

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's with considerable pleasure that I introduce to you and to other members of the Assembly 14 students of a program based at SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science & Technology). The program is called Atira, single parent. I assume Atira's an acronym. I know members will want to welcome, will want to join with me. This program works with single parents and I understand has quite a successful track record.

They're accompanied by two co-ordinators: Phyllis Chuly and Arlene Franko. For reasons that aren't apparent from the information given to me it will not be possible for us to meet afterwards. I regret that. I do however trust that your stay today will be useful and informative and I know members will want to join with me in welcoming you to the Assembly today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swan: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the Assembly 37 grade 7 and 8 students from the Kyle Composite School. They're seated in the east gallery. Today they are accompanied by their teachers, Jim Duerksen and Wendy Turner and their chaperon Carol Argue who also is acting as bus driver.

These students have come a considerable distance to visit our legislature and to visit other points of interest in Regina. I'd like you to join with me in welcoming these students and I'll meet with them at 11 for pictures and refreshments.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to all members of the Assembly nine SIAST students from Moose Jaw who are seated in the east gallery, Mr. Speaker. These students are enrolled in the vocational skills training program, and are accompanied today by their counsellors, Doreen Meadows and Norma MacAulay.

They have already been on tour of the building, Mr. Speaker, and the member from Moose Jaw South advises me that he'll be free to join with me and them for pictures and refreshments, and a visit and discussion of today's proceedings immediately following question period.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see these students take interest in the political issues of the day and to make this visit to their Legislative Assembly, and I would ask all members of the Assembly to welcome them in the usual way.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to all the members of the legislature, two students from the Marshall elementary school, which is located about 20 kilometres east of Lloydminster, and they are located in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. We have with us today Eldon Pierce, who is in grade 3, and his friend, David Braun, a grade 4 student. Accompanying Eldon and David today are their mothers, Charlene Pierce and Debbie Braun.

Mr. Speaker, Eldon and David have been invited here today because of their recent contribution to the fish and wildlife development fund. Entirely on their own initiative Eldon and David organized a fund raising project in school and then donated the money to this fund. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, the fish and wildlife development fund has received money from a private organization, and I would like to thank the boys for their gesture.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Kopelchuk: — I would ask the boys once again to rise and I'd ask their mothers to rise, and ask all members to welcome them to the legislature.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's with pride that I too — as the boys', Eldon and David, MLA — I rise with pride. It's not often that I receive visitors here at the legislature from the great distance that a lot of my constituents have to travel, but today is especially a proud day for me, Mr. Speaker, to have two distinguished young guests visit our legislature.

In talking to them prior to the legislature opening today, that their teacher as well, Mr. Peterson, ought to be congratulated because with the boys . . . and I want to make this perfectly clear, it was the boys' own idea, but the teacher, Mr. Peterson, had encouraged them very well. And it took two months for them to put this whole thing together that had raised the dollars for such a worthy cause.

And I'd just like to take this opportunity as their MLA to personally congratulate them and thank the boys' mothers, Charlene and Debbie, for bringing the boys all the way to Regina, and I'm very sure that all the constituents are proud.

Mr. Speaker, if I could continue. I too have another guest I would like to introduce to the legislature through you and to all members. It's a man, and I'd just like to refer to you, sir, of some of the things that he has done for Saskatchewan as well as Alberta. Because of the location of the city of Lloydminster, it's a very unique situation and border city, and how one man can become involved in two provinces. This man is president of SARCAN, on the national board Canadian Association of Community Living, is commissioner of Alberta human rights commission, board member of the Lloydminster Bea Fisher Centre, physician for the local hockey team and as well, Mr. Speaker, he's been past councillor of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Saskatchewan. I'd

like all members of this Assembly to please help me welcome Dr. A.R. Sayeed to the Assembly.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the legislature, a large delegation of students. And I notice that they're just coming in from Immaculate Heart Junior High in Estevan, grades 7, 8, and 9. They are accompanied, as far as I can tell, by some of the teachers. I believe that Mrs. Arlene Anderson is there some place, and Bernie Collins may be, and Mrs. Marcotte. They have chaperons Shirley Kish, Lil Wanner, Gary Weimer, and others, Mr. Speaker. They'll be filling up the gallery if all 160 of them come. I want this legislature to please welcome the students here from Estevan. I'll be meeting with them later.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Poll on Privatization

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the minister in charge of privatization. The minister and the government has stated on occasions that they would not be continuing with privatization until they had public support as they say on their side.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, according to a poll released this morning, the people of Saskatchewan simply have not bought your line on privatization. According to the poll, 52 per cent of the people in Saskatchewan believe the province is worse off than it was before you started privatizing, and only 14 per cent agree that it's better off. Sixty-four per cent say that it means a loss of control over resources in our economy, 24 per cent believe that it created jobs and diversifies the economy.

I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, and I want to ask you, in light of this poll and the overwhelming opinion of the people of the province opposed to privatization, will you stand in your place today and announce an end to your government's privatization drive? Will you do that today?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, John Diefenbaker, whose statue stands out in the lobby here, said that polls are for dogs, so I won't even comment on that poll.

But let me tell you this in reply, that why would we stop something that is working. This morning the Investment Dealers Association of Canada — and I know these are people that the members opposite do not respect or like, but these people control 95 per cent of the investment in Canada — have released a report on the economic outlook of Saskatchewan and I will quote from that report:

This year a surge in manufacturing investment spending is expected, reflecting the ongoing diversification of the provincial economy. In fact we expect business investment to increase by 23

per cent in real terms, the highest rate of growth in all of the provinces.

And they say we should stop diversifying Saskatchewan. That is my answer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, another question to the minister. The poll results should come as no surprise to the minister that the vast majority of people in the province continue to be opposed to privatization.

Mr. Minister, since you began privatizing in the province, you know that the deficit has sky-rocketed, taxes have gone up at every turn, and the simple fact is that 60,000 people have had to leave their homes in Saskatchewan in order to find jobs in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Minister, I want to ask you, in light of the damaging effect of privatization, how can you continue to stand in your place and defend this madness of privatization here in the province of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what kind of a poll this is. Did they do this poll by show of hands, or how reliable is it? What I am saying here is that the investment dealers of Canada go on to say what the future of this province is and they say the budget deficit, measured as a share of gross domestic product, is expected to fall to 1.7 per cent in 1990-91 from 2 per cent in 1989-90.

The province's sound fiscal management has strengthened business investment in this province. Now that is the judgement of people in Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal — people who understand business and money.

The members opposite say we should do what? What is their policy? Go back to what? Go back to where we were when? In 1940? In 1950? Where are we going to go? We're going to go into the future. We're going to do it through business and agricultural diversification. This is what Saskatchewan needs. If it happens to be that people own their own businesses and that is private, that is good.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. It's true that the people of Saskatchewan do want to go into the future. But I'll tell you, the poll indicates, the Brook poll, that they won't be walking into the future with you and the Premier of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I want to ask you; I know that you're going to be attending the big privatization conference in Saskatoon next week. And I know that the Premier of the province will be attending as well.

I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, will you be going there

and to your own privatization conference that you have arranged in conjunction with it? Will you be going there to explain the damage that privatization had done to the province? Or will you be defending your friends and people who have benefitted from the privatization against the will of the people of the province? Which stand are you going to be taking?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to mislead the House in any way, but the information I have from the media is that the member for Regina Elphinstone is a delegate at this conference, and maybe he should explain why he is going. Has his party changed their stance? Are they now in favour of doing business? Are they now in favour of a free market? He should answer this question.

I will answer this question: yes, I will try to attend if possible and as much as possible because we have duties in this legislature. And there has to be a province that needs to be governed, so I can't spend all my time at this conference.

But this conference is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for Saskatchewan. There will be delegates from 57 countries including Tunisia in Africa, including Poland, including all kinds of countries, including Romania which has had a revolution in the direction of freedom. Those 57 countries will be represented.

It is right in our home province. Therefore I think it's . . . we are obligated to attend. Seven people from the government of Saskatchewan will go there to learn. And I hope the member opposite learns something there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order. Before question period gets a little too raucous, I'd like to remind hon. members to allow ministers to answer and opposition members to ask questions.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. I want to say, Mr. Minister, that it's true I will be attending the conference in Saskatoon in order to defend . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I will be attending the conference in Saskatoon in order . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'm afraid you're having competition. Many people want to ask questions; many people want to answer. However, you have the floor and I recognize the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the minister. I intend to go to the meeting in Saskatoon in order to defend the position of the hundred thousand people who signed the petition here in opposition to the privatization of SaskEnergy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I'm going to be going there to defend the 89 per cent of those in the province who are opposed to the privatization of health care.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the minister, also to defend the position of the 60,000 people who have been forced to leave Saskatchewan to find work.

My question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: are you going there to defend the people of Saskatchewan, the vast majority who are opposed to privatization, or to defend the people who are benefitting, people like McCurdy and people like Childers? What's your position and why are you going?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the NDP are going to the privatization congress. And I would only say this, that I would ask that they do not disgrace Canada while they are there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, there will be a . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat, if the members opposite will give me an opportunity to speak, because I know that the NDP, SFL (Saskatchewan Federation of Labour) coalition in Saskatoon tried to stop this congress so that people from all over the world could not speak freely in Saskatchewan. That will not happen there and it will not happen here in the legislature. No matter how much they shout from their seat, no matter what they should from their seat, we will answer these questions.

Here's the bottom line, Mr. Speaker. Would the NDP please not disgrace Canada at this conference, because people from 57 countries will be present. We would not want to have a report going back to the world that Saskatchewan is an unfriendly place where there's an unpleasant place. They would not want the world to believe that if the NDP ever had power in this province Saskatchewan would not be a place where you could have freedom of speech or do business. That would be counter-productive to what we are trying to achieve in this province today.

Privatization of SGI

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to address my question to the same minister. And before I do, I want to say to him that the hungry children and the 65,000 people who have had to leave this province because they see no future here because of their mismanagement, is the real disgrace that's taking place in Saskatchewan today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I want to address the question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, about how he is prepared to respond to the consensus of Saskatchewan people who live and try to make a living in Saskatchewan.

This poll that was released today, Mr. Minister, says the people say that 69 per cent of the people who live in this province oppose your plan to privatize SGI. In view of that, Mr. Minister, will you stop being arbitrary in the way you approach privatization and will you respond to the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan, and will you stand up in this House today and will you say once and for all in your announcement that you will shelve permanently your plans to privatize SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) and respond to the real people who live here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite talks about hunger but he doesn't talk about a cure. There will be delegates in Saskatchewan next week from Romania and Poland where people are actually lacking food. My wife has relatives in Poland and I know for a fact they are going short this year. These people are trying to get away from a system where the government owns everything and there isn't enough food.

And now they say that these people are coming to Saskatchewan and we should tell these people what? Go back to where you were? We should tell our own people, go to a system . . . the people across here, the NDP do not call themselves social democrats any more. I challenge them to stand up and say they are social democrats. No one in the world calls themselves a social democrat any more. The members opposite use food, but in order to have food you have to have farming and business that can produce the food and their system and their lack of policies have not produced that anywhere.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — A new question to the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you avoided the question totally, and I am going to ask you it again in another way.

