

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to other members of the Legislative Assembly, a young man from Kelowna, B.C. (British Columbia) who's in Regina checking out the University of Regina journalism course. It's anticipated that Mr. Sinclair, Murray Sinclair, who's seated in the west gallery, will be entering the journalism course here at the University of Regina, an excellent course. And I ask all members to help me and welcome our guest from Kelowna and hope he enjoys the journalism course here in Regina.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renaud: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the Assembly, two constituents of the Kelsey-Tisdale constituency. Marianne Thurmeier of Tisdale and Kathy Ryan of Hudson Bay, and I would ask that everyone join with me in welcoming them to Regina today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, some members of a student organization called AIESEC, the International Association of Students in Economics and Commerce from Regina and they're seated in your gallery. David Steen who's the vice-president of corporate relations; and Steven Leibel, the vice-president on special projects; and from Yugoslavia, Mila Markovic who is here in Regina on a traineeship with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

Founded in 1948, Mr. Speaker, this organization is entirely student managed and is the largest non-profit, non-political and multi-racial student organization in the world. And I'd ask the members to join with me to greet these special guests.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Treaty Land Entitlements

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question this morning is to the Minister of Justice. Mr. Minister, in reviewing your statement yesterday in the House on the treaty land claim settlement, I've been able to review the *Hansard* and I'm afraid, Mr. Minister, what I wasn't able to hear at the beginning of your statement yesterday troubles me somewhat.

In it you asserted that the aboriginal community rejected the September land entitlement agreement. Mr. Minister, every bit of information that I have shows that assertion to be a falsehood. And I ask you today to clarify the facts that

you laid out in your statement yesterday that the September agreement was rejected by the aboriginal community and not by the NDP government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well to deal with the very last part of the question first, we have not rejected the agreement. We have accepted the agreement of last September. It took us a while to do that because there was a lot of analysis that we felt had to be done before we could become comfortable with it, but we formally accepted it.

Probably the verb "reject" is not the right verb to cover the situation. It would be more accurate to say that there were grave concerns expressed, and one of them that I recall was the fact that the . . . was that there was no protection from inflation so far as the value of the package was concerned. And this was a very difficult problem for FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) and for the entitlement bands.

There were other issues as well but that was the main one that I recall.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, it is absolutely necessary that we get this clarified because in cabinet documents that were raised in this legislature in the December sitting, it was clearly outlined that the provincial government did not like certain portions of the deal and that there would be renegotiations going on; that there would be a certain amount of filibustering going on; that the government was not happy with the deal.

And I think, Mr. Minister, it is very unfortunate that you would stand in a ministerial statement in this House yesterday and lay that off on the aboriginal people in this province. That clearly if there was any slow-down going on, if there was any renegotiating going on, it was your government, sir, and not the aboriginal community.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well I certainly didn't mean to imply nor I think did I nor have I ever that the entitlement bands or the FSIN were in any way responsible for the . . . (inaudible) . . . And I was quite open about it at the time, Mr. Speaker, that we were reviewing the agreement and we did have misgivings about it. But in the final analysis there was no question about the fact that we accepted the obligations of the government under the September agreement.

The subsequent negotiations that have taken place after that were in an attempt to meet the concern of the bands as to the protection of the package from an inflation point of view.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Well, Mr. Minister, yesterday in your statement we weren't talking about the fact that inflation was a deal-breaker. It was the fact that the negotiations took place on a 70-30 basis with certain requirements in the future over the life of the agreement to be proved up

by the federal government.

And I think, Mr. Minister, if you're now saying that it is the inflation agreeing parts of the thing that FSIN were against, then you should clarify that in your statement yesterday and not go back and say that we've now come down to the question of northern reserves as being the statement. And I think, Mr. Minister, you're misleading the public when you use a statement like that when in the next day in the House you say something else. Would you clarify that, please.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I certainly would not mislead anyone with respect to what was happening. I've acknowledged to the minister that "reject" may not have been a completely accurate verb to have used in that context and I acknowledged that in my previous answer.

It was the concern about inflation and the damaging effect that that would have on the package for the entitlement bands that led the negotiators for the bands, supported by us, that the term of 15 years should be shortened because obviously if the term is shortened, then the ravages of inflation are ameliorated to the extent that it is shortened.

So an attempt was made at the table to shorten it to 10 years and that wasn't acceptable to the federal government, but in due course we did agree upon a term of 12 years. And the subsequent negotiations that have taken place and that eventually led to the difficulty I tried to describe yesterday was one of the consequences of shortening the term from 15 to 12 years. And that's how we got into that situation. I hope that clarifies the situation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, unfortunately the record of your government in negotiating on things like upgraders, AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.), Promavia, public service agreements, GRIP (gross revenue insurance program), leaves somewhat with a queasy feeling on your ability to follow through.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, the ravages on our society and the aboriginal community of not doing the September agreement will pale, will make the stuff with inflation pale in comparison. And I say to you, sir, given your track record on other agreements, you need to assure this House today that you've got what it takes to follow through on this one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm just not going to respond to the provocative part of the member's question to me about the other negotiations that he referred to. We'll deal with those in due course, Mr. Speaker.

What I want to say now is that we didn't try and open that September agreement. That agreement was opened because of the legitimate concern of the entitlement bands as to the value of the package and the effects of

inflation on that package. And we thought they were making a good point.

And for our part, considering our responsibilities under that agreement, the 30 per cent of the general costs of the package and the turning over of the savings where northern communities are converted to reserves, we were prepared to compress that into a 10-year time frame although it would obviously involve the payment of larger amounts of money each year. But we didn't initiate that, if you understand. We were trying to support the Indians in their attempt to shorten the time frame. And all of the negotiations that have taken place since then have taken place in that context, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Job Creation Policies

Mr. Swenson: — New question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, this is in your other portfolio of Labour. Mr. Minister, we're seeing most of the major projects that have been ongoing in this province winding down. That obviously means that a number of people are going to be unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan.

I wonder if you could tell us this morning where trade employers, union and non-union members, are going to be employed in the near future. Are you saying, sir, that because your government has a lack of an economic agenda that you as Labour minister are going to have to try and find other ways to stimulate employment in this province? Are you saying that, sir?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to explain to the member opposite that contrary to his statement that there is no job creation in this province, that the simple fact is that we have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. We have taken away from the large emphasis on megaprojects that was the only emphasis of the previous government. That is true.

Because we believe that many of the projects that you did and the way they were done has simply led to the bankruptcy of the province and the very reason that we're in the problem we are with the budget and with the huge deficit that we have in the province.

What you'll see from this government is a continuation to try to attract people from outside the province obviously to come here to set up industry and business, and we're doing that. But the simple fact is that the vast majority of job creation in this province over the past 10 years should have been promoted by your government in terms of small, local industry. And you failed miserably in that, Mr. Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Minister, you say one thing but the opposite is true. The numbers are in. You're down 18,000 jobs from this time last year.

Now, Mr. Minister, you talk about small industry. You take SaskTel, spend \$7 million of the public's money on 25 clerical jobs, getting involved back in businesses where you shouldn't be. At the same time the meat-packing industry is in to visit the Minister of Agriculture. We got 2,000 unionized jobs on the line in this province in Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, North Battleford, Saskatoon, Yorkton.

You know what, Mr. Minister? Seven thousand . . . or \$7 million to FeedGAP (feed grain adjustment program) would ensure that those 2,000 unionized jobs remain healthy and viable and paying taxes in this province.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want you to tell the families in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon and North Battleford that you are going to have the same dedication to the meat-packing industry and their jobs as you have shown to SaskTel and 25 clerical jobs in the city of Regina. Will you do that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well as the member knows, the government is very concerned about employment and is doing a great deal to help stimulate employment in the province.

The simple fact is, is that your attempts to get jobs by giving hundreds of millions of dollars to out-of-province companies is not going to create the wealth and the base in the province for ongoing development. That's not the way it can work.

We believe, and the statistics show, that the vast number of jobs in this province and in Canada over the next 10 years will not be created by the large projects that you talk about. In fact most major employers will be down-sizing, and that is a fact.

The fact is that the most jobs will be created by local individuals with jobs and employment numbers under 50 people, and many of them will come as a result of the influx of women into the entrepreneurial area and starting up their own businesses. That's where we're going to be concentrating. And I'll tell you, sir, that your record on job creation and the hundreds of millions of dollars that you put into bad deals — and I'm not going to get into the long list of the GigaText and many others where you wasted money — is at an end in the province and we're going to be working with local entrepreneurs to a much greater extent than was ever the case under the past 10 years under your government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I say to the minister, in the last half dozen years the union hiring halls in this province have been empty because everybody's been out on a job site. Today they're on the steps of the legislature, Mr. Minister. Today they are on the steps of the legislature.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'll ask the members to please calm down and let the member ask his question. And while I do that, if the member could direct his

question through the Chair, it may also help.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Mr. Minister, the fact is that people in this province see no future for jobs, no future for employment, and in fact a lot of them are moving to Alberta.

The question I asked you, sir, is, there are 2,000 unionized — maybe more — jobs in the red meat industry in some of our major cities and they impact on our province in a big way. The question was, you had \$7 million to get back in the business of cable television, the same as you did in the '70s. That \$7 million guarantees those 2,000 union jobs. Sir, what are you going to say to those employees in the cities in which they reside?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to explain to the member opposite why many union people in this province are meeting with the government, consulting with us. It's got very little to do with our record. But it is to try to influence our government to have legislation and working conditions for workers — union and non-union — that are different than what they were for the past 10 years under your administration. That's why they're rallying out there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — And the Minister of Labour addressed the group today on the steps of the legislature who were here to support the government in changes that would take away from the regressive legislation that your government and your then premier instituted and drove labour people out of the province for the last 10 years. That's what it's about.

I want to say, when it comes to employment the statistics for the month of May to June in the province, the numbers of employed people rose by a thousand. These are the statistics. The unemployment rate was the lowest in Canada, well below the 11.6 that has been arrived at as a result of Conservative management at the federal level. And I want to say in some areas you're right, unemployment is down; in many areas it rose. For example, manufacturing over the past month rose by 2,000, construction is up by a thousand, finance and insurance and real estate up by 4,000. So I want to say to you that the doom . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the same minister. Good for you minister — 1,000 down, 17 to go — just to get you back where you were last year at this time.

Mr. Minister, you brag about 700 companies coming to this province. You talk about new legislation by the Minister of Justice to help out people in unions. Well there's no point in having a new law in this province, Mr. Minister, if you don't have a job to go to. You can give the people in the trade unions all of the legal protection they want. If nobody's going to come and build and work and do things here, sir, then we've got a big problem.

