

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 10, 1984

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. ENGEL:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to this House, 30 grade seven, eight, and nine junior high school students from Willow Bunch. They are accompanied here by their teacher, Mr. Allen, and two bus drivers — I was just handed the note — Randy Sturty and Clause Fafard. So welcome here. I hope you enjoy the question period, and I'm looking forward to meeting you around 3 o'clock.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Government Advertising

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Premier. We've indicated in previous sessions, Mr. Premier, that if your government was looking for places to cut spending, a prime target would be the self-serving government advertising, costing about \$12 million a year.

Another area might be the recent expenditure of political propaganda at the taxpayers' expense, in the form of some letters sent to every public servant — letters over your signature, bragging of the accomplishments of the government, department by department, on expensive, high-quality bond. And I want to confirm that these letters were personally addressed to every public servant at the cost of about \$1 a letter.

The question, Mr. Premier, is: how do you explain this misuse of public funds on self-serving propaganda?

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

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all want to ask the hon. member, and ask if I might get his information where he gets the bill of \$12 million, and if he can provide that with me, I will be glad to look at it. From my information, that's totally inaccurate. We're looking at, Mr. Speaker, the 1983-84 figures are \$4,437,000. The 1982-83 figures for the previous administration, the NDP, were \$3,343,000, and that was only for part of a year.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the breakdown of that \$3,347,000, and it was \$1,172,000 for the NDP administration for up until April, and it was \$2,171,000 after that in our administration, so we're looking at something like, well at least one-third of it being spent in the first part of the year, 1982-83.

If you put it in 1984 dollars, Mr. Speaker, its current '84 dollars, the expenditure in 1981-82 of the last full year of the previous administration, it was \$9,776,000, for, as I point out, compared to our administration, '83-84 is \$4,437,000. So, Mr. Speaker, you're looking at a difference of something like \$9,776,000 in constant dollars in the last year's administration of the NDP compared to something like \$4,437,000 in our administration.

So I would be glad to look at the question in more detail if the hon. member would provide me with some information of where he dug up this figure of \$12 million.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. The Premier's response reminds me of Donald Duck the other night on the Walt Disney cartoon, who complained that his teacher . . .

**THE SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I believe we're here in question period, and it's a serious time; it's not a cartoon time. I would ask the member to get on with his question.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — My apologies, Mr. Speaker, and begging forgiveness, I'd point out that the mistake is easy to make when we listen to actions of that sort.

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

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Premier, did you completely fail to deal with the question because you didn't know the answer, or because you didn't want to answer it? I asked you about the letter which you wrote on November 26th.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wrote a thank-you to members of the civil service. And if the hon. member wants to know exactly how many letters, I'll take notice and get the number for him.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. The letters, as the Premier well knows, result from the fact that your government's witch-hunt and your incompetent, unprofessional approach to public service lost you a massive number of votes on September 4th. You're trying to buy those votes back, and I can tell you it's not working.

My question to the Premier is: will you ensure that the \$14,000 bill for these letters will go to the Progressive Conservative Party for whose benefit the letters were written?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to repeat the last part of his question. If he wants to know about the impact of votes in the last election — and he brought that up — I believe there was one party in western Canada that lost 10 seats in the last election, and it was the NDP. And there was one party in Saskatchewan that lost two seats in the province of Saskatchewan. And it was the NDP. So if you want to compare results, I suppose we can look at those in some detail.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. But it is . . . I'm simply repeating the question. Will you ensure that the Progressive Conservative Party, which was the sole benefactor of these letters, gets the bill for these letters?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I have visited with and talked with a large number of public employees in the province of Saskatchewan, and first of all, they appreciate having cabinet ministers and a premier visit with them and talk to them about what they do. And secondly, they've appreciated being acknowledged for the hard work that they have been doing in 1983 and '84. And, Mr. Speaker, that is showing up across the province of Saskatchewan.

We are proud of the public service. We are proud of the public service in the province of Saskatchewan, and we commend them for their productivity and for the hard work that they've done, and the professionalism in which they carry it on. And I can only say I may congratulate them in the future. I may say, "Thank you for the good job." I may do it personally. I may do it by mail, or I may do it both.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Premier, and, Mr. Premier, it has to do with your government's program of excessive advertising campaign that you have put forward. And I want to get behind the reason why you have, in fact, launched this excessive propaganda on behalf of the Tory party, paid for by the taxpayers.

And I refer you, Mr. Premier, to the May 2nd letter which you received from the Tory president

of the Shaunavon Constituency Association, Mr. Don McLellan, and it reads in part:

In light of the latest defections, communications seem to be our biggest problem.

And he's writing this letter to you.

With the exception of Mr. Rousseau's office, we are largely ignored as far as appointments, planning projects, are concerned.

And he goes on. He says:

It would be much easier to sell memberships and generate enthusiasm if the various cabinet ministers would kindly keep us informed.

That's from your Don McLellan, Tory president of the Shaunavon constituency. Now what I'm asking, Mr. Premier, isn't what Mr. McLellan indicates — isn't that what's behind your latest splurge of government advertising? The taxpayers of Saskatchewan are forking out millions of dollars to make it easier to sell PC memberships.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member . . . if my hon. friend would like to know what impact it may have on the riding of Shaunavon, I will forecast that we will do very, very well in the province of Saskatchewan — or the riding of Shaunavon in the future. And I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because we have . . . Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members would like to listen, I'll tell them why. Because we've initiated things like power bonds, like Saskoil bonds where constituents in Shaunavon can participate. They can buy for the first time in the Crown corporations in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we have been encouraged. I've had many regional meetings across the province of Saskatchewan with our constituents and members of the party, and they say: please advertise these programs so we can find out where to buy power bonds; where to buy Saskoil bonds; how to participate in the feed programs and the transportation programs; how we can participate in the agricultural programs; how we can get natural gas; how we can get all kinds of programs. And they have asked us to communicate that because they're interested in receiving it. And I'll point out: we have initiated brand new programs like natural gas, like power bonds, like oil bands, and we have spent, Mr. Speaker, '83-84, \$4,437,000 compared to 1981-82, the NDP spent \$9,700,000 and . . .

**THE SPEAKER:** — Order, please. order, please. I would ask the members on both sides of the House to keep the questions and the answers a bit more crisp. We're getting fairly detailed.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A supplement. Mr. Premier, I take it you will acknowledge that you did, in fact, receive this letter indicating that the biggest problem, in light of the latest defections, communication seems to be the biggest problem. I asked you, are you, in fact, responding with this huge taxpayer-paid advertising in reply to the requests of Conservative presidents?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members know, I have spent a total of one hour on television recently, in the last six months — a half-hour television program in the middle of the summer, and a half-hour television program at our last convention. That was entirely paid for by Progressive Conservative members across the province of Saskatchewan.

The entire thing was paid for by PC members, and PC members said: "We want to hear the Premier talk about the kinds of new programs that we've initiated." And I went on half an hour television once, and half an hour television again, and that was entirely paid for by our people.

When I compare what the taxpayer used to pay in '81-82 in constant dollars, it was almost \$10 million. What the taxpayer pays today, 1983-84, it's \$4.437 million. Now the taxpayer is paying,

according to these figures, half of what it was in '82-83. The rest of it is picked up by the PC Party of Saskatchewan, and it is very happy to do it.

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

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Final supplemental. I would like to advise the — ask the Premier, as a supplemental, are you finding that the memberships are selling easier now that you have launched, at the expense of the public, a \$12 million self-serving advertising program?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to announce that as a result of a great deal of hard work, regional meetings, my two half-hour television broadcasts and shows, that memberships are at an all-time high, and they are going up every day. They're increasing rapidly.

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

**MR. SVEINSON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker. The figure mentioned earlier, the \$12 million figures if the figure that comes out of your own Executive Council, Mr. Premier.

