

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

June 1, 1984

The Assembly met at 5:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 83 – An Act to provide for the making of Grants to Certain Senior Citizens to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Calder Hart . . . (inaudible) . . .

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I will read the amendment.

Amend subsection 3(2) by adding:

“but is not to be less than \$1,500” after “regulations”.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, it is our view that this should represent the minimum assistance available to senior citizens. If there is no humanitarianism left in government benches, one might look upon this as a good investment. It's a great deal cheaper for society to assist senior citizens in maintaining their independence.

There is, Mr. Minister, a goodly number of renovations needed to senior citizens' homes which you can't do for \$1,000, Mr. Minister. It is our view that the \$1,500 figure is reasonable. It is reasonable. It is a good investment. It's going to cost you a fraction of what you have given the oil companies. It is going to cost you a fraction of what you have given away to your rather wealthy friends.

I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you wouldn't consider doing a little something more for the senior citizens. This strikes us as being a reasonable minimum. The repairs to senior citizens' homes are often all that is needed to allow them to maintain their independence. Fifteen hundred dollars doesn't buy you a lot of repairs, Mr. Minister, and I . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. I have considered the amendment, and I find that the effect of the amendment could be to authorize a higher grant in certain cases than would otherwise have been provided by the bill. Therefore I find the amendment to be money amendment and it is, therefore, out of order.

Mr. Shillington: — I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. It's most unfortunate. I would ask the minister then, to consider moving the amendment from the treasury benches. It is our view that this should represent a minimum commitment to senior citizens. Surely they have earned the same claim, or a claim on the public treasury, as have oil companies and your other wealthy friends.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that this should represent our minimum commitment to senior citizens. There's a lot of repairs needed to senior citizens . . . They often live in older homes. By their very nature, those are often the homes most in need of repairs. I can tell you, as someone who has put

in a few windows, \$1,000 doesn't buy you very much, and it doesn't take very long to put \$1,000 worth of repairs on a house.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that we should make \$1,500 our minimum commitment. That isn't very much. And there's going to be a lot of senior citizens' homes for whom that isn't going to do the job. But it should surely represent a minimum in a decent, civilized society.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Two comments with regards to that. Number one comment is that there was a task force around the province, and the unanimous recommendation of the senior citizens to the government was that you increase the amount from the previous program of \$650 limit up to \$1,000. It was unanimous recommendation to us by senior citizens that the cap on that should be \$1,000. We took their advice on that.

These aren't new programs. This program was first introduced a number of years ago by the federal government. Now the previous government had a program in, that – I think ended in September of 1983 – had a cap of \$650. We increased that cap to take account of inflation by 54 per cent, taking it up to 1,000, which will be now \$1,000, and that was based on the recommendation of the senior citizens that our committees met with. That's where the amount was set. Should we find in the future that that amount has to be higher, then we would raise it accordingly.

Mr. Shillington: — Will the minister not admit that everything about this program recommends itself to members of the legislature? It assists people who, I think, have everyone's sympathy and support. It is a creator of employment, and you haven't overextended yourself in that regard, either. If you think you're created too many jobs out there, and that's why you're resisting the amendment, then, Mr. Minister, you've been in this Assembly a little too long. It assists senior citizens. It creates employment. It is not really an expensive program. And what is more, it is a good investment, Mr. Minister. It is a good investment in keeping senior citizens in their homes. It costs society a lot less to keep them in their homes than it does to keep them in an institution. I suggest to you, if you haven't got any sense of humanitarianism, then just take it as a good investment and move it at that.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, the second thing that we did with . . . You raise a point with regard to employment. We also expanded the previous program to not restrict it to just simply winter works programs. I believe the program starts the first of August, which will allow it to go beyond simply a winter works program. I think we're all, in this Assembly, are in agreement with the bill that is being advanced. What we are talking about is the thickness of the shell of the egg, and let's not put that in terms of extremely diametrically opposed views.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 8

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister referred to a task force that was around, and I understand that there were hearings held around the province. I wonder, was that report ever made public and is the report around? What I would like is, if I could, is to get a copy of that. Maybe it has been made public and I just have missed it, but if you would get me a copy of that.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I understand it will be made public next week.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The task force . . . The recommendations in that are in a form that will be made public but it hasn't to date been made public.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Correct. It'll be, as I'm advised, next week – or at least within 10 days.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — So you'll make sure that the opposition gets a copy of that.

Clause 8 agreed to.

Clauses 9 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 86 – An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The officials are Paul Robinson, deputy minister; Keith Laxdal; and Murray Schafer.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm going to resist the opportunity to get into the level of taxation – which would be entirely in order – get into the level of taxation that this government has brought to the province. Suffice it to say, we made those arguments in our budget speech, and in your estimates. I think they have had effect, as I'm getting a fair number of complaints about the level of taxation and the lack of services, and therefore I'm going to leave it at that and let the bill go without any additional comments.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I would just like to ask the minister, if I could . . . I notice that there are a list of things where the sales tax, I believe, is being taken off – not a very long list. But the question that I would have is the promise made at the time of the last election. You will remember that you very clearly, in my constituency, in meeting, I believe, with the chamber of commerce in Eastend . . . Shortly before the last election you met with them and you promised that in your first term of office you would . . .

An Hon. Member: — They didn't believe me.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — They did believe you, and I think that's the point that I want to make, is that you, Mr. Minister, at that time in the opposition, were travelling around the province promising to take the sales tax off of everything in Saskatchewan. And in particular along the west side of our province where it does have an impact, and the member from Maple Creek will be well aware, on the main streets of our towns, that it does have an impact when the local business people have to compete with the Alberta stores, it is a problem.

I wonder if you can at this time outline your schedule for the removal of the sales tax completely before the next election. Is that still part of the promise . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

That's right. The Minister of Supply and Services says they fooled the people. And I agree they did. But I wonder if you have anywhere in your mind a timetable for making that promise a reality.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I have said in response to that question many times that I fully am committed; that we will eliminate the sales tax before we leave office.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I would just like to advise you that you have then about one year, possibly two, to complete this program, or it will be left up to the members in opposition when they come into government to face the responsibility of solving that problem that you will have left behind. But enough said about that, Mr. Minister.

I think the people will realize from your answer that you have no intention of taking the sales tax off in your first term, or as some people say, your second term, the first one from '29 to '34, this being your second term, and probably your last for another 50 years. But I think a number of people are disappointed that the sales tax is still on.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think that in the most recent budget we have made significant moves in that direction. We've dealt with the sales tax on all electrical bills for the people across this province.

I only recall, I only recall, just leading into the budget, as the goings across the way were jetting up for the session, and rubbing their hands. And, "What's going to be the issue?" they were asked by the media. And, "We're going to pound on these folks and their utility bills." And we haven't heard one word in the session about utility bills. And that's the reason — because we eliminated the tax on it, brought that down under 5 per cent for all people across this province — for the farmers, for the consumers, for all home owners. And that's one, I think, significant move that we have done with regards to eliminate that tax.

We have moved, as well, in other areas, as this bill has indicated. We would have loved to eliminate the sales tax, and our view was that somehow we would be able to do that. We no more got into office, no more got settled into our offices, and got hit right between the eyes with just how much money was there, and we had to adjust to that unfortunate reality. We gave our commitment that we would deliver what we said we will deliver, and that will be the case.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, you will maybe be aware of this orange and blue pamphlet with a picture of the now Premier on the front. And one of the points in the pamphlet is the elimination of the sales tax. And I want to read it to you . . . There were no attempt to explain that it was going to be limited to certain areas. It said:

This measure will be the first phase of a new PC government's commitment to the complete elimination of the sales tax in its first (not in its term of office, but in its first) term of office, and its commitment to ease the burden of inflation on Saskatchewan citizens.

Now, Mr. Minister, you will know that a promise made and kept is not forgotten easily in the province of Saskatchewan. And we will intend, over the next year, to bring this up as many times as we can, and will bring it up at many meetings, at chamber of commerce meetings when we travel around, that your promises made when you were around four years ago, so that when you make promises next time, so that when you make these promises next time, people will not be trusting of you and you will not be able to fool the public as the Minister of Supply and Services has just admitted you did, at the time of the next election.

And this will be part of the program that we will be telling the people of the province for the next year, is that in many areas where you promised things, you simply have not kept them. And, Mr. Minister, your promises are not believable. And I say that if you don't keep this promise in the next year or two, you are not going to have an opportunity to fulfil the promise unless you live to be about 110, because that will be the next chance you get to do it.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I find this interesting. First, the member from Regina Centre gets up and says: this isn't your first term; it's your second term. That's what he said. He said it was the second term that we were in here, and you indicate this is the first term. So you're both without your act together.

The reality . . . I would challenge the member that stood up and read that commitment to go through the rest of them — go through the rest of the commitments and stand up to it, stand up to it, stand up to it. We would have been able to deliver on the sales tax question had we not found the cupboards bare when we took office. That's the reality of what we found; that's the

reality of what we had to deal with; and now we find ourselves having to deal with that.

We are starting to phase it in. We are living to that commitment. The people, I believe, are accepting that, and we will deliver on that promise as we deliver on all our promises.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Finance, this brilliant Minister of Finance, to stand up in this House, to stand up in this House and to declare to the people of Saskatchewan he didn't know the financial position of Saskatchewan, really is an admission of his lack of attention when he was in opposition.

We have here published what is known as the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund. That report has been published since the heritage fund was established. And just listen to what the minister has said, "The cupboards were bare." In his own first economic forecast document that he put out, shortly after he was elected, he declared himself that there was over \$140 million in cash. He has, all of them, he follows the same principles that's adopted by his leader — half-truths, quarter-truths, and totally lacking in any truth at all.

There's no doubt that the Minister of Finance knew the financial picture of the province of Saskatchewan. He's doing the same thing, this government, talking about the position of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I ask you: where were they during the years that they stood in opposition? Did you ever hear them say, or complain, that there was any problem with a debt/equity? Not a word! These reports were before them.

And what has happened here is, they're caught up, caught up in their philosophy — a philosophy that has been followed in British Columbia, and that province has collapsed economically. They have followed the same Tory patchwork approach to the job creation in this province as they have in Alberta. And really what has happened is not that there was not money, but what this promise was was total deception to the people of the province. They didn't intend to keep that promise. And that was a lot of money that you promised to the people of this province that you would take, remove, in the first term of your office.

And do you know what we got in contrast? Not reduction of the sales tax. What we got, as a heritage from two years of this government, is \$850 million of deficit. That's what you have done, Mr. Minister of Finance, and now you go around with deception, half-truths, misrepresentation. And I'll tell you, you promised the people that you could in fact, you would indeed, cut the income tax by 10 per cent. You had no intentions — none. It's the same, exactly the same, in respect to the elimination of the sales tax.

And I think that what the people of this province are starting to realize, Mr. Minister of Finance, is that this government can't be believed — and that's the truth of the matter. And you have again tonight reaffirmed that position: that, in fact, you cannot trust this Tory government.

In sales tax, which you told the people of Saskatchewan you would eliminate, do you know what the amount of that promise was? And do you mean to say you went into that election and now became Minister of Finance without knowing any facts or what it would cost? The sales tax alone, the sales tax elimination alone, in 1984-85, was \$372 million. That's what you held out to the people of Saskatchewan. You may think that's funny; that you hold out a promise to the people of Saskatchewan to say, "We'll take \$372 million of taxes off your shoulders," and the not do it.

You indicated also that you'd take 10 per cent off the income tax, and you deserted that promise. And in return, what you have done is to give to the people of this province a massive deficit of \$839 million.

I think your performance in the management of the economy has been less — almost a disgrace. It has. You have taken this province from the lowest per capita debt, the lowest unemployment

. . . That was the record – every economic indicator – we led all of Canada. And today, we have an economy that is staggering. We have high unemployment. We have massive people on welfare. You don't have any intentions. You don't have any intentions. You can't. So now what you have to do is to find an excuse why you can't, in fact, fulfil your promises which you never really intended. But you want to go again, and deceive the public again, by saying the cupboards were bare. And when you put out your own document, you indicated that there was millions of dollars of liquid assets when you came to office. How do you justify the continuation of your deception of the people of this province?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I've indicated in response, that the . . . I think the . . . We will stack up our approach to the management of the economy, at any time, with the members opposite.

The most interesting thing about the members opposite, and I believe the three members sitting over there will agree with me – basically, will agree with me. You're going back, and you're talking about somehow you lost power, and that we came to power based on, based on deception. Folks, folks, there was no deception. There was no deception involved. There was no deception involved. The reality of what people wanted in 1982 has changed. They wanted change and they're happy to see a government prepared to address the future and address the change.

Now, when I say the members opposite, I'm sure some of you . . . I'm sure the member from Regina Centre has read the, has read the document by Jim Laxer. Okay, and I'm sure the member from Regina Centre supports many of the premises advanced by Jim Laxer, because I think some of the things that he is saying is really internally what you have said many times, perhaps in this Assembly and outside of this Assembly. And the reality of it is this: you people are going to stay over there, if you keep talking, if you keep talking about somehow we were, we were gypped into going into opposition, the people were deceived, and therefore they're in opposition. The reality of what people are saying today is this: that we need new ideas, new concepts, and new directions. But what do we hear from over there? "We were deceived. We should go back to the old days of where it was before."

And I recall when I was a member of this party back, back 10 years ago, so many members of our party were saying the same thing, "let's go back to the good old days; let's go back to the good old days – 1940s, 1930s, '20s." And that's what people, that's what people, that's what people in our party, that's what people in our party were saying 10 years ago. And we shook out of that shell. We've come into new ideas, new concepts, new directions.

And what do we hear from the members opposite? What do we hear from the members opposite? "Let's go back to yesterday." That's what we're hearing, not change, as the member from Regina Centre often talks about – not change. You don't debate the principles that Laxer advanced in that paper. No, you want to go back to yesterday.

And I recall back 10 years ago when I was stomping this country as a Tory, and there wasn't very many of us, and every meeting we went to, what did we have? John Diefenbaker. He was the guest speaker. He was the only guy that could draw a crowd. And by that time, he had ceased to be the prime minister. A fine man he was.

And you're faced with the same situation today. To draw a crowd in your party, you have to bring Tommy Douglas out, to rub your hands and say, "Hey, the days were good back then. "Folks, you can't come to the view . . . You can't come to the view that we're going to solve our problems by going backwards. You can't solve your views by somehow saying that the electorate were deceived. The electorate are never deceived. The electorate knew what they were voting for. We have lived up to the commitments. We have lived up to the commitments in that brochure that you refer to: a housing program, elimination of the gas tax, and so on, and so on.

The reality of what you people have to look at is inward to yourself, to listen to the member from Regina Centre more, to look for new ideas and new concepts within your party. Keep talking about the past, and you'll stay there forever.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, since you won't read any of our documents, I thought you might be interested in some of your own. I wonder if you recognize this document with the white covers. It is the "Saskatchewan Economic Financial Position, July 1983." Mr. Minister, your government was the master of the outrageous statement, believable only because nobody thought you'd make such an outrageous statement if it weren't true, "Do away with 40 cents to gas tax." You never could; there wasn't 40 cents to do away with.

You were going to make Saskatchewan world-class in virtually everything. I don't recall the government promising to make Saskatchewan world-class in the manufacture of submarines, but it's about all you left out. But the most outrageous statement you have made, and that is a very tough competition, but the most outrageous statement you people ever made was the suggestion that you inherited a poor administration, that the former government was guilty of many sins. I would be the first to admit that. We were not guilty of weak administration, Mr. Minister. We left you a well-administered government, which you're in the process of destroying.

Mr. Minister, you said that nothing was left in the Heritage Fund. I wonder if you bothered to read your document. Did you bother to read on page 11 the amount spent out of the Heritage Fund in 1982, which was 2.5 billion? The amount taken in was 2.6. We left you \$100 million. Now, that may be peanuts to the drunken sailors opposite. I know \$100 million passes through your hands in but the flick of an eyelid, Mr. Minister, but it's a significant amount of money to any government that's capable of anything like competent administration. Mr. Minister, you inherited a competently administered government. You will go down in record as a government which destroyed that in three or four years, depending on when you're foolish enough to call an election.

