay out of some of these disputes and this time with success. We weren't involved in it at all. I think it is settled now.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — In the regional library movement, could you tell me approximately how many areas of the province are not involved in this?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am not sure of the exact number, Mr. Chairman. Only 8 per cent of the municipalities are not part of the regional library system. I should add, Mr. Chairman, that is 8 per cent by number, so that it is far, far less than that by people, because the ones who aren't involved tend to be smaller municipalities, the rural municipalities and so on. All of the large cities and all of the towns and so on are in it, so that it is 8 per cent by number and a very small number by people, extremely small.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — Has that 8 per cent been rather a constant figure or have you been making headway to encompass the whole province into this over the last three years?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — It is moving down every year. In fairness, if I may say so, we are getting down to some of the tough nuts. When you get down to 8 per cent you are down to a very few number of municipalities and we are down to some tough nuts now. So while the 8 per cent figure has been going down, I can't assure the members that it will go down at the same figure.

In five years, I am told, 184 municipalities have joined. That is a 27 per cent increase. It should be recognized that we are reaching the top because we are not going to have 100 per cent.

**MR. TAYLOR:** — What about your funding to the regional libraries? What has been the increase, say over the last two years? Have you been increasing your funding?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am informed that it was 8.5 last year and 10 the year before.

Provincial Library Vote 29 agreed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — If I might, as Chairman, just commend both the minister and his department and the opposition, for the manner in which they have conducted themselves here this evening. It has been very simple to do.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **TOURISM AND RENEWABLE RESOURCES — VOTE 39**

**HON. A. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to, first of all, introduce to the committee the staff that I have with me. To my right is the Deputy Minister Art Hartwell. To my left is the Associate Deputy Minister John Burton and behind me, to my right, is the Director of Administrative Services Ray McBride. Beside him is the Director of Regional Services Lyle Lensen. Sitting behind is the Director of Assistance Programs George Rathwell and the Director of Tourism and Recreation Murray Laird and Director of Fisheries and Wildlife Services George Couldwell.

### **ITEM 1**

**MR. J. GARNER (WILKIE):** — Mr. Chairman, before I get into a few questions I have in this department, I have a few comments regarding this department.

In looking back over the past few years, at financial statements sent out by this department it is rather disturbing. Because I know if I ran my ranch operation like this and went to a bank to try to borrow some money, a bank or a credit union, I wouldn't get anything.

We go from 1975 to 1977 on receipts. We have a 45 per cent increase. We go into 1978 in receipts and we only have an 8 per cent increase. Now we go to disbursements. Disbursements weren't too bad from 1976 to 1977, a 1.2 per cent increase. But then we go to 1978 and we have an 18 per cent increase. For 1978 we have a deficit of \$13,733,192. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a department that should not be running at a deficit. It has been running at a deficit. I think and hope next year maybe the financial statement that can be presented to us, in estimates can at least cut down this deficit.

There are reasons, I believe, for this deficit and I will try to go through some of them. One is our crop depredation program. I've raised this earlier in the House.

I fail to see how any minister can predict one year ahead what the crop depredation is

**April 10, 1979**

going to be for the upcoming year. To tell the people of Saskatchewan (the farmers of Saskatchewan) that an agreement has been signed, when in all essence there was no agreement signed. In 1978 the agreement was not signed until March 1, 1979.

For a minister to lock himself into an agreement of only \$675,000 coming from the federal government on a cost sharing program and then turn around and blame the federal government for not negotiating, not keeping their end of the bargain is deceitful.

Mr. Chairman, not only the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources is at fault in this agreement, the Minister of Agriculture is also, for deceiving the farmers of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — True!

**MR. GARNER:** — It is taking the attitude of (and it seems to be the attitude of the provincial government and the federal government) passing the ducks around, shall we say, saying they're not Saskatchewan ducks, they're not Canadian ducks, they're Carter's ducks.

Mr. Chairman, we have some ducks who shoot their mouths off a lot on the other side of this House. They're doing it right now. I can go through these estimates a lot faster if we'd get some quiet. Otherwise, it's going to take us a long time.

Mr. Speaker, the minister, in the annual report under his comments says, and I would just like to briefly read to you:

To ensure that it remains responsive to the people of Saskatchewan, the department solicits the public's co-operation and assistance in developing policy and programs in a number of ways.

Well one of those ways seems to be the firearm training program promised by the minister in 1977, and I think I would like to read this into the record, Mr. Chairman, 'Firearm training to be mandatory.' This appeared in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, February 18, 1977:

First time that young hunters in Saskatchewan will be required to take a firearm safety course beginning next year. Mandatory training, long touted by the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, was announced Thursday by Adolph Matsalla, Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. He told federation convention delegates in Saskatoon the program will begin in 1979 and gradually be expanded to eventually guarantee all hunters in the province to take safety training. Matsalla said details of the scheme must still be worked out, but cabinet has approved the principle. His announcement brought a standing ovation from wildlife delegates, many of whom had provided instruction through voluntary courses for thousands of young people in the province. Matsalla said it will not be easy to make sure that 200,000 people in the province who hunt will get the required training, but he said historical statistics have proved it worthwhile. He said there were 54 firearm accidents per 100,000 licenses issued in 1960. When voluntary firearm safety training for the wildlife federation began the number had dropped to 19 per 100,000 in 1975. Furthermore, fewer than 1 per cent of the program's graduates were involved in firearm accidents. Yet Matsalla said those 18 and



under, the ones mainly affected by the first stage of mandatory training program accounted for 25 per cent of the firearm accidents in most years.