My question is: at your recent convention it was also enunciated very clearly to the party that communication was a great difficulty, and the story had to get out. The Tory story had to get out. My question is: are you still, and do you intend to, in the future, accelerate the advertising program that you've undertaken to get the Tory story out to the people of Saskatchewan before the by-election in Thunder Creek, and before the provincial election in the spring of '85?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, people around the province of Saskatchewan, I can only reiterate, want to know how to participate in new programs, and we have spent something in the neighbourhood of \$4.437 million last year to make sure that they got that information; and that was at taxpayers expense, public expense, because these are programs used by the public. Where we thought it was in our best political interest for me to go on television, the party paid for that. And we will continue to do both. We will spend money as we see fit to provide various kinds of information on programs. When we think it's appropriate for the party to do it, we will do that. Where the taxpayers are informed of new programs, whether it's power bonds, whether it's energy bonds, whether it's brand-new bonds that may come into the market for various other programs, we will continue to spend the money.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the taxpayers turned away from the official opposition in the last provincial election was, in fact, their overspending and their approach to advertising and propaganda through Crown corporations, and also through other government agencies.

This government appears to have undertaken the same route, and I ask the Premier: in the year to date the official figures coming out of your own Executive Council are in the area of \$12 million. You indicate you'll accelerate that advertising, and I ask you: what is your budget for advertising in 1985 respecting the same propaganda that you are, in fact, undertaking to get out to the people of Saskatchewan?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't give an answer on 1985 or '86. I can suggest to my hon. friend that if we initiate new programs, like, if we have a new potash bond, or a power bond, or an energy bond, or other things like that — new agricultural programs that people want to find out about — then we will be using money to inform people of how to get in on them, buy on them, participate, take advantage of these programs. And that will cost some money.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I would like the hon. members anywhere over there to show me their numbers that add up to \$12 million, and then if they . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's not the case. I go back and I say '83-84, the information I have is \$4.437 million. That is less than half in 1984 dollars of 1981-82 expenditures by the NDP.

### Staffing of Gas Inspection and Gas Servicing Branches

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. My question to the Minister of Labour deals with the government's understaffing of services vital to public safety, such as the gas inspection branch of the Department of Labour and the gas servicing branch of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Last week a coroner's jury found this understaffing responsible, in part, for the death of a 65-year-old Regina woman who was poisoned from fumes from a faulty furnace. And Regina isn't the only area where staff have been cut. In Saskatoon, where the normal complement of gas inspectors is five, my information is that you now have two, and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation gas servicing branch in Saskatoon which should have 17, now has 14. My question to you is this, Mr. Minister: will you not admit that your conscious policy to cut safety staff has, at least in part, contributed to one life already, the taking of one life already, and could take more unless you act and act quickly?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the member opposite is very easy. It's a flat no. There is no indication whatsoever, and I told the members opposite last week, that we will be providing a step-by-step report of actually what happened in this regrettable incident. But the fact of the matter is that it is not due to the lack of staffing. We have reduced staff in a number of areas. We have let 500 people go on early retirement in Sask Power, but you don't see the lights off.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The coroner in charge of last week's inquest said today, on the public media, that across the province your department had decreased the total number of gas inspectors from 22 to 14, by not filling vacancies. In other words, life threatening situations can occur much more frequently than was previously the case because of your cut-backs. My question is this: when are you going to fill the vacancies which should have been filled months ago, and which would have, very likely, prevented the tragedy which we have now had? When will you be increasing the staff in the gas inspection branch of the labour department? When will you be staffing up the SPC's gas branch?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just reiterate what I said last week; we are doing our investigation, and it is almost complete. We are sure that it is not due to the lack of staffing, and our report will indicate that. You have to remember, sir, that four of the inspectors retired in October 1984. We have two more positions where people have been hired, including the chief inspector. That has already happened. We have two more positions that we feel that we have to fill. We have had 28 interviews over the past several months. But there are many, many people that do not have the qualification, total qualifications, that we need for the inspectors division. But we are doing that, and those positions which bring back the complement to 17, which we feel is necessary in the province as far as our Department of Labour is concerned.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the minister to say that the reduction of gas inspectors from 22 to 14 has been because you haven't been able to find qualified people? Is it not true that you have deliberately allowed that number to drop back by not filling vacancies and, in many cases, not attempting to recruit people when vacancies occurred?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, the answer again is, absolutely, no. We have just had the reduction of four people from 17, because of early retirement. Two or three of those positions have already been filled. We have another two, Estevan region for one, and the one here in Regina, that we expect to fill very shortly, and we'll back to our complement.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. By way of

background, Mr. Minister, let me say that the negligence of your department in contributing as it did to this woman's death is regrettable. But your procrastination . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Everybody else is, I might as well. Your procrastination and the excuses which you have offered are really unforgivable. A human life has been lost. My question is: what are you going to do about it? Would it not have crossed your mind when it happened, when you said you were aware of it a month ago, that something should be done? Why did we have to wait until the pressure of public opinion and the questions in this House embarrassed you? Why didn't you act in October when you first heard about it?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we did act in October. But I'm telling the members opposite that it was not due to the lack of staffing that the regrettable incident occurred, and our report will indicate that when we table that in the next day or two.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Minister, are you saying the report and investigation are, at this point in time, complete, and you know what your investigation is going to say? Is that what you just told us — that that report and investigation are now complete, and you're now writing it?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Well, I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that the report is nearing completion. I'll have it finalized this week.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Supplementary. Would the minister not agree that your government's natural gas expansion program in rural Saskatchewan would take considerable time for both SPC gas employees and the gas inspection branch, and can you explain why your government didn't think to add the necessary safety staff required to handle this program before the tragedy, rather than afterwards?

**HON. MR. MCLAREN:** — Mr. Speaker, there has been no indication in our department that we are understaffed. Plain and simple, we are not understaffed. There has been some reduction, but this has happened all over. And we feel that the work load has not increased that significantly. I can look at the income for 1981, which was \$10 million — that's if my figure is correct — but now the figures for the income for 1983-84 is no different. So the volume of work has not increased that significantly, and we are watching the back loads, and we are also concerned about safety for the people of Saskatchewan. We will not let that happen because of lack of staffing. But to answer your question, we feel we are adequately staffed with the replacement of two more people, which we have been trying to get in place for a number of months now.

### **Housing for Seniors in Buffalo Narrows**

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Premier in the absence of Minister of Social Services, and it deals with a housing problem that has taken place in Buffalo Narrows. The community has a 10-unit senior citizens' housing complex and there is a waiting list presently by seniors. I personally know of at least two women in their 80s who are desperately waiting to be admitted to these senior citizens' units. So far they have been refused because the units are full, but one of these units is filled with two employees of your department. Two social workers from your department are living in the senior citizens' housing complex and have been living there for the last four months or so. Can you explain why they are living there and preventing senior citizens in need from moving into these senior citizens' units?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to get as much information as I can from the hon. member. Perhaps the minister of Sask Housing has some information on it, if it relates to a Sask Housing project, and I will take notice. But I'll at least ask my colleague to comment if he has any additional information.

**HON. MR. DUTCHAK:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure who wrote the question for my friend across, but he knows that I came checking into that allegation. He personally asked me to do so, I believe, Wednesday of last week. I was away on Thursday and Friday, and I find it a little unusual

that he now expresses his concern here. I wonder what his motive is, Mr. Speaker, and I will undertake to investigate the situation. And I want to, however, thank him for bringing up the fact that we are building seniors' units which are long overdue in the community, which the former government didn't build.

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

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would like to move a resolution, with leave of the Assembly, recognizing the fundamental importance of human rights in this province and throughout the world, and that this Assembly commends those people who work for equality in justice in all corners of the globe, recognizing that such unselfish work often goes unrecognized and unreported. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to move such a motion.

**THE SPEAKER:** — The Minister of Justice has asked for leave. Is leave granted? Proceed.

## MOTIONS

### Human Rights Day

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. December 10th has been designated throughout the free world as Human Rights Day, and it has been so declared in the province of Saskatchewan. December 10th is the anniversary of the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. This declaration marked the first time nations representing a majority of the world's population agreed on a common standard for the achievement of human rights.