Mr. Minister, I want to comment on something else you said. I assume it is in order for me to comment on; it was in order for him to comment on it, Mr. Chairman. I have difficulty relating it to this bill. It was something . . . You know, he made the comment about James Laxer. I have read the document with a great deal of interest. I am struck by one fact about his comments. They are, by and large, difficult things to implement at the federal level. Many of the suggestions which he makes much, I think, be brought in at the provincial level. And I was struck by the fact that his blueprint for economic recovery had been what we had largely done. I wish time permitted a debate on that subject, because I can tell you, Mr. Minister, what James Laxer has suggested in his paper is by and large what we did at the provincial level. I would be the first to admit that they haven't at the federal level. I think the restraints imposed by the constitution on a federal government make it difficult for a federal government to do effectively. You can do it, but you can't do it effectively.

It can be done effectively at the provincial level. We did it at the provincial level during the '70s, and the proof of the pudding is in the eating. We took this province from a have-not province to a have province. We went from being the poor sister of confederation to an economic strong man. We left his province, Mr. Minister, with an economy of which we were proud, and the public of Saskatchewan were proud. I will admit there were failings of the former government, but they were not failings either in the administration of the government or the management of the economy. When the history books are written about the province of Saskatchewan, those two will stand as our proudest achievements.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, a couple of things I would simply add. I don't want to get into a debate on Laxer, or we'll be here all night, other than to say the Laxer economics, Laxer's comments with regard to the trade union movement and the way you deal with the trade union movement, clearly is an issue that you have to come to grips with as a party. The consumption economics that Laxer referred to, I think you as a party till tend to believe — as your party. The

other point . . . The member refers to the 40 cents, the member refers to keeping your promise in the 40 cents of tax. Now, I wouldn't tend to want to sit down and give the people opposite a lesson in politics.

But here we were in the middle of an election. One of the central issues was elimination of the gas tax advanced by our party that we delivered 12 minutes after taking office. That was an issue. And how did you respond to it? You said, "No, it's not 40 cents; it's 37 cents or it's 39 cents . . . (inaudible interjections) . . ."

Listen. Listen to what I'm saying, and I'll let you guys in on a small piece of politics. You said, "What is it, what is it, what is it?" And you know what you did? Instead of it being an issue for one week, it became an issue for 30 days, and the debate become, "What is it?"

But each day people asked, "What is it?", they said, "Yes, I'm not sure whether it's 39 or 41. But I'll tell you folks, what I do like is the fact that they're going to take it off." And they did that for 30 whole days. And you kept falling into it and falling into it and falling into it. And you're still doing it today.

That's the lesson of the 1982 election that you should be able to write along on your hand and take it from there for next time.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 78 – An Act respecting Crop Insurance

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Would the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The official is Jim Walters. He's the manager of administration division, crop insurance.

This matter was – if I understand, so I can advise the House – was sent to non-controversial bills and referred back to the House because of a typing error that referred to "corporation", the fourth line, and substitute "compensation". It was typing error in the bill. I understand now that was why it was referred back from non-controversial bills back to here.

Mr. Engel: — I understand that the minister has some officials here that he could answer a question about crop insurance – that relate to the changes?

My concern is, Mr. Minister, that with the seriousness of the conditions that exist this spring, and as tough as things are, are you getting a lot of farmers that are writing in? The minister announced that they could defer their premium for one year. Are you getting quite a few calls and quite a few people applying under that? What kind of application is involved, or what do they need to do to qualify?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I wonder, Mr. Chairman, perhaps . . . The Premier is here, and he's far more familiar with the agriculture side than I, and perhaps he will do it.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Will you repeat the question?

Mr. Engel: — Because we've opened up . . . We've originally sent this bill to non-con bills

because of changes that were involved, we felt . . . (inaudible) . . . But because we have the bill back here, I just thought it would be nice to get on record some of the changes that the minister has announced and how they are affecting the program this year.

Could you tell me about how many farmers are applying to not pay their premium and still get insurance coverage this year? You know, there was a special program announced, and we're wondering just how bad it's out there. How many people are in that category?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, approximately 250 to 300 have taken advantage of the new program.

Mr. Engel: — You're charging about 15 per cent interest, I believe, on that. Can you tell me what the potential is? I believe that when crop insurance was before the Crown Corporations Committee, the minister suggested there was about 7 or 800 that were behind one year, and maybe that many more that were two years behind. Is that accumulated . . . ?

When I checked my records when I got out, I didn't know if that's accumulation of about 1,500 farmers in serious arrears, or are those the same 800 that would be behind in their payments that would possibly be what would qualify under that program?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, under the existing legislation, approximately 500 people would have been cancelled this year and about 200 last year, making up the 700. And about 250 to 300 have now been, have insurance because of the new program.

Mr. Engel: — Your minister in charge of crop insurance made quite a little how-do-you-do about how wonderful this thing was. What is that costing the province? Is there a cost factor involved that it's going to be charged to the treasury board because of this program that's in place?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, in discussions with the federal government, they would like to have as many people on this program as possible — crop insurance. As a result, and as you know, they pick up 50 per cent of the premium, and the farmer picks up 50 per cent. So the cost to the provincial government is virtually nothing — administration, which is marginal and it's a fixed cost. So the expenses will be 50 per cent of the premium which is shared by the federal government, and they've encouraged this, because they want everybody on the same kind of program.

Mr. Engel: — I'm concerned that this government that has a lot of programs for wealthy farmers . . . There's a \$25-a-head guaranteed program I can get on cattle. There's a 25 per cent guaranteed loan I can get on setting up a feedlot. There's a lot of programs there if I want to spend some money and if I'm wealthy. If I'm in another category of wealth I can get a \$350,000 loan at 8 per cent or 12 per cent. And some of those programs are costing the treasury some money. They will cost us as much as \$25,000 a farmer on the tax rebate program — \$25,000 you are prepared to give to one farmer on a tax rebate program if he buys some cattle — 1,000 head of cattle — 25,000 bucks that you're going to give that farmer.

And here you have some farmers that are struggling, that need this year with that wind blowing out there, that need that crop insurance. And you tell that farmer to sign a post-dated cheque. You take his premium, you take his arrears, and you add onto that — how much? What would that come . . . If normally my colleague from the Quill Lakes was farming . . . If my colleague from the Quill Lakes were a farmer, besides being a learned gentleman, and he'd have had a premium of \$1,000 on his land at Hudson Bay — \$1,000 premium last year was his premium. He didn't have a crop because it was flooded out. What would that cost him this year to buy insurance? If you calculate your arrears, your 15 per cent interest, would you come up with . . . Say, I used \$1,000 because it's a nice easy number, if he didn't make his payment last year — the payment was due last year before the end of the year, the total costs involved — what are you charging that man so that he can put his crop in this year?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, I could go into all the programs that we've already been through in agriculture. But you raised it, you raised it. All right. Fair enough. I just point out that it's 15 per cent. And in this case, in these cases, it applies for eight months. So in your example it would be about \$100 increase, because it's 15 per cent for eight months.

Mr. Engel: — What about his arrears because his premium wasn't paid last year? There's more than that because you're giving him . . . The \$1,000 was what his premium would have been if he'd paid it last year on time after his payment was due. But you've got to add on to that your interest that the corporation would charge. You've got to add on to that interest itself. I think you're not quite accurate there. The cheque would be \$100 more for the eight months; it would be 150 for the 12. Yes, it would be \$100 for the eight months. But what about the arrears besides?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, in the example the hon. member uses, if the premium was \$1,000, the arrears would be \$120. That's the interest on the premium that was never paid, and that comes to \$1,120 that he would be responsible for. Then the 10 per cent on the \$1,120, or 15 per cent on eight months which is exactly 10 per cent, comes to another \$112. The total would be \$1,232 that the farmer would owe to maintain his crop insurance.

Mr. Engel: — And if that was the lucky guy that was able to pay his the year before . . . If you happened to be one of those guys that was a year behind in arrears and he was struggling whether he could get his crop insurance this year and that too, he'd be looking at about, I figure, \$1,400 for the one year and then \$1,200 for this year. That would be a sizeable contribution to make.

The concern I think we had here is that there are enough people involved in this that are having trouble, yet why you didn't do the same guaranteed program that you have these counsellors doing and involve them in a loan where they could have gotten money at about 10 per cent, instead of the 15.

You argue it's only saving \$100 but, when a farmer is down the line and things are tight like that, that's enough money to clothe his kids for a year in school and have his kids go to school respectable if he's got two kids going to school and buy them each a nice outfit.

I think those kinds of things you don't seem to think about and you don't seem to care about, because you think if there's a person around that's in the farming industry that is, like the minister says, the Minister of Agriculture, that we want to shore-up success. And, my, did you do that; did you do that. You came on loud and clear and with a very large banner. The trouble is the arena we're in and the farmers that see red when they see you coming with these kind of flags. Really they are getting excited, are really getting excited. They have to pick up an expensive way out and they'd pick up on this deal and they know they're paying 15 per cent. And they know that if they've got an uncle or a relative or a friend in the oil business, and they know the kind of deal they got. And I'm not going to take time to elaborate that tonight, but we know what that story is, and they know the kind of deal the doctor and the lawyer get if they want to get into cattle and the tax credits and the advantages. And they know that their doctor friend that's seeing them can make as much as \$25,000 a year . . . (inaudible) . . . And here they're sitting, and they have to pay the top price for the interest, and they have to sign that cheque and put the cheque on the line.

We're actually even breaking the law by making them sign post-dated cheques, because you don't even know if the people are going to live that long. I don't know of any other government that will hold farmers up for ransom and ask them for a post-dated cheque in April and May when the wind is blowing and things are tough and conditions are miserable like they are this spring. It's either too wet in your country or too dry in mine, and things are that tough. And you tell a farmer, "You give me a post-dated cheque, and you put on that cheque 15 per cent over

the premium, and we'll let you have insurance another year."

And anybody else that doesn't need it can get money – can get money with discounts on their . . . If they really are wealthy – and you really get a good set-up – they can even get a discount, and they can get the loan guarantees on their feedlots or whatever they want to do, and they can get \$25,000 tax credit.

I think you really are showing your colours. You really are showing your colours, because you don't believe in the average family-size farm. You believe in those nice commercial little operations where 20 per cent of them could do the farming, and I think it's sad that you brought this bill in here just aggravating us and rubbing more salt on. I think it's a sad day for Saskatchewan to have to talk about crop insurance when we have the wind blowing like it is tonight.

I think it's a sad day because for them, they realize that these people are willing to take the last grain of hope out of farmers. They are willing to kneel them down on the line and say, "Boys, if you want to farm, you give me a post-dated cheque. You give me a cheque for 15 per cent more than what I owe you, and we'll give you some insurance." That's the kind of government they're dealing with.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, let's make it very clear. The previous administration didn't do this. These people would have been out of insurance because we changed the law. Now they can get an insurance policy.

An Hon. Member: — How far behind are they in arrears? How far behind are they in arrears?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — They would have been out automatically.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! The member asked a question. Now allow the premier to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Chairman, we just agreed that under existing legislation, 500 would have been cancelled, and they were this year – 200 last year. And the previous administration set up those laws and administered them.

Now he's whaling away on me and this administration for giving a break to 700 people. Number one, Mr. Chairman, number one, we changed this program to help those people that would not have been helped under the previous administration's program. Number one.

Number two, they charged 1.5 per cent a month. We've just changed that to 1.25 per cent. So we're even charging less interests. So all the things the hon. member is saying about our crop insurance program is twice as good as theirs, because these people wouldn't even have been helped. Number one. And number two, they charged them 18 per cent interest, and we've reduced it.

So let's make that very clear when we look at the programs we're getting into. Now if we want to get into all the other things with respect to agriculture, fair enough. But let's straighten it out.

Mr. Engel: — One short comment, Mr. Chairman. When these people were in government, the interest rate was 22 per cent; the crop insurance was 18 per cent. When you're in government the interest rate's 11 per cent; you charge the farmer 15. Let the farmer be the judge. Let the farmer be the judge. Let the farmer be the judge.

When the interest rate was 22 per cent the farmer paid 18; when the interest rate was 15 per cent . . . when the interest rate's 11 per cent, the farmer pays 15. That's a good deal, isn't it? That's your goofy good deal.

The other thing is this: when these people were in office and things were tough, when these people were in office and things were tough and the fuel was the problem, we had a fuel rebate. We had a fuel rebate program base. I've been begging you for a fuel rebate program. You don't come up with one.

They had purple gas. You took \$65 million . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order! I don't see where that relates to the bill. I would ask the member to stay on the bill.

Mr. Engel: — I'm surprised that the chairman thinks that the expenses involved in input costs of farming do not relate to crop insurance and the ability to pay their crop insurance. He is talking about the 700 people that couldn't pay their crop insurance. Seven hundred people couldn't pay their crop insurance. In the last two years, since you were in government, 700 people can't pay their crop insurance. Now that they want to buy insurance one more year, you're saying pay 15 per cent interest. I think it's awful. When 11 per cent interest the farmers would be getting it at . . . (inaudible) . . . have as good a deal s they had with us. That's all I'm saying.

I think we were . . . From 18 . . . We were at 18 when . . . (inaudible) . . . insurance was 22 . . . was a good 25 per cent discount on the insurance premium. I think that the Premier knows the premium was at 22 per cent. That's why he got elected, because he promised a break on insurance. He promised the farmers \$350,000 at 8 per cent. He's not even willing to give them \$1,000 at 8 per cent.

I think your promises were phoney; your guarantees to help small farmers are as phoney as the wooden nickel. They're as phoney as a wooden nickel. Your commitment to the family farms are phoney. You took away the one little assurance they had; you took away the one little advantage you had on his businessman neighbour, on the plumber. The farmer had an advantage. He hasn't got that any more. He hasn't got that advantage any more. You can talk gas tax all you want, but I can tell you I pay as much for my gas as the plumber does – same price.

When I was a contractor I paid one rate of fuel for my construction business, and I got it for almost half price on my farm. Today I don't do that any more.

Thank you.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. It's very difficult for the chairman to hear when I'm going through the clauses on the bill, if the opposition wants to do this rowdy. I would ask them to be quiet while we're going through the bill clause by clause.

Page 1 agreed to.

Pages 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Page 5

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment to section 16 on page 5. Amend subsection 16(2) of the printed bill by striking out "corporation" in the fourth line and substituting:

compensation.

Page 5 as amended agreed to.

Page 6 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 89 – An Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act

Page 1

Mr. Chairman: — There's a House amendment to amend subsection 4(2) of the printed bill by striking out section (8) in the first line and substituting subsection 28.

Page 1 as amended agreed to.

Pages 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill as amended.

Bill No. 91 – An Act to amend The land Contracts (Actions) Act

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 100 – An Act to amend The Limitations of Civil Rights Act

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

Bill No. 103 – An Act to amend The Coroners Act

Clause 1

Mr. Chairman: — Will the minister introduce his officials?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The official beside me is Ron Hewitt from the Department of Justice.

Mr. Koskie: — I just want to ask the minister . . . I alluded to, in the second speech, the possibility of making an appeal to the general public, and whether that has been done to any large extent, and whether, in fact, you made the appeal rather than going and mandatorily putting into effect the legislation. To some people it's a bit of an affront to have it mandatory that when a person is dead, that the cornea of their eyes can, in fact, be removed, without consent. I have had, Mr. Minister, some correspondence on it, objecting to it.

And really what I ask you is: have you made a personal appeal to the public to provide this type of consent, which is very, very beneficial, as I alluded to this afternoon? But I'd like to ask you whether you have thought of going that route; whether, in fact, that might not work, rather than going the mandatory route.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I listened to your second reading debate this afternoon. There's a couple of things I'd like to clear up at the outset, the onset of the debate here, and I don't think there's really any reason to debate. I think you just have a few questions and I can answer those for you.

First, I should say that this is really . . . This takes place only on a coroner's autopsy, when it's

ordered by a coroner. I'm sure you understand that – not on all autopsies, but when ordered by a coroner.

The second thing, and I think that you're alluding to, about educating and informing the public. Well, I can indicate to you that on three different occasions I, as Minister of health of this province, have appeared with the Lions clubs on television explaining what's happening and so on. As late as last week I officially opened the eye bank in Saskatoon. I suggested to the Lions that certainly there would be an avenue for public education, and one that I think is very, very beneficial.

I suggested that perhaps one of the ophthalmologists from University Hospital, who is a very, very gifted ophthalmologist at the University Hospital, who should perhaps come to the SHA convention, for example, where all the hospitals are gathered, and explain just what takes place in the procedure. And I think that's a very good way of educating the people.