You have already said, Mr. Minister, that you intend to privatize SGI through the back door. You do not intend . . . you have said earlier this year to come with legislation so there can be public debate. Why don't you get honest with the people of Saskatchewan, and you can start today. And why don't you admit that it is your intention to privatize SGI but not to stop there, but that you intend, if you ever happen to form the government again, to privatize SGI and to privatize SaskEnergy and to privatize SaskTel and SaskPower. Why don't you come clean and become honest and admit to that, instead of doing the kinds of things that you have been doing and try to sneak it by, which you have been caught on, and now you're trying to even . . . are even afraid to talk about privatization.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the member from Regina North East, who is Ukrainian, become honest and tell us that the policies that he has adhered to for 50 years starved 13 million Ukrainians in his homeland, and he wants us to go to that kind of a system. My wife is of the same national origin, and she knows that that will not work here. And that member will not honestly say that that kind of a system starved 13 million Ukrainians.

He comes here now and says we should build that kind of a system in Saskatchewan. That is the stupidest thing I've ever heard!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

WESTBRIDGE Acquisition Costs

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for WESTBRIDGE. Is the minister aware that in September of 1989, WESTBRIDGE president, Mr. Leonard McCurdy, sought and received special permission from the board to sell back to WESTBRIDGE 240,000 second preferred shares at \$10 each for a total of 2.4 million, and that the reason he needed this special permission was that his original deal required him to keep these shares for a full five years until October of '93?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I mean they can make whatever decisions they're going to make, and they can buy and sell the shares, Mr. Speaker. That's a decision of management.

I know and you've made it clear today that the NDP don't like Len McCurdy, president of WESTBRIDGE, and they made it clear that they don't like Chuck Childers, the president of the potash corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the message being delivered loud and clear by the New Democratic Party to the business community, to the investment dealers of this province, it's been made loud and clear that they will attack, Mr. Speaker, the business community, the business leaders of this province, the business managers of corporations, Mr. Speaker, so that the companies themselves are hurt, Mr. Speaker — that is the agenda — so that jobs are lost, Mr. Speaker. That is the agenda of the New Democratic Party. They do not care and do not want to see business success in this province. They don't want to see the jobs for the future, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, what we don't like is your government selling off the assets of this province to people that come from out of province. Mr. McCurdy received 2.4 million . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, Mr. McCurdy received \$2.4 million worth of shares as part of his sale of

Leasecorp for \$13 million, and this was the company with assets of \$59,000 — \$59,000. He came into this deal with virtually nothing and a year later he walks out with a cool \$2.4 million. And he still has more WESTBRIDGE shares.

Is this what you call privatization that benefits the people of Saskatchewan, or that benefits one individual?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to give a simple analogy, that if someone wants to buy a McDonald's franchise, Mr. Speaker, they don't pay the money just for the building or the equipment; they have to pay for the name McDonald's, the marketing expertise of McDonald's, the reputation that McDonald's has world-wide, Mr. Speaker. These are intangible assets that have to be paid for.

What did WESTBRIDGE pay for? Mr. Speaker, I tabled yesterday, or I gave the information yesterday about some of the contracts that Leasecorp and Len McCurdy were to bring to the table. And it dealt with, Mr. Speaker, I believe nearly 500 companies of fortune 1,000 — companies like American Express, Bank of Montreal, and I can go on. Canadian General Electric, the National Bank of Canada, Crown Life, Dominion Securities, Gelco Express, Honeywell, Memotec. Mr. Speaker, I could go on.

I gave the information to the press. I know that the NDP won't read it, but literally the contracts of hundreds of national and international contracts, Mr. Speaker, were brought to the business of this province and to WESTBRIDGE through the efforts of Mr. McCurdy, Mr. Speaker.

You don't like to hear that. You don't like to hear that, but when an individual brings something good to the province of Saskatchewan, all you do, led by your leader, is try and attack them personally. And I say you've got no more agenda than to try and destroy businesses in this province. That's your objective, and nothing else.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Mr. Minister, we've heard enough about intangible assets from computer corporations like GigaText.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koenker: — Mr. Minister, this was nothing more than a sweetheart deal for Mr. McCurdy. As president and chief executive officer and board member of WESTBRIDGE, this man carried a lot of sway and he used this way to get the board to agree to this deal. You had representation at that board on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, and I want to know why he was allowed to sell his shares a full four years early and not live up to the agreement he signed when he purchased the company.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, again the information

that the NDP gave yesterday, they referred to some minutes dealing with Mr. McCurdy. And it was interesting when one looked at the minutes that Mr. McCurdy had quite properly absented himself from discussions, Mr. Speaker, and I expect that's the case again.

So to make the allegation that the hon. member has . . . The hon. member also refers to GigaText and the people haven't forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP invested nearly \$10 million in today's dollars, Mr. Speaker, in a company called Nabu — not a Saskatchewan company, Mr. Speaker, a company in Ottawa that you sunk \$10 million of taxpayers' money that went bankrupt, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think we got 10 cents on the dollar out of, Mr. Speaker.

Having said that, the valuations were done, Mr. Speaker, quite properly with all the appropriate information, by a company called Richardson Greenshields. And for the people of this province that are not aware, they are one of the senior investment houses in this province. If you are saying, if the NDP are saying that the investment dealers of Canada and the investment houses, the financial houses gave improper evaluations, Mr. Speaker, say it outside the House. I challenge you to do it because, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying is misleading and wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — I too have a question to the minister responsible for WESTBRIDGE. Mr. Minister, what we're talking about today and yesterday is a case of special privilege, a case of special privilege. We have the chief executive officer of WESTBRIDGE exercise special privilege to cash in his shares four years early rather than putting his trust in the company. Mr. Minister, please explain to this House, why was Mr. McCurdy allowed to cash in his shares four years early and, Mr. Minister, what sort of message does that send to the employees and the other private shareholders?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, it can send a very strong message, as one of the situations with WESTBRIDGE, Mr. Speaker, is that there are very few shares out in the public market. The float, so-called, is not very big, Mr. Speaker. There is a demand for more shares and the demand for the issuing of more shares. In fact, it could have been a very powerful message, Mr. Speaker, to the investment community out there that there are more shares available. Now I don't know the reason, Mr. Speaker, but there could be a very simple straightforward one like that.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the rules are quite simple. In any company publicly traded like that, if a director or if a management person has an interest, it must be declared, Mr. Speaker. It's declared to the board as is done in a normal case. Mr. Speaker, the board makes its decision, the individual absents himself, no special privilege, Mr. Speaker, no special privilege, no special deal, honest assessment, honest evaluation, and honest price, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the Minister. Now, Mr. Minister, let's just recap this situation. We have a chief executive officer that becomes an employee of WESTBRIDGE Computer. He sells assets of his previous company to WESTBRIDGE Computer, not for fair value, Mr. Minister. He sells his assets and he enters into an agreement that he will have a certain number of shares which he can sell five years later.

He goes to the board of directors and asked to sell those shares four years earlier than 1993. The board of directors then goes to the Securities Commission and they give this gentleman special permission. Now what we have here is a CEO (chief executive officer), the man who should know most about the inside operations of this company, bailing out four years early. Considering that the share price of WESTBRIDGE stock is now down to \$5.50, what did Mr. McCurdy know that other shareholders don't know?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I strongly suspect that the agreement was up to five years and not five years. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he gets board privilege. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that he still holds several hundreds and thousands of shares of WESTBRIDGE. And finally, Mr. Speaker, one of the demands is for more of the flow.

Having said all of that, it's very, very interesting, Mr. Speaker, very, very interesting that yesterday the NDP said WESTBRIDGE is a disaster because it's \$5. Where were they when it was 15, Mr. Speaker? Where were the NDP when it was 15? The same company, Mr. Speaker, the same valuations, the same deal, the same prospectus, the same information, Mr. Speaker, was there when it was 15. It was a good deal then and a good deal now, and good for the employees. A thousand people now work in this province because of WESTBRIDGE that didn't work before, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Perhaps the hon. members can carry on their question period outside, but not in the House. You'll have that opportunity.

ROYAL ASSENT

At 10:38 a.m. Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took her seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 26 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year ending on March 31, 1991

Her Honour retired from the Chamber at 10:40 a.m.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Education Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1 (continued)

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. Mr. Minister, the last time I had an opportunity to discuss K to 12 educational estimates with you was on May 7, 1990. And at that time, Mr. Minister, I asked you specifically where direct mail obtained the names and addresses of parents of school-aged children who had received a copy of a direct mail letter from yourself.

You said, Mr. Minister, that you would have to look into that, and I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, if you can today tell us where the Department of Education or D-Mail obtained the names of these parents.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member. I had indicated I would find that information; I have that for you today. You're well aware that this was a very extensive mail-out on evaluations that went not only to all of the parents in the province, but also to directors of education, trustees, principals, everyone involved in education in the province.

Now with regard to the source of names, there were several sources that were used, actually. The source of letters to parents, the letters to the educator groups, that of course came from Education. With regard to the ones to the parents, the same practice was followed there as a policy that was set by your government in the past that the health file was used. I point out the health insurance registration file. That's the same practice that your government had; in fact I think it was your government brought in the policy back in the '70s that made it possible to do this sort of thing.

(1045)

I had indicated to you as well that strategic direct marketing was involved in the mail-out, but they do not have any list of names. There are no lists that they have nor that we have. So the list of the parents, we wanted to ensure that we got to all of the parents of school-aged children — this is very, very important — and this is in fact where the list came from. The Department of Health was contacted and authorization was given to use the health insurance registration file.

Now that is simply a list of the parents, the names, addresses, and age of the people. There's no medical information that's involved here at all, as I'm sure you're well aware.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you confirm that D-Mail was able to obtain the list from WESTBRIDGE Computer, which looks after all of the computer work for the Department of Health?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that D-Mail did not have any list at all. They did not do the addressing of the letters. The strategic

direct marketing worked with the Department of Health to arrange for the addresses to be printed on the letters for parents with the school-age children. D-Mail does not have any list. Department of Education does not have any list. There has been no confidentiality broken here. And we're not talking about medical information; we're talking about the health insurance registration file.

Ms. Atkinson: — And, Mr. Minister, you say that D-Mail arranged this through the Department of Health. As you know, the computing services for the Department of Health are done by WESTBRIDGE. And I am wondering, Mr. Minister, can you confirm that WESTBRIDGE was the one that put these names onto these letters?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, I believe that is the case, that WESTBRIDGE did the addressing of the envelopes and that D-Mail then would have looked after the circulation of the large mail-out, whatever. But they do not have any list. There's no medical information involved or anything else. It's simply a list of the names, the addresses, and the ages. In this particular case, we're interested in those children, I believe, between ages five and 17.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, you tell us that D-Mail did not do the actual listing or transaction onto the letters and the envelopes. Can you tell us exactly what D-Mail did for its \$114,000, and can you tell us what Education paid WESTBRIDGE to print the names and addresses onto the letters and the envelopes?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, the contract was with D-Mail. They would have subcontracted with WESTBRIDGE to do the addressing, as I pointed out. But we have to look at the whole process that's involved here. We have had, I believe, in the neighbourhood of 11,000 responses. There's also going to be more information going out to the parents. And so this is all part of the contract with D-Mail. They'll be looking after all of that procedure as well.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, you did not answer the question. I want you to specifically tell the House what D-Mail did for its \$114,000.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, they of course would be involved in the overall process here. They would have subtracted with WESTBRIDGE as far as the printing was concerned. There's a tremendous amount of postage involved here in this particular fee, this contract that you have indicated. The letters of course, letters all had to be printed, and as I indicated if you've got some 11,000 responses where there's going to be more information going out, they will be looking after all of that.