The Saskatchewan Human Rights code, proclaimed in 1979, and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, entrenched in Canada's constitution, follow the principles set down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. On April 17, 1985, the equality section of the charter, section 15, comes into force. The Saskatchewan government has committed itself to amending Saskatchewan laws to ensure compliance with the charter and to further promote the principles set down in the universal declaration.

The Saskatchewan Human Rights code is to be amended to provide Saskatchewan residents further protection from discrimination. They are also proposing a change to the code in order to enhance the independence of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission.

Government remains committed to promoting equality for all persons in the province. This is demonstrated by our support for affirmative action programs as a means to eliminate systemic discrimination, and the implementation of legislation which will ensure accessibility by disabled persons.

I ask members of the Assembly to honour today, and to recognize today as Human Rights Day, by endorsing the motion that I, seconded by the member from Estevan, the Premier:

That this Assembly formally recognize the fundamental importance of human rights in this province and throughout the world, and that this Assembly commends those people who work for equality in justice in all corners of the globe, recognizing that such unselfish work often goes unrecognized and unreported.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to be able to rise in the Assembly today and make a few brief comments in commemoration of this day, December 10, as International Human Rights Day. I just want to indicate to Mr. Speaker that at the conclusion of my remarks, I intend to move an amendment to the motion put forward by the Minister of Justice, which will, in essence, amend the resolution, and to add:

... and this Assembly specifically acknowledges on this International Human Rights Day, the courageous commitment to human rights demonstrated by Bishop Desmond Tutu, and congratulates Bishop Tutu on his being awarded the Nobel peace Prize for his accomplishment.

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

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I will be moving that amendment, as I said, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks.

As I indicated, it is certainly an important occasion, and one, I think, which prompts us to pause for a moment and to reflect on the world around us, a world in which, for millions of men and women, fundamental human rights unfortunately appear, at best, a distant goal. For many people on this globe, important human rights which we have in Canada, and we enjoy in Canada, are still only a hope for the future — a goal not yet realized.

And whether we turn our minds to the present affliction in west Africa where hundreds of thousands are suffering terrible famine, more terrible than what we can actually conceive, or we turn our minds to the victims of the ultra-right conservative military dictatorships throughout the world, in Chile and Central America, or indeed to the Philippines, or indeed to Poland — nations where human rights have really no meaning, and where arbitrary arrest, imprisonment and torture are all too real — Mr. Speaker, whether we turn our minds to those problems or to the viciously racist regimes of the world, where unjust, racist tyranny by a few is known by the name apartheid — and it is with that view that I move the resolution, recognizing the fight and the work that has been done by Bishop Desmond Tutu.

In too many nations of the world today, men and women cannot join with us today in commemorating international human rights. On occasions such as this we are sometimes able to think of those victims of oppression elsewhere in the world.

It is important, however, that we reflect for just a moment at our own experience here in Canada and Saskatchewan, important that we proudly acknowledge the achievements of the Saskatchewan people with respect to human rights. I think it is important on this occasion that we acknowledge and pay respect to the dedication of our pioneers to the fundamental values and the institutions which furthered the cause of human rights in our province and in our country — achievements in Saskatchewan like the Bill of rights, the first in Canada, which was established by the Saskatchewan people under the CCF government; achievements like our human rights code, the Human Rights Commission, the Ombudsman, all established in Saskatchewan — people working under the New Democratic administration.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in discussion on human rights in Saskatchewan today, there are those who would argue that we should focus only on other parts of the world and only on civil and constitutional rights. But I think they are wrong, for we cannot condemn injustice abroad if we ignore injustice here at home in Saskatchewan, and we cannot concentrate exclusively on civil or constitutional rights and ignore the fact that the concept of human rights is far broader. It encompasses, also, the basic rights for individuals and families to live in dignity, free from moral and social degradation that comes from poverty and severe destitution amidst the affluence of the few.

I want to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and say that across the world where there is racism, injustice, poverty, greed, are all too common — and these are threats to human rights abroad — but today as we in this Assembly commemorate International Human Rights Day, I ask all of us not to forget that we here at home in Canada, and in Saskatchewan, must be vigilant to guard against any threats to basic rights of Saskatchewan people. The rights and noble institutions we have inherited from our parents, let us cherish them and nurture them, and let us pass them on to our children intact and expanded.



I ask all of the members to join with this resolution and the amendment to help further the cause of human rights throughout the world. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the amendment, seconded by the member from Elphinstone, that the following words be added after the word "unreported" in the last line:

And this Assembly specifically acknowledges on this International Human Rights Day, the courageous commitment to human rights demonstrated by Bishop Desmond Tutu and congratulates Bishop Tutu on his being awarded the Nobel Peace prize for his accomplishment.

I so move.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add a very few words. I think that the amendment deals specifically with Bishop Tutu, who is carrying the flame of human rights in the union of South Africa at a very difficult time, and in circumstances wherein the great majority of the people of that country do not enjoy human rights.

It is not easy for anybody not of the white race to speak out on behalf of the large number of people in South Africa who are not accorded what we would assume to be the minimum level of human rights — the right to vote and participate in government, the right to live in communities along with their fellow citizens of different racial backgrounds.

But, Mr. Speaker, while we acknowledge the difficult circumstances in South Africa and, therefore, the enormous contribution to human rights made by Bishop Tutu, we should not assume that those problems are confined to South Africa, or confined to countries distant from our own.

True, Saskatchewan does have a proud record in having a Bill of rights in the 1940s, and fair employment practices acts, and fair accommodation practices acts in the 1950s, and a human rights commission in the early '70s, and the human rights code later on in the '70s, which give us some cause for satisfaction, but certainly no cause for complacency. Eternal vigilance is always the price of liberty.

(1445)

In Canada we have seen remarkable departures from what one would have thought to be appropriate standards of human rights. We saw that at the time of the October crisis of 1970 — the FLQ crisis. And it's always been a matter of bitter disappointment that we, in Canada, felt it necessary to resort to the measures which were resorted to under the War Measures Act, when our neighbours to the south were able to handle the assassination of a president of the United States some few years prior to that without in any way restricting civil liberties. I have always felt disappointment that our system was not able to respond in a way that the United States system responded, a system concerning which I have, at times, been critical.

So it can happen here in Canada. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, it's happened here in Saskatchewan, under this government and the one that preceded it. So we should not be complacent in believing that there cannot be breaches of civil liberties. Accordingly, I think it is very fitting that we have a day on which we turn our minds to the preservation of civil liberties in those areas where they exist, and the expansion of civil liberties in those areas which they do not.

Today is International Human Rights Day. It is fitting that our legislature should acknowledge that. And I think it is particularly fitting on this day that we should acknowledge Bishop Tutu, who is being awarded the Nobel Prize today in Oslo by the international community, in a sense, in honour of his contribution to the expansion of human rights and civil liberties throughout the world.

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

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **SPECIAL ORDER**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Ms. Zazelenchuk, seconded by Mr. Tusa.

**MR. SVEINSON:** — I rise again in this reply to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, and would just like to summarize some of the happenings over the last five days in debate. I think it's been established without question that the direction of Saskatchewan over the next year, or years, has not been very well outlined in the throne speech brought down by this government Thursday last.

I think there hasn't been any debate in the last year or two about the morass that the farming community has been immersed in economically — as a result of weather conditions, as a result of high interest rates, as a result of things that are completely out of their jurisdiction. At one time, I suppose, there was even a difficulty with competition for the purchase of land that does support our whole farming industry.

I don't see demonstrated in the throne speech a great deal of content. I think it's time to call the government to action, and it's time that they demonstrate through their actions that they are willing to look at the problems faced by the people of Saskatchewan, not only in the farming community, but also in communities such as Regina, Rosetown, Swift Current, other communities that do, in fact, have a great small-business sector who faces the same difficulties as the farming community with respect to financing and with respect to doing business in Saskatchewan.

It hasn't been a banner year. In fact, to quote one businessman I talked to recently, he said, "I feel like I'm on the Titanic." And I think that is probably felt throughout this province from north to south, and from east to west.