Mr. Chairman, I have also raised this in the House before. I think it is time that when the government makes a promise to the people of Saskatchewan or to the wildlife federation that they keep that promise. I have heard different comments saying it couldn't be done, so I got in touch with the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation. They have the instructors, the facilities in place to start this program immediately. Why the minister and his department are holding back on a commitment made in 1977, I don't know, and I would like him to give me an answer in his remarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have the Wildlife Development Fund which I believe is a good fund. The Wildlife Development Fund is another area in which the government is trying to co-operate with not only the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, but also to co-operate with farmers, ranchers, hunters and sportsmen throughout Saskatchewan. I have a case, particularly in the Wilkie constituency, in an area that I know well, and I will be giving your department the land description number afterwards, where the minister, or the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources went out and bought a section of pastureland. They bought it, to my knowledge, from Marathon Realty Company. They put a tender in, as so did some young farmers, in particular, the young farmer that had the pasture at the time. Well, I guess the government had more money than the young farmer, and they got the tender. Here we have a young farmer, just nicely getting started in the cattle business, had his pasture, after losing the tender the department tells him to take his fence down. Well, I guess he can't graze his cows on his front lawn. So we had this young farmer sell off his cow herd, and the information that I have received on it, it was to be used for a deer and prairie chicken pasture, which is natural, I guess, under the wildlife development fund. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that section of pasture land real well, because I have a pasture right across the railroad tracks from it. And, if five deer run through it in the summer and 10 prairie chickens fly over it in the summer, that would be a big summer for the wildlife. I would also like to know whose decision it was to buy that land? Who was the department in consultation with to buy it? What does the department plan on doing with it? Are they going to lease it out for grazing or just leave another section of land in Saskatchewan sitting idle, a section that has chased a young man out of the cattle business?

Now in my area, Mr. Chairman, there are sections of pasture land that could be bought because we do have some deer, but it's not in that area. Whoever advised the minister to buy that section of land, pardon the expression, was out to lunch.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move now to the Game Advisory Board, another issue I had raised during question period in this House. I was not satisfied with the answer. The minister did answer my questions though, and that's one thing I will say. The minister has done a lot better than some of the other ministers when it come to answering questions. On the Game Advisory Board, and the minister can correct me if I'm wrong, it is my understanding there are five or six representative groups. They meet every spring. They put forth proposals for seasons, bag limits, etc., for the upcoming season. Now I believe that's good. I believe that's real good for the department to have a Game Advisory Board. There's only one problem, Mr. Chairman. The Game Advisory Board makes a recommendation to the minister. It's the minister and his department who make the final decision on this. I simply asked the minister if I could sit in, not participate, and listen to the discussion at that meeting. I was told no. So I went one step further. I asked for a report that would come from the Game Advisory Board to be sent to my office so I could review it and maybe meet and discuss this with the minister before

**April 10, 1979**

the final season's bag limits etc., were decided. Once again I was told no.

Then I must apologize, I lost my temper and asked him what he was trying to hide because it was very obvious that if I couldn't sit in on a Game Advisory Board, if I couldn't have a report, it just naturally stands to reason that somebody is trying to cover something up. Once the minister has made those decisions on what the bag limit quota is to be in certain areas, that's it, that's final! There is no way that, I, as critic for the department of Tourism and Renewable Resources can change any season, bag limit or date that is to be set. This to me does not go with the statement which the minister had made in his annual report. I am willing to co-operate; the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation is willing to co-operate. The minister's department is not willing to co-operate.

Mr. Chairman, now we have another issue which does disturb me very much. I didn't know about it until December 11, 1978, when I received a news release from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I just briefly have one line that was in that release, 'Matsalla announces support for proposal by Saskatchewan social services to locate a correctional camp in Meadow Lake Provincial Park.' That was one of the most serious errors that member will ever make in his life. First of all, I would like to clarify that I think we have some of the loveliest, the best parks anywhere in Canada right here in Saskatchewan and the government is to be commended for that. They're beautiful parks.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GARNER:** — Why now with a lovely park like the Meadow Lake Provincial Park and I know it very well because I've been there many times, do we have to have a correctional facility built within the park? Mr. Chairman, I don't know.

The information which I have received is that the prisoners serving a term of two years or less will be housed in that correctional facility. Mr. Chairman, I am not a lawyer (although I happen to know two very capable lawyers on our side of the House, some of the members opposite may not agree) but they instruct me that people serving a term of two years less can fall into more than three categories. But three categories disturb me very much, people serving a term for armed robbery manslaughter, and rape . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, Herman, isn't that terrible, that's just terrible, Yes, I can see the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) is having second thoughts about this camp already. That's good, that's real good. I commend you on that.