When you add in all of the postage to that, it's a substantial amount of money. So it's not that they got a lot of money for doing a little work. I would think that their overall mark-up out of this would have been in comparison to whatever other contracts that they might be doing. I don't know what percentage that would be.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, D-Mail gets \$114,000 to print a letter and stuff it. They don't get \$114,000 to do all

the data entry of all of the names and print out all of the names. That was done by WESTBRIDGE. So in essence what D-Mail did for \$110,000 was to stuff the envelopes and mail them and print off the letter. That's it.

Now, Mr. Minister, what did you pay WESTBRIDGE to enter all of these names onto this letter that was printed by D-Mail?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, we didn't have any contract with WESTBRIDGE. The money that the member is talking about would have to be used for several things here: printing of the letter, certainly that was one of them; the preparation of the packages, and you know there's a fair bit of information there in putting all of that together; the reply cards, and I've indicated we got some 11,000 of those; the actual mail-out and postage, just figure out the postage, what it would cost.

They then also would have to pay WESTBRIDGE for the subcontract that they had in addressing the envelopes. Now the other thing that you're overlooking, of course, that the only work that WESTBRIDGE was involved with was the letters that were going to the parents. Keep in mind that there was all the other information that went to school board members and the other groups that were involved here, directors of education, that all had to be looked after by D-Mail as well; that would include all of the addressing and all the rest of it. So we didn't have any contract with WESTBRIDGE. We didn't pay anything to WESTBRIDGE at all. D-Mail would have paid them.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I've done a direct mail to directors of education and school trustees in this province, and there's about 1,500 letters. It certainly didn't cost me \$114,000 to do a direct mail to trustees and directors. And it didn't take very much time, Mr. Minister, in terms of the stuffing of envelopes. And we were doing a fairly major mailing as well.

Now, Mr. Minister, you say that D-Mail paid WESTBRIDGE. Can you tell us what WESTBRIDGE charged D-Mail to do the printing of all of the names and addresses of parents onto envelopes and onto individual sheets of paper.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well you might well indicate that 1,500 letters you sent out. There were 12,000 letters that also went out to teachers. And you're not considering all of the postage that's involved here. Now I've already indicated to you that the subcontract was between WESTBRIDGE and D-Mail. D-Mail had to pay WESTBRIDGE then to do that addressing. So I don't know what that figure was. That was a subcontract between those two. But again, I would point out that there is still more work being done than what you're talking about. There's still going to be more information that's going to be mailed out to all of the people that have requested, whether it's parents or whether it's teachers. And it's quite obvious you're not interested in the answers over there.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you tell us whether the \$114,000 has been paid out to D-Mail by the Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — It hasn't all been paid out yet, Mr. Chairman, because the contract is not complete. We still have responses coming back in from parents and teachers and trustees, and at the completion of the contract, once all of that has been looked after, then of course it will have been paid out. So some has been paid out, but not all.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you tell us how much has been paid out to date and for what services?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Approximately \$60,000 has been paid out and it would be for the services that have been provided to date with regard to the overall contract, which was getting out the information to 114,000 households, plus 12,000 teachers, plus all of the trustees, plus all of the directors of education.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you . . . will you undertake to provide us with a breakdown of the services that D-Mail rendered and the cost of those individual services?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, we will be able to provide you the general terms and a breakdown. We don't have that information with us today, but we will get that to you in the next while.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you tell us whether or not this contract was tendered?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — No, it was not.

Ms. Atkinson: — And, Mr. Minister, can you tell us why it wasn't tendered?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that there is no other company in Regina that can carry out this same type of service, so there was no tender done.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, will you repeat that? You are saying that there is no other company in this province that can do this work? Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that there is no other company that can provide the type of service that we wanted in this particular mailing, within Regina, and as a result there was no tendering done. This is much more than just stuffing some envelopes and sending out information. There's an awful lot more involved to it than that, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, what special expertise does D-Mail have that no other company in Saskatchewan has? Is the only special expertise that D-Mail has is a relationship with the Department of Education, the Department of Health, and WESTBRIDGE? Is the only advantage that D-Mail has, in essence, that it has access to WESTBRIDGE computers and therefore Department of Health records? Is that the only advantage they have over other companies?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well I've indicated to the member opposite that we are following the same practice

that they followed. In fact, they set the policy in so far as the health insurance file is concerned.

It's not that they have access to that. They have no list. There are . . . If we look back into the history there, they used that same file in mass mail-outs that they had. I imagine that the NDP had a specific company probably that they used.

It's my understanding that D-Mail is set up to do large mail-outs of this type and the collection of data and all of the rest of it. So it's not a matter of tendering it out. There's much more than stuffing envelopes here, Mr. Chairman.

(1100)

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I want you to explain to me this little policy that you say that the NDP implemented in the '70s. Mr. Minister, you name one example of where the NDP government did a direct mail to every parent of school-age children in the province of Saskatchewan, using and getting their names from the Department of Health records.

An Hon. Member: — Using a private company.

Ms. Atkinson: — Pardon me? And, Mr. Minister, using a private company.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, the history of the policy of the NDP goes back into, I think, '76-77. Examples of where there was targeting done here was to do with the seniors' heritage rebate program. You people used it for that, as I understand it, the healthy heart survey was another one, cancer foundation survey. This is targeting groups, and I mean that's what was being done here. It was looking at parents of school-age children.

You people established the policy; the idea behind it was for the public good. And at some point maybe you should be asking the Minister of Health for a copy of the policy because it's very clear and you people were the ones that brought it in.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, the difference is that we had a public company, SaskCOMP, which had special obligations and regulations regarding confidentiality. It was not a private computer company doing this work, it was Saskatchewan Comp which was a public company that had to meet certain obligations and legislation and regulation in terms of confidentiality, Mr. Minister. We have a Department of Health obviously that has names and addresses of individuals in this province.

Now when you're sending out a senior citizen heritage rebate form, obviously you want to know who the elderly population are in the province in order to get that information to them. When you're doing surveys, Mr. Minister, that have to do with health issues I can understand it.

But, Mr. Minister, we're not talking about health issues and we're not talking about a rebate to the elderly. What we're talking about is a direct-mail campaign by the Department of Education, the Minister of Education, who doesn't do this internally, Mr. Minister. You contracted to

a private company D-Mail, who then does a subcontract to WESTBRIDGE, which is a private company which has a contract with the Department of Health.

And, Mr. Minister, that leads me to my overall concern. We have from the Provincial Auditor, for the year ending March 31, 1988, a whole section on controls over electronic data processing computer systems. And what it says, Mr. Minister, is that during the Provincial Auditor's audit of departments and agencies:

... it was noted that there was no policy requiring WESTBRIDGE to provide written assurance, attested to by an auditor, that security over the operating system and processing environment at WESTBRIDGE was adequate to ensure that WESTBRIDGE has implemented and satisfactorily carried out the control procedures required by each government department or agency.

Then it goes on, Mr. Minister, and it says:

Accordingly, government departments and agencies have no evidence that their records are protected in accordance with the policies that they have established with the result that the security of their data files and programs may be compromised.

And therein lies the difficulty; therein lies the difficulty, Mr. Minister. The public is becoming increasingly concerned about the information that government has on them. Big brother truly is watching, Mr. Minister.

Now you may think that it is of very little consequence that the Department of Education, the Minister of Health sends a letter to parents in the province of Saskatchewan. And you may think that that's okay. And on the surface, Minister, it is.

But when you dig deeper, Mr. Minister, it is not okay. It is not okay, because it is my view that as a member of the public of Saskatchewan, that any information including my name and address should not be the property of the Department of Education or WESTBRIDGE or D-Mail — it should not be the property.

Now if they want to go out and get that information from some source other than the Government of Saskatchewan, that's fine. I regularly get letters from all kinds of charitable organizations that probably have gotten my name and address from a magazine. But when information about me or any other citizen of this province comes from a government department, including my name and address, including the number of children that I have, whether they are school-age or not, that presents me with a great deal of difficulty. Where does it stop, Minister? Where does it stop?

And what we are engaging in here, Mr. Minister, is a philosophical disagreement. It is my view that the Department of Education has no right to correspond directly with individual parents when they have to get that information from the Department of Health. If you want to go to school divisions and get that information, if they want to provide it to you, fine. If you want to send

letters out to the divisions of education, school divisions, and they want to give that information to the parents, fine. But I have a great deal of difficulty with your government doing direct mail, getting information from the Department of Health.

Now, Mr. Minister, I've sought a legal opinion on this. And while I can say that you have not violated MCIC (medical care insurance commission) and its mandate ... (inaudible interjection) ... No, I didn't. I got it from the Legislative Counsel, sir. And if you want to say something, you can get up and talk. I'll sit down and let you talk.

What I'm trying to say, Mr. Minister, is I have sought a legal opinion on this issue and the Government of Saskatchewan has not violated anything legally. But I can say this, Mr. Minister, as far as I'm concerned you have made a moral violation — an ethical violation.

And when we're in government, I will do everything in my power to prevent that kind of abuse of information — that kind of an abuse. Because I think it goes against totally what the individuals in this province want.

And I would ask you, Mr. Minister, will you stop this practice of using and getting names from the Department of Health and doing direct mails out to individual parents? Because I can assure you, Mr. Minister, while it may meet some of your personal goals and your political agenda, Minister, it does nothing to ensure the public of Saskatchewan that information that government has on them is being kept in a confidential manner.

And I say this to you, Mr. Minister, in a very serious manner. You people are looking at the possibility of smart cards and all kinds of things being put on a little computer card in terms of information that the government has on individuals, and I have a great deal of difficulty with that, Minister. And I want to know whether you'll stop this practice.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member has raised a concern that I think is really designed to mislead what is actually going on here. Mr. Chairman, let's take a look and be very, very clear about what we're talking. Let's be clear about what we're talking.

We're talking about the health insurance registration file. Okay? It does not include medical information. It includes name, address, and the age of people in a family.

Now you people were the ones that developed the policy. The policy ...

An Hon. Member: — Well you change it.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well you say: you change it.

An Hon. Member: — And it was with SaskCOMP; it wasn't with WESTBRIDGE.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well listen ...

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. The discussion going on

across the floor while the member is trying to answer, it does nothing for the debate. The member has all kinds of opportunity to ask her questions and then it goes on *Hansard*. I'd ask . . .

An Hon. Member: — But you can't get at it . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I'd ask members to rise when they want to ask a question rather than debate from the floor.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now I listened when the member was asking the question so I would appreciate it if she'd listen to the answer.

You people were the ones that set the policy that the health list, this particular HIRF (health insurance registration file) file, could be used for the public good. Now in my view, contacting families that have children is for the public good, in the same way that you used it for the seniors' heritage rebate program. You also used it for other programs.

And I would also point out that when you talk about confidentiality, the confidentiality is a lot tighter today than under the policy when you initially brought it in. For the one thing, you talk about SaskCOMP, there was no guarantee of confidentiality with SaskCOMP. There was none whatever. Now the second thing that I want to point out is that when you people were in power, as I understand it, that hard lists were given out to departments. That is not the practice any more with this government, has not been the practice of this government.

So you were the ones that established the policy and I make it quite clear again, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Education does not know the names that are on the HIRF list. D-Mail does not have a copy of that. That is housed with WESTBRIDGE. That is confidential; there's nothing that's been broken there. So the access to this file is very, very highly restricted. So there's no problem there with the confidentiality. But let's be sure about the information that is housed on the HIRF file that we're talking about here.