There's time for action, and now is the time for action. And the throne speech certainly didn't demonstrate that that action was forthcoming quickly. In the five days that we've sat in the House since the debate was initiated, there has been legislation tabled, again not necessarily dealing with the problem, but certainly just a Band-Aid solution to some of the problems faced by farmers in this province.

I see members opposite shaking their heads. I've had a great deal of input from farmers in Saskatchewan since the Bill was tabled, and I can say — I can suggest to the government that there hasn't been a great deal of support for that legislation. That is not the kind of call to action that the farming community expects. They don't expect to be greased with cash either. They expect from a government at least some innovative ideas that can relate to the crisis that they are presently facing.

Small business in this province was promised, prior to April of '82, that there would be low

interest loans available to finance their businesses. In fact, to quote the promise, \$45,000 at 9.625 per cent over 25 or 30 years. I can't recall the amortization period, but it was 25 or 30 years. That would do a great deal, a great deal to solve some of the problems of small business in Saskatchewan. There's no question about that. Ask any businessman in the street. Ask any farmer out there. You could address the problems that are currently facing them that are primarily interest rate related. In fact, they were initiated by high interest rates, but certainly the drought in the past year has contributed greatly as well.

So, in my answer to the throne speech — and I realize the Premier would like to get into the debate today, so I would like to, rather than hold up the Premier of the province and the action program he has in fact planned and will enunciate for the people of the province — I would like to sit down, and I would like to call the Premier in to outline his call to action, outline the action that he will, in fact, undertake to solve some of the problems faced by all the people in this province.

We all suffer. We all suffer when there are difficulties in the farming community — every one of us — businessmen right across the province, school boards suffer. The tax outlay that the government has to work with just isn't there.

So the answers are not easy answers, but that's why governments are elected; that's why governments come in with promises. They expect to be elected on the promises that they offer. And I believe this government was, to some degree, elected on the promises it offered, although there was some bankruptcy related to the old administration. They didn't have the answers either. But all we're asking for is some input, as people in this province, from the government — not just bank-aid solutions, but a new direction.

I look at the agricultural community as being light-years behind with respect to modern technology. This government set up a Department of Science and Technology. You know, the wheels are there, the vehicle's there, but there's no gas in it. What's it doing? Obviously, farming in this province is the number one industry. Well, let's apply the science and technology that other businesses and other endeavours undertake to use. Let's apply it more aggressively — more aggressively. Let's undertake to take the vehicle that the hon. Mr. Currie is responsible for and introduce it more aggressively into the farming communities to, in fact, broaden the scope and develop areas that presently aren't being utilized in Saskatchewan.

The answer isn't necessarily just money. I think there's an answer also in innovation. And, of course, when you talk about innovation in Canada, there is a suppressed feeling that the innovators in this country just aren't treated as well as the innovators in other countries, like our neighbours to the south. The inventions that they would come up with and offer to the farmers and business people are just not protected over a long course in Canada. I think this government could, in fact, undertake to pressure the federal government to change some of the legislation, to offer a little better deal to some of the innovators that leave this country, just because they don't feel they can survive, if, in fact, they put their energies into that type of area.

So with that I would like to just sit down and I would like to listen to the action, the action that this government will, in fact, undertake to present in the coming months. And I would like to call to the government right now, and I would like to see the Premier on his feet to outline that legislation.

Thank you very much.

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

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I sat down earlier to put together some notes for this debate, I read through some previous throne speeches. I may say, if you ever want to set yourself a laborious task, decide you're going to read the throne speeches which this

government has written — dry stuff indeed.

I glanced through, in addition, some clippings of the cabinet planning conference last September, and after hearing this most recent throne speech two weeks ago, there were three points that stood out rather clearly. There's a remarkable sense of *deja vu* that comes when a person has seen or heard something before. There's nothing in this throne speech, Mr. Speaker, which hadn't been said before on at least once and, in many cases, several times. It's apparent that this government's pollsters can pin-point the problems, and they do, and they don't change because this government doesn't meet or solve them. It's equally apparent that the pollsters cannot devise government programs, and neither can the government itself.

The second observation is that this is a government which is losing confidence in its own ability to govern. Even the rhetoric in the speeches is losing some of its punch. A year ago unemployment was the number one priority. Now, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment has risen by almost 20 per cent, we find that unemployment is a matter to be addressed. After two short years the Premier is forced to turn to his Minister of Justice to show some economic leadership in the absence of any leadership from the ministers in charge of the major economic portfolios of the government.

Point number three, there is a yawning gap between the rhetoric of this government and its own performance. The chasm is wide indeed between what they say and what they do, and nowhere is this better illustrated to members of this House and to the public than this throne speech which is totally devoid of any initiatives.

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

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — There is no sense that the members opposite know or particularly care about the human costs which follow upon their failures.

Let me begin by returning to the throne speech. Throne speeches are routinely criticized for lack of detail. But in a tough race this throne speech has really set a high water mark. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this throne speech we are now debating must set an all-time record for having said nothing at all. The speech was so devoid of any pith or substance that I could have written these remarks in September and not had to change a word.

And we, as members of this House, representing our constituents from around the province, should be deeply concerned about this state of affairs. We all know that reciting the record of a government, any government, is a poor substitute for the view of the future. For the signs, when a government begins to recite its record instead of its view of the future, that is a government which has become tired in office. And it's apparent from this throne speech that this is a government lacking in courage, initiative, and energy.

Yet after two short years this government heads closer to an election; we see it getting further and further from any vision of the future. And that's all the more appalling when we examine the record and see the rising unemployment, escalating provincial debt, complete absence of any sensible answer to the farm crisis that are the hallmarks of this record. Bad as that record might be, we can't help but shudder when we realize that their past record must somehow be better than their vision of the future, or surely they would give us their vision of the future.

This is a throne speech that is ripe with a throng of clichés and devoid of any hope for those who need it most.

I said the second observation, Mr. Speaker, was that this is a government which is losing confidence in its ability to meet the challenges of the future, a government that is wandering around with no discernible direction.

(1500)

The government set for itself in the throne speech three objectives: to facilitate the initiative and enterprise of the business community; to protect our common heritage; to enhance the quality of health, education, and social services.

But what of the substance of the throne speech? This government is going to facilitate the initiative and enterprise of our business community. So what else is new? We were told throughout the 1982 election, and *ad nauseam* since, that all that has been keeping this province from being world class was the socialists. The PC Party would create a climate which would generate business prosperity. What of the record? It is an established fact that the actual employment levels, the non-agricultural sector, have declined over the past two years, and the number of employable persons on welfare has jumped very significantly.

And what about the climate for business? What has this government been doing for the past two years? Well our government's been spending a lot of money on lavish seminars and conferences to generate a lot of hype in the media and the business community. But to what effect? There are now fewer people employed in the non-agricultural sector of the economy than there were two years ago. That, I say to members opposite — because it seems to have escaped your attention — that is not a success story. Even the noted economist, Lester Thurow, whom the Minister of Finance called in to give advice on the next budget — heavens knows, if the past record is anything to go by, he could use a little outside advice — even Mr. Thurow pointed out that the so-called business climate has little or nothing to do with economic development.

Mr. Speaker, one must wonder why the Premier chose to ignore the ministers whom he had already asked to be in charge of economic development. Why would he have not given the portfolio to one of the existing ministers?

The question, I guess, is where we are headed now? Sometime this winter, a winter works program may be launched — when, with what guide-lines, with what funding levels, with what kind of employment opportunities? — it's apparent no one has thought out.

Mr. Speaker, the procrastination of the government opposite is even less forgivable because it's not a very new problem. It was one year ago, November of 1983, that the throne speech announced job creation as a number one priority. And that was repeated in the March throne speech. And the Premier said, after the cabinet planning conference in September, that unemployment had reached crisis proportions.

So you could forgive members of this side of the House and the members of the public if they mistakenly thought that the government was going to do something about it. What have you done over the last three months? It's apparent that absolutely nothing has been done to devise a program to meet this problem.