Mr. Chairman, we have a problem with our tourist industry as the figures show with a deficit. How do we go about advertising our provincial parks? Come to Saskatchewan, pay more for your gas. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the ad will read like this: Come to Saskatchewan; come to our beautiful Meadow Lake Provincial Park; we've got good recreation facilities, good, clean streams for fishing. If you get out of hand, we even have a correctional facility to put you in.

Mr. Chairman, the members opposite always like to compare us with Alberta. Well, this is maybe one time when they should just look at Alberta. Alberta also has correctional facilities in provincial parks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, temporary camps only and only when parks are closed to tourists, for example, a temporary forestry camp at Michelson Park to which inmates are sent from Fort Saskatchewan to work cutting wood in winter for tourists to burn in the summer. That's a good policy that I believe the government opposite should accept.

I believe it's good for the inmates in any correctional facility to go out and earn their keep. Alberta is doing it. Saskatchewan is following and as much as I am opposed to having a correctional facility in the Meadow Lake Park, if it was only during the winter season, I could live with that. But, Mr. Chairman, there is no way I can live with that correctional camp build three miles north of the Waterhen Bridge where to my knowledge the inmates are housed in mobile trailers. This is security? No fences around. The Minister can correct me if there are no inmates there now; then I will stand to be corrected. But, Mr. Chairman, when I go to a provincial park for a holiday, it's very nice to take my three small children with me. We park in the lovely campground, the personnel is excellent, the recreation programs are excellent. But, maybe 500 to 600 yards away from the water's edge my little children come up and say, Dad, can we go down to the waterfront? Last year, Mr. Chairman, I said, yes, go ahead. No fear, no danger. Mr. Chairman, if (and I'm saying if) I go back to the Meadow Lake Provincial Park this year (because I like to stay in my own province, travel in my own province) and those little children come up to me and say, Dad, can I go down to the waterfront this year, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to have to say no; no to that! . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . the Minister of Social Services thinks I'm nuts. Well, that's entirely up to him; it's a matter of opinion. I've got some opinions I would like to express about him but we're not allowed to use that kind of language in the House.

Mr. Chairman, it will not be a holiday for myself or my family, because when I'm on a holiday (as everyone else when they're on a holiday) my guard is not up. You go up there to relax and rest. Now you go up there — form your own opinion from that.

Mr. Chairman, our tourist travel in the province and our air travel in the province is in a very sad state of affairs and I can see why we have a tourist deficit. We have cities like Swift Current, North Battleford, Yorkton wanting air travel; not receiving air travel. One example, Mr. Speaker, in July the CTC (Canadian Transportation Commission) approved a NorCan Air proposal to link Yorkton with Saskatoon and Regina. However, eight months later, the city is still without regular service. Also in this with Yorkton, during the Canadian Junior Girls' Curling Championships held in Yorkton last week (and this is dated Wednesday March 21, 1979), he said a number of problems surfaced in getting teams from across Canada into the city. To me, Mr. Chairman, that's tourism. He said the problems are surfacing more and more as the city is also without train service.

Mr. Chairman, a new facility built at the North Battleford airport; \$300,000, no air service. The minister, when asked about these was answering my questions for a while and then he turned it over to the Minister of Transport, which I guess is quite right. But why cannot the Minister of Tourism work more closely with the Minister of Transport. On bringing this air travel to the province's two major cities in Saskatchewan, Regina and Saskatoon, two very lovely cities — air travel during the week; on the weekend, no air travel. What other province, Mr. Minister, has that kind of very poor, inadequate air service? There is no link to North Battleford, no communication to Yorkton, no communication to Swift Current. Then you wonder why, Mr. Minister, you have a deficit in your budget. It isn't very hard to figure out, Mr. Minister, why there is a deficit in that budget.

Mr. Chairman, now I would like to read a quote from the Saskatchewan Indian, November, 1978.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Did you write it?

**April 10, 1979**

**MR. GARNER:** — No, I didn't write it. I'm quoting now. 'Playing around with party politics can be a dangerous game. We can't afford to give open-ended support.' (This is by the president of the Saskatchewan Federation of Indians). 'We must always attach conditions. Two former SFI staff members, Doug McArthur and Jerry Hammersmith, were elected for the government. Both men —' (Now there is a little bit of humour in this article, Mr. Chairman. I can't help it but I have to read the whole article.) 'Both men are cabinet material . . . ' (Well I beg to differ with that.) ' . . . and will advance the Indian position on the provincial level.' (I don't agree with that either. I believe the Indians can do better on their own without these two members.) 'Hammersmith especially owes us. He was elected by a 57 vote majority and over 400 Indian votes were cast in his support.'