Secondly, the Lions, I know, are contemplating putting together a tape presentation with the ophthalmologists perhaps explaining this. I know from being a Lion myself, and the relationship between the Lions and the hospitals of Saskatchewan . . . I think you all know in your small towns that the Lions clubs have in many cases donated a lot of equipment to the hospitals of Saskatchewan, and there's a very good relationship in most towns between Lions clubs and hospitals. And I'm sure that the Lions clubs are now embarking upon a system of public education in this regard.

So I would think that those avenues, that certainly it would be well understood by the public, and as I must say, as I said at the beginning of our discussion, that it is only upon autopsies ordered by a coroner. And then, of course, as you realize, if that deceased person did not want this to be happening, then they could let a next of kin know, and if the next of kin objected to it, they could certainly stop the procedure.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, I think in your response, Mr. Minister, you sort of confirmed my concern, and that is that you haven't really, in fact, tried a very comprehensive program of embarking on the participation of the public on a voluntary basis. You are saying that, you know, they are going to be embarking . . . You are going to have a representative come to the hospital meetings.

What I would have wished that you had done is to actually have put in a program of informing the public and determining in a factual way whether or not they would, indeed, on a voluntary basis, participate, rather than having a mandatory provision. Those were the essential concerns that we have. I don't think you have, indeed, really and truly embarked on a program which would have brought to the attention of the public the need and the desirability of participation in this. That's my basic concern, and I leave it at that.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'll just say that I know that the Lions have, for the last year and privy to that, have been doing a lot of public education, and I think they've been rather successful. I know that in the recent while that we've had to get corneas from Houston, Texas; that there are people here in Saskatchewan waiting for transplants. I think, with the passing of this act and with the education of the public, we will see many sightless people or people suffering from sight impairment having transplants.

When I said I met with the Lions, and I appeared publicly . . . I saw a young man who couldn't play golf before, a young lawyer, now able to go on with his work out there. If you want to talk to the man that started this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm just telling you a few situations, of what happens . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm just telling you. If you don't want to hear the good parts of this, this is typical of you. You don't want to hear what it does for people in Saskatchewan. I've met with these men. I've stood on platforms with these men; and I know these men, and I know what this will do for the sightless of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Koskie: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I asked, and I presented to the minister, a concern that they are making a mandatory provision here. And I believe that before governments go the mandatory route, forcing people, that they should, in fact, make the maximum effort in getting the voluntary participation of people. And all I am saying is, I'm not convinced that the Minister of health has, in fact, done his homework in respect to getting the co-operation of the public.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Chairman, this is just typical, for the members opposite to get up, and tell the Lions clubs of Saskatchewan, the volunteer people out there in Saskatchewan, that they haven't done a good job. That's all he's saying.

And I want to tell you there's nothing different here. There's nothing different here than what was in The Coroners Act before with the pituitary glands, that the pituitary gland could be taken at the time of an ordered autopsy. This is happening with the cornea.

Now, if you want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that the Lions club are not in felling with the people out there, that they haven't been doing a good job, then you stand in this House and you do so. I won't do that because I believe the Lions do an excellent service to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Koskie: — I didn't refer, Mr. Minister, to the Lions club whatsoever. I referred to your incompetence — and so there is a difference. You are passing legislation, and I think it's incumbent upon you, before you impose a mandatory provision on the public, that you, in fact, provide to this House concrete evidence that you have, in fact, tried to get the co-operation of the public through a voluntary process. That's the purpose of this discussion.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, I think I explained in my first answer what is going to be taking place, what has taken place in the last year. I think there has been a great deal of discussion and there will be more. And, as I say, when you go to the hospital associations, when you go to the Lions club, to the local hospitals in the communities, I don't know what more you can do in the public education.

And I, as a minister, am proud to see volunteer clubs such as the Lions working in concert with our government.

Mrs. Caswell: — Thank you. Mr. Minister of Health, what I'm concerned about is, although I personally would not object to volunteering the cornea of myself if I die, that I'm concerned there are some people who have a concern that making such an act mandatory —and I might add that my concerns are also about the 1979 pituitary mandatory operation; the bill passed in 1979 about the pituitary — that they're afraid that this will be a slippery slope to a growing disrespect for the dead. And they're concerned that making it mandatory may make it very difficult for people who may have objections, for whatever moral or personal reasons, to not exempt themselves . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . not exempt themselves.

I can understand how seriously the NDP took their remarks when they were making them, because they certainly aren't interested in listening to mine.

What I'm asking is: what specific provisions and regulations will there be so that people can exempt themselves from this operation? It says the person performing the autopsy must have no reason to believe that the deceased or his next of kin would object to the extraction, but I can understand in eight hours — this operation must be done within eight hours after death — that there may be a difficulty in finding papers or next of kin who would know whether or not that person had a personal objection.

So I'm requesting that regulations be written, or something be written, that there is a very specific, definite way that people can exempt themselves or their minors, minor children, to this operation, if they so desire.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I think the hon. member's question was if someone objected to having this procedure performed. Certainly, if a person did not want this to happen to them, I think that person would be incumbent to let their next of kin know that this would be their request.

And also there's a provision . . . If a person has passed away and the next of kin do not want that to happen, then all they have to do is indicate that to the hospital or wherever the deceased . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . This is the next of kin, if you were listening. This was the next of kin I was talking about. So therefore, I think there is a provision in there that this can be addressed.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, I have one question that's strictly the . . . I have discussed it with both the Lion's club and the doctor who is involved . . . And I would hope that in the regulations, the honouring of individual faiths which prefer the body not to be touched, no matter what reason, would be honoured.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Certainly, I would express that legitimate concern of yours, hon. member, to the Lions clubs, and I think that could be certainly looked after and transmitted to the hospitals.

Mr. Koskie: — Just in respect to the concern of the hon. member from Rosthern, I don't quite know how the minister intends to be dealing with this. Is he going to convey something in a verbal way, or is he setting it up in the regulations? Or is he going to put it in the legislation? Or is he just going to run around from hospital to hospital and tell them, and if staff changes, or the policy is lost, or different staff is on, how are they going to know? Surely you should have it spelled out – if there's certain particular religious faiths who have that firm belief – that it should be spelled out, that their particular religious belief be honoured.

Can the minister clarify more specifically the concern?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Yes, I will bring this to the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Justice, and I think we can instruct the coroners to certainly . . . As I'd said at the beginning, it's only on an autopsy ordered by a coroner. And I think the concerns that you have, sir, and that you're alluding to, can be handled in that regard.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, to the minister carrying the bill . . . In speaking with a coroner, he said if he was instructed, that would work very well. I thank you for your offer to instruct them.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you very much. I will pass that on to my colleagues.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

The committee reported progress.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 81 – An Act respecting the Protection and Management of Crown lands Critical for the maintenance of Wildlife Populations

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 84 – An Act to amend The heritage Property Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 58 – An Act to amend The Arts Board Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 98 – An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 83 – An Act to provide for the Making of Grants to Certain Senior Citizens to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 86 – An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 78 – An Act respecting Crop Insurance

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I move the amendments be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 89 – An Act too amend The Rural Municipality Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the amendment be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly, I move the bill be now read a

third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 91 – An Act to amend The Land Contracts (Actions) Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 100 – An Act to amend The Limitation of Civil Rights Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

Bill No. 103 – An Act to amend The Coroners Act

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move this bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

NORTHERN AFFAIRS SECRETARIAT

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 48

Item 1

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I have with me, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Peter van Es, who was the deputy minister of northern Saskatchewan, is the permanent head of the new Northern Affairs Secretariat.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, what I would like the minister to do is to basically outline this government's policy in northern Saskatchewan. The minister, I know, has been, and will continue to be, a critic of the previous government's administration and operation in northern Saskatchewan. And I agree when you're carrying out projects in northern Saskatchewan, building houses and roads, you're going to, I suppose, from time to time make mistakes.

And, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it's also true that if you don't do anything in the North you can say that you're not making any mistakes because you're not doing anything.

But what I would like to know from you, Mr. Minister, is what your government's policy is towards economic development in northern Saskatchewan, and an assessment of the strategy that you have, and the development that has occurred in northern Saskatchewan as a result of the strategy and planning that you have done in that area.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Okay. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Regina North is distracting me somewhat.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member's question, you know, in terms of the different direction that we believe is necessary and so on: first of all, I want to outline to the member, and I agree with some of the things that have been said by his colleague from the constituency of Athabasca – the member from the constituency of Athabasca who is my neighbouring constituency to the north, and where the majority of the people of what we'll call the northern administration district live – that member, I believe, is in agreement with the way in which I think the develop of the North should go . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to inflame any debate here. We can do that if you like, but I'm just trying to . . . I'm just saying that there is a difference in philosophy between what the member for Athabasca says and what the member for Cumberland, your two colleagues who represent two northern constituencies.

What I will say to the hon. member from Shaunavon is that certainly there are problems in northern Canada. There are certainly problems in northern Saskatchewan, being a part of that wider area which we can all call in this country, northern Canada. There's a major gap in terms of what I will call a training gap between the skill level that has been achieved by the residents who live there. And I'm referring now to the major problem of unemployment which we all have to acknowledge and must acknowledge. And we all should suggest that it's a serious problem in northern Canada, everywhere from Labrador to the Yukon Territory.

I will say to the hon. member that the approach taken by the former government in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was . . . First of all, the problem was the same. And they recognized that and I recognize it. Their approach to the problem was to develop a large – what I have called many times an all-encompassing department – which was a delivery agency. And the approach was to spend a great deal of money on administration. And that was exactly what it was and I don't think the member will disagree with that – a great deal of money on administration, on the civil service, for the lack of a better word of people moving in there.

And far be it from anyone on that side of the House or anywhere else to suggest that those were northern people advancing their own destiny, because they certainly were not. Many were from the state of New York and from the United States and Berkeley, California, and the province of Manitoba, and all over the place. So those people came from there, and they were to tell northern people how they should operate. There's no question.

So what I'm saying, that all-encompassing approach, that delivery agency, government delivery agency approach in one department, did not work and cannot work. What we have said is that we must realign that department, get that department down, and our delivery of government to the northern people in this province would be through the various departments of government which have their expertise and which have the resources – human resources and civil service resources and so on – to be able to deliver those – economic development in a department like Tourism and Small Business where it rightly belongs, because the people there are orientated toward economic development.

Municipal development and the municipalities act and so on, which have been thrusts of this government, we put under the Department of Urban Affairs, where it rightly should be, because people in Urban Affairs understand that sort of aspect of delivery of government services. We did that all the way across, and we can get into that debate, and it won't matter, because that's the way it is.

The problem that you identify and that has been identified by your colleagues, in terms of chronic unemployment in northern Saskatchewan, certainly is a real problem. There is no question about that. This government has identified that problem as a very serious training gap, and one of the things that we have done, which is a very, very proud effort by us – which is not something that you ever did, and the record will show that very, very clearly – is that we placed great emphasis on the training of young people and the training of northern people. And we

have emphasized that, and our budget funding in the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower will show that clearly – the programs that are in place. For example, the building – you know, the Taj Mahal of La Ronge which is the edifice to the glory of the socialist experiment in the North – is now being used as the headquarters of the northern teacher education program, a good program, rather than the headquarters for bureaucrats from Berkeley, California, and everywhere else. That's a change of direction.

Training of the young people in the North for the jobs of the '80s and the '90s is an important aspect. That's the emphasis we have. We don't think there are any quick-fix methods that you can change this. And by throwing money at problems through administration and so you can stand in this House, and say, we have a \$100 million budget which we're throwing at it (and a great percentage of it was on bureaucrats who . . .) And we can get into a good deal of the record from before, if you like. I'm not sure how relevant it is. But I will say to the member that certainly there is a problem with unemployment in the North. It's a chronic problem across northern Canada. It's no different in northern Saskatchewan. We're trying to address it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, in a long-winded statement, you said about the problem that exists in northern Saskatchewan, and I would agree with you, there is a severe problem. The Premier recognized it earlier today when he talked about the problem that faces the people in the North, and talked about the churches in the province becoming involved in shifting their emphasis away from third world countries, like Africa and Latin America and South America, to northern Saskatchewan. He said there are many people who are poverty-stricken in our province who should have a priority over those in third world countries.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He certainly did say that, Mr. Minister. And I'll say that it's a sad admission when the premier of the province rises in this Assembly and advises the church groups like the SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation) to shift their onus away from the third world countries to places like northern Saskatchewan where people are, in fact, going hungry.

Mr. Minister, I would like you to give me an analysis of the result of your so-called economic strategy for northern Saskatchewan. I would like you to tell this Assembly and this committee: have you in your mind had any success in your strategy, and if, in fact, the unemployment rate has increased or gone down as a result of your programs that you have set in place as an alternative to what was there under the New Democratic years from 1971 to '82?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, first of all, an item that needs to be very clearly laid out here. I must clarify what the member said. The premier today, in discussing another matter today, and talking about SCIC and the matching grants to the third world and so on, at no time suggested that the church groups of Saskatchewan should be responsible for placing their emphasis away from the third world and into northern Saskatchewan. At no time did he suggest that.

What he said . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Listen very carefully now, Mr. Member, because what he said very clearly is, from the . . . because you were asking about the Government of Saskatchewan's spending priorities, and he said very clearly that all were spending priorities as a Government of Saskatchewan. He at no time discouraged the church groups of Saskatchewan and the citizens of Saskatchewan, of whom I'm one, in terms of donating to their own churches and their own denominations for use in other parts of this world where people are hungry, and so on. At no time did he discourage citizens of Saskatchewan from spending that money which has been going to the third world, to put that into the North.

What he said: the Government of Saskatchewan, in its matching grants, the Government of Saskatchewan . . . our spending priorities . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . He did not say. He said our people here in this government, and our spending priority is on education for northern Saskatchewan. He did not say that the people in the church groups should be spending on education in northern Saskatchewan. He clearly said that the government's role is on education.

We accept that, and we have, in fact, increased spending on education and on many departments in the northern part of this province. There's no question about that, and there is more money being spent on education in the northern part of this province now through both – and I say education in the broader context – education and advanced education and manpower, right across there.

An Hon. Member: — It is down.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — It is not down. There is more money being spent on education now, in education and advanced education and manpower now, than there was before.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, I read in your budget on page 12 under Advanced Education and manpower, that in 1983-84 the spending in northern advanced education and manpower was 3.7 million. This year it is 3.2. How can you stand there and say that it's increased when your own budget says that it's down half a million dollars?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Okay. The hon. member will suggest that it is not equal. I will say to the hon. member the money that is being spent by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower indirectly in the training programs in the North, and directly with the agreements that are with mining companies and so on which were not in place before . . . The mining companies have agreements . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no. Just a minute. The mining companies for training on the job and so on have agreements with our Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, and there are people being trained on the job and there is government money going into that. That is our role and we accept that role. We accept that role as a government.

And my colleague, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, has moved very well ahead in those thrusts . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He has not. The NORTEP (northern teacher education program) program which is a good program, which we'll give some credit to your former administration for starting, is now considering a move into other than only teacher education, which was very clearly defined as only teacher education. It is now more than that and will be more than that very soon.

And we have no apology to make for the amount of money that we spend on education in northern Saskatchewan because we must address the training gap that exists there.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, I would ask you, Mr. Minister, if you would care to look at page 12 under Advanced Education and Manpower. You have just told this Assembly and this committee that the spending on advanced education in the North has increased, and the number that I see is 3.7 million in 1983-84, and in 1984-85, 3.2 million. And then, if you would turn to page 30 under Education and northern education, you will see 1.6 million in 1983-84, and 500,000 in '84-85.

Now I would like you to tell me where the money is that you say the increase is. I'd like you to take the budget and show me where the money is.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — If the member will look on page 30, which I believe he's reading from, and reading partially from that, if you look at the asterisk beside the 596,190 and look at the bottom of the page where you're referred to by that asterisk, that star:

A portion of this subvote is included in the subvote Grants to educational agencies, organizations, associations and institutions in 1984-85.

An Hon. Member: — Well, where is that one?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — That's this, that's this . . . And a portion of that is included in educational agencies, organizations. That's all in this budget under those aspects, and I'll tell you the page in a

short time.