A few days ago the Premier told the people of the province that he would appoint a minister whose sole responsibility would be to deal with the unemployment crisis. A week later he appoints the Minister of Justice to be a part-time employment minister. My goodness, that is really taking the tiger by the tail, is it not?

Mr. Speaker, this one appointment speaks volumes about the lack of confidence the Devine government has in itself. How does the Premier handle the growing employment crisis? The performance reminds me of the little red hen who wanted to bake some bread. I can see the Premier at the cabinet table asking the ministers who wanted to bake some bread. I can see the Premier at the cabinet table asking the ministers who have the responsibility for major economic portfolios, "Who will be my employment minister?" And the response from these economic and political giants around the table is uniform: "Not I," said the Minister of Economic Development; "Not I," said the Minister of Finance; "Not I," said the Minister of Tourism and Small Business;

"Not I," said the Minister of Energy; "Not I," said the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower; "Not I," said the Minister of Labour. And somehow or other, perhaps because the Minister of Justice was absent that day, he wound up saddled with the responsibility for jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that I don't have the final word on how the Minister of Justice was chosen for this responsibility, but if I can't figure it out it can be forgiven, because nobody else has been able to figure out how that choice was made, either. One is left with the inescapable conclusion that so little confidence did the Premier have in the ministers with the responsibility for economic development that he believed the Minister of Justice could do better on a part-time basis than the others who have failed him on a full-time basis.

That is a clear crisis of confidence in itself and, I suggest, bad judgement on the part of the Premier. And it does not give him much cause for hope for those who are unemployed.

The throne speech also said, Mr. Speaker, that it would protect our common heritage; beyond mentioning the Heritage '85 program, there is no suggestion of how that objective is going to be met.

The third objective in the government's legislative program is to enhance the quality of health, education, and social services. Under the heading of social development the PC government announces that it opposed to violence and degradation against women; it's opposed to child abuse, and I suppose therefore the government thought that it set itself apart from all those who were in favour of violence and degradation of women, and in favour of child abuse. It's helped thousands . . . The throne speech says it has helped thousands of men and women regain their independence. One can only conclude that they believe the vicious attack and the vicious cut-backs in welfare benefits has somehow or other assisted people in gaining their independence.

Finally, this government boasts of improved consultation with labour, the federal government, and others. I have accused the Minister of Labour of a multitude of sins. I do not ever recall having accused the Minister of Labour of having engaged in too much consultation. The Minister of Labour was notably absent from this year's Saskatchewan Federation of Labour conference.

Mr. Speaker, this speech is loaded with previously announced programs but very little which will, in fact, enhance the quality of health, education, and social services. Mr. Speaker, I said this speech was lacking in pith and substance. I said this government lacked self-confidence. Mr. Speaker, as serious as these flaws are, an even bigger concern is the almost inhuman lack of human feeling and human understanding for the problems they have created.

This government launched its economic recovery program two years ago with its widely publicized "open for business." And since then we have steamed full speed ahead through two provincial budgets; a throne speech in November of '83 which said job creation was a number one priority; a budget speech four months later which repeated that; and one year after that throne speech of November '83, unemployment is nearly 20 per cent higher, and we have no action, no suggestion of how this government is going to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, we have a government opposite which is run by graphs, tables, and statistics of questionable validity, but one that does not seem to understand the human dimensions of the problems that need to be addressed in our cities and towns, and on the farms, and across the northern regions of this province.

I really wonder if the members of this government opposite know what it's like to lose a job in a society that measures human worth by the job that you hold. Have they measured the human costs of unemployment, alcoholism, divorce, suicide, and family violence? The human realities of unemployment go far beyond the gross national product, and far beyond the comfortable feeling of members opposite that "We're okay."

Before the federal election I was asked by Mr. Benjamin to act as his campaign manager. I have an admiration for Mr. Benjamin over the years. He has taken many principled stands, at times when it wasn't popular to do so. And I agree. And I may say that as the . . . when I accepted the position, I did so with a touch of nervousness. I may say, however, that as the campaign opened, that nervousness entirely dissipated. And I made a brash prediction on election day that Les Benjamin would win his riding by a larger majority than he had ever won, and that he would win it by 5,000 votes. And I had to apologize to Mr. Benjamin for that. I sold him very short. He won it by 8,000 votes.

I may add that in the campaign it became apparent that Les Benjamin was going to do better than anyone, including, I had thought, in part because of a well-run federal campaign, but in part because of a dismal record that this government had left. Undoubtedly, the largest problem which plagued Dan Williams and Mr. Mazurak, who ran against Mr. Benjamin, was unemployment. Over the year, last year I've had calls and letters from people pleading for assistance, with a variety of problems. I took the trouble to add up and categorize those. over half of the calls and letters which I received asking for assistance have their roots in unemployment.

And I remember some of the faces that I saw during the campaign, and I remember saying at the time if only I could take those people, bring them into the Assembly and let you people see the faces of the people who are suffering, you might do differently. If the member from Maple Creek thinks I'm sanctimonious, may I suggest that the member from Maple Creek and the Minister of Social Services join me on a tour of my riding which I will set up. We will do a small tour of those who are unemployment, those who are on welfare, and then we'll come back in the House and debate the issue, and I doubt that the member opposite will be as pious and righteous when she comes back from seeing the faces of those who are hurting as she is now.

What is protecting members opposite is their ignorance of the appalling conditions that are being caused out there. I remember calling on a woman in her 30s in my constituency who lives with a husband and four children. He husband has been unemployed for the last 18 months, and they don't know how they're going to hang on to their home. And I remember her telling me that her savings were gone. I can still see the desperation that was etched in that woman's face.

Her husband was more bitter than desperate. He felt himself humiliated about the prospect of having to collect welfare for the first time. He was in his 40s. He wanted a job, not a hand-out. And I may add, he was a skilled tradesman. There just were no jobs.

I haven't had an opportunity to talk to that individual since, but I've often wondered if he could share with the members opposite his disdain — what must be a disdain for the comments of members opposite, and in particular the Premier, who talked about upgrading people's skills when there is already a surplus of skilled people in almost every trade.

I remember talking to a steelworker on the east side of my riding who had a co-worker who moved out of town in search of cheaper accommodation, had been laid off, and who had committed suicide.

I also remember calling on a woman who calls on families in crises. She described her work-load, the growing number of cases, and the severity of the problem. Without any hesitation she pins unemployment as the root cause of the increasing level of family violence and child abuse. She pointed to the psychological strain that comes from a loss of feeling of self-worth, couple with feelings of frustration, fear, and desperation.

(1515)

During the federal election, I often wished I had a dollar for everybody who freely admitted they

had voted for the party opposite in the last election and swore that they would never do so again.

Typical of those people was a young woman who worked for the Conservative Party since 1975. Done more than just voted; she'd worked for them. She told me that she'd been unemployed since March and had come to realize that the only way she was likely to find an employment was by changing the provincial government.

I have been a candidate in four elections. of three of those elections I have been on every doorstep in the riding introducing myself to the voters. In all four of those elections I have used the same introduction. I've said, "Hi. I'm Ned Shillington. I'm your NDP candidate." I ask them their name, and then I ask them where they work.

But you know what? I couldn't use that introduction this time around. I found out in 1982 you don't ask people where they work because many of them are embarrassed to have to tell you that they can't find work. And you never ask young people where they work.

In my research on the human costs of unemployment, I came across a statement that appeared as far back as June, 1980, in a publication called *The Catholic Mind* offered by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. The article was an invitation to the Christian community to join them in raising questions about the human realities of unemployment, its underlying causes, the distortion of social values, and the possibilities for joint community action. Among other things, they point out very clearly that it is the poorest and the weakest members of our society which are made to suffer the most.