Well, Mr. Minister, my question — these two MLAs, what conditions did the SFI attach to their support? Would you care to be in touch with them, or ask them, and give me that information later on?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister now, I think it's an important problem that we have. I think it is time that the minister and his department brought in a new game act. I'm calling on him to bring that new game act in this session.

The way the game act is right now, a monetary fine is not working. When we have shooters (and I classify them as shooters) — we have very good hunters in the province, but we have a percentage of shooters and these shooters are going around breaking the law, harassing, whether it's the big game population or the game birds in Saskatchewan. They're going on private land. They're not asking for permission. They're leaving pits open. They're opening gates. They're cutting fences . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . if the hon. member will shut up for a minute I'll tell him . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I'll tell you what, I will shut up and I'll fall asleep while you're talking.

**MR. GARNER:** — Well, that would be better if you would fall asleep. Then we could conduct the House in a lot better order if you would fall asleep. Mind you, I didn't know you had waked up until your lips started moving.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in this new game act if the shooters (and I refer to them as shooters) had their licence suspended for a longer period of time, it would be more effective than a simple monetary fine. Many farmers and ranchers who I have talked to are getting very disturbed by the fact that there are not enough teeth in our present game act. Mind you, the minister over there sure has enough teeth, because you see them all the time.

Mr. Minister, I strongly urge you to look at this. I would like to read your reply to a letter that was sent to your department by a gentleman from down south.

'On February 10, 1979 a letter expressed your concern about hunting on private lands without permission.' (I won't read the whole letter, Mr. Chairman, because I believe the business of this House is more important than members standing up reading letters. I will just read part of the answer that the minister gave).

'I can assure you that my department is concerned for the landowner and is endeavouring to improve landowner-hunter relationships in every reasonable way.'

Mr. Minister, I recommend to you that if you did bring in a new game act, it would have an impact on the shooter. I do believe our hunter-farmer relationship would improve. Our hunters would have a better chance when they are out hunting because there would be less of the shooters (as I call them) running around causing problems, not only for the farmers and the ranchers, but for the other hunters and sportsmen in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, if you will give me a few answers to that, in your comments, then I will be ready to move on to questions in your department.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like to, first of all, reply to some of the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner).

One of the first comments he had made with respect to the department concerned the low level of funding for the entire department. I think that each and every minister in his department would like to have more funding, but at the same time I think we have to look at the overall operation of the government. I am very much surprised that the hon. member has been so generous in agreeing to providing more funds for spending in this department. I think the other hon. members have been doing the same for other departments. On the other hand they say that you are spending too much money and then on the other hand they are saying you are not spending enough. Now, which way do we go? I wish you people would make up your minds. It is either one way or the other. If we increase the taxes, I suppose you would holler too that you shouldn't be increasing fees. You shouldn't be increasing taxes and the rest of it. I don't think that deserves any further comment, except that during the last number of years, we have been able to maintain the level of service in spite of the fact that perhaps the funding hasn't been increased to a point that the hon. member would suggest or I personally would like. We have been able to reduce some staff and by doing that I don't think our services have really reduce that much, if any. Our staff growth over the last decade has been practically nil and we have been having more services. Staff has been reduced by over 5 per cent in the last four years and yet we were able to provide and maintain the level of service that is acceptable by the public and acceptable by the government. We also have indicators that our productivity has increased. This I think should make the opposition quite happy because they have been making remarks that civil servants are being paid too much or perhaps they're not doing the amount of work they should be doing. The productivity isn't there. In our own department the sick leave claimed by employees has dropped by 50 per cent during the last five years and the amount of overtime by public service staff has been reduced by 85 per cent in the same period.

Now, during the last number of years, I think that if you look at some of the expanded services of the department, you will find that we have gone ahead in improving the regional park program. As a matter of fact, legislation has been introduced only about a week or two weeks ago with regards to increased funding to regional parks. The Moose Jaw Wild Animal Park is going ahead. The campgrounds have been expanded and various subdivisions have been opened. Two years ago, we introduced the regional tourism program. That, too, required some extra funding. Nevertheless, we were able to work within the funds that we had. I want to also point out what this year we are going to commence on the building of a new fish hatchery and that, too, should be quite a boost to the department as well as the province of Saskatchewan in the fishing industry.

With regard to fees in parks, I think we must be reasonable in setting our level of fees. I think if you compare the level of fees we had in operation last year with other provinces,

**April 10, 1979**

we were perhaps a bit low. I think there is a limit as to how high you can go with park fees, campground fees and the rest of it so that we do not cause any difficulty for the low-income groups.

Before I go into the next point, I would like to point out to the House and to the committee, and particularly to the hon. member, what other people have to say about our parks, the development of our parks as well as our staff. I am referring to an article that appeared in the Leader Post, Saturday, March 24, 1979. This is out of the 'Parks of the Prairie Provinces', by Doug and Bob Patro. In quote the authors' comment, 'However when it comes to provincial parks, Saskatchewan has the most dynamic provincial parks organization on the three provinces.'

I read further: 'Its officials are energetic, innovative people, eager to show off the province, working to make the parks, people pleasers.' They write: 'There are ten historic provincial parks spread throughout the province and each has some special attraction for visitors.'