But those are all there, and that money is being spent. And I'll tell the member today, and I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, there is not less money being spent on education in the North. There is more money being spent on education. If you take education in its broader context, and you must take it in its broader context, including education, advanced education and manpower, training on the job at the various mining sites – which you guys want to close down – all of those. And you take all that together and there's more money being spent on education than not, than was before.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, you say there is more spent, and I have quoted you the numbers that show that less is spent. I would like you, Mr. Minister, to write down where this money has gone into the other agencies and give it to me, because I simply don't believe you when you say that there is more money being spent on education in the North. I will believe your budget that you have printed here, which shows that less than \$1 million, a \$1 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, yes, you have an asterisk with a little explanation. But where is that money?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, what I will do for the hon. member – and I don't have that bit of page right here – but what I will undertake to do this for the hon. member. I will stand here and tell you that I know that there's more money being spent on education across the board. What I will undertake to do for the member is provide you with a list of the money and where it's spent, and including that aspect with that explanation, because it's an important one, and I will undertake to provide you, after I've got the information from the Department of Education, where this . . . I'm not sure if this question was asked of the Minister of Education at that time, or to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. But rather than to just say to you that you should have asked it there, I will say: I will undertake to pull that information together and I will provide it to the member.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Minister, I would have expected when you were quoting and saying that there was more money being spent, that that statement would have been based on something that you had in your hand that you could have now given to me. But what you're saying is that you made a statement that there is more money being spent. But now you have to go back and find out whether or not you are accurate, otherwise you would have the information here for the committee, and I challenge you to give me that information. Because the numbers you have in your budget would show that there's \$1 million less being spent in education, and your rhetoric about training in northern Saskatchewan is just that.

What I would ask you in my previous question, Mr. Minister, is for a detailed analysis on the success of your programs over the last two and one-half years, and how it has impacted on the unemployment rate. I wonder if you can inform this committee whether or not your programs and strategies have lowered the unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I have said to the hon. member, and I will say to the House: if the unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan is chronic, it was chronic for a long time before. I could read you some books. It was not improving under the NDP. There are no figures anywhere that will show you, or that will show me, or that will show anyone that our unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan is any worse or any better. It's not a record of which we are proud.

So what I was saying to the hon. member is . . . I will say that it's not any better and it's not any worse. It is certainly a chronic problem. Unemployment is a chronic problem in northern Canada, and it remains a problem in northern Saskatchewan. There is no question about that. I'm certain we can agree to agree on that. There's no question about it.

As far as the various policies of economic development, and so on, I know that there were some questions from your colleagues to my colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, and he did talk about economic development thrusts in northern Saskatchewan at that time. That

was the proper place to place those questions.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, I wonder, in the area of welfare pay-out in northern Saskatchewan, whether you would have a breakdown as to how the government welfare rolls in northern Saskatchewan are stacking up. You will know that in the province today there are 64,000 individuals who receive welfare — care-load and dependants. And you will know that when you took over office, 47,000 were on welfare. I wonder if that trend of a drastic increase in welfare is going up at the same rate in the North or is it a phenomenon that is only seen in southern Saskatchewan — and if you have those numbers, I would like you to give them to me.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No. Mr. Chairman, I know the hon. member — and I believe it's the same member that is asking this question — asked that question to the Minister of Social Services at the time when those estimates were being considered. I don't have the exact figures. We can certainly undertake to pull those together as it relates to the particular northern administration district. I will undertake to provide that to the member. I don't have them here.

I think it's important to point out — as I said for Education: I say for Social Services, and other areas — it's very, very wrong for anyone to suggest in this House or anywhere else that government programs for people in need, and so on, are not in place, because they are in place. There's no question that social services payments — and I believe it to be the case, without figures, but I believe it to be the case — that they are going up in northern Saskatchewan. And in some of those cases, it's because rates for some of the categories have, in fact, gone up. But other than that, I would just say to the member that I will undertake to provide the information to him, but I don't have it with me right now.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, I don't think it's good enough for you to stand here in the House and to ridicule the performance and the record of the previous administration. Because I want to go through some of the achievements of building the infrastructure in northern Saskatchewan during the 1971-1982. The job wasn't complete and we admit it. But a significant development did take place.

I want to indicate some of the achievements: more than 1,300 low-income subsidized homes were built in northern Saskatchewan; 14 water and sewer systems were installed or expanded; electricity was provided to 17 communities; 12 new air fields, plus two additional airports constructed; major expansion of community access roads, and upgrading of northern highways; over \$42 million for school construction, including first schools in eight settlements; extension of Sask Tel microwave services, increasing phone access from 24 to 97 per cent of the population, and television access from 15 to 96 per cent; funding for 18 community halls in various communities, and arenas; fire halls and municipal offices and fire trucks; forest fire suppression facilities upgraded, including provision of new aircraft.

Those were some of the basic infrastructure developments that took place in northern Saskatchewan. And so what I'm going to do is to go through some of these items and to see if you can indicate to us how your success has been in developing further the infrastructure of northern Saskatchewan in those two years you have been in government.

I'm going to start off . . . Can you indicate how many new homes, low-income homes, were brought to northern Saskatchewan? I have a good idea how many were built last year. Look at, little minister. And so I ask you, Mr. Minister, in respect to low-income subsidized homes, can you indicate over the course of last year how many were added to northern Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I would say to the member that I don't know how many houses were built. I know that the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, which has responsibility for building houses across this province, builds houses in northern Saskatchewan as well. So you would best direct that question to the minister of Sask Housing.

If you want to go on further, I know that since we've come to office, there have been fire halls built, there have been a continuation of the infrastructure development. There is no question there was a great need for infrastructure development. There's been an increase in fire halls, there's been some other road construction, community halls have been built, there have been rinks built, water and sewer projects carried on. There's no question that all those things have kept on, and there's an infrastructure, and I would ask the hon. member to name for me the communities now . . . Name for me the communities now who do not have the infrastructure in place that he's referring to. Name for me the communities that do not have the infrastructure in place.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, you come here and you indicate that you have a policy for northern Saskatchewan. Now I've asked you, in respect to housing, and all you get up and say, "Well, I think we built some homes." But, Mr. Minister, you are in charge of northern Saskatchewan. What are you in charge of? There was no housing built last year in northern Saskatchewan.

I want to ask you whether . . . In the area of social development, what happened during our administration? Health and medical staff more than tripled; community health worker program implemented in nine communities and was expanding; six dental clinics constructed and Northerners trained as dental assistants; two new community health centres built, Sandy Bay and Pinehouse.

And it goes on: northern teacher training program was established at La Ronge; the northern curricula and teaching materials were developed; three community colleges in the North were established; new training facilities were established at Buffalo Narrows, established active planning for additional facilities; adult training being provided to over 1,300 residents . . . We had a bursary program set up for the development of students attending southern universities; northern corrections program was put in place; northern magistrates now resident in the North and legal aid services available.

Perishable food transportation subsidy was implemented; 16 day care centres were established and 60 day care homes; northern foster care program was developed; the Northern Home Care Program operating in nine communities and expanding in 1982-83 under our administration; and there was funding and training provided for five regional recreational boards.

That's not a perfect record, Mr. Speaker, but there was a building of an infrastructure and certainly there was a development for Northerners in the social field and social development.

And I want to say, Mr. Minister, your government has literally abandoned the North. They have become the lost citizens of this province, and as my colleague has said, the shock that the Premier sent through this here Assembly today when we start talking about increased grants to international aid – and the Premier alludes to the fact that it would be much better if we had the religious organizations start sending their assistance to the Third world which he has established in northern Saskatchewan. That is what is happening under your administration.

I'm going to . . . In respect to technical schools, we had indicated in our last budget in 1982 that we would immediately commence the building of a technical school in Prince Albert. Two years passed – two years – and now you have just commenced the construction of a technical school. We indicated that we were going to put in too a branch technical school in La Ronge. That has been, in fact, cancelled.

So what I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, rather than standing up and generalizing, can you indicate some of the specific economic developments that have taken place under your government; give me a list of the new industrial economic development that has taken place?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, the member talks about their last budget in 1982, when they announced a technical school for Prince Albert, and I can say to the hon. member from Quill Lakes that less than one year after that election where their budget was rejected, we announced and have now under construction, a school in Prince Albert, a technical school in Prince Albert, which is almost double, almost double the size of that which you announced in 1982.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — So don't tell me that there's no commitment to the training gap in northern Saskatchewan, because there is.

Now as far as the hon. member's allegation about economic development, about all the various things, we have said many times it's extremely important that the various delivery agencies of this government will deliver programs in the North as they deliver them in the South, and they will have concern for the unique problems of the North within those various departments where the resources are.

Those questions — many of them were asked of my colleagues in the various departments. If you'll look at the Northern Affairs Secretariat, which estimates we are now looking at, the Northern Affairs Secretariat is in no way intended to be, nor will it ever be, a delivery agency — program delivery agency. We don't deliver programs, so we are not here to be able to tell you how many houses were built under Sask Housing program, because Sask Housing has its program.

We're not here to tell you about the economic development program of my colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. We're not here to tell you about those other programs, but you could have asked those questions in the other departments.

This secretariat is brand-new, as of today. This secretariat is a liaison department. We will be gathering together, and we will be keeping track of the various departments. If you have specific questions about northern issues that you want to ask, I will undertake to gather them from anywhere, and I'll send them back to you.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Mr. Minister, what has happened in northern Saskatchewan should make this government cringe with shame, Mr. Minister, and unfortunately, given the nature of this government, what has happened in northern Saskatchewan was entirely predictable.

On election night, Mr. Minister, I believed for some period of time that I had the highest majority of any New Democratic party member. I found out about 2 in the morning, I didn't. There was one beat me, and he was elected from the riding of Cumberland. He got 80 per cent of the vote, and I asked myself, "What is he going to get next time? 100 per cent, I guess." It was predictable, Mr. Minister, the one area in Saskatchewan where you people have nothing to lose politically was northern Saskatchewan, and by golly, you sure stuck it to them. It didn't take you very long.

When I looked around this province and I thought to myself: where are they going to save some money because they're spending it like drunken sailors? I looked at northern Saskatchewan; I thought to myself, oh, my God — and it happened. Their worst fears were realized, Mr. Minister. They expected the worst from you. They voted in mass New Democrats, and their worst fears have been realized.

Do you know that my colleague, in his nominating convention before this '82 election, had 1,600 people out at his nominating convention out of an electorate of 4,000 people. When the nominating convention was over, as far as they were concerned, the election was over. It's like being a Democrat in Alabama 20 years ago, Mr. Minister. I wonder what they must think now. They must think, by golly, we were right. Because this government has exceeded their worst

fears; it has exceed their worst fears.

The unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan was nothing that we were very proud of. We thought it was . . . There was nothing we were very proud of, Mr. Minister, but you've made it worse. You've dismantled the infrastructure of northern Saskatchewan and you had nothing to replace it with. It was part of the nonsense that you people peddled when you were in opposition. Unfortunately, you believed it because when you got into opposition you implemented a number of the things you said you were going to do.

Mr. Minister, you, Mr. Minister, you have been irresponsible in dealing with the people of northern Saskatchewan. You have been unfair . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the member from Maple Creek has become the great expert on northern Saskatchewan. She's going to tell what it's like in northern Saskatchewan. She thinks that . . . You think that Regina is the wild, far North. Well, I'll tell you it's not. It's a different world. It's a different world, Madam Minister. It's a different world up there and you don't understand it. You didn't understand it when you were in opposition, and you've learned nothing in the five years that have passed since you went into government.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, that's a cute remark. My, that's clever, that's clever. That's clever of the member from Maple Creek. I shall be interested to see the member from Maple Creek take part in this debate from her feet. I shall be interested to see her take part in it from her feet because all she's done is sit and yell from her chair.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Everyone's yelling. No one is on the topic. Can we proceed with the debate?

Mr. Shillington: — I admit I was yelling and I apologize for it, Mr. Minister, because I can't, Mr. Chairman, because I can't make myself heard at any other decibel level. Members opposite are extremely sensitive about northern Saskatchewan and well they should be, well they should be. You had nothing to lose up there. You have destroyed what little they had and have left them with nothing but a reduced rate of welfare. It was the one area of the province where you had nothing to lose politically and you've been crass about it. And it is most unfortunate, it is most unfortunate.

The unemployment rate has gone up. Alcoholism is up. And, Mr. Minister, if you don't believe that, then I suggest you try going to northern Saskatchewan and talking to those people. Because when the member from Athabasca and the member from Cumberland stand here in this House and talk to deaf ears — you are deaf about it — when they stand here and try to talk to you about the conditions in northern Saskatchewan, I tell you, they're telling the truth. It's the great tragedy of our time that this government could care less — this government could care less.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'll tell you who didn't get 80 per cent. It's the member from Regina North. And I'll tell you who's not going to get elected next time. It's the member from Regina North. So I hope you enjoy all the insults you're getting in this legislature, because you're not going to see another one, Mr. Minister. I hope you enjoy it.

Mr. Minister, I just don't know how you square your conscience with what you've done to those people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You haven't. You criticized us endlessly because of the programs we implemented, and the member from Quill Lakes just read off a few of them . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, yes, that's right; that's right. Bureaucracy run amok. The member from Saskatoon South remembers it. He remembers it. That's what you said. You said \$100 million was being wasted. You said programs like the medical health staff that tripled — that was wasted. Community health worker programs implemented — wasted. And an unfortunate number of people from southern Saskatchewan who know nothing more about the North than you do, also believed it.

And when you went into office, unfortunately you did to those people what you said you were going to do. And their lot is a good deal worse now that it has ever been. Their lot now is no worse now than it was in 1971, before the former administration took office. The difference is that during the '70s they had some hope that they were going to join the mainstream of the Canadian society. And what you've done is you've taken that hope away from them. You've taken that hope away from them, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, these estimates for Northern Affairs Secretariat – a paltry \$490,000. I can't think of anybody who's getting less from this government except the Women's Secretariat. And I guess that tells you the priorities of both groups in this government. The people of northern Saskatchewan have gone from having a budget of \$100 million to \$490,000 — \$490,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, misleading the House, misleading the House. Well, you never mislead the House because you never speak from your feet. You're always speaking from your chair, and you can't mislead the House in that fashion, because it's never going to hit *Hansard*.

If the member from Maple Creek is still as all-knowing about northern Saskatchewan as she was when she was opposition and used to criticize us endlessly for trying . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Will the member please stick to the topic – something to do with northern Saskatchewan?

Mr. Shillington: — It is unfortunately difficult for me to stick to the subject of northern Saskatchewan with the member from Maple Creek bellowing at the top of her voice, because I simply cannot make the minister hear me.

Mr. Minister, I don't know what we're going to do with northern Saskatchewan. I suppose we're going to do nothing. And I think, Mr. Minister, you may be right in political terms. Your political judgement may be right . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Oh, for heaven's sakes.

Mr. Chairman: — There's no provision in the rules to applaud the press, so could you get on with the debate?

Mr. Shillington: — Nothing in the rules, Mr. Chairman, and no reason to either.

Mr. Minister, I ask you to respond to the needs which my colleague from Athabasca and my colleague from Cumberland would raise if they were here.

An Hon. Member: — Where are they?

Mr. Shillington: — Where are they? Well, I'd like to know, Mr. Minister, where the ministers are. We have dealt with the estimates and bills, and there have been two ministers dealing with them: the Minister of Supply and Services and the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance purports to deal with agriculture for heaven's sakes. You know about as much about agriculture as I do. If you want to talk about who is absent, we'll talk about who's absent. It's the entire treasury bench that's absent.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Will the member please keep the debate on the northern half of the province?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Chairman, the member from Regina Centre . . . It's very interesting and, as you will know, Mr. Chairman, my home is in Meadow Lake. My constituency includes places like Waterhen Lake Indian reserve and places like that, where people who are Northerners consider themselves Northerners and are very truly Northerners in this province.

Now the members opposite here, the member from Quill Lakes, the member from Shaunavon, and anyone who knows the geography of Saskatchewan – now we are going to get into the

very great experts on northern Saskatchewan: Quill Lakes, Shaunavon, Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and Regina Centre – are going to tell us about northern Saskatchewan.

Now the member from Regina Centre talks about the majority at the election of his colleague from Cumberland. And he mentions how his majority was great and so on and how the people of northern Saskatchewan embraced the New Democratic Party.

The Mistasinihk Place that I told you – the whole committee rooms and the whole activity that went on in terms of electing that member was in Mistasinihk Place. That member from Cumberland was working for DNS at the time and was out selling memberships. And prior to that, prior to his election and nomination in the Cumberland constituency, he was in Athabasca selling memberships against the present member from Athabasca, taking his nomination. So don't tell me about . . . I'll tell you about the North and about the people involved in it, and the people who are involved in the political process in the North, none of that which you know. You know none of that.