Now I have here as well the authorization from the Department of Health to use the HIRF file and I'll be very pleased to table a copy of this for you. And it's laid out very specifically what has to be done in order for them to use this file. And all of those conditions have been met.

So, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the HIRF file — and that is the health insurance registration file — was used to contact parents with school-aged children is very, very important. I mean I would think maybe more important or just as important — I shouldn't say more important — as contacting the seniors about the heritage rebate program.

Now there have been other groups, targeted groups, where this file has been used with the authorization of the Department of Health. Now again it's a long-standing policy. You brought it in. Are we talking about a double standard here now, Mr. Chairman? That the NDP brought in the policy; they used it; we're following the same practice and yet now it's not right for us to do this for the

public good?

Mr. Chairman, I mean let's be fair about this. So I'll be glad to hand over a copy of the authorization which clearly states what's going on and I think at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that maybe the member opposite would also table her legal opinion.

An Hon. Member: — No, you have no right to start yapping and asking for information from us. You wait for another year. Call an election.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Aw keep quiet.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I want to know, Mr. Minister, what guarantees you have that Mr. Tkachuk — which gets the letters from WESTBRIDGE that have all of the names and addresses on them and the envelopes — that Mr. Tkachuk hasn't xeroxed the envelopes and has the names and addresses of every parent of school-age children in the province of Saskatchewan? And then what Mr. Tkachuk does is he puts those names and addresses into his data entry process, and then he uses those names and addresses to assist the political party of the Progressive Conservatives in their attempts to do political work.

Now, Mr. Minister, can you confirm that D-Mail was the company that you used in the Assiniboia-Gravelbourg by-election, where a direct mail was done to every citizen in that constituency?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any problem with the confidentiality here. I can't see that anyone that would be xeroxing a clear window envelope, 114,000 of them that went out. Let's be clear on the use of this for political purposes, and there's no question about it, that the opposition used that. The opposition used that, Mr. Chairman. That was quite obvious in the . . . Back in the 1982 provincial election, the NDP used that when they got a list of all of the people on social services and contacted them directly.

But that has not been the policy of this government, Mr. Chairman, and all of these documents are confidential. I don't think that there is any possibility that this confidentiality could have been broken when you consider 114,000 letters going out to parents, the names and addresses on there. We're going to have 11,000 — or we have over 11,000 — of these that have already come back, and D-Mail is going to be involved with the dispersement of the information that's going out to these parents.

Mr. Chairman, this is work that's been done for the public good, a very important evaluation piece.

(1115)

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, the names and the letters were personalized. I've got copies here. The names on the envelopes weren't on the label, Mr. Minister. They were on the letter.

Now, Mr. Minister, I have had an opportunity to read this contract that you entered into between the Department of

Health and the Department of Education. And there's a nice little statement here that says: no other use will be made of the file without the approval of the director, information systems branch.

That's a nice, simple statement: no other use will be made of the file. That's really nice and easy to understand. But what guarantees are there, Minister, that no other use of the information will occur?

What guarantees are there that Mr. Tkachuk — he goes and gets the letters from WESTBRIDGE and the envelopes from WESTBRIDGE and he takes them over to D-Mail. And then what does he do? He xeroxes all the names and addresses of the people from the letters and then he gets those names and addresses and he enters them into his own data bank. What guarantees do the Department of Education get from Mr. Tkachuk that that wouldn't happen?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I find it appalling that the member opposite is calling into question the signature and the commitment of a long-time public servant in this province, a long-time public servant. Ron Cox who has been with the Government of Saskatchewan, as I understand it, for many, many years. And I think that for you to be calling into question the long-standing service of a public servant is just not acceptable in here.

I think it's also interesting, Mr. Chairman, that when we look at the fact that this is a long-standing policy that is being followed, the policy that that government in fact brought in — the same things are being followed there.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think it's always quite interesting too that the member from Quill Lakes bellows from his seat, at the same time hasn't got the courtesy to allow me to give my answers. I listen to the member opposite. We are following the same policy that they brought in. Now they talk about double standard. I mean they bring in a policy, they follow it and it's okay but when we follow their same policy, then it's not okay. So Mr. Chairman, I think the public would question that.

There's no question here in so far as the confidentiality, the list that was used. There's no question that it's going out to parents of school-age children, that we've got a clear case of public good and no one else has any list of the HIRF file. It's intact and for you to be making accusations are just totally out of line.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, are you saying that Mr. Tkachuk who worked for the Premier of Saskatchewan, and we realize, Mr. Tkachuk was a civil servant for three years, and we realize that Mr. Tkachuk worked for, I believe it was Mr. Collver, the previous leader of the Tory Party, and then he went to work for the Premier of Saskatchewan and now he's gone into business.

And his little company is to do direct mails with the people of Saskatchewan. It's called D-Mail. And what Mr. Tkachuk has done is he's got lots of names and addresses of the citizens of Saskatchewan. In fact, I believe, he had all of the names and addresses of the citizens in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg in the by-election and he sends

out direct mail letters from the Premier and he engages in political work on behalf of the Tory party.

Now my question, Mr. Minister, is can you assure us that Mr. Tkachuk did not xerox all of the names and addresses of all of the parents in the province who have children from the ages of 5-17 and put that information into his particular computer?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm referring to the person who signed the letter, the authorization . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure who has the floor here, whether it's the member from Elphinstone or myself. It seems that decorum and courtesy in this place is a little bit lacking on that side of the House at times.

Mr. Chairman, we're talking about the individual who signed the letter of authorization from the Department of Health, that's Mr. Ron Cox, and a long-time civil servant in this province. And for the member to stand in her place and question his authority, is really something that I don't agree with.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that all documents, reports, or other materials of any kind produced or developed from or in connection with the performance of services by the contractor pursuant to this agreement, shall be and remain the property of the minister.

Now we have a legal contract with Strategic Direct Marketing. There is no way that this type of action could be carried out. If the member opposite wants to stand outside the House and makes those accusations, I'm sure that Mr. Tkachuk would welcome it. But there is absolutely no truth to her allegations whatsoever.

She made a comment here the other day that Mr. Tkachuk probably had a list of all the farmers in the province. Well the list of the farmers, you can get that from many sources. You can rent it, as I understand it; you can get addresses from post offices. There are lots of sources for names of different groups in the province.

But the fact is that we used a list here for parents of school-aged children to get out information to them that they in fact are asking for and appreciate very much. In fact there are many that are suggesting we need to do much more of that. And that is coming from educators and parents, Mr. Chairman. So we will continue to do that.

And we're following the same policy that was established by the NDP government back in the 1970s, but the issue here is the fact that it was okay for them to follow that policy, but it's not okay for us to do it.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Chairperson, if I can respond to the Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, when the NDP implemented this policy in the '70s, we had what was called SaskCOMP which was a publicly owned computer company that worked with the Government of Saskatchewan and various government departments. We did not have a private company by the name of WESTBRIDGE Computer which according to the auditor doesn't have any controls that guarantee that records are protected. When we had a public company by the name

of SaskCOMP, the employees if they divulged information could be fired or sued or discharged, fined, Mr. Minister; we didn't have a private company.

Now the purpose of private companies is to make money and so it should be. And so what private companies may or may not do is sell lists of people, names of people, particularly in this information age. And according to the auditor there is no protection of the records and the names of the people of this province; that the various government departments have not entered into any kind of arrangements to protect public information, which is really private information.

When this policy was implemented, Mr. Minister, there was no private company doing the direct mail for the Government of Saskatchewan; that was done in the mail room, done by public servants who have an obligation to uphold the oath of secrecy, Mr. Minister. There's no such obligation when it comes to private companies like D-Mail, no such obligation when it comes to WESTBRIDGE according to the auditor's report. So we're talking about two very different things, Minister, two very different things.

And while the civil servants can enter into a contract that sounds good on the surface, and no doubt this is what they mean, Minister, I want to know what sorts of controls your government has over people like Mr. Tkachuk that the information that he gets from WESTBRIDGE, which is a private company which gets the information from the Department of Health, which is a public Department of Health, which has some obligations to the public.

I want to know what assurances you can give this House, legal assurances, Minister, that this information isn't going into Mr. Tkachuk's computer and that he isn't xeroxing this information, putting it into his computer, and then using that information to make a profit, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, let me point out to the member opposite, when she talks about SaskCOMP and confidentiality, let me ask her this. The fact that all departments had access to hard printed copies of those lists, now was that confidentiality? I mean here then you had a large, large group in each department that had access to that list. Now was that confidentiality, Mr. Chairman?

I think, as well, that we have to consider the fact that contracts are legally binding. And when you talk about companies that are in business for a profit, let me tell you that the companies that are in the business, such as Mr. Tkachuk, are bound as well by a code of ethics with the direct marketing association of Canada, that they cannot be using lists that are not authorized. They cannot be doing things that are unethical here or it would mean the end of those companies. So keep in mind that there are codes of ethics by which any of these companies, particularly in some cases where they do deal with sensitive information, that they're bound by.

So I mean there's a policing mechanism set in there as well. So the fact is that we're using a company here to do work for the Department of Education; they're set up to

do large quantities of mail-out such as this. We're not talking about lists that have any kind of medical information on them; there was authorization from the Department of Health. Mr. Tkachuk at no time had any list from the Department of Health or from WESTBRIDGE.

And I think that when you consider the fact that we have tightened up the controls from what you people had . . . No longer are these hard lists available to the departments; that's been tightened up. So if anything, when you stop and consider it, things are an awful lot tighter today than they were when you brought out the policy.

So when you talk about the auditor, he certainly pointed out the deficiency, as he does with all kinds of programs. It's then up to different departments in government and the different organizations to tighten up following that. That's why he makes recommendations. That's been the practice in this province long back before you and I were in government. And that's the same policy that's considered today.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out again that we are following the same policy established by that government. This is a file that is very highly restricted. It does not include any medical information on it. The NDP government set it up that it could be used for the public good.

That's what was the case here, where it was to the public good to ensure that we contacted every parent in the province that had school-age children. And to me, Mr. Chairman, nothing could be more important than that when we're talking about evaluation, when we've got a new curriculum program that's coming in and there is a tremendous amount of information that needs to go to parents.

So we've got a mechanism to do that and there's certainly nothing wrong with that. A policy brought in by that government that we're following, and we in fact have tightened up a lot on the restrictions of that policy.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Minister, I don't buy your argument. If you want to communicate with parents, which I think is reasonable, Minister, you can send the information out to the various school divisions across Saskatchewan, and they will ensure that this information gets to parents.

Now obviously, Mr. Chairperson, I'm not going to change the minister's opinion on this, nor the political cabinet ministers' opinion on this. But I would like to appeal to the civil servants over in the Department of Health and other government agencies. In my view there are not enough controls on confidential information, and when I say confidential information I'm talking about an individual's name and address. There is not enough control.

In view of the fact that we have now gone to this WESTBRIDGE Computer, which has entered into several contracts with the Government of Saskatchewan worth some \$90 million I understand, there are no guarantees that when this information goes over to WESTBRIDGE

Computer and then WESTBRIDGE is subcontracted with groups like D-Mail, that this information won't get into the hands of the Tory party because Mr. Tkachuk, the owner of D-Mail, is a political associate of the government. And what he does is he does direct mails during election campaigns and by-election campaigns.