I think it points out that we alone in Saskatchewan are not the only ones who talk about the good parks we have, but there are people from outside of the province who notice that as well when they come and visit us.

The hon. member was trying to make quite a point or quite an issue with regard to our waterfowl crop depredation program. He was point out that I, as the minister of the department, haven't been doing enough to push the issue in order that we might be able to provide a good crop depredation program to the people of Saskatchewan and for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I would like to speak here a little more in detail with regard to this. The member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) has accused this government of shirking its responsibility in the area of crop depredation, or of dumping the ducks on the Saskatchewan farmer. Now, the member knows that nothing could be further from the truth. Let me remind the member and the committee of the leadership role that Saskatchewan New Democratic governments have taken in defending the right of Saskatchewan farmers to fair compensation for crop damage by waterfowl. The Migratory Bird Convention act quite clearly places full responsibility for waterfowl and thus waterfowl damage with the federal government.

For a number of years we made it a policy to assist the federal government in meeting that responsibility. We shared in waterfowl conservation projects; we exchanged research and technical information, we enforced the provision of the Migratory Bird Convention Act. We also recognized, many years ago, that crop depredation by waterfowl created a heavy economic burden for many Saskatchewan farmers and we pressed the federal government as far back as the early 1950s, so that they accepted the responsibility. The federal government refused to introduce a crop damage program then and for many years after. But the CCF Government of Saskatchewan at the time recognized that waging a lengthy debate with Ottawa for many years would not help the immediate economic problem facing farmers at that time.

In 1953 the CCF Government of Saskatchewan introduced an insurance program offered by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and subsidized by the provincial government. I want to remind the member and the members opposite, particularly the member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) that Saskatchewan was the only province in Canada to offer such a program.

It was in 1972 that the federal government finally began to accept some responsibility for crop damage and agreed to participate in a cost share program. Of course, that program was patterned after the insurance scheme that had been successfully operating in Saskatchewan for nearly 20 years. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that it was only in 1972, after Saskatchewan had finally convinced the federal government to participate in a cost share program, that Manitoba and Alberta opted to participate as well. The fact that Saskatchewan has led the struggle to have Ottawa recognize its responsibility for waterfowl damage for nearly 30 years is on the record. The fact that Saskatchewan recognized the burden on farmers and introduced an insurance program 26 years ago is also on record. It is on the record, Mr. Chairman, if the member for Wilkie had only made an effort to look it up.

I have discussed Saskatchewan's role of leadership in bringing benefits to farmers suffering crop damage. I want to deal with Saskatchewan's role of leadership now that Ottawa has taken those benefits away. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, it was not until 1972 that we finally succeeded in getting Ottawa to own up to its share of responsibility for waterfowl damage. At about that time we recognized that the benefits farmers who suffered losses were receiving were too low, they had been far surpassed by inflation. We also recognized that since Ottawa was responsible for migratory waterfowl farmers should not have to pay provinces for insurance against damage caused by a resource under the control for the federal government, a resource which they were always paid taxes to preserve.

We, in Saskatchewan, initiated another struggle. We pressed Ottawa to introduce a new program based on straight compensation for damages, rather than upon insurance. This way, any farmers suffering damage would be eligible for compensation without the outlay of insurance premiums. We also pressed Ottawa to raise the maximum benefits to a level which would at least reflect the cost of production. In 1978 when we met with the federal government to renegotiate the federal-provincial crop damage agreement, we were armed with these demands. We had the full support of the Conservative governments of Manitoba and Alberta. As a matter of fact, we had meetings together and we approached Ottawa in a unified way. We were successful in having the program changed to one of straight compensation and we succeeded in getting the maximum benefits under the program doubled from \$25 to \$50 per acre, another example of Saskatchewan leadership, Mr. Chairman.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, when the federal Liberal government announced its program of massive mindless spending cuts, Saskatchewan took a role of leadership in fighting for the continuation of the crop drainage program. Before the announcement of the spending cuts, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding), myself, and our officials spent considerable time and effort negotiating with the federal government on the 1978 agreement. By September we had reached a settlement on a one-year program with the increased benefits I mentioned earlier. The Minister of agriculture and I signed the final draft of the agreement and forwarded it to Ottawa for signature by the federal Minister of Environment. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat this information. The Minister of Agriculture and I signed the final draft of the Crop Damage Prevention and Compensation Agreement on September 18, 1978, and I believe the hon. member has been making a comment with regard to our not signing an agreement. I note from Hansard that on March 20 the member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) accused the government of offering the program to Saskatchewan farmers when the agreement wasn't signed. It would seem then that the hon. member would have preferred that we delay the

**April 10, 1979**

payments to the farmers. What we have done is try to accommodate the farmers as soon as possible, rather than wait until the agreement is finally signed. In any event, we did sign the agreement. We proceeded with the program in good faith because we are concerned with the economic burdens the crop damage placed on the farmers, and we wanted to help immediately in dealing with those burdens despite all the obstacles the federal government placed before us. I want to inform the House that we finally did receive a signed copy of the agreement confirming federal participation in the program. It came on February 8, 1979, nearly five months after we had signed. Were we to stand idly by for five months while farmers suffered on the flimsy excuse that we didn't have a signed agreement? Perhaps the member for Wilkie would do this, but we in the New Democratic Party stand behind our commitment to be responsive to the needs of the Saskatchewan farmer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — There's one other main point which I want to raise, and that is simply this. If the member for Wilkie is so certain that we have handled this situation inadequately, then surely he could point to either Tory Alberta or Tory Manitoba as examples of how it should have been handled.