Let's take you back a little bit. You said how . . . The member from Quill Lakes and others have suggested here tonight the great satisfaction on the people of the North of the New Democratic Party and the former DNS and all those things. Let me read you a couple of the headlines. Oh, the headline, July 14, 1981, the Prince Albert *Herald*. Here's the headlines: "Unemployment, work skills in the North draw Northerners attack on DNS." Blakeney held up by protesting natives" – P.A. *Herald*, June 27, '81. "Metis Occupy DNS Building in La Ronge," P.A. *Herald*, June 16, 1981. "A lot of favouritism shown in DNS hiring practices," P.A. *Herald*, July 17, 1978. "Blakeney avoids confronting protesters by leaving Buffalo Narrows in a helicopter."

Well, I'll tell you, and I'll give you a little bit of a list here right now. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to give you a little list here right now. All of my colleagues have travelled to the North since the realignment of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to the various line departments, and I'll tell you, there's not one of my colleagues that had to leave one northern community, large or small, by helicopter, to avoid meeting the people of the North. Not one. Not one had to avoid the people of the North when the people of the North came in.

My colleagues going to the North and to the community of Beauval, three ministers have visited there; the community of Buffalo Narrows, five ministers in there in the recent past; Rabbit Lake, Cluff, Rabbit Lakes, Creighton, Cumberland House, Fond-du-Lac, Green lake, ministers visiting. Look at the list, Mr. Chairman. A list of all of our ministers from this government who had the various responsibilities for the various departments. And can you tell me where you've seen a headline that one of our ministers or our Premier or anybody in this government has had to avoid the people on the ground, and get in a helicopter and fly over them because they're afraid of them? Not once. So don't try to tell me, Mr. Member from Regina Centre who hasn't been north of Craik, that you know something about northern Saskatchewan, because you don't.

The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg suggests he knows something about northern Saskatchewan. He went fishing to Canoe Lake once maybe. The member from Shaunavon will suggest he knows something about northern Saskatchewan, and he doesn't. And the member from Quill Lakes, once again this year, tells us he knows something of northern Saskatchewan, and he doesn't. And he talks to us about \$100 million budget. A hundred million dollar budget is being spent in northern Saskatchewan now, but it's being spent by the various departments on programs that make some sense, and not on administration in some big Taj Mahal building. Get a bunch of bureaucrats from Berkley University and the New York stadium, who couldn't even vote in the last bloody election in this province because they weren't citizens working for your government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Thank you. I was just waiting for those guys' lights to go out. Mr. Chairman,

earlier today when I was talking to the Premier . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order! I ask the members on the government side to be quiet so we can hear this debate.

Mr. Engel: — Some of them you might have to throw out to get quiet.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon, when I was talking to the Premier about what the government's role was with the Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation, and why they cut it to \$900,000, he said they did that so they could spend money in northern schools and in northern education, Mr. Minister. They said they cut \$1.2 million from SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation) so you could spend it on northern education.

Well, Mr. Minister, I took time to look up what you're doing for northern education. And if you look at your own estimates on page 12, item 8: northern advanced education and manpower, estimated for '84-85 – 3.265 million this year. What was it last year? 3.7 million – a cut. On page 12, bottom line: a cut of \$265,000 – \$265,000 less for education, so that the Premier could say he took the \$1.2 million from SCIC so he could use it in the North for education, and he spent \$250,000 less in advanced education. Well, you say, that's not fair. You're only talking about advanced education.

Well, let's look at Education. Let's look at Education. You turn to page 30. Turn to page 30 of consolidated fund budgetary estimates, northern education. Northern education, Mr. Minister . . . This year your estimate is that you're going to spend \$596,000 – \$596,000. But what does it say in the estimate for last year? \$1,663 million; a cut of 1.1 million. So you cut \$1.1 million from education; you cut another \$500,000 from advanced education, which gives you \$1.7 million spent less on Education, so that you could cut the SCIC budget. That's what you . . .

And then what does the Premier say? What does the Premier say? He says: we cut that from SCIC. We cut that from Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation so that the churches could get involved and the churches could support our own third world, our own problem in northern Saskatchewan. Well, you're not doing it in the budget and you're not doing it for matching grants in the third world around the world. I think it's a deplorable record you have.

Mr. Minister, your expenditures in the North are deplorable – cutting that much in education alone from your last year's estimates. I think it's tremendous. I think it's tremendous where your priorities are. And yet you have the \$300 million. Yes, you got your \$300 million for your oil companies from those two cuts – one from education; one from SCIC. I think it's a deplorable record.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the members before when we talked about education, and I want to make it very clear to members opposite that the line, the demarcation line is not as thick in the wall, is not as high as it was. So you take a case of education, and he's pointing it out. And I'm informed by the Minister of Education that . . . I'm informed by the Minister of Education that all the NORTEP grants in education – NORTEP, northern teacher education program – and the third party . . . And plus 5 per cent of . . . NORTEP plus 5 per cent, and they put that into third-party grants, third-party grants across the whole piece in education.

So what I'm saying to you, and I look at other things and you mention . . . And several of your colleagues have talked about the North strictly with the idea that there's that line and that's it. And I'll tell you about communities like Prince Albert and Meadow Lake, where there are regional centres for government agencies, whether it be education or social services or what it is.

And many areas that were once in the northern administration district – they still remain in the

northern administration district, but were once administered out of La Ronge or Buffalo Narrows – strictly within that administration district because of the all-encompassing nature of DNS, are now being administered from offices in Prince Albert for some of their areas where it's more convenient to operate out of Prince Albert, and in fact, it's more efficient. And anybody in the civil service will tell you that.

And for Meadow Lake and people in Green Lake and people in Beauval will thank this government for being able to go to Meadow Lake and deal with the same place where they shop, than to go across to La Ronge where the road system in the North . . . For members who have not been there and don't understand it, the road system of northern Saskatchewan on what we call the "west side" is a north and south system as it should be, and there is no east and west road system – very limited east-west road system. La Ronge is not a traditional trading centre for anyone on west side North in the northern part of this province. Meadow Lake is. Prince Albert is. La Ronge is, for a certain area up into the North-east. Buffalo Narrows is for some areas in the North-west. Those are the communities that are now the service centres.

So when you go across that line into Prince Albert and to Meadow Lake and some of those areas, you'll see that money that goes into some of those districts is not strictly designated as northern. And it may be very difficult for you to agree that the demarcation line should be reduced in importance, but that's a policy statement of this government. We've made it many times and it will continue to be the case.

As far as the suggestion by your colleague and by yourself, I believe, that the infrastructure has been taken apart, and so on . . . It certainly hasn't. The water and sewer and system . . . That is . . .

And it also should be on the record and should be very clear, that when we took over the administration of government, there was a plan in place by the former administration that they called decanting – decanting of the department of northern Saskatchewan, which taken apart . . . I don't know whether the word "decanting" means . . . In the wine industry, I know it means let the dregs fall to the bottom. I don't know if that was what your plan was, or what, but it certainly wasn't the sort of terminology we wanted to use. We use "realignment." It's the same process. I suppose you could say we accelerated the process that was under way and changed its direction to some degree, which I think was better for the program.

So with that . . . But it should be clear that DNS was not there for the total time even under your administration. And the stated policy of DNS, when it came into being, was that for a period of time, put the infrastructure in place. To some extent that happened, and when it did happen, decanting was in place. We said let's accelerate the process and get out of that bad experience.

Mr. Engel: — Today your boss told this House that they'd cut \$1.2 million from Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation, SCIC, because they're using the money to be spent in the North for northern education. I suggested that from the budgetary estimates, that 265 or \$500,000 was, very close to \$500,000 was taken out of the consolidated fund on page 12. I suggest another million-one was taken out of northern education, which to me is one million-seven, and there was only 1.2 million in . . . (inaudible) . . . And I'm trying to establish from you why he would consider this an increase in spending in northern education when it's in fact \$1.7 million less.

And I think that's the point I'm making. The numbers show it. They're plain. The numbers show, and they're plain and they're marked, and they said even that:

The 1984-85 subvote structure of the vote Advanced Education and Manpower has been altered to reflect certain changes in organization. The estimates have been reallocated on a comparative basis to the subvote . . .

So that adjustments have been made. The adjustments have been made so you can get a

comparative figure. And it's a reduction of almost \$500,000 on the first page, on page 12, and it's an additional reduction of \$1.16 million on the second page. That is a cut in spending for education in the North, which he considered was a valid argument to move money out of SCIC. I would like you to comment on that, or should we call the Premier in here to apologize for deceiving the House – again?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — No. Mr. Chairman, the member was, I believe, here discussing with somebody when I was explaining the Education estimates and costs to your colleagues. And I did explain it to some extent to you as well. It's important to note that a good deal of the education dollars which are, in fact, spent in northern Saskatchewan – grants to third parties, for example, which are in a different category in the estimates in education – but a good number of those go into northern Saskatchewan. So you can't say that they're not spent there.

Under the old regime and the way the system was before, the demarcation line was clear and anything North of that, whether it be a grant to a third party, whether it be the NORTEP program, whether it be – whatever it was, it was all in that one, all-encompassing budget.

That's not the case now, but if you want us to pull that together – and, in fact, I undertook to do that for your colleague – I'll pull together, as near as is possible, the dollars in Advanced Education and Manpower; the training programs which our Department of Advanced Ed and Manpower has entered into with the mining companies and so on, on the ground in the North; and the education . . . In other words, education in its broadest context, which we should talk about when we talk about northern education. I'll pull those together, and I'll undertake to provide them to the member. I've already given that undertaking to your colleague, and you will have those.

What I'm saying to you here is that there's more money being spent on education, education-related expenditure, in northern Saskatchewan now, than there was before. It's important that you know that, and that's the case.

Mr. Engel: — I want you, when you're preparing that, to make the comparative comparisons with what was spent in the previous year, because the estimates don't determine that. And don't add in all your southern administration and all the money that's spent for students that are coming down through whatever. Because he indicated that we're providing a service to northern Saskatchewan, and I believe that it was an excuse to avoid that you are not performing up to par. Your government is not performing. I think the allegations that have been made by my colleagues are fair allegations.

From my vantage point, I can see what's happening in half of our province. It's depressing for somebody from southern Saskatchewan to see a beautiful part of Saskatchewan having that attitude towards those people that live up there, and treat them to such an extent where your leader will say the churches should get in and deal with them like they do a third world country. I think that is a deplorable attitude: to abdicate the responsibility that you had to those people that make up half of this province and life in half of this province – the best half, as far as I'm concerned. I envy people living in northern Saskatchewan. I like a lot of water around, particularly this year. I think it's great to see the amount of water you have, the natural resources you have.

And give those people a chance to pick themselves up by their bootstraps like they were doing. Don't put 95 per cent unemployment as a norm. Don't accept that as a fact of life. Don't expect us to believe you're doing a good job when you're doing that, Mr. Minister, because it's horrible; it's lousy. It is something you should be ashamed of. The Ombudsman should take you guys to task, and you should be forced to resign. You should be forced to resign for doing this. In fact, in some countries of the world, you'd be given lashes. That's what you deserve for that kind of treatment of your fellow man.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, the hon. member tempts me once again, but I will resist it.

The hon. member talks about what the Premier said today, and I've been through that, as well, today. Now, it is not true, it is simply not the case, that the Premier said that the church groups should divert their money to northern Saskatchewan. That's simply not true.

And if the hon. member comes to this House, as he does on several occasions . . . He did not tell the church groups to divert their money to the North. He said that the matching money and the programs, our spending priorities, one of them being northern education, and we talk about our spending priorities as a government and will divert our money. But he at no time suggested that the church people of this province should divert their money — their donated money to the various denominations — to northern Saskatchewan. That is an absolute misrepresentation of the facts.

The hon. member comes in here on many occasions and purports to speak on behalf of the various Christian denominations or church denominations in this province. And he knows full well that he's misrepresenting what the Premier said today, and he shouldn't do that, if on one hand you're going to represent the churches on one hand, and then say that the Premier of this province said what you suggest he said, because he did not say that.

Now, he did say in discussing the SCIC grants and the level of those grants in the estimates — which is the right place to do that, and you had the right to ask that question, and you did — he did say in his discussing those estimates that the spending priorities of this government did not allow for an increase in those. And I'm not sure of the numbers that were involved in that, and I don't deal with those estimates. That doesn't matter, but he . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, that's fine. He said that the spending priorities of this government — and every government has to have spending priorities — one of our spending priorities is education in northern Saskatchewan; education across the province.

The hon. member says his spending priority would be to spend more and more money into the third world. I say that the programs undertaken by SCIC are reasonable programs, but it's just a matter to what degree you spend your money on. To what degree do you spend your money on that, as it compares to other things in the spending priorities of government, and developing a budget? So it's important it's clarified.

Mr. Engel: — It is a shame. It is a shame that this minister tries to slur and create those kind of impressions, because the only thing you've got to hide behind is because we won't see that *Hansard* record in time before this House adjourns. We won't see that record. But you wait till you read it, because I challenge you . . . I challenge you to send it to your friends in the church groups. I challenge you to send out that message that your Premier did — because I will. I will. And I'll send the record out that shows that he said that the money should be spent in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order! I've allowed a lot of debate on what the Premier might have said this afternoon, and it's the view of the Chair that what he said, he said, and it will be recorded, and anyone can make whatever use they wish of it. However, it would be repetition for the two members here, yourself and the minister, to repeat arguments over whether or not he said it or not when we don't know what's in *Hansard* until tomorrow. So whatever is said has been said, and I think the points have been made, and this topic is now becoming repetitive.

Mr. Engel: — Okay, Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat the argument. All I'm saying is that as far as priorities are concerned, to leave the impression that your priorities are for northern Saskatchewan are false. There is no priority by this government to bring the level of the people in northern Saskatchewan up to our level. There is no priority there. There's no program there. You could be in government for 200 years, and they won't catch up with the programs you've got there. They're not going to catch up with those kind of priorities. They're not going to catch up.

And for your Premier to refer to that area as a third-world type country, that is sad news. But that's at least truthful. That's one time he was truthful, because he was admitting his defeat in this whole situation.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, obviously the hon. member talks about the programs and speculates about what the future will hold for the North under our administration for 200 years. We have not suggested to anyone that we'll be in power for 200 years. But when we are in power for one-tenth of that, at the end of 20 years, you'll see that many, many changes have taken place — and we'll still be here.

Mr. Engel: — The minister still is getting up and distorting the facts. I said he could be in power for 200 years, and the way, at the rate he's going, he wouldn't catch up. I'm suggesting that. And I've said it today about 10 times, and this is repetitive, Mr. Minister, but he's hard of hearing: that in two years time he's not going to be here, because at the rate they're going there's nobody on that side that's going to be a repeat of history. History repeats itself, and these Tories are going to find out what people think of them in Saskatchewan.

I didn't believe Tory times were going to be that tough. I was too small to remember. I was too small to remember last time they were in, but the people that tell me how tough they are were very accurate in their description, because they're describing the kind of situation we have today, when you cut from the poor to give to the rich, when you design programs that should be effective for the small farmer and you make them effective for the big farmer. The whole situation in the North is serious. It's serious, Mr. Speaker, and all this minister does it try to distort the facts and distort the impression that is left, and try and make us say things we don't say. That's all this minister knows. He likes to grope around in the muck.

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I want to, for the record, put forward a summary of the position that we take in this caucus. And we could go on arguing with the minister that he's doing a wonderful job in northern Saskatchewan. That's what he's saying: things are better; things are going well; great amounts are being spent on education; more money is being spent in the North.

And if one looks at the last two years under the Progressive Conservative government, we'll see that it's crystal clear from the budget that the funds and the services for Northerners are once again being cut sharply; advanced education and northern advanced education cut both in staff and funds; northern education in the *Estimates* cut in both staff and funds; northern health services, page 42, cut in staff; Parks and Renewable Resources, page 61 of the budget, northern field services cut in both staff and funds; Tourism and Small Business, page 86 in the *Estimates*, northern economic development cut back very sharply, from 2.1 million to 1.6 million; Tourism, on page 87, grants for northern economic development cut back to a fraction of last year, from 1.4 million to only 200,000; Urban Affairs, page 89, northern municipal services cut back from 2.1 million to 1.69 million.