You are short 17,000 jobs. Your Minister of Agriculture is threatening another couple thousand jobs of union people. Will you rethink taking \$7 million, Mr. Minister, and investing in the cable TV (television) business, and redirecting that into some union jobs that mean a whole lot for the province of Saskatchewan? Will you do that, sir?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — What I want to say to the member opposite, that after 10 years of attacking unions, I want to say that the mood in Saskatchewan is changed. That we're not going to allow you from your seats in opposition to continue to put the wedge between the farmers in the province and the working people, the unionized people in the province. That's over.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Before I allow the next question, I must ask the people in the galleries to please not participate in the activities on the floor. Thank you.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question to the same minister. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this minister does not want to talk about the employees in the meat-packing industry. And, Mr. Minister, I say to you, if you want to take Moose Jaw Packers and Canada Packers in Moose Jaw, I would guess that probably half of the employees live in my constituency. Those are almost all unionized employees, sir, and I want to make sure that those meat-packing jobs and this \$200 million in spin-offs continue to work in the province of Saskatchewan.

I simply said to you, you had \$7 million to put into the cable TV business for 25 clerical jobs in the city of Regina. Your Minister of Agriculture threatens 2,000 unionized jobs in the meat-packing business. Will you repriorize your \$7 million and ensure that those 2,000 jobs are here this time next year?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Just for the member's information, so we keep the record straight, I want to indicate to him that when their government got rid of the hog program, SHARP (Saskatchewan hog assured returns program), and the beef stabilization program, and went to the tripartite program federally, which we were opposed to and told them it was a bad idea, beef feeding and slaughtering in Saskatchewan went from 400,000 to 240,000, almost a 50 per cent reduction. It went down from 400,000 to 240,000, and you know that. You destroyed the beef . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I'll give the minister another 10 seconds to finish his answer before I recognize the member from Saskatoon Greystone.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — The member knows very well

that the biggest impact on the beef industry in this province in the past 10 years has been the change from beef stabilization to the federal tripartite program. You did that, sir, against the best advice of the farmers and the beef industry in this province. And I think, sir, you're making up a very, very phoney issue to try to cover your tracks in what you're saying here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Government Record in First Nine Months

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Deputy Premier, it has been now over nine months since the election, and it has been nine months since the people of Saskatchewan believed you. They elected you because they believed what it is that you were telling them. Those same people are now looking back and they're wondering how their lives have improved as a result of that election.

Given that you are now reaching your three-quarter mark of your first year, will you give the people of Saskatchewan, the landlords of this legislature, a third-quarter report detailing what you think it is that you've accomplished.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for her question, and I'm pleased to answer it. The government immediately, when it took office, put in place an independent commission to open the books to see what the finances of this province were like. We made that public. There was a detailed report.

Mr. Speaker, we did the same thing with Crown Management Board, engaging Ernst & Young to do an analysis of the financial situation of the Crown corporations. That report was provided, and it was provided in detail to the public and to this legislature.

There has now been a budget introduced in this legislature which begins the correction of the disastrous management of the last 10 years under the provincial government, and that is more detailed than any budget document in the history of Saskatchewan.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, in that budget we made a commitment to this legislature and to the people of this province that in November we will have a mid-term report, a paper which will be published and made public to indicate where we are at with the budget which we announced on May 7, initiatives that have to be taken to make any necessary corrections. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, it will once again be the first time in the history of this province that that kind of information will be provided.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Premier, anyone living in this province in the last nine and a half years under the corrupt and inept government of those years, knew exactly what kind of a fiscal mess there was in Saskatchewan.

So if you indeed have a vision, which is becoming

apparent that you do not have, it is not making life better for anyone in this province the things that you have done since you have come to power: 14,000 fewer people are working in agriculture; vehicles sales are down by 29 per cent except for of course luxury Lexus vehicles; 3.4 per cent of young adults in this province between 20 and 24 years of age are unemployed, the people we need to stay in this province; our overall labour force is down by 18,000 people, and 2 per cent more people simply quit looking for work.

Now I think it's about time that the people of this province actually heard the vision of this new government.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I think the record is very clear. The job losses that have taken place in Saskatchewan have taken place because of the kind of economic development strategy, which my colleague talked about before in the previous questions, that the former government had in place.

And the job losses that took place last year was as a direct result of the policies of the GST (goods and services tax) and the kinds of policies which put hundreds of millions of dollars into megaprojects, to corporations from outside of the province of Saskatchewan, that's created very few jobs.

I am pleased to report to the member from Greystone that that is now being corrected. We have got the finances of this province under control. That's one of the reasons why between May and June there was an increase of employed people in this province by 1,000.

I think it is clear that we are in the right direction. The situation that we inherited was not an easy one. No one suggested it was easy. There are some difficult issues that we have had to deal with — and we're going to deal with them. We're going to deal with them openly, honestly, and we're going to account for them. Because it is not only today that we have to be concerned about, and the member from Greystone ought to know that. I ask her to join us in making sure that we also be concerned about our children and their children and their future as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — I'd like leave of the legislature, Mr. Speaker, to introduce some guests.

The Speaker: — If I may, as long as the member doesn't introduce them all one at a time.

Leave granted.

(1030)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Speaker, in all of the galleries of the legislature this morning we have representatives of the Saskatchewan provincial building trades. We recognize them because they're all wearing the white sweaters with the logo of that organization on the front.

These people, Mr. Speaker, have just finished participating in a large demonstration in front of the legislature and it was my privilege to say a few words to them. And I would like now to introduce them through you to members of the legislature and ask that we welcome them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Minister of Labour on behalf of the official opposition to extend a greeting to all the folks in the gallery today. It is a time-honoured tradition in this province that groups of citizens gather on the steps of the legislature to speak to their elected officials and I'm glad to see that the folks from the trade unions took that opportunity today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 78 — An Act to amend The Labour-sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Labour-sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to and the Bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, as it relates to questions put by members, question 46, I would ask the question be converted to motion for return (debatable).

The Speaker: — Motion for return (debatable).

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to question 47, I hereby provide the answer.

The Speaker: — Answer tabled.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 72 — An Act to amend The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act

Hon. Mr. Cunningham: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise today to move second reading of the amendment to The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act. This amendment is intended to conserve agricultural . . . Saskatchewan's key remaining natural areas of Crown lands. These lands are important to many species of birds and animals. The Act will also protect and co-operatively manage ongoing agricultural production on the lands.

An additional 1.5 million acres of wildlife habitat on government-owned agricultural land is proposed to be

designated under The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act. With this addition of land, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act will contain 3.4 million acres of natural areas that are valuable to wildlife and those who enjoy them.

Mr. Speaker, this initiative helps fulfil recommendations by provincial, national, and international conservation organizations to conserve some of our remaining natural areas. At meetings like the recent Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, there was much concern over cutting of the rain forest. In truth, it is likely man has already had more impact on the great plains than the rain forest will see for many years.

In protecting a total of 3.4 million acres of government-owned land, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act is the most cost-effective habitat program this province has. The taxpayer pays nothing, and we all know that it's cheaper to conserve our natural areas than to try to resurrect them later.

But we do not want our farmers and ranchers, already under so much economic pressure, to pay for these natural areas. We will not impair their ability to continue with current agricultural practices. The lands to be placed into the Act are found mainly in the south-west and along the forest fringe, with small parcels scattered across the rest of the province.

These lands will be administered by Saskatchewan Rural Development. Although this government presently sells agricultural Crown lands for agricultural purposes, lands providing critical food and shelter for wildlife are restricted from sale and have been for eight years. All of the lands that are designated as critical wildlife habitat land will continue to be used for grazing, haying, and petroleum activities. But alternatives which are harmful to wildlife on these lands will be controlled.

Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes the importance of wildlife to Saskatchewan, to the Saskatchewan people, and in turn the relatively high importance of Crown lands to wildlife survival. In the latest figures Statistics Canada tells us that 84 per cent of Saskatchewan residents said maintaining abundant wildlife was important, while 86 per cent favoured efforts to preserve endangered wildlife. In a recent poll 77 per cent of Saskatchewan people view the protection of the environment as very important; 87 per cent of these people agree the provincial government should protect Crown lands in their natural state for wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, in agricultural regions less than 25 per cent of the land remains in a natural state. These natural areas continue to shrink. There are 15 endangered or threatened species in Saskatchewan. Along with these species, populations of many game birds and other wildlife species have been or could be reduced by any further loss of habitat.

Mr. Speaker, the Crown lands involved here are of strategic importance to wildlife in Saskatchewan and to the vast majority of the people who appreciate wildlife. In total these lands form only 5 per cent of the agricultural region, yet provide one-third of the critical upland

wildlife habitat. The government recognizes that any further loss of this critical wildlife habitat would have serious effects on bird and animal populations in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that wildlife habitat will be saved without having any significant negative impact on agricultural use. These lease contracts are not disturbed. Also this government's commitment to make agriculture Crown land available for sale to the farming community is not affected, as the majority of Crown land administered by Saskatchewan Rural Development remains available for sale. This Act will not impair a lessee's ability to assign the lease to their children, heirs, or others who purchase their operation.

Mr. Speaker, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act ensures that both wildlife and agricultural interests will be protected for the benefit of present and future generations.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to give second reading of the amendment to the Bill, The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are definitely some things in this process and in the Bill that have raised a significant amount of questions. In my part of the province and in the member from Maple Creek and significant others — in Shaunavon and throughout the south-west — the concern has been raised, Mr. Minister, in the general context of a very, very, I believe, serious misconception by the people who promote wildlife and that is that the natural grasses will enhance the wildlife across the province. And that, Mr. Minister, in my humble view, is not a fact. It's not a fact.

And what's propagated by the NDP (New Democratic Party) across this province that says that if I keep this land exactly the way Mother Nature had it, it will continue to produce wildlife that is in abundance across this province in excess of what it has already done.

And you know what I've learned? I've learned for my period of time in the agricultural industry, in the ranching industry, I've learned some very important things about understanding nature and its involvement in my ranch and the community I live in.

I want to extend it beyond that. When the pioneers came to this province, in the province of Saskatchewan there was actually very, very little opportunity down in the south-east part of the province for wildlife to exist. And what has happened over the past 75 and 85 years is that trees have grown in those parts, around the pot-holes, and all through that south-east part of this province. And today there is wildlife there in abundance, in excess of anything that has ever happened before.

And you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because there is an opportunity for them to graze and there is an opportunity for them to be protected by the people who cultivate and who promote agriculture in those rural communities.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

And as I went travelling in the central part, on the east side of this province, where we have considered — because I'm only 50 years old — where we have considered, Mr. Speaker, that trees have been in existence in the east side of this province for ever . . . And the member from the east side of Canora and Pelly should understand this. If he would go and ask those people who have lived there and are over 75 years old, he will hear them say this as they told me — when they came to that part of the province of Saskatchewan there were very little trees and underbrush for these animals to expand their numbers. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

And why has it happened? It's because the people in rural Saskatchewan have placed an emphasis on providing an opportunity for wildlife to procreate and get their increase in numbers. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact. And by putting a law in this Assembly to continue to protect may increase it some more.

But I will tell you and I will tell the member from Shaunavon, the member from Shaunavon who was almost run out of his constituency at a number of occasions and a number of meetings because of The Critical Wildlife Habitat Protection Act . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think the member from Shaunavon may not know, being a new member, but I know the member from Morse does know, that he can't have a debate between two members in the House unless it's in Committee of the Whole. But the member from Shaunavon now does know and if he wants to get in, he should stand and I will recognize him.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, I will say this to the members of this Assembly, that agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan has enhanced the opportunity for wildlife to exist here.