Let us look for a moment at progress in those provinces. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that to the very best of my knowledge, neither Manitoba nor Alberta yet have signed agreements with the federal government. Saskatchewan is the only province that has signed the final agreement. For some time now Saskatchewan had led in defending the interest of western farmers on this question. Saskatchewan took the initiative in co-ordinating a position for all three provinces when we began negotiations on last year's agreement. Saskatchewan called and hosted the meetings among the ministers and their respective officials. Saskatchewan has taken a leadership role and that leadership is supported by the governments of Alberta and Manitoba. Now, if the member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) had looked he would have discovered that this, too, is on the record.

Mr. Chairman, we are proud of our role of leadership in the fight to retain the waterfowl damage program, and to win a better deal for western farmers. Now, while we worked hard and successfully at developing a united position for the three prairie provinces, our success in dealing with the federal Liberal government has been limited. Trudeau Liberals act arrogantly, irresponsibly and unilaterally without consultation with the provinces. On the issue of waterfowl damage this was clearly demonstrated by the federal government's unilateral decision to cancel the program without any prior consultation of any kind. The people of Canada will not tolerate this irresponsibility any longer. I'm sure. They are looking for an alternative to form a government that is responsible, that is responsive and that is truly willing to tackle not only its obligations to western farmers but to all the other elements of Canadian society as well.

Mr. Chairman, these obligations certainly have been neglected for many years. The alternative that the people are looking for, I'm sure is not the Conservatives. That would simply be replacing irresponsibility and arrogance with incompetence and inability. The Conservative Opposition in this legislature certainly shows that to us. The alternative that the people of Canada will turn to on May 22. I am sure in this particular areas in the western provinces will be the New Democratic Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, my remarks on this particular subject have been



somewhat lengthy, nevertheless I wanted to put the record straight as to the leadership that Saskatchewan has played with respect to the crop depredation program.

The hon. member made some reference to public participation, that we do not do enough in consultation with the public. I think again that he is wrong there. I think that if he checks the record of this government in so far as consulting with the public, with regard to park planning he will find that on record we have a number of park planning study reports. We are consulting very closely with the public. Just recently, information meetings and public hearings have been held with regard to the development of the Qu'Appelle Valley as well as the Good Spirit Provincial Park. These are only recent ones.

He also made mention of the game advisory committee. It is quite apparent that the hon. member is very anxious to be a member of the game advisory committee. I want to advise the hon. member that the game advisory committee is a committee set up as an internal committee for the department, to advise the minister as to the various changes that may have to take place with regard to setting of seasons, bag limits and all other matters dealing with game management.

I want to advise the hon. member that on this committee we have representatives of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, Northern Saskatchewan Trappers' Association, Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Saskatchewan Stock Growers Association — eight in all.

We feel that the committee adequately represents wildlife interests, interest with respect to waterfowl, big game, and the rest of it. For us to open up our committee hearings to the public I think is going the wrong way. I don't think we'll be able to function in a way that would be practical. I suppose you could have as many ideas as there are people on one particular subject.

If the hon. member wants some input into the committee, if he has any ideas, any suggestions, my office is always open. Therefore I am quite prepared to take his suggestions to the game advisory committee and have them deal with them and see what they think of them. I think our representation from the various organizations well represents the people of Saskatchewan.

The next subject that the hon. member has dealt with is the mandatory firearm safety program. I must agree that he is right in saying that I have made an announcement to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation with respect to a mandatory firearms safety program. At that time I felt that we might be in a position to proceed with it. Nevertheless, I have changed my decision on it, and rather than proceed with a mandatory firearm safety program, I decided that we should expand our voluntary firearm safety program and see what happens. We should evaluate it and I am quite certain that the hon. member would probably agree that that's a much better way to go than the mandatory way. At least, I hear the Conservatives often speak about compulsion being a very bad thing, so therefore, I think you should agree that perhaps by expanding the voluntary firearm safety program, we have done the right thing rather than the wrong thing.