These are your figures. This represents what you indicate is added expenditure to the North. And I want to say that over the past two years of the Tory mismanagement of the economy, the Tory abandonment of the North, the facts show how the situation in the North has deteriorated. Social assistance case-load has increased by 50 per cent, far more rapidly than it had increased in the past, or in the South. Unemployment has increased by a third. Northern communities now have 75 or 85 or 95 per cent unemployment.

I think, quite simply, Mr. Minister, your government has really no economic strategy for the North.

As I said, there are cut-backs in northern economic development grants; cut-back in the northern training funds; cut-back and cancellation in capital projects such as highway and health services training facilities. There's an abandonment of the hiring quotas at Key Lake to give the

Northerners an opportunity to work.

The consequence for the Northerners, I want to say, Mr. Minister, have been indeed tragic. There's a decreasing economic activity. There are no jobs for the young people, just despair. Family breakdown and family violence is on the increase, instead of social and community development. And crime is on the rise.

Your priorities are clear, Mr. Minister, your government's priorities. You found no problem within two or three months, of finding a tax holiday, a royalty for the oil companies which has netted them somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$350 million. You are able to find and develop the largest cabinet this province has ever seen. You have increased – 57 per cent increase in the budgeted funds for cabinet ministers. But what you have done is abandon the North.

And I think you can stand up here, but you can come forward with no economic plan. You talk idly about a great tourism that is going to develop in the North. You talk about training, but you have no economic development going on.

And I think the record is abundantly clear, Mr. Minister, that what this government has done is to abandon that segment of society which least can afford to be abandoned. It has been said that a society and the degree of the civilization of a society is measured by what we do for the least fortunate of our citizens. And I think it's not uncommon, because the right-wing philosophical approach that you take is that you have debts to pay and those are the ones which have promoted your success in the election, and those debts will be paid first. And that's to the oil companies, to the banks, to the wealthy. That's who you're promoting.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, you might smile and take this lightly, but there's 25,000 people in desperate straits in northern Saskatchewan. There are families without hope, young people destroying themselves with liquor and drugs and no future. And I'll tell you, it's happening in southern Saskatchewan, but not to the magnitude that it is in the North.

And I think, Mr. Minister, that your government has failed. I think, clearly, the evidence before us is one of total failure.

I guess what I wanted to ask, in concluding those remarks, is if you could perhaps outline what in fact this agency is going to do. You have a very, very small amount of money, you have abandoned the North and the Northerners, so perhaps you could outline what's the intention of having the secretariat.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member from Quill Lakes gives a long litany, and so on, and I guess the best thing I could say at this stage is that I do deny what you're saying. I say to the hon. member from Quill Lakes that I disagree with your approach to northern affairs and to . . . I disagree with your approach. You obviously disagree with our approach to northern Saskatchewan. Many people in northern Saskatchewan, whom I know personally for a long time, long before I was ever in politics, disagreed with your approach, continue to disagree with your approach.

What more can I say, except to say that there's no question that all of us on this side of the House disagree with your approach on many things as it relates to social issues and others. And we will continue to disagree, as will the people of Saskatchewan continue to disagree with you. And we'll be here and you'll be there.

So I don't know what else I can say, except to say that, Mr. Chairman, that the member has outlined – and I think at the beginning of his remarks he said that he wants to on the record, and that's fair and that's good that he put it on the record because it's high right to do so – put on the record in terms of the feeling of his caucus and the ideas of the New Democratic Party regarding northern development, the approach to government administration in the North, etc. And that's

fine. He's put that on the record, and I would just leave it at that and say that I disagree with their approach and will continue to do so.

Mr. Koskie: — I don't want to continue much longer in respect to this. But in respect to the Northern Affairs Secretariat, I asked you if you'd outline what, in fact, you intend to have it do.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Okay. I did outline that to your colleague from Shaunavon in the first question, but I'll give it just briefly now.

The secretariat will be, and . . . There is a need, certainly, and you've identified that before. There is a need for certain unique northern issues; for a focus within the government for northern people or residents of remote communities — have a focus to which they can turn, as it relates to government issues and so on, whether it's all of the various departments that deliver the programs. And we believe that those departments should deliver the programs.

So what our secretariat will do, will be and will act as that focus for northern people. It will have the powers to set advisory councils — those kinds of things — of northern people who are very close to the issues, close to the problems. And you and I will agree that there are problems. There's no question that there are serious problems of unemployment and other things. And you mentioned some of the other ones that can be a result of unemployment. There's no question, how alcoholism and some of those things certainly are a result of unemployment, and many statistics show that, not only in northern Canada, but anywhere where unemployment is a chronic problem.

So the secretariat will be the focus for northern people. It will be the focus for northern issues. It will take issues to the various agencies of government, and including private sector firms or the agency of government, perhaps the Department of Tourism and Small Business as it relates to development in the various communities. Those are the kinds of things we'll do.

We'll have northern people involved in the advisory councils that can be appointed from time to time to address particular issues over a particular period of time or even some ongoing councils. So those are the kinds of things we do. We're a liaison agency and we are looking forward, with a small staff, to be able to pull a good deal of the data together.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Minister, the Northern Affairs Secretariat has approximately seven people, and I was wondering if you could indicate to us whether any of the people . . . How many of those seven that form the Northern Affairs Secretariat, how many of them are from northern Saskatchewan, if indeed any of them. In fact, if you could send over the names and the positions and the salaries of each of the seven that form the total number of employees in the Northern Affairs Secretariat . . .

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — The seven people that are provided for in the budget. There are seven people on; there are two vacancies. One, two, three people . . . One is from Prince Albert, which is further north than many of the members in this House are from. Two are from La Ronge. The deputy is not from northern Saskatchewan. So three of the people are from northern Saskatchewan of the seven.

Mr. Koskie: — Could you send me over the names of each of the employees? You say you have five, you've got two vacancies; so send the names, the positions, and the salaries of each of them.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll send that over to the member.

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 48 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Ordinary Expenditure

Mr. Chairman: — There are no ordinary expenditures for this year. Do any members have questions on the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, ordinary expenditure?

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN SASKATCHEWAN

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 26

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 26 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

ENVIRONMENT

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 9

Item 10

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment, as much for the record as anything? We will not be making any extended comments and probably none at all on all these other estimates. That should not be interpreted in any sense as an approval of this administration. It's just that we think we've said it on the main estimates. There's little point in saying it again. So we will not be saying anything. But that does not indicate approval of anything you've done.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We acknowledge that.

Item 10 agreed to.

Vote 9 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

TOURISM AND SMALL BUSINESS

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 45

Item 13 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

SASKATCHEWAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Vote 148

Item 1 – Statutory.

Vote 148 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

TOURISM AND SMALL BUSINESS

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 45

Vote 45 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

URBAN AFFAIRS

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 24

Item 25 agreed to.

Vote 24 agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FUND LOANS, ADVANCES AND INVESTMENTS

SASKATCHEWAN POWER CORPORATION

Vote 152

Item 1 – Statutory

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Minister, I would like to direct a question to the minister in charge of Sask Power.

An Hon. Member: — We've only been at this for 11 hours straight. No stamina.

Mr. Engel: — I can understand that after 11 hours of continual sitting . . . (inaudible) . . .

When you discuss Sask Power's borrowing and money requirements and needs, the concern that I'm raising, for my riding particularly, in what your long-term plans are regarding the coal mine. I think when we discussed it in question period you made your colleagues quite happy by suggesting that this company, that this company that's getting involved that you set up as a subsidiary, the Poplar River mining company or whatever it's called . . . I don't remember what the name of it was exactly, but I believe it is called the Poplar River mining company. And I'm wondering: have you gone any further on subdividing and making arrangements so you have that little coal mine operation in a neat, little package separated from Sask Power? Is that operating under that new company with the new drag-line?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, we still haven't . . . As far as the drag-line is concerned, that is still . . . The companies are registered. It's in place. We haven't gone to the point of getting that company operating yet. We're waiting for the decision whether we are going to privatize the coal mines. We've got bids in from six different companies that are interested in that work. It's a big evaluation job and, if we can't save any money by going that route, we'll continue to do the coal mining ourselves. But no decision has been made as yet.

Mr. Engel: — What direction is SPC planning on taking there? When you got bids to do the

mining, were you planning on setting up this little company and then leasing that company or selling that company with its mining operation? Was that the idea of originally setting up a separate company?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, no, it was to do with the drag-line itself. But the people that . . . If we went into the private sector coal mining, they would be purchasing the drag-line from us. But we had to set up this mining corporation. And I'm not an income tax expert or anything like that, but it was something to do with depreciation with the drag-line having to get started now under Sask Power, and then it got turned over to the other companies. But it was just a matter for depreciation purposes at the time. But right at the moment, there's no different. We haven't decided what we're going to do there.

Mr. Engel: — With only a year and a half or so left in your mandate, do you feel it's important to make that decision and jeopardize the next government? I think the concern, the concern and . . . What I want to issue or what I want to press on the minister is that there is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, no, I can't really say I would do that many, but I do think you have twice too many ministers. I do believe that there are twice too many ministers, because if a handful of members in opposition can keep track of 25 ministers and 12 legislative secretaries, plus all the Crown corporations, I'm sure we could run them too.

The minister from Swift Current and from Indian Head-Wolseley are seeming to smile their approval and agree with me. But, Mr. Minister, what I want to share with you, what I want to share with you from the coal miners, that live both in Coronach and the Rockglen area, is that those people are very concerned in who they are going to work for. They have established a tradition, and Sask Power has been a very good employer. Sask Power has treated those people fairly.

I go down and visit the mine site and the shop, and you've likely been there. You've likely seen when you come in the door on the east wall is a little sign there that has a number of there with accident-free days. Mr. Minister, that is a record in North America. That is a record that Sask Power has developed and has built on that tradition that we started with them over the number of many years that this was part of the company.

And Sask Power has a situation in place where they train their workers as ambulance drivers and paramedics and first-aid people. And they are so safety conscious that they're doing an excellent job. Their concern: that if they get privatized and taken over by a private mine, the same thing will happen as mines right across Canada and the United States, where coal mining is one of the most dangerous industries and where the accident rate is really high, compared to the private one. And this is what the workers are sharing with me. We're not going to get the same kind of benefits and job security as we have with Sask Power, but we're also not going to get the same kind of protection — the health and safety standards that you've set up in your corporation and that have been set up for you, are second to none — are second to none. And I want to emphasize that.

So when you're considering on selling that, I want to remind you that our party has passed a resolution that we are going to expropriate for \$1 whatever you sell it for. So I want you to assure the buys that that is still in place . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That threat and that blackmail is still in place. That is still in place. And the people of Saskatchewan are waiting. We are trying to do everything in our power to jeopardize your ability to sell that coal mine, and we hope you heed some good advice because you are now over the hill. You're gone over the hill and we're down, we're moving into an election time very quickly, very quickly, and I want to tell the minister to be very careful because you're treading on very thin ice. You're treading on very thin ice, and I think your friends will be very disappointed in you if you make a deal with them and they know it's going to cost them heavily. It's going to cost them heavily.

All I want to say as far as this estimate is concerned, and where you're increasing your borrowing again and borrowing still more money, that if it's necessary to put in your gas and try and implement your promises I guess you'll have to do it. But I think that don't jeopardize your mining operation. The people of Saskatchewan are going to be using electricity for a long time. They own the mine. They own the equipment. Keep it that way. Keep it that way. It's not going to improve if you give it to a private concern. And the only disadvantaged are going to be the people that are the people that are working there. The 90 or 100 people that are working there are very happy.

I'd like you to comment on that, and then I have one more series of questions on the maintenance down there.

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Chairman, as minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power, I'm responsible for the corporation for the people of Saskatchewan. And the only reason that we went out to get some bids from the private sector companies was to see that, in fact, that they mine coal cheaper than the Saskatchewan Power Corporation could. If they can, and it's going to have to be substantial, it's not going to be even or a few pennies lower. It's going to have to make it worthwhile for us to make that change.

When we have the debt that we have in Saskatchewan Power, we have to look at every angle to help bring down the cost of the operation to keep the utility bills down. And you've been attacking us for months on that. And you've been creating a false impression for the public in Saskatchewan as to what power rates actually are.

Because there was a freeze in '82, we went half way through '83 without any increase. Then we got an interim 15 per cent and a 13 per cent on gas, and you're telling everybody that was 28 per cent all across Saskatchewan, adding 15 and 13, which is garbage.

Then we had a freeze in '84 on natural gas. When you take it all across the board, we have had about a 7 per cent increases in power rates and about 4 on gas. So we're looking at every angle to reduce those costs. If we can do it by substantial savings in coal mining, we will certainly look at that.

I'm just as concerned and I'm happy about the record of the employees of Sask Power and what they're doing also.

And I've been in touch with the union. I've talked with Bob Sproule. I've had him up in my office, plus representatives from the miners down there, to discuss this. And we are going to be keeping in touch with them and keeping them informed as we go along because we don't want their jobs jeopardized. We've even guaranteed that no one will lose their jobs if it, in fact, takes place.

But as of today we haven't got the evaluation done. It's a massive program, and we, as of today, I have no idea how it's going to pan out. It could, in fact, mean that we won't make any changes at all.

Mr. Engel: — That would be the smartest thing you could do — is to stay with the status quo on this one — because I don't have that great a degree of confidence in the political hacks you've put at the head of departments and the head of a Crown corporation. I would feel much, much more comfortable if you would have argued with the people that are pulling the strings and calling the shots in your party, and you would have said, "I'm getting paid \$75,000 a year; I'll handle Sask Power myself. I'll stay as president."

If you would have done that, I'd have had confidence that you'd have picked the right thing, and you wouldn't even call tenders on that coal mine. You would have said, "They're doing a good job, and we can compare with what other companies are paying to get their coal. And look at what these guys are doing it for, and look at the equipment we've got. We're not going to give

this away.” You would have said that. I wish you’d stand up as minister in charge and still assure the people that you’re going to do that. That’s one aspect of it. Please don’t change that.

What you have changed and what concerns me greatly is bringing in that company called Pro Maintenance Ltd. I think that’s a disgrace to Sask Power, Mr. Minister. Here we have a situation where a company from Manitoba or Ontario or someplace – it’s not a Saskatchewan-based company from what they tell me – come and moved into Coronach. They came into Coronach, and they brought in some – I don’t want to call them fly-by-nighters, but they’re not permanent workers; they’re not permanent workers – they brought in a crew of guys that live in a construction-type thing who got some empty and vacant houses around the area where Sask Power’s permanent staff and maintenance people were on doing the job. They guys came in. They’re using Sask Power’s equipment, Sask Power’s shop, Sask Power’s tools to do the maintenance, and they’re doing a two-bit job in the maintenance.

Your own people have to go back and follow up and correct the maintenance work these guys are getting paid dearly for. And if you think that’s a good deal, Mr. Minister, if that’s how you run your company when you were in charge of Morris cultivators, that’s why I’m out in the field fixing half the time because that’s not a good way to maintain a shop and I would to get even with you a little bit because I wish I had bought a Friggstad cultivator. I’ll say that publicly. I bought a Morris 65 cultivator . . .

An Hon. Member: — I bought a Friggstad.

Mr. Engel: — And he’s got a Friggstad. I fix and he doesn’t.

But anyhow, that is not very practical, Mr. Minister. You’re not very practical when you brought in your friends to do the Pro Maintenance Ltd. Who is Pro Maintenance Ltd.? Who owns the company? Who are the shareholders? How much did they pay you to get the job to do the maintenance there?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don’t investigate the shareholders of all the various companies that we give tenders to. As I said before, we are trying to save pennies for Sask Power to bring down the \$1.2 billion debt that you left us with when we took over which was supposed to be . . . when you keep talking about \$800 million in the province, there’s 1.2 billion in Sask Power by itself.

We’re trying to save pennies, and if we can save pennies by giving a bid to a contractor that can do the job at a lesser amount but still do it according to the specs that the Sask Power people come with, I suppose that’s what we’re going to do. We’ve done it in Estevan but, first of all there’s got to be savings. If there isn’t savings, we won’t make any changes. It’s as simple as that.

And if you want to start talking about Morris Rod-Weeder. I ran John Deere equipment on the farm and I had to fix it too. But when you can start with 23 employees in 1960 and go up to 800 in 20 years, then the company must have done something right or it wouldn’t have been there. I’ve got no . . . I don’t know the shareholders of the companies, and I can assure you that they didn’t pay us or Sask Power or the PC Party any money to get the contract.