I'm going to explain something else to the members here, and there are a lot of people in the province of Saskatchewan who have on occasion visited The Great Sand Hills in the south-west part of the province of Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, I have some of those in my constituency. And I have some of those ranchers who have been there for four or five generations, starting at about 1895 and on. And I have visited with some of those people over my life and I have talked to them about what existed when their grandparents came to that part of the world.

And you know what, Mr. Speaker? Over and over and over again, I hear this simple, straightforward logic, and that logic is this: there was no water in The Great Sand Hills, Mr. Speaker. Where would the deer and antelope play? Down along the river, but not in The Great Sand Hills, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you men and women in this Assembly can spoof about what you're doing, but you are seriously curtailing the involvement of agriculture and ranchers in the province of Saskatchewan by putting this regressive kind of legislation in on the books here today.

And I'll tell you why. The people in The Great Sand Hills are the most adamant about protecting the soil, protecting the plants, and protecting the animals that live on their property.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to continue the point I was going to make. Many people in the province of Saskatchewan, and especially urban, do not understand that in The Great Sand Hills prior to 1910, there were no deer because they didn't have an opportunity to have water in those places.

And you know what the ranchers did? They put down a well, put up a tank with a windmill and put water in there, and you know what, Mr. Speaker? Today, today, I will grant you this, that that is the best mule deer and white-tail deer hunting in the province of Saskatchewan.

(1045)

And do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It's because the ranchers decided to do something with their livestock in the same places that the people now want to say, I got to protect that. I got to put my arm . . . society has to put its arms around it to protect it.

And you know what the ranchers say? We've been doing it all the time. For the first time you've begun to understand what the world is really all about. They have, Mr. Speaker, been providing that protection to the wildlife, because you know what? They understand the existence and tough times in those locations and I know that they are very, very seriously concerned about this.

You know what, Mr. Speaker? They are so concerned about it and the process that was used in delivering this that they are prepared — and I've talked to . . . I have over 100 of these that are affected by this legislation alone. I have over 100 in my constituency. And they are telling me — and I'm just telling this to you so that you clearly understand the kinds of things that are going to impact here — that if you, Mr. Minister, bring forward this legislation and pass it here without some very, very significant consultation, they're going to close their borders to every hunter in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I will lay this before you too, sir, that that is wrong for you to implement this without serious discussion. And since it first was suggested in the throne speech, I know that the member for Shaunavon has been down in his constituency and visited with farmers and ranchers there, and they were not happy. The RM (rural municipality) of Val Marie, for example — and needless to say I will perhaps point out the name of the secretary treasurer of that RM, and I'm sure he wouldn't mind . . .

An Hon. Member: — Barry Dixon.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Barry Dixon — right on — has focused his attention on this very Act as being very, very destructive. And why, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister? It's because he understands the ranchers and farmers in that community that have provided habitat ever since they became involved in the land in the first place. And there are more deer there today than there were 100 years ago. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact.

And I want to point out to the members of this Assembly that when you think that you are going to protect wildlife by putting this Act in and saying you cannot sell this land, that's a fallacy, Mr. Speaker. That is absolutely, totally wrong.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people have said this over and over again.

Earlier this week we had an invitation to attend the Saskatchewan Stock Growers executive meeting here and had a beef barbecue that they sponsored — and the minister was there; I compliment him for being there — and they told me, and I know they told him, that the role of the minister and his responsibility . . . And he made a commitment to them, he made a commitment to them that he would not pass this legislation for at least a year until they felt comfortable about it.

And, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Minister, if you do that . . . if you don't do that, there's going to be some very serious problem in managing the wildlife in the south-west part of the province of Saskatchewan. And I'm not telling you something that you haven't heard from them before.

But I want it on the record in this Assembly that there is very, very serious concern about what's going on with the Department of Natural Resources and this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the people in rural Saskatchewan not only understand the value of agriculture, they understand the value of allowing this natural habitat to continue to exist as it has for centuries. And, Mr. Speaker, and, Mr. Minister, I know that the people in the south-west part of the province are very concerned — very concerned.

Ranchers have called me from along Diefenbaker Lake and into the Sand Hills and said, what are you going to do with my land? And they have told me if this passes with the kind of process that was involved in dealing with it when you started out, Mr. Minister, they're prepared to close their leases off from hunting — their land, everything. And that, Mr. Minister, is where you have to walk a balance in not only providing responsible government, but responsible attitude in relation to those producers who are growing that wildlife on that land.

Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister, I want to point out something to the general public, that the financing and raising of this wildlife on agriculture land is completely financed by agriculture. It's completely financed by agriculture because every one of them eat on my land, every one of them nest, every one of them have fawns, every one of them have young, and it's on my land that they do it. And every rancher has that sensitivity to the kinds of things that he does.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, these people have those deer walking across their lawns, standing on the front porch. And in fact if you went down and talked to Mr. Watson he would tell you this story. How a deer saw his reflection in the patio door and butted the deer and knocked the patio door out of the house.

And that's how these farmers and ranchers deal with the kinds of livestock and animals that they have on their

place. And you want to go challenge me on that story, you go talk to him yourself. And as a matter of fact, if you'd have been in Swift Current when the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) had their convention there, you'd have been able to talk to him yourself because he's a councillor for that division of that municipality.

And, Mr. Minister, before you implement anything in this process here, you need to seriously evaluate what impact you're going to have on the hunting in the province of Saskatchewan. Because I think if you implement this quickly, you are going to have a very serious problem. And that, Mr. Minister, is not a threat; it's not a warning; it's a plain, simple fact.

And, Mr. Minister, what are you going to do then? Are you going to put in a law that says you can't stop people from hunting on your land? And what are you going to do then? Are you going to herd these deer and antelope onto other people's property so that you can shoot them and do away with them — destroy them?

And, Mr. Minister, you are going to have to deal very, very seriously and very, very consciously with a great deal of respect in relation to the people who live on those leases, who have deeded land in that area because you are going to have a serious problem with this.

And, Mr. Speaker, because of all of what I said, and the member from Rosthern who is responsible for the Natural Resources department has more to say on this yet, I therefore ask for adjournment of debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 73 — An Act respecting Certain Services with respect to Co-operatives, Credit Unions and Names of Homes

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. This will be a rather brief set of comments, Mr. Speaker. I'm moving on behalf of the Minister of Justice who is, as members of the Assembly will know, occupied with a group that were here earlier.

I rise to move second reading of this Bill. The existing co-operative credit union legislation provides for fees to be charged for various services and functions the registrar's required or authorized to perform. These include fees for registration, examining or obtaining copies of documents, and reserving names.

Additional services are provided by the corporation's branch for which there's no authority to prescribe fees. For example, each year many telephone requests for information on specific businesses are received. Responding to telephone inquiries provides the public with quick access to information. It is, however, a major claim upon the time of the staff, and it has been determined that it would be appropriate to charge for it.

The department will be distinguishing between an individual who might call from the community of Moosomin from a law firm who might call in Moosomin. The latter, it is felt, should pay for the service, the former

would be more of a nuisance. So we will be distinguishing between those two services.

Requests are also received for various reports such as names and locations of certain types of business in a geographic area. This type of service too, satisfies public demand.

This Act provides for regulations to charge fees for these services provided by the corporation's branch. In the case of The Names of Homes Act, this Act, I should say, Mr. Speaker, is almost exclusively used by rural people, and is used, really, to name farms and not homes. In the case of The Names of Homes Act, the amendments will remove the amount of registration fee from the Act and provide for regulations to establish fees. This is consistent with the approach taken in other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move second reading of this Act.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sense that this Bill might be more a housekeeping Bill, but I also, as I was listening to the comments from the minister, it sounds to me like it's also a Bill that is going to requisition more money from the taxpayers. And certainly, I think, we must take a few more . . . another brief look at it, even though I possibly could suggest we move it into Committee of the Whole where we could get into some of the intimate details for what might have . . . the normal process is to go through second readings. So at this time, I'll just adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Speaker: — Before I recognize the minister, I want to recognize the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. Why is she on her feet?

Ms. Stanger: — Thank you. I'm going to ask leave to introduce some guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Stanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your patience with me bobbing up and down. But I did want to get these two guests introduced because they're long-time members and supporters of our party. And they're here visiting in Regina today, in your gallery. They are Joe and Ilene Degenstein from Battleford. And I'm sure that many of the members know Joe and Ilene, and we'd like to welcome them here today and say welcome to the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the member from Pelly on his feet?

Mr. Harper: — To ask leave for the introduction of guests.

Leave granted.

Mr. Harper: — Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the

House, a constituent of mine who is seated up in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bruno Mriva. Mr. Mriva is a neighbour, a very good friend of mine, and a fellow farmer. And Bruno is down here today to take part in the labour demonstration because he's also a member of the ironworkers' union. And I'd ask all the members to welcome Bruno down here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1100)

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 74 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act (No. 2)

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll make a few comments on The Land Titles Act amendment (No. 2), and then I will thereafter move second reading.

Mr. Speaker, my comments are going to be a touch more detailed on this. There's no way to summarize the amendments to this legislation in a quick fashion.

A number of changes are being made. These are changes of enormous interest to the legal profession and the banking community and, I suspect, not of broad interest otherwise.

After the Bill gets third reading, we will be following a practice established by the former member from Qu'Appelle Lumsden, Mr. Lane, and we will be mailing out copies of the legislation and explanation to all members of the Saskatchewan bar and the banking and credit union community.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill contains a number of amendments to The Land Titles Act. It includes some reform mortgages, mortgage priority, building restriction caveats, duplicate certificates of title, and the assurance fund. Most of these amendments, I am satisfied, would be welcomed by members of the bar, of the commercial bar, of whatever political complexion they might be.

Presently, Mr. Speaker, in each case the entire mortgage document is registered in the Land Titles Office. What has happened over the years is that an enormous bulk of paper has accumulated which is expensive to store and of little value. In most cases the documents are extremely repetitious. Documents of several thousand words are typed out by secretaries in a few seconds because there's only a few words changed from one document to the next.

The effect of this will be to provide a summary-form mortgage so that the mortgage has two parts. One is a summary form that contains interest rate, land description, mortgage amount, repayment dates, etc. That will be part number one. Part number two is all of the usual forms.

In almost all cases, each bank, credit union, has a form that it uses. These forms are simply torn off a pad and filled in. The effect of this amendment will be that the credit unions and banks and mortgage companies and the Farm Credit Corporation and so on can file a copy of all

the terms. And they've only got to do it once.

Then anyone who wishes to search the mortgage can get a copy of the summary form. If that doesn't provide all the information you need, you can also get a copy of the file terms. It will save quite a bit of expense. And in due course I expect the savings would be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars for this. This is a fair expense.