And what are the values? What's the message that the poor, the weak, and the unemployed get from this government? Mr. Speaker, the message should shock the conscience of any person who was . . . Talk about the public. The message is a cut-back in the levels of financial assistance to those on poverty to the point where hunger in the city of Regina has become a serious problem — and I'm going to talk about that in a moment — training programs for jobs that don't exist, an expressed determination to do something about wife-battering and child abuse, the complete disorganization and confusion in dealing with its root causes of tackling unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is inhuman, and the lack of any substantive action on the part of this government is inexcusable. This government seems only concerned about protecting the rich from taxes. They exhibit a complete lack of concern about the growing social and economic nightmare facing the unemployed of this province.

I remind members opposite that the gospels are noticeably devoid of any suggestion that the problems of the poor should be solved by cutting back on the assistance available to them. The gospels exhort Christians to heed the poor for they are also children of God. And I really wonder how members opposite, and particularly the Minister of Social Services, square their conscience with the cut-back in social services and the problems that has caused.

Mr. Speaker, we have a government that is long on rhetoric and very, very short on performance. For the past two and a half years we have been fed nothing but clichés. The Premier reminds me of Marie Antoinette who said, "Let them eat cake." The Premier seems to say, "Let them eat snooze. Let them eat our boosterism." I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members opposite, and to the thousands of unemployed, that boosterism and slogans are no substitute for jobs.

Another serious problem I encountered in the federal election was the delivery of government services. Some areas of government are approaching a breakdown in their ability to deliver government services. Not in all the years of Ross, former premier, Thatcher and his fight with the public service have I ever seen the morale as bad as it is now. It is not the firings, but it's the lack of leadership. This government has lost the confidence in its ability to govern. It is beset by drift



and indecision, and that is so painfully obvious to the public servants.

I may say I wasn't surprised at the brief from SGEU on the delivery of social services in the department. That department's function, and the function of Social Services, is to assist and work with people on welfare to deal with their problems, so that they may join the mainstream of society. Staff levels are so low that they have little time for anything but shuffling paper.

Mr. Speaker, the food bank in Regina should be an embarrassment, and would be an embarrassment to any government with anything that approached a conscience. That a food bank should exist at all in the bread-basket of the world speaks volumes about this government's callous attitude to those who are unfortunate enough to be out of a job.

And I wonder if this government knows just how overrun the food bank is. you know, when the food bank was set up there were those who said there's no need for it, not in 1982, or in 1983, there's no need for it. They're exaggerating. This is not the '30s. I say to members opposite that the food bank is unable to deal with the level of requests, and they have attempted to restrict those who come to them for assistance so that the food that they have may go to the neediest, and they don't take people off the street who come there for food. You must be referred by a social agency so that they may deal with the neediest. And there is nowhere near enough food to deal with even those who were referred to them by social agencies.

I recall going into the Knox-Metropolitan church on the 19th of November for a meeting, and in that church there is a social agency called the Downtown Chaplaincy, which is one of the agencies which refers members of the public to the food bank. And there was a sign on the door: no more referrals to the food bank until the end of the month, because the food bank couldn't handle any more referrals.

Mr. Speaker, the morale has deteriorated in almost all departments of government, perhaps none more so than the Department of Labour. The minister's refusal to speak to the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour is not only an exhibition of cowardice, but it is symbolic of a larger problem — a department at war with the working people whom it is supposed to be speaking on behalf of.

The deterioration in that department is so bad that, while I was shaken by the death of Polly Redhot, I have to confess I was not surprised. I had been waiting for a disaster to happen., I knew both Polly Redhot and her husband. I've been in their house on more than one occasion. I last saw them on voting day. I was walking down the back alley behind their house. I saw Tom Pelletier sitting in the back alley, offered him a ride to the polls; he took it. That was the last time I saw them. I don't know who they voted for. I'd kind of like to think they voted for me. They're two people whom I respected. But I may say that I wasn't surprised when I saw the regrettable incident.

The delivery of government services is in such an advanced state of deterioration that the assistant gas inspector for the Department of Labour, Mr. Peter Whitehead, when asked, "Could it happen again?" said, "Unfortunately, yes."

The end result of this government's mismanagement in the short run, I suppose, was a walloping victory for Les Benjamin and Simon deJong. But the end result in the longer run is a tragedy for the people of this province. And we have again an exhibition of this government's inability to govern in Bill 1. This is not an issue which will directly affect any of my constituents, and my colleagues are more able than I to deal with the shortcomings of the Bill. But I do think the Bill deserves an approach by an urban member, for if the direct effect of the Bill is minimal, the indirect effect is huge.

I don't know what the statistics are on retail sales. I am told by some merchants that they're off by as much as 65 per cent. I got that statistic from one merchant who said his sales were off by

65 per cent. It's apparent that the economic slow-down caused by the crisis in agriculture is hitting small communities and large. I know that in the month of October there were three lawyers for every house sale in the city of Regina — so sharply has house sales fallen off.

And what is needed is something more than the inane statements of the Premier who continues to live in the world created by his own rhetoric. I say to the Premier on behalf of all the unemployed in my riding, who in an indirect way bear the brunt of this government's mismanagement of the farm crisis, that we're not leading the nation in job creation. We're number nine. We don't have the fastest-growing labour force in Canada. We're number six. We don't have the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada, Manitoba does, and it doesn't have anywhere near the resources or advantages that this province does. Never in living memory has Manitoba had a lower rate of unemployment than Saskatchewan until they had an NDP government and we have a Conservative government.

Small businesses in my riding are in trouble, as well. They haven't received quite the attention that the unemployed have, but the crisis is coming. It's a certainty that by spring the business community will be facing its own crisis, and this government offers them no assistance, not so much as a passing word.

Members on this side of the House were not exactly expecting that this government would do the problems justice. After all, in essence, it runs contrary to your right-wing philosophy, which says, "Let every man take care of himself."

Even we were surprised at the tiny, timid mouse which you brought forward as a solution to the worst problem in agriculture since the '30s, and if we were surprised by the Bill, the public reaction has been one that has ranged from disbelief to outrage. Everyone from the editorial staff of the *Leader-Post*, to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, to the Palliser Wheat Growers, have said, "You people are out to lunch," and they've invited you to come back from lunch and deal with the problem.

(1530)

We await with some interest the speeches of members opposite on Bill 1. Do they really feel that any Bill, however far-reaching (and no one has accused your Bill of being far-reaching) . . . Do you really feel that any Bill, without a cash injection, could ever be adequate? Do you really believe that a Bill which does not protect livestock, cattle, growing crops, and machinery, is worth the time and expense that it took to pass it? Do you really believe that all those who have commented on it — and they are almost unanimous — are all wrong in the condemnation of what you're doing? Do you really believe that the whole army can be out of step but you?

I say to you that your administration of this province's affairs are proving to be even more surprising and bizarre than your campaign which brought you the election in the first place.

In summary, I say to the government that if you really believe you've done a good job over the last two years, if you believe we are number one, and that you are number one, then I say to members opposite, "Call an election." We, on this side of the House, would dearly welcome an election call because we believe that there are growing numbers of the public who would also welcome an election call.

If, on the other hand, you share some doubts about the course you've taken, if you share some of those doubts which are of epidemic proportions, then do something about it. Set your sights on a new course and begin to tackle the problems instead of trying to fashion a world out of fantasy, a world built entirely of words.

It's trite to say that wishing doesn't make a fact so. it's trite, but it seems necessary to remind the members opposite of that — necessary because, as often as the Premier is present for question period, and he must be absent more than any other Premier in Canada, as often as the Premier is present for question

period, and as often as he will answer the questions put to him, which is a great deal rarer, we see him talking about a world as he wished it were, and not as it really is. When will this government have the courage to face the mess that they've created? And if the answer is never, then the sooner this government calls an election the better. Oh, what a Christmas present that would be.

I'll be voting against the motion, Mr. Speaker, as will all members of the official opposition. The tragedy, I guess, is that members opposite . . . There are no members opposite with the courage and clarity of thought to give this throne speech and the record of the government which it represents an honest assessment and vote against it with us.