Mr. Engel: — I’m pleased to hear that. I’m sorry for taking the little dig on the cultivator. I just got word that my man broke a piece on it again. But anyhow, I would like to have that stricken from the record if I could. I suppose I shouldn’t be comparing cultivators here in public.

But that has nothing to do with a company called pro Maintenance Ltd. And are you in fact saving money? How many people did you lay off at Coronach so that you could put Pro Maintenance in? Could you provide that information to me: what the permanent staff was that were doing the maintenance down there? How many you laid off to bring in the contract? And what the contract is for for Pro Maintenance Ltd.? I’m sorry I missed those estimates in Sask

Power's Crown corporation estimates.

But if you could give me those figures in writing, that's basically what I'm interested in. Because the people at Coronach that I've talked to are complaining desperately that Pro Maintenance Ltd., as a company, isn't doing a good job. They're not doing excellent work in the maintenance like you say they are. If you're saving pennies on it, I think you shouldn't have hired them, because the guys that were doing the job were doing a good job. Okay?

Hon. Mr. McLaren: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have those figures, but I'll get them for you and drop you a line.

Mr. Chairman: — Any more questions on Sask Power?

Vote 152 – Statutory.

Motions for Supply

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I would move, number one resolution:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, the sum of \$44,719,830 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: —

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, the sum of \$58,971,000 be granted out of Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I move that:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$572,153,230 be granted out of the Saskatchewan Heritage Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: —

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1985, the sum of \$22,500,000 be granted out of the Special Projects Fund.

Resolution agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolutions be now read a first time.

The said resolutions were reported and read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move that the resolutions be now read a second time and agreed to.

By leave of the Assembly, the said resolutions were read a second time and agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That Bill No. 104, An Act to grant to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending respectively on March 31, 1984, and March 31, 1985, be now introduced and read for a first time.

Motion agreed to and bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, prior to asking for leave to move this bill for a second and third reading, I would simply like to make a few comments to the Assembly.

I would begin by, I think, acknowledging all members of the Assembly for the contribution that they have made to our province and to the democratic process over the last 65-odd days that we have sat in the Assembly. Too often, I think, we do battle like war in this Assembly. Tempers flare at times. I think we should bear in mind, and recognize and keep in mind, that we all are representing the people of Saskatchewan, that we all have made sacrifices — be that from our business, be that from our families, be that from our social lives that we all forego — to sit here and represent the people of Saskatchewan.

And I think in the closing of the session that we should perhaps pause a moment and recognize that particular fact as to who we are. I believe it's important that we all leave here with a sense that we came, we did what we were elected to do, we all represent the people of Saskatchewan, and I think it's important that we recognize that.

From this side of the House, I would certainly like to congratulate all of our members, 55-odd members, that sit in this Assembly. I believe that what we have seen in the, now the third session that we have sat as a government, I think we have seen significant improvement by all the members of the Assembly. Certainly, the contribution made by many of the members that came into this session for the first time — and there was a great many of them — be they in the back bench, be they Legislative Secretaries, be their chairmen of committees, be they cabinet ministers — I think we all grow as we become part of this place for perhaps a little bit longer than the first year we're here, or the second year, or the third year.

By and large, as a government, we are, I would say, satisfied with the programs that we have brought forward in this Assembly this session. While many of them perhaps are related to the budget, I think what we are seeing more and more in legislatures across the country is that you cannot address the questions that we face, we cannot address the questions that all governments face, simply by passing laws and creating new regulations. What we do is package together what our spending estimates are going to be for the year, the new thrusts that we intend to take.

And I believe that the direction that you saw in this session, s to the direction our government purports to take, and perhaps more than anything else, perhaps more than anything else, what could describe that move, I think, Mr. Speaker, is this: is that we believe that the people out there think, the people out there believe, that the ways of the past – be they the Government of Alberta, be they the former government of Saskatchewan, be they the Government of Ottawa – the policies that we have pursued in the past, and certainly all of them with a degree of sincerity, are not working with the problems, the dilemmas, and the realities of the 1980s.

And what people demand of all governments, Mr. Speaker, is that we change; that we look for new ways; we look for new opportunities and new directions. And we believe that we, as a government in Saskatchewan, have done that job as well as any government across this country.

The new incentives that we have brought in this year with regard to small business . . . I think many of them are very innovative. And those policies, for a large degree, came from a collection of this caucus – and a collection of this caucus, Mr. Speaker, going out and talking to the people of this province and asking the people of this province what they saw s the things that we should do and the areas of change that we should take.

We have moved, as well, with regard to the Crown corporations, not in a dramatic and Draconian or philosophical way, in the sense of saying either you have Crown corporations owning everything or that you turn around and sell all the Crown corporations to the private sector. You must find balances, Mr. Speaker, and you must find new ways of doing things – be that a joint venture with the private sector; be that allowing the people of Saskatchewan to participate in the Crown corporations by way of a guaranteed investment like the Saskatchewan Power bond or a participating bond like Saskoil.

We, like many other provinces across this country, Mr. Speaker, but I think in a more meaningful way, have come up and dealt with the question of welfare reform. Welfare reform is an easy one, and the members opposite will be critical of us in the sense of cutting back on benefits, particularly benefits to single employable people. The reality out there, Mr. Speaker, is that people think and people believe that there needs to be changes; that we can no longer rely on the concepts and the principles of the 1970s. And while we sit and see millions and billions of dollars in this country, be it in welfare payments, be it in unemployment insurance payments – and those are all important; they're the important safety nets that we live with, and it's imperative that we preserve those safety nets – but it's also imperative that we challenge that system, Mr. Speaker.

In the area of local government commission, nobody has all the answers to the financial problems of local government, be it construction of hospitals, the construction of nursing homes, the building of schools, whatever it might be. Those have to be dealt with by a broader base than simply 64 elected people sitting in this Assembly. We must reach out and involve the people that run the school boards, and the people that work in hospitals, the people that deal with the hospital boards, the local governments, be it rural or urban. We must reach out and ask for their advice, Mr. Speaker. And that's the direction that we take.

With regard to the fundamentals of, the fundamentals of what government is, we in this Assembly, we in this government, have devoted more dollars – almost one-third of our budget – to health care. We stand firmly and squarely behind the health care system. But we didn't build, Mr. Speaker, that this . . . The people of this province has built over the last 40 and 50 years. We did not tear that system down, Mr. Speaker, we made it stronger.

And our commitment to agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the largest commitment ever in the province of Saskatchewan to the farmers of this province.

In this session, Mr. Speaker, we believe that much was accomplished. And perhaps I can leave on

a political note. Perhaps, perhaps before we return, Mr. Speaker . . . Perhaps before we return, Mr. Speaker, there will be a federal election intervening before this House reassembles back in the fall.

And I simply say to the people of Saskatchewan, I say to the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, the next test, the next test as to what the people of this province believe, what they believe of our government and what they believe of our party, is going to be reflected in the polls, of what people are saying and how people vote in the next federal election. It's not always that way. It's not totally that way, Mr. Speaker, but by and large, it is.

And I say going into that federal election, Mr. Speaker, there will be more Progressive Conservative members elected to the parliament of Canada from the province of Saskatchewan than any other party. They will increase over last year. And that will be the test, Mr. Speaker, that will be the test of the Government of Saskatchewan as well, to that degree.

I would simply say in closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish all of the members of the Assembly a great summer. I trust that we will reconvene in the fall to deal with a new session of the legislature, to deal with a new budget, to deal with a new program.

I would wish all the members, both on this side and that side of the House, that you have a very good summer. And, by and large, Mr. Speaker, I wish them all that good summer, and I'm sure that we leave as friends, and as we leave as elected officials, Mr. Speaker, committed to the job of trying to do what we can for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to have a chance to say a few words on the appropriation bill which we are debating at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way, in some ways, in the 64-day session which we are quickly bringing to a close. We will all remember that evening in the glitter of the TV lights when the Minister of Finance rose in his place with his budget to bring in what he would have had us believe to be a fair and equitable budget. But, Mr. Speaker, what has happened over the last 64 days of sitting in this Assembly has proven that this government is not a fair and equitable government when it comes to dealing with people, when it comes to dealing with job creation and employment. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have found is something quite different.

If we look at the record of the government to date, after only two short years, the record of this government, Mr. Speaker, has to be questioned. And I say that, because when we look at the number of people who are unemployed in the province at the present time; when we look at 39,000 people unemployed; many of them being under the age of 25 . . . In fact, during the estimates of the Advanced and Continuing Education Department, the minister admitted that the unemployment rate among that group under 25 was, in fact, 18.4 per cent. And not only 18.4 per cent, Mr. Speaker, but a paper that he released to the opposition at that time, predicted that that number would go to 20 per cent in the next couple of years.

And I say that a government that would accept that kind of unemployment among the youth of this province is a government that does not understand what is needed to create employment and what is needed to create a dream for the young people who will form the province over the coming years. I say that having 64,000 people on welfare, Mr. Speaker, at a time when other areas of the country are coming out of a recession . . . If you look at the job creation in other provinces, you will find the record much greater in number in other provinces. In fact, in Saskatchewan, we now are number seven in the job creation program across Canada.

And I think not only is it a disaster to have 64,000 people on welfare in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but to have a government that talks about welfare reform when, in

fact, what they are doing is cutting back on families, on handicapped people, which we have brought out in this session, leaves people wondering whether this government really deserves the confidence and the trust of the people of the province.

In the area of agriculture, I want to congratulate, in particular at this time, my colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, for not only taking on the government on their agricultural programs and criticize the policies that have been brought forward where tax incentives, where people will be able to have loopholes to avoid paying provincial taxes as a meaningful solution to the agricultural problems.

What I find it amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that this government, in two short years, has got so out of touch with what the reality is in agriculture in Saskatchewan. In talking to people, the first thing that comes to their mind when they talk about what their problem is in farming today would be the cost-price squeeze in the low prices of their commodity. What this government seems to think is that the farmer who's struggling out there to buy his seed and fertilizer and chemical this spring, they seem to think that what they want is a tax reduction in their income tax.

Well I find that hard to believe, because most of the farmer who are struggling against what this government is doing are not paying income tax. And they need the kind of program that was outlined by my friend and colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg: a fuel rebate program and some assistance to haul their feed from northern Saskatchewan or Manitoba or wherever, to help feed their cattle. And, Mr. Speaker, they need the kind of programs that would assist in getting the seed into the ground.

As well, we have before us a bill which I'm sure we will not be allowed to deal with, a bill which would allow for a moratorium on debt for farmers for 18 months, which was introduced by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

In the area of social programs, Mr. Speaker, I think the contrast is here between what this government is doing for those who have, and what it is not doing for those who are on the bottom rungs of the ladder in the economic scale in our province.

We have programs which have been introduced in previous budgets and continued in this one, which will allow for hundreds of millions of dollars to go to the oil companies of this province and oil companies from other areas of Canada and the United States. And this at the same time, Mr. Speaker, as people who are handicapped and on welfare are seeing their payments cut by 20, 30, and as much as 40 per cent in the province of Saskatchewan.

I say that when you have a government that takes that kind of an approach, then many people in the province will question whether it will be able to carry on and will have the trust of those elected at the last election.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look close – not at what programs are being announced by this government in terms of employment creation, in terms of programs to help people; not to listen to the rhetoric – but to look at what is really happening, to look at the fact that unemployment is at record levels, to look at the fact that education is in difficult times, to look at the farm economy and find that we have not had such a serious situation since the 1968-69-70 period.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for everyone in the province to remember – and the Minister of Finance mentions the federal election – I think everyone should remember that it is imperative upon them to realize that when you elect a Conservative, a right-wing government, they are going to do right-wing things.

The trend and the historic fact of electing right-wing governments, whether it's Bennett in B.C. or Ronald Reagan in the United States or Sterling Lyon in Manitoba, is that they are going to do

those kinds of things that will benefit those who are rich and wealthy at the expense of those who are less advantaged and have a difficult time in dealing with those who are and would take from them in terms of monetary and other areas.

And I say in closing, that this session has proven that this government is continuing down a path that I believe will be rejected soundly by the people of the province at the first opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and bill read a second and third time.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Assembly move to page 12 of today's blues for the motions for returns. What I will propose to do is go through the returns with various amendments. I will advance the amendments. We can proceed through them in order by number, and I will proceed that way as opposed to the chronological order as they are seen in the blues if that's acceptable; one, two, three, you know, through that way.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Return No. 1

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Lingenfelter that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 1 showing:

With respect to each aircraft operated by the executive air transport service of the central vehicle agency of the Department of Supply and Services for the period May 8, 1982 to December 7, 1983: (1) the total number of trips made by each aircraft; (2) the starting point, stopping points and destination for each aircraft on each trip; (3) names of each passenger on each trip on each aircraft; and (4) costs charged to any Saskatchewan government department, board, agency, commission, or corporation for each passenger on each trip on each aircraft.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — With regard to motion no. 1:

That the motion for return no. 1 be amended be striking out the words, "May 8, 1982", and substituting:

March 18, 1983.

In addition: exclude "stopping point" in subsection (2); exclude names in subsection (3); and delete subsection (4). Therefore, the motion will read:

With respect to each aircraft operated by executive air transport service of the central vehicle agency, Department of Supply and Services for the period March 18, 1983, to December 7, 1983: (1) the total number of trips made by executive air service; (2) the starting and destination points of each trip; and (3) the number of passengers on each flight.

I so move, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing here is a continuation of the government, which it has done on other occasions, in avoiding the release of the information that is needed by the opposition and, I believe, wanted by the public, in terms of trying to find out what the government is spending on various items when they are travelling out of province.

And I do not intend to spend a lot of time on this point, because we have made it very clearly on several occasions.

But I want to point out to the minister that this is not satisfactory, and this issue is not going to go away, because what we are dealing with here is the public's money being spent, in many cases in large amounts, on ministers travelling out of province, and in this case executive aircraft being used. And I think it's important that the people of the province would want to know this, and I cannot understand why this government would want to hide it, and why it would be in the best interests of the public not to have this information released.

Amendment agreed on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 25

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Shillington that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 25 showing:

With respect to renovations undertaken to a suite of offices situated in Regina at 1871 Smith Street and occupied by the deputy minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs: (1) the nature and extent of renovations undertaken in 1983; (2) the cost of each aspect of the renovations and the total cost of renovations undertaken in 1983; (3) whether or not a water purifier was installed in the suite of offices referred to above; and (4) if a water purifier was installed, the cost and supplier of the same; (5) if a water purifier was installed whether or not it was acquired through a call for tenders.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with regard to motion no. 25, page 9, item no. 11, I move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That the motion no. 25 be amended by striking the words out in subsection (2) "the cost of each aspect of renovation", and therefore the motion will read:

With respect to renovations undertaken in a suite of offices situated in Regina at 1871 Smith Street and occupied by the deputy minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs: (1) the nature and extent of the renovations undertaken in 1983; (2) the total costs of renovations undertaken in 1983; (3) whether or not a water purifier was installed in the suite of offices referred to above; (4) if a water purifier was installed, the costs and the supplier of the same; and (5) if a water purifier was installed, whether or not it was acquired through a call for tender.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Return No. 32

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 32 showing:

- (1) The total cost to the Government of Saskatchewan of the Agriculture Outlook Conference held in Saskatoon on February 7 and 8, 1983, and particulars of: (a) the cost of rental of facilities; (b) the cost of meals, lunches and banquets provided; (c) the cost of entertainment at the banquet on February 7, 1983; (d) the cost of

receptions; (e) the cost of expenses and fees for each speaker at the conference; (f) other expenses. (2) The amount paid to or on behalf of each person who received or benefited from the payment of expenses by the Government of Saskatchewan or any of its agencies or Crown corporations for attendance at the conference.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, if we could now move to return no. 32, page 12, item no. 1. I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That the notice of motion for return no. 32 be amended by striking out all of the words following “February 7 and 8, 1983” and that the following be substituted:

The total cost of each of the following . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I believe that we have a bit of a procedural problem here in that the resolution that you’re dealing with now, or the return, has not been moved at this point and would need a mover first before it can be dealt with to amend it.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder, with leave of the Assembly, if we could agree to the opposition House Leader moving motions 1 through 75 in one motion.

Mr. Speaker: — The member has asked for leave. Is that agreed? Proceed.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would move that orders of the Assembly do issue for returns 1 through 75 showing.