The registrars will still accept the other form of mortgages. Mortgages are occasionally used by individuals. It is not very common, but occasionally used by non-financial institutions. And these will still be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, the reforms will also affect building restriction caveats. These are as obscure as they are troublesome to the system. Building restriction caveats typically restrict the type of building activity that can take place on property. These last an enormous length of time, almost always outlast the building they were designed to deal with and then become a terrible nuisance to get off the title.

Currently a court order, the only way to get these building restriction caveats off. This amendment will allow the registrar to remove the building restriction caveat if on its face it is expired, and sometimes that's the case, or if a half a century has elapsed.

A registered owner of land benefitting from the building restriction will be able to withdraw the caveat provided that the requirement for removing and easements are followed. And I won't get into this in detail. I suspect the audience for this detail is going to be awfully limited this morning. I see some agreement in that subject.

The members, I think, will be familiar with duplicate certificates of title. Traditionally these are called deeds. They are used by farmers almost exclusively. Financial institutions will accept duplicate certificates of title. It's a form of a mortgage. And that's the only purpose to which duplicate certificates of title are used.

I won't get into detail. I suspect members will forgive me if I don't give them the detail of the alternative arrangements which have been provided. Suffice it to say that it has been worked out between the Land Titles Office and the financial community, the banks and the credit unions really, an alternate system for hypothecating the title. The duplicate certificates of title when this is proclaimed will be an historical anachronism. Landowners who want to retain their title may do so.

My father has the original deed from the original grant from the Crown back in the last century still in the family, as is the farm on which the land's been farmed. So if you want the deed as an historical document you may have it; otherwise they will disappear from the system.

One other comment on which I'll touch briefly and that is the assurance fund is being abolished. It has been a very long period of time since the assurance fund served any purpose except to provide work for a few bookkeeping staff and accounting staff. Otherwise it serves little purpose. The assurance fund will be consolidated with

the Consolidated Fund, and the assurance fund will also pass into history.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments are consistent with the Land Titles Office systems ongoing objectives to update and clarify existing legislation, serve the needs of registry users, operate the system more efficiently.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move second reading of An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minor responses to the comments and regarding the Bill brought forward by the minister.

And I can appreciate the fact that the minister's suggesting much needed . . . to look at ways of maybe eliminating some of the paperwork that is necessary in transfer of titles. The minister also indicated that they will be notifying the bar, the Saskatchewan bar and the financial institutions about the change once the Bill is proclaimed.

But I'm also wondering if it wouldn't be appropriate to maybe inform the realtors association of Saskatchewan as well, as it sounds to me like this type of information is something that they would be very aware of or would like to be aware of and made aware of as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

Bill No. 75 — An Act to repeal The Bulk Sales Act

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Another one of these Bills which is of interest, this time, to the business community, the retail business community and the financial community and not much else.

The Bulk Sales Act was enacted in 1911. A primary method of financing for businesses for ongoing credit — not capital monies, but ongoing credit — is to take security against stock-in-trade. The purpose of the Act was to protect wholesalers and bulk suppliers against retailers who sell their stock in bulk without paying creditors first. The Act requires the purchaser of stock in bulk to ensure that there are no debts owing on the stock before the sale is completed. There is a method of doing this in the Act; one obtains a declaration to this effect from the retailer.

The legislation also provides that obtaining a sworn declaration from the retailer frees the purchaser from any liability for retailers' debts. The protection offered by the Act is based in part upon the assumption that even though a retailer might be intending to defeat the claims of his or her creditors, he or she would not swear a false declaration.

Mr. Speaker, this assumption makes evident the inherent weakness in the Act. In addition too, changes in the primary method of financing businesses have limited the usefulness of the Act. Today's financial institutions

provide financing for the establishment of retail businesses. Financial institutions secure their claim to businesses by registering security agreements in the personal property registry pursuant to The Personal Property Security Act. Unsecured creditors rank behind the secured creditors during a sale of the business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Saskatchewan joins a number of provinces who have repealed, or who are considering repealing, this legislation. British Columbia repealed its bulk sales legislation; Alberta and Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, are reviewing these respective recommendations from their respective law . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . they are, from their respective law reform commission.

The Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan has commented on The Bulk Sales Act as follows: it is legislation which has outlived its usefulness, has become an impediment to the facilitator of a good business practice.

In addition, members of the Saskatchewan branch of the Canadian Bar Association have agreed this Act should be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I move second reading of an Act to repeal The Bulk Sales Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in light of the exuberance shown by the House Leader toward the Bill, it might be appropriate that the opposition just take a little closer look at the Bill prior to its receiving second reading. So at this time, I would adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

(1115)

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Expenditure Education Vote 5

The Chair: — I wonder if the minister would introduce her officials.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my left is Fred Renihan, the ADM (associate deputy minister) from the Department of Education; and seated directly behind him is Robin Johnson.

Item 1

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I welcome all of your officials today and yourself.

Given the financial difficulties facing the province, it's imperative that — I think all of us in fact agree — that we quickly have to find some solutions to our economic

woes. And one of the things that's been mentioned by everyone is the need to do more with less.

In the throne speech, it was stated that there was going to be an organization entitled the Saskatchewan Education Council to advise on improvements to our educational system.

Can you tell us the status of this particular group?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the question from the member about the Saskatchewan Education Council, which was committed to in the throne speech, we're in the process of putting together the . . . what will constitute the establishment of the council, making sure that all of the sectors and stakeholders in education, including students and parents, will be represented.

There are . . . at this stage we haven't got names yet, we're just consulting with the various stakeholders and organizations to make sure that when the council is established it will have the appropriate representation.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, who will be determining the specific objectives of the council?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, there will be terms of reference established. We do already have them in draft but they haven't reached the approval stage yet. And what we see the process being is . . . as the member will be aware, there are a number of reviews ongoing, being the SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology) review, the review of the university panel. We have a review of distance education, of the high school curriculum, a very comprehensive look at all of the sectors of education, and it's very important.

It's such a complex system in a way that when you change one thing, for instance if you make changes in the high school curriculum without consulting the post-secondary sector, then you have a problem with articulation.

So our objective is to do a very comprehensive overview of the components of the education system and then to have the results of those reviews before the Saskatchewan Education Council for their consideration in developing in a collaborative way a whole new vision for education for the province.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. I guess one of the things that I'm most interested in is to have access to what the objectives of this council will be. And if they're in draft form, I will indeed be most pleased to be able to even see that. But when in fact it's determined what the objectives are, would you be willing to share that information with me?

And before I end with that one question, there are corollary questions. I would like to know what . . . if in fact you're going to have some form of measuring whether or not the objectives are being met, if you would share the information of who, when they are chosen, are going to be on the council, what their qualifications and credentials are, and what remuneration will be attached

to their participation on the council.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be pleased to have a meeting with the member from Greystone at any time and would be delighted to receive her input and suggestions as to the make-up and mandate for the council. And it's very appropriate now that it is in draft form so that ideas can be . . . new ideas and new perspectives can be incorporated into that exercise.

We feel it's going to be very important for all of Saskatchewan people, and it is planned at this stage — as I say, it is in draft — but it is planned that the council . . . the supervision of the council and their perspective will be an ongoing exercise so that there will be from this point on, as you might say, a perpetual review and critique of the education system.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, is it being considered as part of the mandate of this council to actually have the authority to give direction to government about where they believe money should be directed in order to have the opportunity to focus it on where they identify people need help most?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, one of the roles, as I said earlier, for the . . . that's seen for the Education Council will be to develop a vision for education for the province in all sectors, and in conjunction with that to develop a clearly enunciated strategic plan which would be revisited on a regular basis.

And it would be an advisory council only, but certainly I think when we have an opportunity to have a discussion and the member from Greystone can see how the make-up of the council is proposed, that certainly the government is setting it up to take advice and to act on advice.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, just to go back for one moment, you had indicated in your previous answer — not this one, but the one prior — that in fact you would like and you would appreciate some input from myself with regards to the draft that you presently are working with. Can I assume from that that you'd be willing to share that draft with me?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Well, Mr. Chairman, at this point it would be a working paper and is subject to revision and change. But I would certainly be prepared to have a meeting with the member and go over it in detail.

Ms. Haverstock: — I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, it's been . . . in many different committees we've of course been able to look at the work that had been done by the previous government and also ways in which expenditures were hidden. One of those ways was actually found in the departments, like the Education department, by creating seconded positions.

I'm wondering if in fact there are any seconded positions remaining, and if so, how many are we talking about, what amount of expenditure is involved, and what is the rationale for providing such positions now?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, as we had indicated in an earlier session I believe, among the approximately 60 positions that were in the department that are not there now, there were I think approximately a third. We are checking for the exact number of secondments. I think that . . . And there still are some.

In '91-92 there were 71, and for 1992-93 there are 57. However, we are doing within the department an internal reorganization exercise with the assistance of an outside facilitator. We want to have the department organized in a different way with a more horizontal organization chart, if you like. And the staff in the Department of Education is not only aware of it, they are fully involved in the reorganization of the department.

Now in some cases secondments are used, for instance in the curriculum-writing area. We might bring a teacher in, an experienced teacher with a certain kind of expertise to be involved in the writing of a certain curriculum. Then when that job is finished, normally the teacher would go back. I think what we did see was a number of long-term secondments; secondments that had been renewed over a very long period of time.

And that's not, as the member knows, that's not the purpose of a secondment. A secondment is, the person who is seconded remains the employee of the board or the area of the system from which they come and are permanently employed. So they're supposed to be borrowed and then returned when the job is over. And there were a number of those long-term, extended secondments.

And that's one of the things that we're looking at in the reorganization, is to minimize those positions. And if a position is indeed permanent, then to describe it as such. But secondments do have that use, and that's a valid use. So we certainly will continue to have secondments in certain positions from time to time.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, are there specific measures in place in order to ensure that abuses are being avoided? And I also had asked what sort of expenditures are being incurred at present with secondments. Where I understand what you're saying is that you're evaluating these, the numbers have changed from 71 to 57, is my understanding; 57, to some people, would still seem like a very large number. And while some of those are justified, I think that they all should be able to be justified.

And I'm wondering what is in place to assess the purpose of these secondments and the monies associated with them to ensure that, in fact, the citizens are getting their money's worth.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to outline where the current secondment staff is located, in which areas of activity. And as I said before, that curriculum writing is one of the main areas. And out of the 57 . . . these are the old numbers; out of the 71, there were 19 in curriculum and instruction and three in evaluation and student records. There are seven in regional offices. We have the regional offices of the department

throughout the province. And the OMLO, the Official Minority Languages Office, has 18.

This is one of the things that we hope to achieve in the reorganization of the department and the involving of the department staff in that new structure, is so that permanent employees and people who are on temporary assignments through secondments will all know exactly how they fit, what their place is in the structure.

And I hope that at the end of that time we will have a mechanism to monitor the number of permanent employees or casual, versus the number of secondments. And in the interest of open and honest government, that information will at all times be public.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, in your estimates, you're providing monies for school construction. And I'd like to know how much of the money that you are proposing to spend is devoted to actual construction and how much is devoted to retiring debts from past projects.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, there is no current, new construction this year, but there is approximately \$65 million shown in the estimates as being capital expenditures. That is this year's current commitment to construction that has already occurred.