Now while the civil servants of this province might believe that letters such as this are enough to protect the public, in my view they are not enough to protect the public. Because they have no guarantees — none — unless they are actually over at Mr. Tkachuk's office when the information comes from WESTBRIDGE over to Mr. Tkachuk's office, and they can stand there and they see this information put into envelopes, that this information is not going to be xeroxed and at some later time put into computers to become . . . to form the data base for the Tory's political agenda.

I would call on the civil servants of Saskatchewan to be aware of that and for them to remember their oath of office, which many people have taken in this province where they are sworn to uphold the public good. And in fact there are provisions in many pieces of legislation where they could be fined or fired for releasing this kind of information.

Now I know the government . . . I know that civil servants have to be accountable to the political leaders of this province, but I say it's wrong, it's wrong for this kind of information to be going anywhere outside of government, anywhere outside of government, and that's in fact what is happening.

(1130)

Now if the Government of Saskatchewan wants to do a direct mail campaign to parents, then that should be done by civil servants, civil servants. Hire a bunch of civil servants to stuff envelopes and that sort of thing, Mr. Minister. It should not be going to private business because they have no obligation to uphold the public good and their oath of secrecy, but civil servants do. I've been a civil servant and I know that. You cannot use information on people for any reason outside of government, Mr. Minister, and you know that and civil servants know that. In fact there have been occasions when civil servants have talked too much when they shouldn't have. When you work for the government, you take on an oath of secrecy. In my view this does not . . . this letter is well and good. And I'm sure that people believe that this is enough. It is not.

Now I'd like to go on to something else. Mr. Minister, in supplementary estimates for the official minorities office, we note that in 1988-89 and 1989-90, in each case millions of dollars were given in supplementary estimates to the Official Minorities Language Office. And why wasn't this originally put into the budget?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, just to finish off on the statements that the member made with regard to the D-Mail. I can understand your concern about confidentiality. I share that concern. And anybody who has worked with special needs kids — and when you're dealing with sensitive information — understands

and appreciates that. But again I would point out to you that, as the Minister of Education, I have the responsibility to ensure that all of the parents are contacted — those parents that have school-age children. It's pretty difficult to do that through all of the school divisions. We work very closely with the trustees and the teachers and the directors of education. We have to continue to do that. But we're dealing with some pretty important data in education today.

Now when you talk about the accessibility and the concern about the Department of Health putting out this information or giving authorization to put it out, let me tell you this; that when you people were in power and the policy that you established, there were hard copies of those lists going to the departments — going to the departments. But they were going not only to the civil servants; the politicians also had them; the ministers had them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can't tell you; I don't have a copy of that list. As a politician, I do not have a copy of that list from the HIRF file. I do not have that at all. So things have been . . . and there are no more hard lists going to departments.

So I think the confidentiality has been tightened up considerably, and so it should be. Because when we're dealing with sensitive information, although some would say that names, addresses are not sensitive; we're not dealing with something sensitive like medical information. So I agree with you about the sensitivity, the accessibility.

Now with regard to OMLO (official minority languages office), the additional moneys are negotiated under the Canada-Saskatchewan subsidiary agreement, and that's not done until after the provincial budget comes down. It's money then that's 100 per cent recoverable from the federal government.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. Minister, I wasn't in government in the '70s or the early '80s. I wasn't elected until 1986. If ministers had names, that's wrong. If hard copies were going around departments, Mr. Minister, that was wrong . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, and so you stopped it.

But there's still some problems with information, Mr. Minister. If you want to do a direct mail campaign, have your Department of Education employees do it for you. We know that they're not going to be xeroxing names and sending them out to the Tory party to use during an election campaign, because civil servants don't engage in that kind of political activity, Mr. Minister, as civil servants.

Now, Mr. Minister, can you assure us in the future that it won't be D-Mail doing this, that it will be the Department of Education, that this will be done internally in order to control this sort of information. Now you may say that names and addresses aren't confidential. And I suppose when you're looking at medical records, they're not confidential in that sense. But it's still confidential. As a civil libertarian, I don't want my name and address and the number of children I have over at D-Mail. I don't want

that, and many parents don't want it. They don't want it.

There's no guarantees, Mr. Minister, that it's not there. You have said nothing that assures me that Dave Tkachuk didn't xerox all of the letters — 114,000 letters, Mr. Minister, or however many there were — and put this into his data entry system, or his computer system. Mr. Minister, you don't know. You can't possibly know. And the Department of Education can't possibly know. The only people that'll know are the people over at D-Mail.

And so I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, in the future if you want to communicate with parents, get the information from WESTBRIDGE computer. Either have WESTBRIDGE computer stuff the envelopes or bring the material back to the Department of Education and stuff it yourself.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we will assure, or ensure as time goes on that confidentiality certainly is secure. I will not guarantee to the member that we will not use the same process again. That's accepted practice. It's a policy that they brought in. And if we are to be involved in sending out further information to all of the parents of school-age children in the province, we will go the same route. The policy is there. And we're not set up to do that. And we want to ensure that we reach all of those parents.

Confidentiality is important. There is no question about that. There are no lists around; I do not have any lists; I'm sure Mr. Tkachuk does not have any list, and we will certainly want to make sure that all of the regulations are followed and that the controls are in place, as they are established by the policy that is now being used.

I have one other additional point with regard to the question on OMLO that there are additional dollars that are negotiated during the year. It's difficult to say how many at any particular time. Last year, we negotiated \$8.665 million, more dollars, and again, as I pointed out, this is fully recoverable from the federal government and this is a long-standing practice as well, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, your answer to my question is not reassuring at all and I cannot accept . . . I mean, obviously I have to accept your answer but it's not acceptable to me. In my view, government information . . . information on individual citizens in this province should not leave government, not at all; it should not be over at D-Mail.

I want to tell you, Mr. Minister, that we did not do direct letter campaigns in the '70s. I am told by my colleagues that we did not do that. We certainly sent out applications to the elderly for their senior citizen rebate or whatever it was called at that time, heritage rebate. That we did. But it was not a direct mail campaign, Mr. Minister. And the information was not contracted out to some private individual; it was done internal to government, Minister. You were contracting out work to private companies, a Tory company — Mr. Tkachuk used to be the principal secretary to the Premier — a Tory company that does direct mailing for the Tory Party of Saskatchewan. It's quite different, Minister, it's quite different and in my view, it's totally unacceptable.

Mr. Minister, I want to go on. I want to go on to the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation payments to education. And in subvote 64 on page 33 there is an indication that SPMC was paid \$4,712,900 last year, and in the current budget of this year this has gone down basically \$1.1 million to \$3,619,600. Could you explain why there's been a drop of \$1 million?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, while we're looking for that information, I would just comment to the member when she talks about the confidentiality and secrecy and guarantees and direct mail-outs, I mean, I think it's a difference in interpretation of what she refers to as a direct mail. She's saying they didn't use it and we did. I think it's much the same thing, Mr. Chairman, the difference of philosophy that we also have.

It's unfortunate that you feel that there is a difference between . . . that we don't have credibility with the private sector on such things as oaths and contracts and the binding agreements that are signed, and the fact that people are committed by these contracts that are signed. The secrecy, that it's only going to be there if a civil servant is looking after it.

So, Mr. Chairman, there's something wrong with the comments the member is making in that we can't have the private sector doing business and feel that through legal contracts that the contracts are not going to be binding.

There are many cases when these lists have been used for the public good by both governments, and that will be the case, I'm sure, in the future. I mean, to talk about it being used for political purposes, certainly that has not been the case other than, I would point out as I understand it, back in 1982 when the Minister of Social Services of the day used a list, in fact to send out letters to all of the people on social assistance in the Rosemont constituency. So I mean it's really, really something for her to stand up and talk about it.

You maybe have another question; we're still finding the information on that \$1 million.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well while you're getting that information, Mr. Minister, can you tell me what was purchased by this money that went to SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation)? Did it purchase polling, advertising? And would you also provide us with a detailed listing of all of the consultative contracts you've entered into in the last short while.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well the contracts with SPMC, Mr. Chairman, are to pay for accommodation, mail, photographic and records management services. The accommodation services would include such things as rent, operating and maintenance charges, office furniture rentals, space improvements, telephone co-ordination and management, program equipment, and any taxes associated with the properties. So that's what we pay them for.

(1145)

Ms. Atkinson: — Does this money that goes to SPMC also

... is it used for polling or advertising?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — No it is not. And I would suggest that other specific questions that the member may want to direct to the minister responsible for SPMC, but the contract that we have is for the ones that I outlined: accommodation, mail, photographic and records management services.

Ms. Atkinson: — Can you tell me what this records management service is?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — That's for the storage of files, all of the material that would be collected at the end of the year.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you give me a detailed breakdown of the \$3.6 million under those categories that you've listed, and can you be a little more specific in terms of the subcategories under the individual categories you've listed?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, did the member want ... did you want for '89-90 or for this coming year?

An Hon. Member: — This coming year.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — This coming year the amount that's projected for accommodation is 2,772,300; for mail it's 810,000; photoservices 6,000; and records management is 31,300. The total in the blue book is \$3,619,600.

Ms. Atkinson: — Okay. Mr. Minister, I realize that you have introduced some amendments to The Education Act that specifically deal with the correspondence school and the creation of a correspondence school revolving fund. And I also realize that we'll be able to talk about that in more detail once we get to the Bill, but I want you to give us some explanation during these estimates, Mr. Minister, of why it is that you have decided to change the system as we had previously known it in terms of the correspondence school.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, we look upon the role of the correspondence school as changing substantially today for different reasons; because we are moving farther into the distance education so that we can bring more quality programs to the smaller rural high schools; the fact that a lot of new technology, audio-visual technology, is going to be utilized, and there are a lot of opportunities, I think for the correspondence school. And we really are aiming at a greater amount of service.

We know as well that there are more adults that want to improve their schooling, and some of them become involved in the correspondence school courses as well.

So two different groups that we're looking at. Those smaller rural high schools where they don't have the same offerings as some of the larger ones would. This provides them with the opportunity to take some of these other courses. The revolving fund of course is going to give them increased flexibility to meet these changing needs and particularly as it relates to the rural residents

and rural school boards. So it's going to help them out, I think, a great deal.

The way it's going to work ... it will operate quite similarly to how the Book Bureau presently works in regard to the revolving fund.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, last year we had an estimated expenditure in the correspondence school of about \$1.4 million. Last year there were about 32 employees that worked for the correspondence school. Do you anticipate that this fund will be a total recovery fund in that the correspondence school will operate on its own, it'll be a viable operation on its own through the recovery of cost through fees?

And, Mr. Minister, can you tell me whether you anticipate that there will be any job loss as a result of the changes that you're proposing in the amendments to The Education Act.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — The idea is for total cost recovery. We don't anticipate job losses, and in fact we anticipate there could be a need to increase the employees because there are going to be more people involved in taking courses. So we may have to increase the staff.

Now I would point out as well that the tuition fees for adult students will remain unchanged for 1990-91. The province will provide additional money and training allowances to subsidize the cost to providing correspondence courses to adults who wish to upgrade their skills. So there are going to be new opportunities created here as well.