Let me point out some statistics as to the improvement that has taken place or the success of the expanded firearm safety program. Firearm accidents in Saskatchewan are decreasing. In 1960 there were 106 firearm accidents reported and 14 of these were fatal. In 1977 there were 67 firearm accidents reported. Eight of these were fatal. In 1978, there were 59 firearm accidents reported. Four of these were fatal. Now, you

can readily see that it was through the efforts of the firearm safety program that the accidents have been reduced. Though I do not have the statistics here, I am quite certain that during this period there must have been more people using firearms. Now, since 1960 there have been 1,463 firearm accidents. Since 1960 there have been 65,630 graduates from the firearm safety program and only 88 of these graduates have been involved in firearm accidents. I think too, that we must be prepared to wait and see what the impact of the federal gun legislation is going to have on firearm accidents. I am not saying that at no time will the government consider a mandatory firearm safety program. Nevertheless, if we have success of this kind, why should we proceed in a mandatory way when we are being successful through a voluntary program? I have some agreement from the opposite benches.

The hon. member referred to the Wildlife Development Fund. The substance of his remarks were with regard to a section of land that has been bought by the Wildlife Development Fund and apparently, in his opinion, has been taken away from some young farmer. I am not to sure whether the description of the section is the same as I have some information on here, Section 5, Township 39, Range 18W3. We are talking about the same thing. Yes, this land has been owned by Marathon Realty for some time and this land has been advertised for sale. We have arranged to purchase it, without having knowledge that there might be somebody that would be interested in it. We can't tell who is bidding on it. It's available for sale so therefore, we placed our bid for it. This land has been particularly useful and adaptable for wildlife purposes.

This land was purchased in June of 1976 for a price of \$16,250 or \$35.88 an acre. In other words, 8.5 times the assessed value.

One of the other areas that the hon. member has discussed is the establishment of the correction camp in the Meadow Lake Provincial Park. He apparently expresses very much concern about this park — I am not too sure whether it's his own concern or the concern of the people that may visit the park. It seems to me that if I was in his position and had the experience of knowing how these camps operate, I think I would be safer in Meadow Lake Provincial Park than I may be in some of the major cities.

We have two other correction camps. One is in Buffalo Pound, which has been in operation for 10 years and another one in Moose Mountain that's been in operation for some 30 years and we haven't had any major problems with them. As a matter of fact, I do know that in a couple of cases or several cases, the inmates that have been in this camp have become employees of the department. In other words, these employees have been rehabilitated back into the mainstream of society. I think the fear being expressed by the hon. member is groundless. I believe these camps are serving a good purpose, not only to assist us in the operation and maintenance of the park but at the same time, to assist in the rehabilitation of many of the inmates there.

**MR. GARNER:** — Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to make a few more comments on the minister's remarks stating that the members on this side want you to cut back, which is true, wanting more spending less money. I think the minister has his priorities in the wrong place.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister was commenting from a quote in a paper, I think it was the Leader Post, he was quoting about the beauty of our provincial parks. I don't disagree with him there whatsoever. I've already commended the government on that. It's a beautiful park. But in that quote — and also the way they're operated, fine — I didn't hear the gentleman who was commenting remark about the correctional facility within

that park. That wasn't mentioned in that quote.

On the crop depredation agreement, the Canada — Saskatchewan waterfowl crop damage compensation program, terms and conditions, would the minister please give me the date he stated that he and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) signed that agreement?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — September 18, 1978, I believe it was. We'll look that up to just make sure. Yes, that's right.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to clarify if this is the same agreement or if there were two agreements for the Canada — Saskatchewan agreement, waterfowl crop damage compensation program, terms and conditions. This agreement was made the first day of March, 1979. Would the minister tell me what agreement he signed and maybe there were two agreements. I don't know. I would like clarification of that, please.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Yes, there were two agreements. There was a prevention and compensation agreement that was signed on September 18, 1978 and then there was another agreement, the prevention agreement, that was sent back by the federal government on February 8, 1979. That's the prevention agreement.

**MR. GARNER:** — Would the minister repeat which agreement he's talking about, please?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The prevention and compensation agreement was signed on September 18, 1978. There were two agreements and the prevention agreement came back to the department on February 8, 1979. That's the prevention agreement. The compensation agreement went to the Minister of the Department of Agriculture.

**MR. GARNER:** — Then I would like the minister to tell me what this agreement here is about, because the way I understand this agreement is that the federal government provided that payment by Canada under this agreement shall not exceed \$675,000.

I don't want to read this whole agreement into the record.

Further, number 16 under this agreement (and surely the minister has a copy of this agreement, his signature is on here, Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources in Saskatchewan, Adolph Matsalla) — it's the Canada — Saskatchewan agreement, Waterfowl Crop Damage Compensation Program, terms and conditions, number 16 reading:

Nothing contained in this agreement shall commit either party to any obligation, either financial or jurisdictional, beyond the terms of this agreement, nor shall this agreement form the basis for the negotiation for any subsequent agreements.

Could I have a copy of those other agreements that you've signed so that I can find out where all these agreements are? It's very evident that the farmers of Saskatchewan only received prorated claims of 68.3 per cent of their claims. I just can't understand all these agreements. Surely the minister must know which agreements he has signed and whether they're for the crop damage program.