Normally there's a 10-year time frame to pay for a new school. And the shares of the province and the local board are contributed and so forth. No part of current construction, if there is any, is ever shown in the current budget. Like, if a new school was built in '91-92, there would be no cost shown. The cost would be the amortization over the following 10 years including this one. So this year's contribution of \$65 million is mortgage payments, if you like, on past construction.

(1130)

And if we didn't undertake any new construction whatsoever, that would be, the \$65 million would be a diminishing amount over 10 years. And by the end of a 10-year time frame, it would be zero. But we do certainly propose, once we finalize our plan for the allocation of capital to begin as our financial resources allow, to of course invest in capital in our education system again.

The other amount that would be shown in the estimates being \$14 million all together, 3 million of which is designated for post-secondary institutions and universities and leaving \$11 million for repairs and maintenance and emergency construction, of which 8 million-odd, I think about 8.8 million, has been allocated and announced in firm projects already. So there is a certain contingency amount there for occupational-health-and-safety factors that need to be corrected in the balance of the year.

That's the explanation I can provide for the capital amounts being divided into contributions for past construction and this year's current maintenance, which is always shown in the current budget.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam

Minister, I know that this has been raised previously, but I have received so many letters about this that I would like to have your response to this question to me specifically.

Approximately \$1.6 million is going to be spent on a school in the town of Loreburn. And when this addition is completed, the K-6 school at the town of Elbow is going to be closed. I'm wondering why these monies are being allocated for construction when the school at Elbow could be kept open with modest renovations.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, as the member opposite understands, I know, this kind of decision is the responsibility of the local board, the division board which is duly elected by the people that they represent. But there is some background to this situation in the form of a note that I have here. It's fairly recent, dated June 16, and I would be very pleased to table it and provide a copy to the member so that she may have the details that supports the board's decision.

Ms. Haverstock: — I appreciate that very much. I'm going to move to universities, and I'm wondering if you would be willing to provide the names of persons who are members of the inquiry into universities and outline their qualifications.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I'd be very pleased to do so. There is a three-person panel that has been named. The chairman is Mr. Al Johnson, who is currently a professor emeritus at the University of Toronto and was, at one point, the president of the CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation), among many other professional and academic activities that he's had in his life.

He is currently in South Africa on a CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) project, advising the South African government on the integration of black people into the public service. So I think once he finishes that, he shouldn't have a lot of problem with the situations in our universities.

He is supported by Gwen Randall who is . . . I should mention also that Dr. Johnson was born and raised in Saskatchewan and educated here in Elbow. And although he's from out of the province now, he is a Saskatchewan native.

Gwen Randall is also a Saskatchewan native who is a lawyer now, engaged in private practice in Calgary. She is Queen's Counsel. She was formerly, as well, a member of the board of governors of the University of Regina.

Brian Tinker is a Ph.D. (Doctor of Philosophy). He is now retired, lives at the west coast. But I think the member will recall him as a member of the administration at the University of Saskatchewan and, prior to that, at the University of Regina. He did serve some time, just prior to his retirement, on the administrative staff of the University of Calgary. So he certainly has a good insight into the administrative workings of universities and is familiar with the Saskatchewan scene.

And I think all these people will understand the philosophy of Saskatchewan and how Saskatchewan

people see the universities playing a role in our society and our economy. And that is the kind of credentials that we wanted, is people that would be in a position to take an objective view, because they're not part of the current university community in the province, but people that were born and raised here and have spent some of their working life here and their professional life and that truly understand how Saskatchewan people feel about the goals and role of their universities.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Madam Minister. Mr. Chairman, I hope that one of the things that won't happen . . . when people come from a very traditional way of conceptualizing universities, it means that they may in fact have very innovative ways of beginning to look at new ways. It's just not . . . it doesn't become part of their paradigm, if you will.

And one of the realities is that when the Premier of Manitoba ends up signing an agreement with the Governor of Minnesota to in fact not only have requirements for entrance to be at par but to have tuition at par, to have research and development dollars shared, and we don't seem to be able to reconcile our differences between the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan, I only pose to you that I hope that what we will do is to see some very useful ways of being able to look at the ways that universities can share in research dollars or do some things that may be quite different, in looking to what's been happening in Manitoba and Alberta and Saskatchewan universities, doing more in joint ventures with them. That's just a comment. And I do wish to go on to another area because I seem to be monopolizing your time today.

There's been a lot of discussion about testing of Saskatchewan students. And I don't know if you know about my background, but of course before my life as a clinical psychologist I did an enormous amount of testing. In fact taught at university, specific classes regarding diagnosis and remedial work, prescriptive teaching of children with learning disabilities.

What I'm interested in here is the fact that we bring in foreign tests which are extraordinarily expensive and really do not provide an adequate measurement for the kinds of children that we have in our province or even for that matter Canadian children at large.

And I'm wondering if you're considering providing funds, indeed if you are providing funds, for the development of solid, locally based tests that are founded on basic subjects, that are going to eliminate the use for foreign, expensive tests?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, if I could answer the first comment first. I think that the member will be encouraged to know, as I am, that as a result of the western premier's conference, which was held at Williams Lake in April, one of the communiques that came from that conference was a directive for the western education ministers to meet and to . . . the objective being to see whether there were areas where we could share resources.

As another side note, you mentioned the University of

Manitoba and their arrangements with the U.S. (United States). And I'm not sure whether you're aware; I just became aware recently myself that the Government of Manitoba set up a review panel very similar, with a very similar mandate to our universities review panel. Theirs is headed by, I believe, their former premier, Duff Roblin. And I'm not sure who the other members were. But the mandate was very much the same.

So we had this western education ministers' meeting just this very week — it was on Monday and Tuesday. And it was the ministers from Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia. Alberta and British Columbia both have departments of continuing education and K to 12, so there were the two ministers from each of those provinces. Saskatchewan and Alberta have only the one department. And then the Yukon and the Northwest Territories were represented as well.

It was just an extremely productive meeting. The time . . . I mean, everybody is feeling the fiscal pinch, and so people are prepared to talk about sharing and doing things co-operatively and collaboratively in areas that a few years ago they probably wouldn't have discussed in depth.

So one of the things that was on the agenda was post-secondary education, and there will be follow-up to this meeting. Each province or territory sort of went away with a task to develop. One of the provinces is going to develop an interprovincial assessment and recommendations on the more efficient delivery and sharing in distance education. One is looking at the universities.

And to their credit, the leaders of the western Canadian universities have been meeting independently of the ministries on their own, talking about ways of sharing research dollars, centres of excellence, and looking closely at models like the Western College of Veterinary Medicine which is funded, as you know, core funding by all the provinces, and looking at those models.

Another area that will be pursued is the development of aboriginal content in curriculum, which is a concern for all of us. And really it doesn't seem sensible for four provinces and two territories to all be having people working at this independently. It's true that in terms of the French governance and that component of the curriculum and the aboriginal component there are regional differences. But it doesn't mean we all have to do our thing, that surely there is a core that could be established, and then people could put the appropriate flavour on it for their own jurisdiction.

So there are those important areas that will be pursued. Another one was the transfer ability of credits and of teaching credentials from one jurisdiction to another. So we will be taking really a comprehensive approach in looking at these issues on a regional basis and we will be meeting again. So I think it is probably one of the most productive efforts that has happened for a long time, and the people that were there were very sincere in following through.

On the second, the testing, I know that you will be

encouraged by our efforts to develop a provincial education indicators program. And I may as well refer to it myself before I get the question, but Saskatchewan did participate in the international assessment of education progress. This was the international test. There were some press releases surrounding the results of this earlier this year, I think about February. And Saskatchewan students did rate very well comparatively in those tests to students from other countries and also to students within other provinces of Canada.

(1145)

Then earlier this year we declined to actively participate in the school achievement indicators project, which is a Canadian one. But the reason for that . . . and we took our decision not to stay out of it for ever, no decision is ever green, I guess in that sense. But we think it is so important, especially when we're developing a new curriculum, to have a provincial evaluation system that evaluates what we are doing. It establishes a baseline from where we are now and measures our progress on that. And that once we have that established and we're doing that in a collaborative way involving parents, involving the business community formally through the chambers of commerce and the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, so that they will know what we're doing and how we're addressing the issue of accountability . . . That exercise is becoming fairly intense. It started a number of months ago.

And once we're satisfied that we have a good internal method of measuring — and throughout that exercise we will be monitoring the Canadian indicators project — and if we feel at some point that they can dovetail together or they can support each other, we would be willing to review the decision. But in the meantime we're concentrating on developing our home-grown test.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Madam Minister, I couldn't be more delighted by your response regarding the way in which there's going to be more co-operation between the provinces, particularly when it comes to post-secondary education.

To refine a bit my question on standardized testing, you know one of the things that we truly need to acknowledge in this province is the fact that 68 per cent of our young people, native young people, are under the age of . . . 68 per cent of the native population is under the age of 23.

One of the things that I found in my professional work that was truly tragic was, because of the kinds of standardized tests that were used in our province, as foreign tests standardized on white middle-class American children, that our native population, our children in this province of native ancestry, were never diagnosed with specific learning disabilities — never. They were diagnosed as educably mentally retarded. And it was simply because of the standardized tests that were used.

And that's one of the aspects that I'm hoping that the Department of Education will look at and be committed to, is the development of our own tests, looking at our specific population and the needs that are going to be required to ensure that we have specific education

programming that is going to allow our young people, regardless of background, to be able to learn well and become full participants in our society.

I'm pleased to hear that there is a commitment to local standardized testing, the development of it. But I'm quite interested in knowing the time lines for this. As you know, being able to end up doing this kind of work and coming out with the kinds of results that we're going to need are going to be longer term. And I'm wondering what portion of the education budget is being allocated to the development of local standardized tests.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Well, Mr. Chairman, again this would be one of the areas where when, to go back to where we talked about secondments, this is becoming an intense exercise because we realize the importance of it. And so there are some people that are seconded to work on this project. We certainly share the concern with respect to the performance of and the opportunities for aboriginal students in our system. And we've had numerous conversations with leaders in the native community. We know that we have to do a better job in our education system.

One of the evidences, I guess, of our commitment to this is the five-year agreement that we recently entered into just within the last few weeks with the Gabriel Dumont Institute, specifically for curriculum development that has a Metis content. And of course an evaluation system to correspond with that content would be very important. There have been agreements with Gabriel Dumont Institute prior to this, but they were always one-year, and it made it very difficult for them to plan ahead in a more comprehensive way.

To the question on the assessment and evaluation, how much we've budgeted for it, we have, in this year's budget, \$640,000 on the assessment and evaluation. And then under the provincial exams and student records, the amount budgeted there is 1.226 million.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, I'm wondering if you could give to us the names of those individuals who will be involved in creating locally standardized tests, and if you could state their credentials.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, we can certainly undertake to provide the specific individuals rather than giving you a list of all of the people that work in the evaluation department, the people that are assigned to this particular task, and we will — and their qualifications — and we will undertake to do that.