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

**HON. MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure to once again be a part of addressing this throne speech. This would be the eighth throne speech that I've been involved with since 1978, and it is a pleasure.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the constituents of Arm River for their continued support. My motto in Arm River is: I back all constituents, regardless of political affiliations. And it is a pleasure.

The throne speech, Mr. Speaker, had two main themes: job creation and agriculture farm debt. Starting out with job creation, Mr. Speaker, the opposition were disappointed, and rightly so. In their words, Mr. Speaker, rightly so they were disappointed in the member that was picked to be the minister responsible for job creation. They know right well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member from Qu'Appelle would do a tremendous job in his position. They know that. They know that he's even a hard man to go to in question period. There's many, many reasons why they should be not satisfied with the choice of the minister for job creation. But we on this side of the House are proud of the Premier's choice, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll be talking mostly on my short remarks this afternoon about agriculture farm debt. The members opposite are not in touch with the farmers in rural Saskatchewan. Last spring they brought in a Bill into this House, Bill 30, for a blanket, debt moratorium, but they did so without going throughout rural Saskatchewan and seeing what the people of Saskatchewan really felt. That's different than what the members from this side of the House do. Our Minister of Agriculture spent the entire summer, along with other rural members, going through rural Saskatchewan, seeing what the problems were, and doing what the people want. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite, when they were in government, made their policies and legislation from this building. They did not go out and talk to the people of Saskatchewan, and that is why they're on that side of the House, and that's why we're on this side of the House.

When they were talking about a blanket, debt moratorium on farm land and machinery and all sundry suppliers, they were not listening, and for this reason they did not understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If you include implement dealers, farm suppliers, etc. you would bankrupt them, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The members opposite were not in touch. The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg stood up in this house the other day and said he had talked to many, many implement dealers that were disappointed that we did not include implement dealers in our Bill that was tabled — Bill No. 1 that was tabled this week in this House. He is so far out of touch, Mr. Speaker, as I, to reassure myself, I talked to many implement dealers on the weekend, and to set the record straight, I'll explain to the members opposite why.

When you finance through a machine finance company, the dealer is responsible. So if the farmers does not pay that payment that's due, it is charged back to the dealer. So when the company says to repossess that machine, the dealer picks up the machine and he is billed for the payments. Now what they're asking is for the dealer to pay the payment and not be able to have the right to pick up the machine. Now if the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and the

member from Shaunavon would be in touch they would know that machine dealers in this country are in favour of what this government done, a Bill that protects farm land for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

When they were comparing their Bill to what we've done, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were thinking of conditions in 1971, not comparing them to 1984. In 1971, as any farmer in Saskatchewan knows, the conditions were different. The economy was much — was actually excellent at that time. The grain bins were full. In fact they were building, and that's why Mr. Romanow brought that Bill in in 1971 because people couldn't pay their debts because they were short of cash. They were short of cash and not be able to sell grain.

Mr. Speaker, it is much different now. People are behind in their payments on land. They're behind in their payments. The price of grain is down. Commodities are rising. Commodities are going down, and costs are going up. It's a much different situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, than it was in 1971, and the members opposite did not talk to farmers in rural Saskatchewan or they would not have tabled or asked for Bill No. 30 to be discussed in this House at all.

Now points about our Bill, I'd like to talk about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is there's quite a difference. We are saying that this Bill will protect farm land in Saskatchewan — farm land. The points that they're saying, that it will put no cash in the hands of the farmers. I contradict them, and I will point out a few reasons why. Also, Mr. Speaker, the difference is that they wanted to protect absolutely everyone, and we wanted, in this Bill, leave an opening where, if someone is not a viable farmer, that the lenders would have an opportunity to deal with these type of people, of which there are few, but there are some.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is why we have a reverse onus, that the lender has a right to take this individual to court, and if they can prove through the courts that this individual is not viable, then they can be dealt with in a different matter. But, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite just says, save everyone, absolutely everyone, regardless.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they had of been in touch with people in Saskatchewan, they would have found out this; that there's many, many farmers out there that have been careful; they brought machinery and bought land when they knew their finances could cope with this situation and they would be able to pay their bills. And they do not, and they're saying loud and clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're saying loud and clear, that we do not want our tax dollars — our tax dollars — to be spent to save a farmer that overbought.

Now we also, in saying that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have thousands of farmers out there that did get themselves into problems, with no fault of their own if they overbought in the last few years when land was too high, machinery was too high, and they got in at the wrong time. Now this Bill will protect people like that and give them a chance to get their affairs in order over the next year or so.

Now where the cash is to the farmer that the members opposite will not even open their eyes to at all is this: they wanted us to guarantee or give money out to people to save them. Well, it would be exactly the same thing as far as cash to that farmer is concerned if he borrowed another 50 or 1,000 or 10,000 or whatever for his farm. He still owes that much more. But in this case, under our Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the farmer may — his choosing — if he cannot pay his sundry bills, he can delay on his land payment and use that money to pay his sundry bills, to pay the businessman in his town, pay for the tractor repairs, buy his fertilizer or whatever to put another crop in. Now he's going to owe the same amount of money because he's going to be taking the money that he received from the sale of grain or whatever, cattle, that the bank normally would have got on a land payment, will now be used for his sundry account. So it's really the same amount of money but at much less interest than borrowing it at a high operating cost.

Members opposite, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have a different view and a different philosophy entirely. They believed, from 1971 to 1982, they believed in spending tax dollars for the farmer; but only one way. I watched them very carefully, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from 1971 to '82, and I never seen any programs for farmers other than buy their land. If you went to the prior government and you had a financial problem, sure, we'll help you, we'll buy your land. this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will never do that.

(1545)

I was a proud man when the Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member from Souris-Cannington, stood up at his seat in this legislature in July of 1982 and said, there will be no more land purchased by this government, and that all farm land, government land, land bank land, and lands branch land is for sale. That made a lot of proud people in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is why did land get so high-priced through the latter years of the '70s? Land went too high. Farmers were paying more than they could afford for land. Two reasons. The Saskatchewan government was the main bidder. They were buying the land. They were outbidding neighbours. And they were getting the land. So when you have the biggest landowner in North America, the Saskatchewan government, buying land, it makes it hard for an individual, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be able to bid against This. And this drove the price of land up.

Another reason why land went up in price, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was capital gains. The Progressive Conservative Party had nothing to do with capital gains being put on farm land. But the federal Conservative Party in the last election made a promise, and I'm sure they will keep that promise, that capital gains will be removed, thus bringing the price of land perhaps down some, and along with the Progressive Conservatives in their great victory in April of 1982 in dispensing with land bank, the price will level out to what farmers wish to bid for land. They'll be bidding against one another instead of bidding against governments.

Mr. Speaker, just a few words about crop insurance corporation. I have some up-to-date figures I would just like to put in the record for the members opposite. They've been giving out allegations that crop insurance are away behind in their payments. Now I want to get on the record these up-to-date figures. On November 28th, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 1980, there were 14,212 yield loss claims that had been processed. To that same date in 1984, 22,801 claims. That's over 8,000 more claims than there were in 1980. In money paid out in 1980, \$49.3 million; in 1984, \$108.4 million. Now on December 5th is my last update I've had from the corporation. Claims processed were 30,500; paid out \$140.5 million. They are projecting to be completely finished by the 31st of December. We will be very, very proud of this because in 1980, under the prior government, when the loss wasn't near so great, they finished on the 6th of February. We will have our payment out, which will be \$250 million, \$0.25 billion, and that'll be paid out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by close to December 31, 1984.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just a couple of words on adjusters for crop insurance. The member from Shaunavon had been alleging that there is a shortage of adjusters in his area. Well I'd like to just touch on a few points in Saskatchewan, and how many adjusters they have. Now I see here, Assiniboia, Gravelbourg, Shaunavon have about the most adjusters than any other place in the province of Saskatchewan. Right out of the town of Assiniboia, 12; Gravelbourg, 11; Shaunavon, 13; Raymore is the only one that has more and that's 15; where places like Davidson is only 6; Outlook, 8; Melfort, 5; Carrot River, 4; Wilkie, 6.