The school boards that paid tuition on behalf of their students will be reimbursed through the operating grant, as they are now, and tuition fees for the adults will still remain the same. I think it's about \$64 or something for a student, which is a very good rate. So no job loss, in fact there could be an increase in jobs.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, as someone who used correspondence courses with my students when I was teaching ... you may not be aware of this, but correspondence school fees have increased substantially since 1982. I think you're aware of that and, Mr. Minister, if this is going to be a self-funded operation, can you give us any assurances that the fees for these courses are not going to sky-rocket?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we don't anticipate, as I've indicated — there won't be any change in the fee for adults, in so far as those who are in school systems. That is all recovered through the operating grant. We would anticipate that there may be other opportunities there because of this increased flexibility for people taking courses that in some cases might be provided through SCAN (Saskatchewan Communications Advanced Network).

Also in some cases companies may be involved in helping to upgrade some of their employees and paying the shot. So to give you a guarantee, the rates will probably increase for the students in school systems but

they will in turn recover that in the same way they do now.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, in the school that I was principal of, we weren't able to recover that from individual school boards that funded the students and so obviously, when the fees went from, I believe \$40 a subject to \$60 a subject, it has a real impact upon the school. And if you are a student in rural Saskatchewan or an adult and you're trying to take three or four correspondence courses, \$60 is expensive. And if this is going to become a self-funded system, then I fear that we may see horrendous increases in fees for people who basically are trying to get an education and don't have access for whatever reason to the regular school system.

Now, Mr. Minister, we'll have an opportunity to talk about this further once the legislation is debated in the House, but I'd like to move on to another subject. And that has to do with the grade 12 repeat statistics in this province.

As you are aware, we are seeing more and more students who have a grade 12 returning to high school to upgrade their grade 12. We are seeing students that have 70 per cent averages or 65 per cent averages going back to high school or returning to high school to upgrade their grade 12 because of enrolment quotas at the University of Saskatchewan and because of the lack of spaces in many technical school programs in the province.

For grade 12 students, Mr. Minister, high school has become very, very competitive. And I suppose from my particular philosophical viewpoint I don't think kids in high school should be into that kind of stress and pressure, competing with fellow students to gain entry into university programs or vocational programs.

And obviously, Mr. Minister, when these kids are returning to high school, repeating, that has an impact upon the local school division. For instance, Mr. Minister, in Saskatoon in the first semester 185 students returned to high school to upgrade their grade 12. That has an impact upon that school division. Now I understand from the Saskatoon people, that at a recognized cost of \$3,233 per student, that they were looking at about \$600,000 in cost for these young people to return to high school.

I'm wondering, Minister, if this is a concern that you share with a good number of people in the community. And, Mr. Minister, can you tell us why you think kids are returning to grade 12 to upgrade their grade 12?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, first I'd like to address the correspondence school again — you had asked a question there, and I believe you're referring to radius. Well, any publicly funded institution, today the policy is that it is all fully cost recoverable.

Keep in mind again, too, I think a concern that was raised here. We're talking about cost recovery of the correspondence school, we're not talking about a profit, cost recovery. So when we consider the number of adults that are wanting to take courses, this rate is still going to be the same — \$64, which is a very minimal amount, Mr. Chairman, for the service that's being provided.

Now with regard to the other one that you have raised, certainly I share your concern about students that are going back to grade 12 to increase or improve their averages. We do have a lot of them, and that indeed is unfortunate. At the same time, we have to try to address the problems. We're attempting to do that we know, through regional colleges, and trying to make university education more accessible for students out in the rural areas so that they don't all have to come on campus if they can have those opportunities off campus as well. We're working to improve access through that particular method.

I think last year, when you look back at the statistics, that there were some 200 students that couldn't get into university in the fall. Some of them then did move on and went into other institutions. But as I understand it, all of them had opportunities to go and take night classes or to take courses at other times. So the number last year was very, very limited.

But none the less it still is a very important concern, and we have to continue to work on that. We have to continue to try and make higher education more accessible, and we've all got to work together on it. I know that school boards are concerned because it's costing them a lot of additional money each year for staff for those students who are coming back. So we've all got to work on that.

(1200)

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, we all have to work on it; that's true, but I don't see very much progress being made in the province of Saskatchewan. School boards are worried about this. Teachers are worried about it because they are seeing increasing pressures in their class-rooms because of the kids that are coming back. And those kids that are already there doing grade 12 for the first time and the kids that have come back are busy competing for marks with each other, Mr. Minister.

In my view that's not what an education is about. An education isn't about competing for individual marks in order to get into a institution of higher learning. Education should be a place where you co-operate with each other and you learn things for the sake of learning, not for the sake of having excellent marks to get into the College of Commerce, or whatever.

Now, Minister, you say that you're worried about it. I note that there was a very small increase in funding to the University of Saskatchewan, for instance, and they have now implemented permanent enrolment quotas in the College of Arts and Science. And as my colleague, the advanced education critic, has told you on numerous occasions, there are students that had a 65 average that have gotten into the university that did very well at the university. And with enrolment quotas at the University of Saskatchewan, students who don't have a 73 per cent average are being prevented from getting into the university and they are being prevented from having an opportunity to get an education, Minister.

So while you say you're trying to get some things into the regional colleges — first and second year university I

understand — Mr. Minister, that is still going to cost the taxpayers money. You're still going to have to fund education. And right now what we have here is a funding crisis. You're not funding post-secondary education adequately enough. Consequently, these institutions have to implement enrolment quotas. Consequently students that would have been eligible to get into those institutions with a 65 per cent average are being prevented from getting into those institutions. Then those students are going back to high school to upgrade their marks, and this is having an impact upon the local school divisions that have to pay for it.

So what we see is a vicious circle. We're not saving any money by having kids repeat grade 12. It's costing money. We're not saving any money in the long term, Minister, by not properly funding post-secondary education. Mr. Minister, what are you going to do about this? What are you going to do about it? Why can't you properly fund our post-secondary institutions, so that we don't have a situation of hundreds of kids returning to grade 12 to upgrade marks when those marks would have been entirely appropriate and it would have met the standards years ago when education in this province was properly funded.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well it's easy, Mr. Chairman, for the member to talk about the funding of education back in the good times in the '70s when the economy was an awful lot better; certainly there was a little bit more money, but I would still stack our record up against theirs any time as to the funding that we put into education.

With regard to the specific students that we're talking about here, and you wonder what we're doing. We have, at the present time, a committee working called, bridging the gap, and they are looking at recommendations, Mr. Chairman, as to how we can address the problem. So there is a committee that's working on that. They're looking at bridging the gap and a study with a report coming up very soon with recommendations. This has included all of the members involved with education and the universities. This appears though to basically be a problem with the University of Saskatchewan and the fact that we do have more students wanting to come into that area from not just Saskatoon, but from all over the province.

Now I think it's interesting, and I point this out to the member, that a survey that was done by the U of S in September 1988 showed that many students who were refused admission had enrolled either in evening classes or another institution or were employed. I think another interesting point is that 72 per cent said they had applied to two or more programs or institutions, thus inflating the application records or figures.

So sometimes we have to keep that in mind too that it looked like there are an awful lot of students that aren't getting in, that the number is much larger than it actually is because you got students that are enrolling in more than one college or more than one institution. I think that if you consider the funding that we have provided to our universities and our post-secondary institutions over the last number of years, particularly the universities, our average is higher. We have contributed more money than

any of the other provinces in western Canada.

So I think that that speaks pretty well for what this government's commitment is when you consider the economy, when you consider what the economy is here compared to British Columbia or Alberta, and you consider that we have been able to provide more increases, more funds . . . more increases I guess basically, than any of the other western provinces.

Now the idea of quotas is not just unique in Saskatchewan. I'm sure you're aware of that. There are other universities now that are having to bring in quotas, and certainly it's unfortunate that that has to happen, but that's the way things are today.

You talk about underfunding. What's happening in the other provinces? We've got many more young people that want to go to university today. That's part of the problem, a problem that you people didn't address when you were in power back in the '70s because you didn't anticipate that the enrolment at the U of S was going to go beyond 10,000 students. And you know well what it is today.

So that's a problem that we have to deal with. That's why there's a space shortage. Who would have ever thought that the number of students would have increased as dramatically as it has. I'm sure that you wouldn't have thought of that as well.

So we have to take a look then at . . . You asked what we're doing. We have taken a look at the whole problem. And all of those who are involved with it — the school boards, particularly in Saskatoon, and the universities and the trustees and the teachers' federation involved in looking at this along with us. And we'll be looking at the recommendations and see how we can address some of those problems in the near future.

I would also suggest that we've got to continue looking at other off-campus programs that can be provided. And I know that there are a lot of different options that can be considered that we haven't got going right now. Distance education is I think going to provide much greater access, along with what I've indicated to you about regional colleges. So there are steps being taken and we have to work to increase the funds just as soon as the funds are available.

Ms. Atkinson: — Well, Mr. Minister, I find your answer somewhat disappointing. I mean you're trying to justify why we have enrolment quotas. And I don't care if we have enrolment quotas in western Canada or other jurisdictions. That's irrelevant.

In the province of Saskatchewan a fundamental principle of education has been accessibility if you've met the standards, Minister. And we have young people in this province and we have adults in this province that are able to meet standards if the University of Saskatchewan was properly funded.

Now, Mr. Minister, imagine a young person — and I will use a family member for example, my own family member — a young person who's 24 years old, is

married, has two children, has been in the trades, has been a journeyman carpenter and a journeyman cement mason, and the economy has fallen out from under him. There is nothing going on in the construction industry.

So this person decides that he would like to go into education and become a teacher. And he applies to the College of Education to become a teacher. And because his marks, I believe, are not 78 per cent, he cannot get into the College of Education.

So he is denied from getting into the College of Education because there simply aren't enough spaces to train . . . And we're looking at a teacher shortage in this province come the mid-1990s. He can't get into the College of Education — even though we need to expand the numbers in the College of Education — because he does not have a 78 per cent average. But he certainly has a 74 per cent average out of high school. And so this young man has to either return to high school and take upgrading and try and get in or he gives up — he gives up.

And what's happening, Minister, is that young people in this province are giving up and they're moving elsewhere. That's what's happening. And a fundamental principle, I believe, Minister, is that young people in this province or people in this province should be able to go and better themselves, should be able to get into post-secondary institutions if they meet the minimum requirements.

Now it wasn't too long ago that all you had to have was a 65 per cent average to get into arts and science, and for some students this was their way to get into other colleges. They went into arts and sciences, they applied themselves, they did well, and they could then get into engineering or commerce or medicine or nursing or education. And that's no longer the case.

Now the minister obviously has quite a different view of education. Obviously he has a different view, and I think that's unacceptable, Minister. There are large numbers of people that don't have 78 per cent averages or 80 per cent averages, but if they had a chance, Minister, they would do well. They would contribute to the economic, social, cultural, and political well-being of our province by furthering their education.

And, Mr. Minister, in my view the Government of Saskatchewan is denying people access to universities in this province because of their consistent underfunding of education, because they don't have a real commitment to the people of this province.

They have a commitment to the Weyerhaeusers and the GigaTexts and the Peter Pocklington and the Rafferty-Alameda, the George Hills — they have a commitment to those people — the Leonard McCurdys, but they don't have a commitment to the real people of this province, the people who are going to be here long after Leonard McCurdy goes and long after Chuck Childers goes and long after Peter Pocklington is gone. The people who are going to be here in this province and have some faith in this province, your government doesn't have a commitment to them.

How do you explain that, Mr. Minister? Don't talk about enrolment quotas in other parts of the country. Talk about Saskatchewan. That's what the people in this province are interested in. And they're interested in knowing whether or not you have a commitment to this province or you don't.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt about the commitment of this government to our students — whatever age they may — whether they're high school graduates or they're in the K to 12 system or if they're post-secondary. Let's take a look at some of the changes that have taken place.