As well, as I referred to earlier, there is an advisory committee composed of people from the education stakeholders, the SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association) and STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation), LEADS (League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents), the business community, the home and school association, as an advisory committee to this body.

This is a fairly long-term project because the tests are developed in this collaborative way to correspond to

specific curriculum that's being developed and then the curriculum and the testing system then are tested in a pilot by teachers in the field. And then the results come back.

So it's certainly more than a one-year project. It's a term project, a matter of developing the curriculum, developing the tests to go with it. So it couldn't be really described as a standardized test because in each case it will conform to the curriculum and can be adjusted regionally. For instance, like for northern students.

So it's a longer-term project. I don't mean to say off into the far blue yonder, but two or three years until it's completed and refined.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. I think one of the things that I was making reference to that is a little different from the broader standardized testing to which you are referring, is the need for more specific standardized testing that addresses what we are facing now and will be a growing challenge as the years go on.

I refer specifically again to native children in our province. It requires an enormous amount of expertise to develop standardized tests. It requires even more expertise to develop standardized tests for children who are special-needs children. And I guess one of the things that I'd like to do is to simply remind the minister that I have spoken to her and written to her about one of the few individuals that lives in this province who not only started the Institute for Child Guidance and Development, not only was the head of the Department for the Education of Exceptional Children, not only has written books that have been recognized internationally, but has developed standardized tests and in recent years has been one of the few individuals who has gone from one reserve to another to begin to look at and address this very, very important area.

And I do hope that Dr. John McLeod will be, at some point, at the very least consulted in these matters.

My next question is regarding Saskatchewan's two universities because they produce now up to 900 teachers a year. And in a recent study that SSTA published — in fact it was in their estimates — that through the balance of this decade, there are only going to be, as they predict, 400 jobs available for these university graduates each year. I'm wondering, for every one that we train to be a teacher in this province, it appears that we're educating another to teach beyond our borders, and that . . . or the even worse alternative, which is to line up in the unemployment lines.

I'm wondering when there's going to be an allocation of resources to be used more effectively so that money is going to train our students for jobs that are going to be available within our own province.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the member, I'd like to assure her that I did receive, and we had a conversation about, the attributes and qualifications of Dr. McLeod, and I certainly appreciate them. And I do want her to know that the department is working very closely with Dr. McLeod on a specific project in Prince Albert at the moment. And we certainly

do intend to employ his expertise wherever possible, and we do recognize that his credentials are more than sound in this area. So we appreciate — I appreciate personally — the reference to him and the correspondence from the member recommending him to us.

On the matter of . . . I guess you would call it supply and demand of teachers, this too was the subject of our interprovincial meeting of ministers earlier this week, where some provinces are importers of teachers and some are exporters. This is one of the subjects that will be addressed, or certainly falls within the mandate of the universities review panel. So we hope that they will deal with this in consultation with the universities and the education community and that they will have some recommendations to make in this respect.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, would you be willing, when you receive some information about their recommendations, would you be willing to share those with me?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I certainly expect at this time that the recommendations and the report of the universities review panel will be completely public.

Ms. Haverstock: — Madam Minister, one of the things that's become evident is that we really are not, in the province of Saskatchewan, competitive in the fields of science and technology. And I'm wondering what resources are going to be devoted to training persons in this particular field.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Well, Mr. Chairman, again I am assuming that, or I'm more than assuming, I'm expecting that this will be one of the areas that's looked at by the universities review panel. And I know that, in recent years particularly, Saskatchewan and Canada have not devoted enough in terms of financial resources and encouragement to science and technology and research in this country and in this province.

But we certainly do have a very solid base and a world-recognized base of science, technology, and bio-technology in Saskatoon at the university there, together with the medical college, the hydrology centre, the SRC (Saskatchewan Research Council), the establishment of the NRC (National Research Council), and VIDO (Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization), Biostar, and last week the addition of a company from Denmark that is establishing here that is active in the field of bio-technology.

We certainly do have some scientists whose expertise is in demand in the world. So we certainly don't have to take a back seat to anybody in that area. We will try to increase, depending upon or in keeping with the recommendations of the review panel, people into science and technology.

We had in 1988-89, 85 scholars attracted by the Industry, Science and Technology Canada bursary program, 117 in '89-90, 108 in '90-91, and 106 in '91-92. So that the numbers of people, students that are attracted into those faculties, are gradually increasing. But I think too that we are not doing enough and that looking to the needs of the

future, that we certainly will try to find ways to improve our expertise in this area and to attract more students into those fields of endeavour.

(1200)

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, I guess one of the things I'm really seeing here, what I was trying to present, was the dilemma that I see. It's an imbalance. Let's step out of education for just a moment and I'll use a different example.

When we're talking about the training of nurses, what we're finding is that they are being trained in how to deal with specific treatments of people that are really not based on preventative medicine or specialty areas. We're spending a whole lot of money graduating nurses who are not going to fit into what has been presented by your government as a particular model of health care. So that's monies wasted, and a lot of these individuals are going to have to go elsewhere or be trained very differently.

On the other hand, in education we now have 900 people who have graduated — the projection is that this is what's going to be happening each year — with only 400 jobs available. And we have a deficiency in certain areas where we very much need to be able to have a growth in our population of young people who can be employable. The latest statistics, in fact those that have just come out this month, have shown that the one area where unemployment is rising the most is with young people between the ages of 20 and 24. And it's up 3.4 per cent.

So obviously we are not seeing where things are headed here. And I think that if there are two areas which are absolutely crucial for the future of this province, it happens to be in education and training. So what I'm wanting to really understand is where the strategy is going here. And I applaud your efforts in wanting to involve a wide range of individuals, but what we need to do is to have some prompt intervention here that's supposed to be leading somewhere.

And I think that it's the responsibility of government to have a vision too, and to provide for people what the overall vision will be, unlike people who live and work in isolated disciplines who don't have a responsibility nor do they have the capacity to see the overall picture. They're one component part, and they in essence have to be viewed as a special interest group. And they have to be plugged in as a part of the collage that fits into the overall vision.

And that's not what I'm hearing. Okay? That's the part that's missing here, is a sense of where the province is going in education. And people who are out there need to hear. Universities need to hear. And people who have responsibility for K to 12 have to understand that if in fact the government's saying we're reducing education costs by 2 per cent this year and 2 per cent next year and 2 per cent the year after, but we're consulting with everybody . . . what are we going to end up with? What's the picture going to look like for the province of Saskatchewan in four years time in education?

And that's really where I'm getting at here, is that I

applaud your efforts to involve people, but I want to know what your plan for education is. What can the people of Saskatchewan expect their education to look like in four years?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the question from the member from Greystone, in the development of this vision or the absence of a vision I guess, is exactly what has prompted us to institute these reviews of the system. And as I said earlier, it's very difficult to tinker with a part of it without causing a problem somewhere else. So it's necessary to take the time to do a very comprehensive review of each component and then bring those together to develop that vision.

So we would think that the time frame for all of this . . . If I had it on a graphic I could show you how it all fits together. We don't just have a bunch of balls in the air. We really do have a plan for the results and the recommendations of all the reviews to feed into the Saskatchewan Education Council, and then with assistance they will develop a vision and a strategic plan.

And this is not projected to take years; this is projected to be . . . well it'll never be complete because it'll always have to be reviewed and changed as conditions change because we're living in a very dynamic era. But we certainly see something that will be in the public forum by very early in 1993, and certainly in time for us to incorporate some specific recommendations of the review panels and the council into the budgeting process for '93-94. So we do expect some relatively early results, but an overall picture that can be shared with the people of Saskatchewan by very early next year.

And it does take . . . We have a unique model of an education system in Saskatchewan. I guess I never really quite appreciated it myself until I had contact with ministers of Education from across the country. Some people think that, well we do all this consulting in Saskatchewan. We consult with the SSTA, with the teachers' federation, with the league of administrators, with the business officials, and we've developed over the years a collaborative model.

So we have a situation, and it's a tradition in Saskatchewan, that there isn't somebody that goes around and says, this is the way we're going to do it in Saskatchewan. Some people think this is cumbersome. I don't share that view. And after seeing a little bit of the inside of what happens in other provinces, where for instance the trustees' association provincially will take one view and the teachers' federation takes the other view, and the post-secondary takes one view and the K to 12 takes another, and then legislators sort of move in the middle and please some of the people some of the time and you have strife and strikes and it affects the quality of what happens in the education system and . . . We don't have that.

And I think it's well worthwhile for us to preserve that co-operative spirit within the education community. And from time to time when there can't be a consensus, yes, government has to take leadership. But I think it is important that we use those links and those bridges that

have been built traditionally in Saskatchewan between the stakeholders in the system to draw everybody in so that they feel part of the result.

So that's approximately the time frame and that's the reason for it taking maybe a little bit longer than some people think it should. It certainly takes longer than hiring a consultant and giving six weeks to come up with a new vision for the province. But with our tradition in Saskatchewan of personal, holistic involvement in our affairs, I think that the process that we have under way is really more in keeping with that.

And specifically you mentioned the training, the changes that are going to be required and the training for health care workers. And, Mr. Chairman, the member will be encouraged to know that we have some concrete results already. We have been consulting between the Department of Health and the Department of Education, with the medical professions, with the nursing, with the SRNA (Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association), and the CNA (certified nursing assistant), the established groups, on how we will change the training of health care workers to correspond to the wellness model and the extension of home-based care.

And in fact just within the last few days the Department of Health has entered into a specific contract, one that I'm aware of, with SIAST, to train in a specific area. And there will be more of this. And that one program is the result of consultations that we have taken with exactly that objective in mind. And we certainly are continuing to do that and will build into the training and education component for health care workers the requirements they will need to meet the demands, the different, certainly the changing, demands of what we see as the wellness model and home-based delivery of health care services.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, I of course concur with you that in no way would I want to see some consultant brought in to review things for six weeks and then give us what our vision should be for the province of Saskatchewan. I say with great respect that people supposedly voted for your government because they believed that you did have a vision for Saskatchewan. And that's what I see lacking here. I think that it's very important to consult with the groups that have provided an enormous amount of valuable input and guidance into the way our education system has developed in Saskatchewan.

But it is only the government that has the opportunity to look at everything under the umbrella. And it's the responsibility of those who are governing the people of Saskatchewan to have a mission, to have a particular mission statement, to have principles in place that are going to be required to be met in order to reach that mission statement.

And it is the groups involved to which you are referring who in fact are involved much further down the process, and those individuals are part of the objective development. But the overall mission, there has to be some mission that this government wishes to have.

And the reason I'm saying this is because, how do we

know how education is going to fit into economic development? How do we know how education is going to fit into the overall health care needs of this province, or science and technology, in the way that we're going to have people helping to develop our needs as far as energy are concerned or biotechnology is concerned?

What are we . . . what is the way in which we can understand education fitting into such things as agriculture when we know that agriculture can't simply stay the same way? I mean when we began the world wheat trade, we were only one of four competitors. Now there are 59 of them. I mean we can't simply continue to be an exporter of grains and oilseeds. I mean the point being that we have to become a centre of excellence on agricultural technology. We're going to need the people with that kind of ability to be able to fit into what it is in the future that we want to become.