**April 10, 1979**

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, there were two agreements. One was a prevention agreement and the other was a compensation agreement. My department looks after the prevention portion of the program. The Department of Agriculture attends to the compensation portion of the program. Yes, I think we've signed it. Nevertheless, the program has been divided. The Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources looked after the prevention portion of the program and the Department of Agriculture attended to the compensation part.

The prevention agreement was for \$675,000 for which we shared one half. The compensation agreement was \$1,350,000 of which we shared one half, \$675,000.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Minister, could I have a copy of those other two agreements because the agreement I have here is in black and white. This agreement was made the first day of March, 1979. Can I have a copy of your two agreements so that I know which agreements and how many agreements you've signed. Because all these agreements and the farmers still came out short. May I please have a copy of those other agreements?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, we can supply the hon. member with the prevention agreement. In so far as the compensation agreement, that would have to be requested of the Minister of Agriculture. Is that the compensation one?

**MR. GARNER:** — I will take a copy of that agreement, then, when you give it to me.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — But he's got two. You got two. One in September, and one in February.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Chairman, further to the minister's comments on the Game Advisory Board, no complaint. I think the Game Advisory Board is good. The minister did not answer my question. I did not want to become a member of the Game Advisory Board. I wanted to sit in and listen to the discussions made by the Game Advisory Board or have a copy of their recommendations sent to my office. The minister has further stated we can't have all the public at these meetings. I completely agree with him, but I am an elected representative of the people of the Wilkie constituency. I am the critic for your department. I am just asking for information and I would like you to answer. Who makes the final decision on season dates, bag limits, quotas, etc.?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — The minister makes that decision upon the advice of his committee and the officials.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Chairman, that's just the point I tried to bring out before. It's the minister who makes the final decision so that if I'm not satisfied with it and other people in contact with me are not satisfied, nothing can be done once the decision is reached. That's the way the minister is going to run the department and his statements earlier about co-operation — Mr. Chairman, that's not co-operation. The firearms training program — why promise this to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation? They have been requesting it for some ten years? Furthermore, the federation suggested just prior to the last licence fee increase that the moneys go towards establishment of a permanent compensation program and a mandatory firearm safety program. The government agreed and increased the licences in 1977. In the two years the government has collected an estimated \$800,000 from hunters. Now two years later we still haven't got either program.

Mr. Chairman, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation organization is I think a fairly well recognized organization all over Saskatchewan. They're concerned about the hunters. They're concerned about our young people. The minister has promised it to them. Then he backs out and says well, we'll go on the voluntary. They're asking for it, and as much as I don't agree that things should be mandatory, Mr. Minister, this is one thing that I personally believe should be mandatory, if we can only save ten lives! That's ten very useful lives we can save.

Regarding the wildlife development fund the minister is stating and I will check it tomorrow in Hansard — that when they tendered on this section of land, they didn't know anyone else was going to be interested in buying it. Now, come on, Mr. Minister. Oh, that's a feeble excuse, now come on. You didn't answer my question about who advised you to buy it. I want to know who advised you to buy it? Now you have told me the price you paid for it, that's fine, but whoever advised you to buy that, as I stated earlier, was out to lunch. Mr. Minister, by saying that you didn't know that anyone was interested in it that means whoever advised you had their eyes shut when they went around to look at it because there were cattle in the pasture, the man had a fence around it. Do you think that man didn't want that land? Do you think there weren't other men who wanted that land? Mr. Minister, your department put a young farmer out of the cattle business, that's what you did.

Mr. Minister, I would like you to tell me right now, who advised you to buy this section of land?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, as in all decisions of the department, it's the officials and the minister who make the decision.

**MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to know how many people. I want to know who, in this special case, made this decision because their eyes were shut.

Will the minister tell me how many students he will be hiring in the upcoming tourist season?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Chairman, that is a very difficult question to answer. We, first of all, have to assess our needs and then hire the employees accordingly. Of course, we also have to look at our budget as to how far it will go. At this point in time, I really can't give him an accurate figure of how many employees we are going to hire for the summer. I think maybe we can tell you how many we hired last year and that might give you some idea as to how many may be hired this year. I am going to give you a ballpark figure. It will be about 1,200 seasonal employees.

**MR. GARNER:** — Will you tell me, Mr. Minister, approximate how much money have you set aside for paying these funds and what area of jobs or regions will they be working in?

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Again, the hon. member asks a difficult question. If he wants an accurate answer it's going to be quite difficult for me to give this, although I can say that we are going to hire some people in each and every park and they vary by number, depending on the size of the park and the amount of work that is to be done in the park. It's very difficult to tell you that we're going to hire so many in Meadow Lake Provincial Park and so many in Moose Mountain. In so far as what the costs were, that is the wages that the department has paid in the hiring of seasonal employees, we don't have that

**April 10, 1979**

handy here but I think we can give you man months. Is the hon. member interested only in what we hire in various regions or in the department? Various regions? All right — Saskatoon 181 man months.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** — Order. Could we have a little order here, please.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — By regions the figures are — Meadow Lake, 476 man months; Regina, 538; Prince Albert, 586; Hudson Bay, 539; Melville, 366; and Swift Current, 213.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.