Since 1980 the number of students in Saskatchewan has increased by 44 per cent, an increase of 44 per cent since 1980. Now part of the problem that we've got on our campus is a shortage of space, at the time when these people were in power and did absolutely nothing about that.

Let's also consider the fact the information that we have is that there was no student last year that had an average of 65 per cent or above that couldn't get into classes at the University of Saskatchewan, in taking night classes or whatever the case may be. No students, Mr. Chairman. And at the same time, that anybody who did well in those classes that they were taking at night school — if they did well in them — then they were admitted into the second year of arts and science.

So the fact of the matter is what the member is saying opposite about a lot of students being denied access is just not true. If they wanted to go, they could go.

Let's also take a look at history in this province — that there have always been students that couldn't get into university for not having a high enough average. I can remember when I was going to university, the average probably then was about 60 per cent. Well if you had students that had a lower average than that, they had to try and upgrade their marks so that they could get in. So that's always been the case, whether it was 60 or 70, or whatever the case might be.

So I've indicated what we are doing to address the problem. We've got those students then who have access to night classes that they can go and take, and many of them have done that. But the information we have from the university is that there was no student that would have been denied taking night classes if they had the average of 65 per cent.

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I was listening intently to your last answer to the Education critic, the member for Saskatoon Nutana. And in your response you said that when we people were in power, when the NDP was in power, they never did anything for the university. And that, sir, is just absolutely not true — absolutely not true.

Between 1974 and 1981 at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, the New Democratic Party government led by Allan Blakeney spent a total of \$84.181 million in capital construction costs at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon.

So for you to stand here and say that we didn't do anything, that we didn't do anything for the university, that we didn't build or we didn't try to expand the facilities, is just not . . . contrary to the facts, Mr. Minister.

(1215)

But, Mr. Minister, I want to ask you a few questions about your record and the way in which you've spent taxpayers' money for capital construction costs at the universities in Regina and in Saskatoon.

And I notice, Mr. Minister, I notice that since 1982, when you people came to power, that the ratio of spending at the universities, the ratio of spending at the universities has become totally unbalanced vis-à-vis one university over another.

Your ratio of spending for capital cost construction has ended up in a situation where the university in Regina is the only university in Canada where people walk around with umbrellas in the hallways to keep the rain off their head. It's the only university with an indoor swimming pool in the hallways in order to try to keep the water that leaks through the roof from the floor of the university. It's the only university in Canada where the government ends up bailing out WESTBRIDGE Computer Corporation by building a big building for the use of WESTBRIDGE Computer at taxpayers' expense, while the rest of the physical plant at the University of Regina goes steadily downhill.

Those are the facts, Mr. Minister, and it's a disgrace. It is a disgrace to the tradition of educational excellence in the province of Saskatchewan. To appear on the front page of newspapers, not only in Saskatchewan, but across the country, the pictures of kids' plastic swimming pools in hallways in order to catch the rain that drips from the roof. And that just is a disgrace.

Mr. Minister, you want to talk about disgraces and who disgraces Saskatchewan, it's that kind of action, it's that kind of inaction, I should say — that's more correctly putting it — it's that kind of inaction that has resulted in the physical deterioration of the University of Regina.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, can you explain your government's policy since 1982 of spending \$6.43 at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, in terms of capital cost construction, for every \$1 that you spent at the University of Regina? Can you explain that inequity? And I ask that question, Mr. Minister, not saying that the money should not be spent at the University of Saskatchewan, but why is it have you deliberately cut and undercut the funding for the physical facilities at the University of Regina?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't recall saying that the NDP didn't do anything. I certainly understand that education has been a commitment of any government in this province, as long as I can remember — NDP, the Liberals prior to that, and certainly it's been a commitment with this government and will continue to be so.

You are not saying anything about the fact we have spent

\$243 million since 1981 as far as capital is concerned on the universities. So that's substantially more than what you people did back in times when the economy was a heck of a lot better than it is today.

You talk about the comparison between the U of R and the U of S. Let's keep in mind that the University of Regina is only, I think, about 25 years old. And certainly now it's at the stage when there's more and more money being needed each year as far as repair is concerned. But there could have been more done, I'm sure, too when you people were in power as far as repair was concerned.

The University of Saskatchewan, when you consider how old some of those buildings are and the amount of money that's needed for rehabilitation is substantial. So you've got to keep that in mind when you're taking a look at the amount that's being spent on capital.

The University of Saskatchewan campus has an awful lot more on it than what you've got here when you look at all of the different colleges — the University of Regina, a relatively small campus in comparison to the University of Saskatchewan. So that in itself would explain why there's been a substantial amount of money spent in Saskatoon as compared to what has been spent in Regina.

But I think that traditionally the Department of Education and the government of today has tried to treat the two university campuses in a fair and equitable manner. We see that the needs are not always the same. We understand the need today, the students' union building, that's something that they're anxious to have started. Fine Arts is long overdue on this campus, and that's something that we want to address as soon as we can. I also know that in Saskatoon that the agricultural building was long overdue. That was something that you people didn't address when you were in power and yet had been requested for some 25 years.

So we do have a lot of money going into capital today. A lot of it is for renovations and for rehabilitation of buildings that were spent many, many years ago, so we are trying to be fair with each campus. It's not that any one is being given a higher priority than the other.

Mr. Lyons: — Well, Mr. Minister, it's very easy to say that. It's very easy to say that we are committed to something. It's very easy to say that, yes, this is our plans, these are our plans. It's very easy to say that, you know, we're going to go ahead, and we're going to do this and we're going to do that. Those kind of words, sir, those kind of words are easy to say.

But the record of your government has been one of inaction, not of commitment, because commitment implies action and the one thing that is clear to everybody that attends the University of Regina has been a total lack of action for capital cost construction, other than for certain projects which have benefitted you politically in terms of deals with the federal government on the summer school . . . or the language centre which was part of the original Rafferty-Alameda trade-off, and now with the WESTBRIDGE Computer scam out there.

The facts of the matter are, Mr. Minister, the facts of the

matter are that since 1982 for every dollar spent on capital construction at the University of Regina, you spent \$6.34 at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, which is not to deny the need for capital construction at the University of Saskatchewan. But what it does do is show that your commitment to the University of Regina is nil. It is nil, Mr. Minister, because of the deterioration of the physical facilities.

Your apparent answer to my original question, why this inequity, was that because there's so many more students at the University of Saskatchewan than there are at the University of Regina. And once again, Mr. Minister, the facts don't support your argument. There are two and a half students at the University of Saskatchewan for every student at the University of Regina — two and a half times. Not 6.34 times students, two and a half times students. So if you try to say that because there's so many more students up there that you need 600 per cent, 600 times more spending is ridiculous. It doesn't hold any water at all.

I want to ask you again, sir: given that between 1974 and 1982, the Government of Saskatchewan didn't need to repair buildings because we were building buildings at the University of Regina; we were building the administration humanities building out there; we were building College West; we were making additions onto the class-room building; we were making additions onto the library facilities; we were helping to build Luther College; helping to build Campion College during that period of time — we were building at that time, not letting things run down — can you explain once again why it is that there's this inequity of capital cost construction between the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon? Why is it that you are spending \$6.34 for every dollar spent at the University of Regina? Why is that inequity?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that the member likes to bring in all of those things that he and his government are opposed to, like Rafferty and like WESTBRIDGE — very unfortunate.

We had a good discussion last night with the member from Saskatoon South about WESTBRIDGE and the new facility that's being put out there at the university campus right now in the research part. A very good deal for the University of Regina. This is something that was endorsed by the administration and by the university board of governors, and request to us then that we give them permission to go and borrow the money to put up the building, a building that will be leased to WESTBRIDGE and then will become property of the University of Regina, as I think within about a 10-year period of time, and just an excellent deal as far as the University of Regina is concerned.

I think that it's incumbent upon us to use every available option that we have to get other sources of revenue for our university campuses, other than from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. And I think when we look at the amount of research dollars that we have coming in here, the more we can get, the better it is going to be, that we don't have to use our local taxpayers' money.

Now let's remember, when you're talking about the comparisons between Regina and Saskatoon, you're talking about enrolments in Saskatoon that are double what they are here. Granted that. You've got, again as I pointed out earlier, buildings which for the most part are much older than here in Regina. And when you consider that in Regina you've got, I think, about seven faculties compared to about 16 different departments in Saskatoon . . .

But let's take a look at some of those other faculties in Saskatoon. You've got a lot of research facilities that are built in. Say let's take the College of Veterinary Medicine, let's take the College of Medicine; let's take the College of Engineering or agriculture. Consider for a minute all of the research and development that goes on in those colleges.

Now when it comes to the purchase of equipment . . . I see that for 1990-91, that 802,000 budgeted for the University of Regina and 2.6 million for the University of Saskatchewan for equipment. Now let's consider the type of equipment that is being purchased. When you get into the research area, you should well know that the equipment is very, very expensive. The facilities are very, very expensive.

So you've got to take that into consideration when you look at that breakdown. You're looking at very, very high-cost facilities. That's a much different situation than when you're repairing a roof in Regina or repairing a roof in Saskatoon. Certainly that should be the same. But you haven't got the research here at the University of Regina that you have in Saskatoon, and that necessitates a lot more expensive operations.

Rehabilitation for this coming year, \$1.4 million for the U of R; \$5 million for the University of Saskatchewan. And again, that points out the age of the buildings in Saskatoon compared to the ones here in Regina.

So you're obviously going to need much more renovation and repair on those older buildings than you are going to have here in the city of Regina. So it's not that the government is being unfair; it's taking a look at the needs of the day and where the biggest priorities are.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Minister, that is totally fallacious. Your argument is totally fallacious, sir. With all due respect, nowhere, nowhere in national newspapers across the country do we see pictures of kids' swimming pools in the corridors of the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. Nowhere, sir, we don't see that any way at all.

The facts though, the facts, we do see it at the University of Regina. We do see it at the University of Regina. You know, eavestroughs dropping around, people wearing umbrellas, taking umbrellas into class because they don't know whether the roof is going to leak on them — you don't see that at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon either.

What has happened, sir, I submit, and I think the facts will support that, is that you have engaged in a political strategy to strangle the University of Regina, to strangle

the University of Regina to pump minimum amount of money into the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon and develop this huge inequity.

Let me give you a few more facts, Mr. Minister, on those inequities. Since 1982 your government has spent \$101.124 million in capital expenditures from '82 to '88 at the University of Saskatchewan — \$101 million; whereas at the University of Regina — \$15 million, \$15.7 million. I mean that's the inequity; that's the inequity.

And in Regina, in Saskatoon, as I said before, you don't see the deterioration of the physical plant that you see up in Saskatoon. And yes, I recognize that funding for cyclotrons are expensive. Funding for our technology is expensive. And I've absolutely no quarrel with the government putting more money into R&D (research and development), putting more money into R&D, not less. That's not the issue here.

(1230)

The issue here is when you have a situation where one university becomes a laughing-stock because of the physical deterioration of its campus, a laughing-stock nationally. I ask you: who is the disgrace to this province? Why is it — and once again you've failed to answer the question — why is it that when we have a crisis situation in terms of the physical plant here in Regina, you fail to respond?