And if we want to have centres of excellence in, you know, becoming a centre of excellence on energy options and conservation or the centre of excellence on agricultural technology, to end up exporting to the eastern European countries or whatever, and teaching them, giving them our knowledge instead of simply our products, then there has to be a plan for all of this.

And that's what I'm most frustrated by, is that there really . . . What I'm hearing from you is that there is a process involved of including people, but I don't know what the mission statement is, the way that the government is saying, this is where we want to go. And so when we're dealing with economic development or economic diversification and trade or health care or agriculture or education, these are how all the component parts fit.

Now I'm sure that we could go on for even longer than what we have. Let me give a very specific question and this might expedite the process here. Like many other areas, education is experiencing some innovative challenges. And one of these areas of innovation is the introduction of work study or what is often termed co-operative education in both secondary and post-secondary levels.

The federal government sponsors a lot of the programs like this at the secondary level, but their declining funding formula often prevents our local school boards from being able to bring forward many of these types of programs. My question to you is: what such programs does your department sponsor? And how much, if any, is expended on them?

(1215)

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, to go back to address the first part of the member's comments with respect to a vision and a strategic plan. It's interesting to note, and the member may be aware, Mr. Chairman, that there is a strategic plan for the K to 12 system that was initiated by our former administration. The collaborative work really started on it in the late '70s.

The strategic plan is called *Directions*. It was developed with all the stakeholders in the education system, including teachers. And I know that there are times when,

if you can't have a consensus or if it takes too long to have a consensus or somebody has to take the leadership . . . but I think it just wouldn't be appropriate to develop a strategic plan, for instance, without involving the people who are going to deliver it.

The strategic plan called *Directions* involved the teachers closely and had their support so that they felt a part of the vision. Some of the plan did get derailed. It formerly was unveiled and started, I guess, really about 1984 with the development of the core curriculum. It was supposed to be a 10-year project.

It's a resource-based curriculum, so it is expensive. And by resource-based I mean that, just in general, instead of a student having one text for grade 5 for one subject, the intent of the core curriculum is to teach students, first of all, the basic skills in to be literate and skills in numeracy, the three R's, so that they know the basics. But to also teach them to look for information, to be critical thinkers, and to be self-reliant learners so that when they exit the school system they are in a fit condition to adjust to whatever changes may come. Because we have no crystal ball, we have no idea. People would never have guessed 20 or 25 years ago what our high school graduates and university graduates would be facing today.

So the intent of the strategic plan that was begun to be developed in our former administration in the late '70s is really well under way.

We've revisited it recently knowing that we will be operating and . . . this K to 12 system will be operating under fiscal restraint for the foreseeable future. We wanted to make sure that if there were cut-backs made or corners cut that they were done . . . that there are savings made still keeping the vision in full view. And that the objective of the strategic plan that we called *Directions* wasn't compromised because of lack of funding.

That we may have to . . . and we have announced that we will slow down the pace of implementation. We've added another two years onto the time frame for completion of the introduction of the core curriculum and the testing system that will accompany it. So we felt, we still feel, that it's the right thing to do.

But if it is the right thing to do it's important, more important to do it right than it is to do it quickly. So we've extended the time frame to make sure that boards have got the resources to give teachers the in-service time for professional development so that they can become familiar with the curriculum and so that the resources are available at the class-room level.

But that is . . . basically the objective is to teach students to think for themselves, to search out information, not to learn things by rote, so that they will be able to make the adjustments and the transitions in their future education when they leave the K to 12 system, and in their adult working life as conditions around them change and the sands shift, that they will be self-reliant people who will be able to make those adjustments and transitions.

So that's part of a strategic plan that really is already there,

that was initiated by our administration and I guess, fair to say, within our philosophy, which means accessibility by all people, equality of opportunity and education no matter where in the province a student lives, and responsiveness of the system to the current and changing needs of people for education and training.

And there have been some dramatic changes, Mr. Chairman, as the member opposite will know, where in our society in terms of the fitness of students who arrive in the class-room to learn.

Even when we started the development of the strategic plan we call *Directions* for the K to 12 system in the late '70s, it would never have been contemplated, I don't think, by anybody in Saskatchewan that one in five children would live in poverty, that 30 to 40 per cent of children would arrive in an elementary class-room in a not fit condition to learn because of emotional problems, hunger, poorly dressed in severe weather.

And so we are initiating what we're calling an integrated school model. We'll have approximately a dozen pilot projects running this year in September already. It will be a co-operative model that will involve the departments of Health and Social Services and Justice and Education with resources in terms of dollars and energy from those departments all within the school, using the school as a centre.

Because in cases like this, you could have the very best curriculum in the world, and if the children arriving in the class-room are in a not fit condition to learn because of other situations, these can't be expected to be solved, all the ills of society, by the education dollar and the class-room teacher.

So this is another initiative that we've taken in response to some current conditions that we hope to improve as the economy improves. But they are with us today, and we have to face them. We have to make sure that those students are not disadvantaged when they leave the education system.

In response to the questions about the work-study programs, like the co-op programs . . . And I think the question was with respect to joint federally funded programs. There are a wide variety of programs and they are declining. In fact, there was in this current fiscal year, there would be \$218 million less to the education system cumulative from the federal transfer payments. This is a very serious problem, the off-loading of federal responsibility to the province. But it is continuing, and it's something that we're trying to adjust to, and to take advantage of as many federal dollars as there are available.

We do have the Canada student loan program. It desperately needs changes. And we're making representations on a regular basis, together with the other provinces, in that respect. But it is \$52 million in the '91-92 loan year that's repayable, most of it repayable, assistance to students. But that's federal money that's available.

There is the Canada-Saskatchewan training agreement on

labour-force development. That emphasizes the need for a co-ordinated approach to training and labour-force development. It has been stable at 75,000 — \$75 million, sorry, in each fiscal year as against the provincial contribution of 122. So the federal funds in that is less than the provincial, but it is there; it's available. And that's one of the programs that's not decreasing.

Funding for literacy projects through the Secretary of State's department is in 1992 half a million dollars.

There is another training program that is available too. I'm just looking for the amount here. This is a cost-shared program for apprentices. It's not available to all apprentices; it's tied to the unemployment insurance fund. And I'm sorry I haven't got the numbers for that one here. I think it's not a budgeted one. It's probably a capped one and it depends on the qualified applications that they receive.

There is the Saskatchewan skills extension program. The total amount in that one is \$4.2 million. There are federal seat purchases within that offered by the regional colleges which would amount to about between 25 and 30 per cent of that amount.

Then there is in the area of languages, there is an agreement, a protocol, fully reimbursable federal funds — \$10 million in 1991-92. Just somewhat over 10 million. That was in '91-92.

And we don't budget that figure. We do that through orders in council because we don't know which institutions will qualify and exactly which amounts each institution will get. So it's a bit cumbersome, but we spend the money and then we have it fully reimbursed. But that's why it's not shown as a budgeted item, because we don't . . . there is no provincial money net, in the end. It's that we have to pay the money in order to get it back.

The other one is a subsidiary agreement which relates to the enhancement of francophone minority instruction and governance, and there was \$27 million available in the 1988 agreement. It was a 10-year agreement. Some of it was forfeited by the previous administration by their not instituting the French governance model. But there is approximately \$13 million left, and we're attempting to renegotiate it back to its original level.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Vice-Chair, and Madam Minister, I do want to make a brief comment about your remarks earlier and that is about the one strategic plan that you have from the 1970s. I guess that's part of my concern, as much as the concept of *Directions* has been good and is of value.

If one takes part in something like the Aylmer conference in Quebec and other places, that's part of what the problem is, is that we can't anticipate many, many of the changes in the future. And unless we get to thinking in very different ways, conceptualizing the future and anticipating changes, we aren't going to be ready, our people are not going to be ready, for what happens.

Just one clarification on what you were saying about work placement or co-operative education programs. Am I to

take it from what you were reporting that we as a province do not singularly fund any of these work-placement programs or co-operative programs, that they are all joint-venture programs with the federal government?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite sure that I understand the member's questions. I thought that her question related to specifically which programs were funded at least partially by the federal government. And so those were the ones that I outlined.

But of course we do have the partnerships between SIAST programs and the business community where there are work placements. We've got the programs at the University of Saskatchewan within the College of Commerce which has their co-op program. We have initiatives ourselves within the department to fund literacy programs in the work place, to fund co-operative programs. So yes, there are a large number, and I certainly hope there'll be a growing number.

And I should really address, Mr. Chairman, the member's comments about the need for the updating of the strategic plan because we did . . . I thought I mentioned it, but I might not have been clear to the member. It was just last week I believe that we had a press release relating to the review that we did to update the strategic plan. The update was initiated, well, early this year, very late last year, I think about December, because we realized we were already into the budgeting cycle. We realized that the fiscal realities that this province is facing was going to have an impact on education. We wanted to make sure, as I said, that the strategic plan, the vision in the strategic plan, wasn't impaired by decisions that would be made in response to funding questions.

(1230)

So we had a committee do an intensive review of the strategic plan directions, and they gave us a report last week. We did issue a press release with respect to it and a written response that I made to their recommendations which we do intend to implement.

So indeed we do have a very recent, in fact only days-old, comprehensive review and updating of that plan.

The Chair: — Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Kluz: — To ask leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Kluz: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to introduce to members of the Assembly some guests that are in the east gallery: my wife's sister Gloria and her husband Barry and their children Sarah, Amy, Maggie, and Matthew are in town today and just dropped in to watch some of the proceedings. And I would like all members of the Assembly to greet them here today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chair: — The Chair joins the member in recognizing

and welcoming the special guests and recognizes the hon. member for Saskatoon Greystone.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Expenditure Education Vote 5

Item 1 (continued)

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chair. I was wondering if you would be willing to table the information that you just spoke about, the updating of the strategic plan, beyond what's available in the news release.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to provide the member — I don't have one with me at the moment — but I would certainly be pleased to provide her with a copy of the complete report and the recommendations and my written response and a copy of the press release.

There has been — we don't get much time to listen to the radio in this job — but there has been considerable interest by the press. I don't know what they've used, but I have done quite a number of interviews with respect to the study that is called Into The Classroom. So I will make sure that you do receive a copy of the report and the response.

Ms. Haverstock: — One of the parts of my question . . . I'll actually restate my question and you do not have to answer specifically what the programs are. But my question was: what such programs does your department and only your department sponsor and how much, if any, is expended on them?

It was not what the federal government was spending. My comment was merely that it appears as though there's ongoing diminishing of funding for education from the federal government.

I think that you concur with me that this — when we're talking about work study or co-operative education — that these are really significant types of programs. They have an important role to play when we're talking about the development of the people of our province. So I was most interested in whether or not the government has reduced or increased its expenditures in this area.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the question, which I think I understand now, that the member is asking for the provincial contributions to these types of programs, and I do have an extensive list. And in the information previously where I referred to federal contributions, in all of those programs, I think without exception except for the minority languages which is fully refundable, there is a provincial contribution as well, in most cases very substantial.