Mr. Speaker: — I think we’re going to have to deal with them one at a time from here. All right, proceed.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We will do that until I get to my next theory, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the item no. 1, return no. 32, page 12:

That notice of motion for return no. 32 be amended by striking out all the words following “February 7 and 8, 1983” and that the following be substituted:

That the cost of each of the following: (a) the speaker’s fees and expenses; (b) the catering expenses; (c) miscellaneous expenses; and (2) the total amount paid to and on behalf of those persons benefiting from the payment of expenses by the Government of Saskatchewan, its agencies and its Crown corporations in attendance at the conference.

I would so move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, if we could now revert back to page 10, item no. 12, motion for return no. 33.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Return No. 33

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Blakeney that an order of the Assembly do issue for return 33 showing:

With respect to air fares paid by the Department of the Executive Council for persons who, during the period May 8, 1982 to December 8, 1983, flew on commercial airlines: (1) the total dollar amount paid for air fares; (2) the names of each person for whom an air fare was paid; (3) the destination of the flight which each person took for which an air fare was paid; and (4) the total dollar amount paid in respect of each person for whom each air fare was paid.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I would move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake, that return no. 33 be amended to read:

With respect to air fare paid by the Department of Executive Council during the period April 13, 1983 to December 8, 1983: (1) the total dollars amount paid for employees' air fare; (2) the name of each employee for whom an air fare was paid; and (3) the total dollars amount paid in respect of each employee for whom air fare was paid.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, again with leave of the Assembly, in the interest of time, we have amendments for returns no. 61, 62 through 75, 79 through 86, and 94 through 99. Now I'll take that again for you: return no. 61, return no. 62 through 75 inclusive, returns no. 79 through 86 inclusive, and returns 94 through 99 inclusive.

The amendment that I propose to make will, in all cases, be the same, Mr. Speaker, other than the number of the return. Now would the House wish that I move each of those amendments or could I move them in a block?

Mr. Speaker: — Does the member have leave of the House to move them in a block? Proceed.

Return No. 61

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 61 showing:

Regards the period March 25, 1983 to December 12, 1983: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Premier of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trips, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following (a) air fares; (b) hotels; (c) meals; (d) taxis; (e) gifts; (f) gratuities; (g) entertainment; (h) expenses; (i) miscellaneous.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I will read the amendment to the House. We'll deal with motion no. 61 first so that you get the format of it.

That motion no. 61 be amended as follows: by deleting all words after "trip" in subsection (3).

The way the return would then read would be as follows:

Regarding the period March 25, 1983, to December 12, 1983: the number of

out-of-province trips made by the Premier of Saskatchewan (and this will be for each minister); (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person that accompanied him at government expense (so anybody that was with him at government expense); and (3) in each case, the total cost of the trip.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the Minister of Finance send me the amendment that you have moved, please.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

Returns No. 62 – 75, 79 – 86, 94 – 99

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — With the indulgence of the Assembly, would the Assembly agree to each of the other ones that I advanced out being voted in a block, as opposed to one?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

Motions as amended agreed to on division.

Return No. 76

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 76 showing:

For the period of May 8, 1982 to March 22, 1984, the total amount paid to the firm of Dome Advertising Ltd. By each department, board, commission, Crown corporation, and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; and the nature and cost of services rendered in respect of each of the following: (1) advertising placement; (2) creative services; (3) market research; (4) opinion polls; (5) promotions; (6) public relations; (7) media relations.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Okay, with regards to motion for return no. 76, I'm not sure what page it is. No, return no. 76. Okay.

That a motion for return no. 76 be amended by substituting:

February 29, 1984

For "March 22, 1984: and be deleting all words after "Saskatchewan". Therefore the motion will read:

For the period May 8, 1982 to February 29, 1984, the total amount paid to the firm of Dome Advertising Ltd. By each department, board, commission, Crown corporation, and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

Return No. 77

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 77 showing:

For the period of May 8, 1982 to March 22, 1984, the total amount paid to the firm of Roberts and Poole Advertising Corporation by each department, board, commission,

Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; and the nature and cost of services rendered in respect of each of the following: (1) advertising placement; (2) creative services; (3) market research; (4) opinion polls; (5) promotions; (6) public relations; (7) media relations.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake, that a motion for the return no. 77 be amended by substituting:

February 29, 1984

For “March 22, 1982”; and by deleting all words after “Saskatchewan.” Therefore the motion will read:

For the period May 8, 1982 to February 29, 1984, the total amount paid to the firm of Roberts and Poole Advertising Corporation by each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 78

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 78 showing:

With respect to each aircraft operated by the executive air transport service of the central vehicle agency of the Department of Supply and Services for the period December 8, 1983 to March 22, 1984: (1) the total number of trips made by each aircraft; (2) the starting point, stopping points and destination for each aircraft on each trip; (3) the names of each passenger on each trip on each aircraft; and (4) the costs charged to any Saskatchewan government department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency for each passenger on each trip on each aircraft.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with regard to motion for return no. 78, I move, seconded by the member from Meadow Lake:

That the motion for return no. 78 be amended by excluding “stopping points” in subsection (2); excluding “names” in subsection (3); and deleting subsection (4). Therefore the motion will read:

With respect to each aircraft operated by executive air transportation service of the central vehicle agency of the Department of Supply and Services for the period December 8, 1983 to March 22, 1984: (1) the total number of trips made by executive air service; (2) the starting and destination point of each trip; (3) the number of passengers on each trip.

I so move, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

Return No. 87

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 87 showing:

Regarding the period March 19, 1983 to March 22, 1984 with respect to the use of

law firms: (1) the name of each law firm that has received remuneration from any department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan; (2) the amount received by each firm; (3) the name of each department, board, commission, Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan for which said services were rendered; (4) the nature of the legal services rendered in each of the above stated cases.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake:

That a motion for return no. 87 be amended as follows: by deleting subsection (4).

Moved by myself, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 88 – 93

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the next ones, which is motion for return no. 88, 89, 90, 91, 92 and 93, is all a same amendment, and I could move them as a block, if the House would accept that, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Do the sample on 88.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That a motion for return no. 88 be amended as follows: by deleting subsection (2).

An Hon. Member: — The sample was 87 – 87 was the sample.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The same amendment proposed, Mr. Speaker, for 88, 89, 90, 91, 92 and 93.

Amendments agreed to on division.

Motions as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, if we go to page 8 now of the blues.

Return No. 2

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No. 7, order for return no. 2 showing: I will propose that be ordered.

Mr. Speaker: — Return no. 3 ordered.

Return No. 3

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Return no. 3 ordered.

Mr. Speaker: — Return no. 3 ordered.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Return No. 55

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 55 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Education; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms, and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I would move now to page 12, order for return no. 55, Mr. Speaker. I would move that we call a question on that, Mr. Speaker, and encourage all members to vote in the negative.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Speaker, given the hour of the day, I don't intend to carry on very long. But I think it is an outrage that the government would suggest that this information is not in the public interest to disclose. There can be no conceivable basis for refusing to give us this information. The only basis for refusing it can be that it's not in the best interest of the Conservative Party. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is contrary to what they said when they were in office, out of office, and it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the government opposite has chosen to disclose virtually nothing under these particular paragraphs.

Mr. Koskie: — Yes. I'd like to make a comment in respect to this. And I want all to know the nature of the order that we are moving for here. First of all, it says:

To move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 55 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Education; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms, and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

I am absolutely shocked that we ask for information in respect to written contracts, this government has decided totally that any information that would expose the extravagance of these personal service contracts is not going to be disclosed to the public. There can be only one possible conclusion, is that they are paying an exorbitant amount. They have a lot of political hacks hired on personal services contracts, and what they're doing is running their political machine within and on the taxpayers' money.

There can be no other explanation why that information wouldn't be provided to the opposition. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious what we have been saying, that this is a government that has been spending more money more loosely than any government in Canada for people at the political trough. And here is another example of them secretly wanting to retain that information for themselves, and saying that it's not in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan to know how they're, in fact, spending their money. I think it's a disgrace that the Minister of Finance would stand in this House and refuse to give that nature of information.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I read this particular order for return no. 55, it makes me wonder who they are really trying to cover up for. Down in my country we have a person driving around in a little red car that is foreign to Gravelbourg, with a foreign . . . for a different . . .

not a Gravelbourg licence plate on it – back and forth. He has time to run his motel business. He has time to be seen around, and we see him driving back and forth to Regina on a regular basis.

And here we have the brother-in-law of the Premier in a car, in an office next to his hotel at the court-house, and we wonder what kind of duties he's really performing for the Minister of Education. Is he giving you some advice on the French language? Does he have the experience and qualifications to do the job?

The word around Gravelbourg is that the first year he only got 64 or \$65,000. Now maybe his wages are higher than that. Maybe his wages are higher than that.

Why can't you tell us, why can't you tell us what this information is? Why do you have to defeat this motion? I think you can try and get everything done, and group them and lump them and join them together, and wait till the dying hours of a day that we've spent here – 12 hours already. And now you want to pass this kind of a motion and say, we're going to defeat it. You don't need to bother answering those questions.

Well, the people of Gravelbourg know what you're doing here. They have ideas. And there's a moccasin telegraph that has a way of getting these numbers out in the country. Do you want the right numbers out there? Or do you want it out there with the imagination of somebody else might be? We don't know. We don't know what he's getting.

We don't know what he's getting, but we want you to tell us what all the people that get more than \$1,000 a month on contract, and we want you to lay it out before the people of Saskatchewan. Be an open government like you said you would. Don't be a sleazy, corrupt group of people like you are.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, in response to the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I believe the minister has already spoken on this one. I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg refers to one individual that they're looking for contract information on. If the member would refer to return no. 118, which we will arrive at, which we have not arrived at, on page 19, 118, and they ask specifically for the information regarding one Mr. Rene Archambault employed and where he's employed, and each interest, and we'll get to that motion as well. And that motion will be ordered, and he'll have all of the information.

So for you to stand here and suggest that we are unwilling to give you the information on Rene Archambault of Gravelbourg is absolutely false.

Motion negated on the following recorded division.

Yeas – 4

Engel
Lingenfelter

Koskie

Shillington

Nays – 21

Muller
McLeod
Andrew

Smith (Swift Current)
Baker
Duncan

Hodgins
Rybchuk
Hampton

Taylor
Katzman
McLaren
Garner

Currie
Young
Bacon
Sutor

Gerich
Schmidt
Tusa
Zazelenchuk

Return No. 56

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 56 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Justice and the Attorney General; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, with regard to item no. 56, return no. 56, I would ask the Assembly to negative that motion.

Motion negated on division.

Return No. 57

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 57 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Continuing Education and Advanced Education and Manpower; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Return no. 57 – I would ask the House to negative.

Motion negated on division.

Return No. 58

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 58 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more or with the Department of Industry and Commerce and Economic Development and Trade; (2) the date on which each written contraction was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No. 58, I would ask the Assembly to negative.

Motion negated on division.

Return No. 59

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 59 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the experience and qualifications of each person retained under contract; (5) the duties of each person under contract; and (6) a copy of each written contract.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No. 57 I would ask the House to negative.

An Hon. Member: — 79.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — 79. Sorry, Mr. Speaker, no. 59.

Motion negated on division.

Return No. 60

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 60 showing:

- (1) The name of each person whose services were retained after May 1, 1982 under a written contract under which such person was paid or entitled to be paid an amount of \$1,000 per month or more by or with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan; (2) the date on which each written contract was entered into; (3) the amount, terms and conditions of remuneration for each contract; (4) the duties of each person retained under contract; and (5) a copy of each written contract.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — On return no. 60 I would ask the Assembly to negative.

Motion negated.

Return No. 100

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — On item no. 100, page 14, I would ask the Assembly to vote in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker: — 100 ordered.

Returns No. 101 – 124; 126

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I would like to order perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of time, order no. 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118 (for the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126.

Return No. 125

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 125 showing:

For the period May 8, 1982 to March 22, 1984: (1) the name of each permanent public service employee, as defined by section 1 of The Public Service Act, who has

been dismissed by the Government of Saskatchewan; and (2) who of the above have appealed their dismissal to The Public Service Commission as provided for under sections 37 and 38 of The Public Service Act and in each case, the result of the appeal and the cost, nature, and terms of the severance.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — No. 125, I would ask the Assembly to negative.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out again to the Assembly what the government and the Minister of Finance is asking us to vote against. And I read:

For the period May 8, 1982 to March 22, 1984: (1) the name of each permanent public service employee as defined by section 2 of The Public Service Act, who has been dismissed by the Government of Saskatchewan; and (2) who of the above have appealed their dismissal to The Public Service Commission as provided under sections 37 and 38 of The Public Service Act, and in each case the result of the appeal, and the cost, nature, and terms of severance.

Mr. Speaker, I think the reason for asking this question and putting it on the order paper is obvious: that the taxpayers have every right to know how many people have been fired, how many people have appealed and won their appeals, and here I refer only in the context of showing it as an example. It would be my understanding that someone like the person who worked at the nursing home of the riding of the Minister of health would come through this area. And there are many others who would show up here, and I cannot understand why the government is hiding. And they would say that there are only a few of them; and if that's the case, then why are you hiding it? If there are great numbers, then I think the public would want to know, and the amounts of money that was spent. I can't understand why you're doing it.

Mr. Shillington: — I knew the member from Maple Creek would welcome my comments. I knew she'd welcome my comments. I just want to point out to members of the Assembly who do not sit on public accounts that this information was refused to us in public accounts as well. We could not get this information. No pretence that that was done in the best interests of the public, just done in the best interests of the governing party. Obviously they're ashamed of this, as well they should be. The treatment of the public service by this government is one of the darker chapters in a book full of a fair number of them. It isn't going to be available to us. That's regrettable, and I would urge all members to vote in favour of this.

Motion negated on division.

Return No. 127

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — 127 ordered.

Mr. Speaker: — 127 ordered.

Return No. 128

Mr. Lingenfelter moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 128 showing:

A copy of a report entitled *Recommended Strategy for the Delivery and Utilization of Informatics Services* prepared for the Government of Saskatchewan informatics rationalization study steering committee by E.C. Kehayas, J.M. Agnew, and B. Corbishley of Thorne, Stevenson and Kellogg, management consultants.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — And the last one is item no. 75 on page 31 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 75.

An Hon. Member: — No. 128. Return to 128.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — And I would ask the Assembly to negative that. That is an internal study that is still under way with the Government of Saskatchewan. No position has been taken on it. I'm sure no one expects internal studies, prior to a decision to be taken, to be made public. That has never been done before.

Motion negated on division.

MOTIONS

House Adjournment

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, with leave of the Assembly . . . Could I have leave of the Assembly to move a motion? Prior to it, I would just like to, on behalf of the government, to wish all members of the opposition, all members of our caucus, and the members of the media, a good summer, a prosperous summer, and we will look forward to seeing you all back here in our trenches in the fall of this year.

And with that, seconded by the member for Meadow Lake, I would ask leave of the Assembly:

That when this Assembly adjourned at the end of this sitting day, it shall stand adjourned to a date and time set by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government, and that Mr. Speaker shall give each member seven clear days notice, if possible, by registered mail, of such date and time.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would just join with the Minister of Finance in wishing all members of the Assembly and the press an enjoyable summer and a well-deserved short rest. And I'm sure everyone will have many things to do in the constituency. And I hope that everyone will have an enjoyable evening tonight and get plenty of sleep, and be rested to drive home tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 10:12 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following bills:

Bill No. 58 – An Act to amend The Arts Board Act

Bill No. 78 – An Act respecting Crop Insurance

Bill No. 81 – An Act respecting the Protection and Management of Crown Lands Critical for the maintenance of Wildlife Populations

Bill No. 83 – An Act to provide for the Making of Grants to Certain Senior Citizens to assist them in making Repairs to their Homes

Bill No. 84 – an Act to amend The Heritage Property Act

Bill No. 86 – An Act to amend The Education and Health Tax Act

Bill No. 89 – an Act to amend The Rural Municipality Act

Bill No. 91 – An Act to amend The Land Contracts (Actions) Act

Bill No. 98 – An Act to amend The Vehicles Act, 1983 (No. 3)

Bill No. 100 – An Act to amend The Limitation of Civil Rights Act

Bill No. 103 – An Act to amend The Coroners Act

Bill No. 104 – An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively on March 31, 1984, and on March 31, 1985

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 10:14 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:16 p.m.