I would submit it's part of your political strategy to try to boot Regina around as you've been doing economically, to try to boot Regina around as you've been doing in terms of grants for education, not just at the university, on the other levels of education.

But be that as its side, we have a crisis situation at the new campus in the University of Regina. You've mentioned the Fine Arts building. Two years ago I was at a meeting with professors, with administrators from Fine Arts campus, along with the Minister of Culture and Recreation from your government. We had a non-partisan discussion of the issues. At that time, your government was still saying, yes we're going to do something about the Fine Arts campus in Regina. Yes, we know there's the deterioration there. Yes, we're going to have to develop long-range plans for it.

Since that time, nothing has been done there either. You have deliberately, sir, I believe your government has deliberately ignored the higher educational needs of the University of Regina and the facts bear me out — \$101 million in six years to the University of Saskatchewan, \$15 million to the University of Regina for capital expenditures. Right? That's the ratio — \$1 for Regina, \$6.34 for Saskatoon. Leaking roofs in Regina, and money going into slowpoke reactors and your commitment to that kind of expenditures, which is ripping the university community apart in Saskatoon because of the tremendous opposition to you wasting money on a technological toy.

I would say, Mr. Minister, as my colleague from Regina Victoria has pointed out, that the real problem here is that the Tory MLAs from Regina, the member from Regina

South and the member from Regina Wascana have sat like bumps on the log at the cabinet table, have sat like bumps on the log, and they're afraid to speak up for the university community here in Regina. The results bear that out. They have done nothing whatsoever to try to improve the quality of the physical plant at the University of Regina. They have not stood up for Regina as they have never stood up for Regina, because they're more concerned with their own little political careers and the political survival of their government than they are with standing up for the people of Regina.

Once again I ask you sir: try, if you can't politically defend those inequities, at least make a commitment today that you're going to pump a few extra million dollars to try to save, to try to at least halt the deterioration and fix the roof. Will you do that, Mr. Minister? Will you make a commitment to fix the roof at the University of Regina? Even that would be a step forward compared to what you've been doing.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think I've seen a better example of gross over-exaggeration, misinformation, than what we've just heard from the member opposite. I mean it's shocking to hear him stand up and talk the way he just has. I mean talk about a lack of knowledge about education and how funding is provided to our universities and to our school systems — I mean a total lack of knowledge. I think he needs to talk to his critic over there, who's got a pretty good base, I think, as to how the educational system works in the province.

For him to say that there's a political agenda to try and do away with the University of Regina is just one of the most ridiculous things that I've ever heard. We're as committed to the University of Regina as we are to the University of Saskatchewan. That's just, just ridiculous.

I wonder where the member opposite has been, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the construction of the upgrader. He says that this government has done nothing in Regina. Where was he when the upgrader was being built? I mean one of the largest projects that's ever been built in this province. I wonder when he's going to stand up and say he's in favour of the fertilizer plant, like the Moose Jaw members have; Moose Jaw members, his seat mate there has indicated that.

Anyway, we are committed to the University of Regina, Mr. Chairman, in the same way we're committed to the University of Saskatchewan. The university board of governors and administration, they set the priorities over there. I really don't buy his argument about leaky roofs and swimming pools and all the rest of it. I mean talk about a gross over-exaggeration. It's just unbelievable.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, we will endeavour to ensure that the universities are dealt with fairly. We can take a look at the expenditures at the University of Saskatchewan right now, some \$92 million going into the College of Agriculture. That's going to certainly skew the figures a little bit when it comes to capital. But we do try to treat both universities fairly.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much. Mr. Minister, I

want to refer you to the Arran school division, or school situation, and I know you're familiar with it.

Mr. Minister, I know that parents have made a great deal of representation to you in their endeavours to try and save their school. As I understand it the high school program at Arran is scheduled to close come June of 1990 and high school students will then be transported to Pelly, I believe. Mr. Minister, the parents are concerned that their children will have long bus routes. In some cases, I understand that they're looking at up to 60 miles a day for students to go to the school that the Kamsack School Division is proposing.

Mr. Minister, I also understand that the concerned parents have spoken to you about the possibility of setting up a separate school in their community, a school that would be Catholic, because as I understand there are a number of parents who are of the Catholic denomination. Mr. Minister, the parents have forwarded to me a copy of a letter that you sent to them, dated April 30 of 1990. And I need some clarification as a result of your letter.

As I understand it, Mr. Minister, if you are a non-Catholic, you have the right to indicate in this province that you want your school taxes to be paid to the Catholic school board. Mr. Minister, is that not the case?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very familiar with the Arran situation. And I think the thing that we're trying to respect of course in that situation, as we do in all situations in the province, is the role of the school board. Okay. We have to respect that. The decision was made by the school board that they were going to shut down their high school this year and take the children — I think it's only 10 miles or 10 kilometres possibly — down the road to Pelly, which isn't a great distance.

I can understand the concern that's been raised. I mean parents are always concerned when there's going to be any change to their present school. But that's the decision that the board has made in that particular case.

As I understand it, with regard to the taxes, if there is a Roman Catholic school board and you are a Roman Catholic living in that particular division, your taxes automatically go to that board whether your children go to the school or not. In that particular case there is not a separate school. So there's no place for the taxes to go other than to the school division at the present time.

Ms. Atkinson: — I understand that in this case parents' taxes or citizens' taxes are going to the Kamsack School Division. As I understand the situation, what the Arran parents are attempting to do is to form a separate school board which would be in charge of the Arran high school, Mr. Minister.

In your letter you say — and I'm just seeking clarification — that a separate school division is restricted to taxing only the property of those bona fide members of the minority religious faith. And I realize that this is true. However as a non-member of that religious faith, I can indicate that I want my taxes to go to a Catholic school. If that's not the case, Minister, could you please clarify that?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — As I've indicated, if there is a separate school board, then the Catholics would pay their taxes to that. But it's not the case then with regard to others who are non-Catholic. They cannot do it. Their taxes would still go, in this case, to the Kamsack School Division.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, then I think we have some difficulties in this province because there are citizens in this province who are not Catholic — in the city of Saskatoon, for example — whose children go to a Catholic school and they have indicated that they want their school taxes to go to that school. Mr. Minister, it would appear as though what you're saying may be the legal interpretation of the Act, but in my view, Mr. Minister, that is not necessarily the practice of a number of citizens.

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the agreements are . . . This is something that's been an accepted practice by law since the province was formed. Now in Saskatoon, there may be a reciprocal agreement whereby a parent can designate their taxes to go to the Catholic school. That's the understanding that I have here.

Now in the Arran situation, let's be clear on what we've got in that situation. They had first indicated to me that they wanted to form a separate school board and had done a survey. But in fact then that the list that was presented to me showed that Catholics were the majority of the population. Now The Education Act doesn't allow for a separate school board being set up when the Catholics in this case are in the majority. They have to be in a minority.

So then they did another survey and they deleted some people from there, and the next list that they presented to me showed that in fact the Catholics were a minority. So we have indicated to them that there are certain conditions, as you can see from the letter there, that they would have to meet.

But the bottom line in all of this, Mr. Chairman, is that if a separate school board were formed in the Arran community, that the only way that they could get any kind of tax money from the non-Catholics would be through the negotiation of a successful agreement with the Kamsack School Division. So that would again be a local decision.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, in terms of the second part of your letter, you talk about school attendance, non-Catholics. As I understand it now, school divisions do not force children of parents who wish their child to attend a separate school board to attend the public school system, that there is some element of choice in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I'm wondering, minister, is it your view that a school division in this province could force a parent of children who are in the majority faith, I guess we could say, to attend the public system if that parent wanted their child to attend the separate system?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, the children in

this case, non-Catholic children, could go to the separate school. But if the Kamsack board in this case said that they could not go, that in fact would be the case because they have that right. And in any event, no taxes would go. Even if they allowed the children to go, taxes would not follow them unless there was an agreement with the board.

(1245)

Ms. Atkinson: — So parents could not declare that they wanted their taxes to go to the Catholic school system, even though they may not be Catholics. They couldn't declare that. Mr. Minister, are you getting your interpretation out of The Education Act and have you checked this particular provision of The Education Act with our Charter of Rights and Freedoms?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that we wouldn't have a separate school system unless the present provisions were in place. The fact is this is not in violation of the Charter. This is something that as I indicated: if even if the parents were allowed to have their children go to the separate school, in this case, that the board does not have to give up the taxes, unless there is an agreement between the two boards. So it does not violate the charter of rights, and this is something that's been in place for a long, long time.

Ms. Atkinson: — As you know, Mr. Minister, the charter of rights addresses individual rights. And so I'm talking about the individual right of a parent to determine whether their children will go to school in the context of the public school system and the Catholic school system and whether or not their taxes will follow that child. If an individual parent, Minister, were to launch a case, an action, under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, is it your view that the provisions of your legislation will be upheld, Minister?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the information I have is that there is no violation of the charter of rights here. Again the basic reason for this of course is to protect the separate system as it has been set up. So I mean . . . I think from what you're suggesting, if we were to make some change there, then it could, of course, have serious ramifications as far as the separate, so it's not possible for this to happen. The school board has that right and that's a long-standing tradition.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, I am not suggesting anything. I am simply trying to understand the possibilities because it's been put to me that a case might be possible under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to challenge the provisions that you address in your letter. And I am simply trying to get an interpretation from the Department of Education. I am wondering, Minister, given that you believe that The Education Act would withstand such a challenge, can you at some stage table or give to me an opinion, a legal opinion, as to why you've arrived at that conclusion?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we can look into that further for you, if you'd like. But the understanding that we have right now though is that what you're suggesting is not a possibility. It's not violating the charter, and that the school board has the right to

determine where the children go. That's something that may override in this case the rights of the parents. And we have, I think, cases of that with independent schools as well. But the board maintains the right to take those taxes, and they also have the right to determine whether the child goes to school if they live in that attendance area.

An Hon. Member: — Will you send me a written . . .

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Well, I'm not sure we can send you a written . . . We'll find more of this and get clarification and give it to you later. We'll give you what we can.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Items 10 and 11 — Statutory.

Items 12 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

Item 16

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Minister, can you send me a list of all the organizations, educational agencies, associations, and institutions that will receive funding through this particular estimate; and can you indicate to me how much funding they will receive?

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Yes, we can do that, Mr. Chairman.

Item 16 agreed to.

Items 17 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

Item 25 — Statutory.

Items 26 to 29 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Education Education Development Fund — Vote 64

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 64 agreed to.

Consolidated Fund Loans, Advances and Investments Education Vote 141

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 141 agreed to.

Supplementary Estimates 1990 Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Education Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 5 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd like to thank the officials.

Ms. Atkinson: — Before the Department of Education officials leave, I would like to thank you on behalf of my colleague, the advanced education critic who can't be here today, and myself and the official opposition, for all of the information that you were able to share with us. We found it very useful.

We hope that we haven't taken you away from your busy schedules for too long. We appreciate that you have many other things that you do in providing services to the people of Saskatchewan each and every day. And you have been here for well over two weeks, I believe, and we want to thank you for that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Meiklejohn: — Mr. Chairman, I too would like to thank my officials, not only for the tremendous support that they have been during the last couple of weeks, but also the support and assistance that they provide for all levels of education throughout the province during the year, and they do just a tremendous job. And I'd also like to thank the critics from across the way for the questions and the debate and discussion we've had over the last while. I certainly appreciate the input that I've had from them as well, and suggestions that they make throughout the year. So I would thank them as well.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.