Then we have a total of 14.97 million that is under the subvote name, training programs. And then there's one that is a total of 6 million that is under the subvote, education outreach fund. And I won't read the whole list,

but it includes amounts of which the member will be aware, like the VRDP (vocational rehabilitation for disabled persons) program which is \$3.2 million.

There have been in some cases slight adjustments, but in most cases the amounts are very similar to the prior year. There is apprenticeship upgrading and special skills, which is 585,000. We have out of the province training agreements, like where we buy seats in other universities or technical schools where we don't offer the course in Saskatchewan; that amounts to 341,000. Then we have a northern training program which is 2.7 million. There are other programs here like our support of the NORTEP, the northern teacher education program, and the urban native teacher education program, SUNTEP (Saskatchewan urban native teacher education program).

There are a wide range of programs that the province supports in literacy, on-the-job training, on-the-job adult upgrading, skills extension. We do support a number of programs and we do consult with organizations, with the Provincial Apprenticeship Board, for example; with the organizations that represent disabled people. We try to determine what needs are greatest so that we can allocate our limited resources to the most appropriate places. Granted, it's not enough; we'd like to do more. But I think our record in this area is one that we can be proud of.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Madam Minister, do the numbers that you're talking about represent an increase or a decrease in expenditures?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, if the member is referring to the amount budgeted for this year versus the amount actually spent last year, in most cases, the amounts are very similar. There is some small reductions probably in keeping with the global reduction that we had to third parties. We reduced third-party grants to the universities by 1 per cent, to the K to 12 system by 2 per cent, to SIAST by 3 per cent, and to the regional colleges by 1 per cent.

So what we did when we worked on the balance of the line department budget — and the other, which could be described as third-party programs — was to try and keep them at the level they were last year or a reduction of not more than other third parties would have received.

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, we have a lot of dedicated school professionals in our province. And they have I think been very open about understanding the financial crisis that we're facing, and have been working very hard to reduce the costs in their respective schools.

Unfortunately I think what we're doing is beginning to ask more and more of our schools. I'm wondering how you see them being able to cope with their added duties, given that their funding is going to be reduced this year and they know that their funding is going to be reduced next year.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the question about how to do more with less, this is one of the reasons for our development of the pilot projects in the integrated school model where we will be looking at

collaboration between the departments of Health, Social Services, Education, and Justice in having a co-ordinated service to children with needs in the class-room, to make them more receptive to learning and to share that responsibility so that it's not completely the responsibility of the teacher.

The other things that we are doing is asking . . . and what we did do when we announced the third-party grants was we asked the education community to look very closely at their administration systems and to try to make sure that as many dollars available for education as possible find their way to the level of the class-room and the teacher, because that's the only place where education happens.

And some school divisions in the province, particularly some of the rural ones, are very thin on administration already. And so I wasn't saying that they all have a bureaucracy that they can do away with. Some of the rural divisions already are staffed at a very low level, and they really don't have administration that they can reduce.

But some of the larger school districts and certainly the department . . . that is the reason that we reduced our establishment by approximately 60 people. We reduced our administrative budget, our global administrative budget, by 12 per cent because we were trying to send a message and set an example to others in the system that we must make sure that our resources get to the student, who is the client of the system, and that we don't use it up in administrations that spend their time having meetings with each other and never get near a class-room or a class-room teacher.

And I think there is more that can be done. We are in the process of talking to the stakeholders in the education community about setting up a group that will look at the governance question because there certainly are some areas in Saskatchewan — some rural, some urban — who feel that they can provide a better level of service if they do things co-operatively. And it doesn't necessarily mean a formal amalgamation. It just means a way of doing things better.

We have talked to all the partners in education about that exercise, and they do all want to become involved. It's summer holidays for a lot of people now, not for us. But we're planning to start that exercise in the beginning of September — just talking with people and listening to people about how school divisions can work together to reduce their administrative costs and see those dollars at the class-room level.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, what impact do you think the cuts — the 2 per cent cuts — are going to have on our ability of our school boards to implement the core curriculum?

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, I think we addressed that. We knew that it was possible that there would be an impact, in fact, likely that there would be an impact. What we wanted to be sure of was that the impact didn't derail the vision and the objective. So we did appoint a review committee. It was a subcommittee of EPPAC (Educational Program Policy Advisory

Committee), actually that was chaired by Dr. Sam Robinson, who is the assistant dean at the faculty of education at the University of Saskatchewan.

And they did submit their report last week which was called Into The Classroom, and I have undertaken to provide a copy of that report. And certainly one of the main reasons for setting up that review and asking for it to be done and asking for specific recommendations was that reason that we wanted to know what the impact was, how it could be measured, and how the effects of it could be softened in terms of the implementation of core.

Because the education community and certainly the teachers in this province that have piloted those programs, that have worked on that curriculum are very much committed to it. And we wanted to make sure that we employed their efforts and the results of their efforts in the most productive way.

So I think that you may feel assured when you do see a copy of the study that they've done and the results.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, as you know, there's legislation that requires school boards to provide services to children with special needs. And I'm wondering if you can tell us if you're allocating sufficient funds that is actually going to allow school boards to carry out this requirement.

(1245)

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, we do have a fund, SNPF called, you know, called the special needs program fund, and we are reviewing the formula with the advent of a greater amount and a greater emphasis on mainstreaming, which we support. It became necessary to review the way the allocation is made. And we did make some changes in it. It seems to be working.

And another recent special adjustment was a different allocation, or an adjustment in the allocation for special needs children who are in foster care. Because there was a time when the funding formula recognized students up to a certain number, but if the number of special needs students in a school jurisdiction was more than average, there wasn't an appropriate recognition.

And this would happen, for instance, in the area around Prince Albert where there might be a disproportionate number of special needs aboriginal children in foster care. So we did refine that formula and we did make an additional allocation for that kind of circumstance. It seems to be working well.

The other aspect of the special needs student that we have paid attention to is a different approach, if you like, a team approach in terms of the consultants that are available to provide services at the class-room level. And it's in a state of transition as certain individuals who were assigned certain jobs in the department before have been replaced by teams. I know from the mail I've received that there are some people that feel like, oh the support has been removed because this person isn't there any more. But I think as people get accustomed with the new approach they will realize that the allocation of resources to meet

the needs of their child in their class-room will actually be enhanced by the new system.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Madam Minister, I know that in my experience in years past in special education, that every time a formula was changed it was changed in order to save the government money, and fewer children were being able to actually qualify for those special needs dollars. So I hope that doesn't change if there's going to be a change . . . that isn't the case if there's a change in formula again.

I'm wondering, is there any consultative support available from your department to help rural schools with the few resources that they have to address the needs of seriously handicapped children? I of course am as interested as anyone in ensuring that these children can be served as close to their homes as possible. And if you in fact have some support I'd like to know the nature of it.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, with respect to the allocation in this current estimate for special needs children, it amounts to 38,890,000-odd dollars. And that is up from approximately 25 million in 1989. So I don't have all the numbers for the intervening years but it certainly is increasing at a regular pace. The budget was not cut; it was one of the areas that was increased.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Madam Minister, in the estimates that I have there is actually a cut-back in support in the form of field services to rural boards. And I'm wondering how that can be justified in cutting back that kind of programming when you still hope to preserve the education system that strives to give people quality education regardless of where they live in the province.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, this would represent some of the reductions that I referred to in the establishment of the department itself in Regina. There wasn't a reduction of staff in our field offices that are out in various parts of the province, but there were five positions abolished, if you like, within the department that related to those people in the field. And that was done following a very careful assessment as to whether those people were needed.

So even though it says field services in the subvote, it wasn't people that were out in the field. It refers to positions that were in the department that are not there now.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you, Madam Minister. It's interesting, because I do have a network of people with whom I consult on such things as estimates. And in this case many of the questions that I'm raising today have been brought forward, and in this case by a director of education of a rural school board. And in his experience, of course, one of the concerns that he has is that he says it's becoming almost impossible to provide quality education in a rural area when you've already been a highly responsible person as a director of education, and you've ensured that you're not top-heavy in administration where you've spent the last few years putting the dollars where they can be serving the people, the children, best. He's not feeling this way. He's feeling

in fact that the field services have been reduced to his school district.

Have you given any consideration to expanding the correspondence school, the role of correspondence schools, so that people in rural Saskatchewan might even receive more effective help than the kinds of things that have been happening to them lately? And if so, I'd like to know what sort of options you're considering.

Hon. Mrs. Teichrob: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the first remarks about the director of education in a rural department and his concerns — his or her concerns — I would be most pleased on some other occasion, perhaps when we meet to talk about the mandate that we discussed earlier, to hear of specific details about that.

Because what we did do in the third-party funding formula, for instance, was make adjustments which might have not been entirely visible. Because we talked about globally 2 per cent reduction but there actually were rural school divisions who received an increase. Everyone didn't receive a 2 per cent global increase. There were some who received a reduction of more than 2 per cent; there were some who actually received increases.

And we did pay attention to and make adjustments within the funding formula for such things as in the transportation factor, the small school factor. If there was a division where a small school was farther . . . was more than 30 kilometres away from another school, we actually provided more money for that school. Same thing in the sparsity factor; we made that kind of an adjustment.

And with respect to the second part of the question relating to the resources to the correspondence school and distance education, I was assigned responsibility for the SCN (Saskatchewan Communications Network Corporation) — the distance network — at the end of March.

And in reviewing the role of SCN, the role of SaskTel, which does do delivery of some distance education on fibre optics, the correspondence school within the department, SIAST, the regional colleges, and both of the universities, it quickly became evident to me that there are a lot of people with expertise trying to do a good job in an area in distance education that has a very great potential but that the efforts were much too diffuse. So I set up a task force, headed up by a facilitator, Mr. Chairman, that the member may be familiar with, is Dr. Barry Brown from the University of Saskatchewan, is acting as a facilitator.

And representatives from all those groups who are involved in distance education are involved in this exercise, the objective being to rationalize our efforts in distance education, to determine which are the best points, where should the headings be, how can we collaborate on production of software and production costs for programs, not only within the province but within the western region.

We do expect a report from them early in the fall. We know that with the changing demographics in

Saskatchewan that distance education has a great potential never, never to replace the role of the school, but certainly to enhance the quality of programs that are available within the high school and post-secondary curriculum, and for adult education and training and retraining opportunities as well.

So we do want to make sure that we're allocating again those scarce dollars in a very focused way, rather than diffused through these seven different centres. I think the people that are working on this exercise are very dedicated to the future and the future potential for distance education. So I do expect a good and positive result from that task force.

We also received a report fairly recently from the distance education committee of the K to 12 department. And interestingly enough, even though the other exercise involving SCN is not quite as advanced, the recommendations from the Distance Ed Committee looked very much like what was shaping up in the other exercise that's going on. So I'm sure that good results will come from that and that distance education has really an excellent and promising future in this province.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.