Now we don't understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why the member from Shaunavon came out with this remark that he did in public. He said that there was only five, five adjusters in the whole south-west, the whole entire south-west. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the normal for the south-west, the normal is 45 adjusters, 45 adjusters. We trained 15 more in June and July making 60. We brought in 20 more and made 80 adjusters in south-west Saskatchewan. So I'm just

contradicting the member from Shaunavon. If he had come out with 60 or 70 adjusters, we could have maybe overlooked it. But when you're saying five compared to 80, it was just more than I could stand, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Just in closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to say a few words about the members — the official opposition. I've been in this legislature since 1978. I'm involved very much in politics since 1964-65. I followed the political life of the member from Elphinstone. We, naturally, had a different philosophy, but I used to admire him as a gentleman and a man.

But something bothered me in this sitting of this legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He asked questions in the very beginning that I didn't think would ever come from a man of his calibre. Some of the suggestions that he has made, I will not enlarge on what they were, but he will know and the public will know what I'm talking about.

And also, another member that just spoke prior to me, when he made, to me, very, very insulting remarks on the Minister of Social Services, I was ashamed that I have to sit across the House from a man that would say such a thing that the member from Rosemont . . . How could he square himself with God when he goes to bed at night? Now that is a remark that I just can't take, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has been a pleasure to speak for these few short minutes on this throne speech and it will be a pleasure, as always, to be a part of a Progressive Conservative government that brings in a throne speech like this. I am proud. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

**MR. EMBURY:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to add a few words to the throne speech debate. First, I'd like to add my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the speech.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition have been upset because the throne speech basically addressed two issues. Those two issues were the issues of jobs and debt, farm debt.

Those are the issues, Mr. Speaker — not nuclear arms, although that is a worthy subject of debate and concern in the world. But the opposition leader decided that he wouldn't support the speech because it didn't have nuclear arms in it. The address is to jobs. In my seat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, jobs is the issue.

It is not easy — and it cannot be done overnight — turning around a socialist government that have been around for years and years. Mr. Speaker, the NDP did more damage to this province than could be seen on the surface. The NDP's answer to jobs in the past was to either start another Crown corporation or, if there was a small business doing well enough, they would nationalize it.

But, Mr. Speaker, they didn't look at the underpinnings of what this economy needs. Mr. Speaker, they don't understand that there are many things that go into a long-range job creation package. Mr. Speaker, the NDP had colleges, community colleges, had technical schools, they had classes, they were training people. But what has been sadly discovered by many of those young people coming out of those colleges and technical schools was that after they had gone through the training there were no jobs available. There was no common sense in designing the courses and the classes that these people were being trained to the jobs that would be available when they got out.

I'm happy and proud that our Minister of Advanced Education has taken a look at that and, in a long-range program, has expanded the spaces in technical schools. But more than that, has looked at the curriculum involved in those technical schools so that when these young people

are finished their training, they have a good chance of getting a job because we've identified what will be in the market when they get finished.

Mr. Speaker, it is our philosophy, not the NDP's, that we would like to be the generator of jobs and not the provider; that is, Mr. Speaker, that we try and get the enthusiasm of the private sector to provide those jobs. It is foolish, Mr. Speaker, as the NDP did for years, to ignore the fact that the private sector is by far the largest provider of jobs in this province and not the public service. Although at the rate the NDP were going over the last 10 years, we're not quite sure, given another 10 years, whether perhaps the public service was going to be the largest employer.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina Centre has today called for an election. Mr. Speaker, I suppose, having called for the election, they would then scramble into the back room and then come up with some policies because we've heard none for the last two and a half years — none, not one alternative, not one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP have provided only half an opposition. They've provided criticism of any proposals put forward, but no alternatives. And I think, Mr. Speaker, an opposition that says nothing means nothing. And, Mr. Speaker, that opposition means nothing. I think they have either tried to mislead the public or they don't understand the broader strategy that is being put into place here, and it is strategy that is based on education. It is based on using a tax system that is used as an incentive rather than a penalty.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP, when in power, used taxation simply to gather more and more revenue for the government coffers, to pay for their every-growing civil service.

I am happy and I was happy to support the measures last year that introduced venture capital and other types of taxation incentives, taxation incentives so that the private sector could invest in this province, invest in the province now and for the future, and provide jobs.

And in that way we did two things, Mr. Speaker. We did two things. We provided jobs. it provided a climate for investment that by doing that we diversified our economy which needs diversification now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is not, and we cannot rely solely — although very important, and we will for a long time and forever on agriculture — we can't rely solely on the natural resource sector. We must diversify. And that is something that takes a long time. It is something that not only takes a long time but we have to — and we have had to for the last two years — overcome a great negative attitude towards this province by other people because of the former administration. People were worried about coming into Saskatchewan because, you know, the belief of the NDP was that if anything works nationalize it.

Mr. Speaker, people didn't like that. They didn't like to come in here and spend a lot of money. Ask the folks who came in in the potash industry what they thought about being invited in in one decade and booted out the next. Mr. Speaker, it isn't really good for trust and it's not that great for investment climate. So it's taken some time to turn that around. But, Mr. Speaker, it is turning around. And it will turn around.

Mr. Speaker, on the subject of jobs, we've heard the opposition from time to time and from month to month complain about the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan. No one, no one in Saskatchewan is happy with unemployment, period. But I think, when I think back over the months, of the arguments going back and forth, the best statistic you could find, month after month, 12 months a year, is when you are consistently the lowest unemployment rate — consistently.

Last month we dropped into second place by 0.7 of a per cent and next month we will probably be the lowest again. But month over month over month, for 12 months in a 12-month period, we

have the lowest unemployment rate which puts, which questions, Mr. Speaker, which questions those statistics that the opposition use.

(1600)

On the one hand they say your population has gone over a million people, but you don't have more people working. Yet, when your labour force is larger than it has been before . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I think now we have three members of the opposition back, so we're attracting them back. Mr. Speaker, the lowest unemployment rate consistently over the last year is what we had. And there's no arguing with it.

Mr. Speaker, we've also heard from the opposition. I'll just retract for a moment. We've also heard from the opposition, who have attacked the Minister of Labour on labour relations when they themselves had probably one of the poorest labour relations records in Canada — in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in the first seven months of 1982, most of it under the NDP government, the province lost 267,000 man-days due to strikes — 267,000 because their labour relations policy was such a great one. And in the first seven months of this year, under our administration, we lost 9,000. And they are attacking the Minister of Labour on his labour relations policy. I think the figures, Mr. Speaker, speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the other fallacy, the thing we hear most often from the NDP opposition, is that somehow we are giving away hundreds of millions and billions of dollars to oil companies. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy has probably one of the best royalty structures, has done more for the oil business in this province and therefore employment and therefore investment, in the last two years than they ever dreamed of. Does anybody remember the \$60 million a year that the NDP used to pay for dry holes? What kind of oil policy is that?

Under the NDP, the oil industry was dead. There were no jobs. There was no investment. There were no upgraders. There was nothing. Mr. Speaker, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina Centre is still wanting to go for an election, and it will come. You will be able to practice law full-time after that, which, Mr. Speaker, will be a help for his clients, I'm sure.

Mr. Speaker, in the first half of 1982, under the NDP, only 280 wells had been drilled. Production was at 75 per cent of capacity. Their March and June land sales, combined, only netted \$10 million — \$10 million. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy, when he has a land sale now, goes past that in the first half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, this is part of the NDP policy. Their policy really was this when it came to oil: if they couldn't develop it, nobody else could; if they couldn't get a bureaucracy with tens of thousands of people to get in there and drill the oil and pump it, produce it and sell it, nobody else could; or, conversely, we're going to keep it for the future. Well, the future under the NDP was pretty bleak.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of energy and Mines should be congratulated for his policies which have meant so much for this province in the last two years. Without his policies, that whole sector — that whole sector — would be as bad as it was in '82. And you could go into Estevan and probably get five hotel rooms instead of none. You could go into Lloydminster, and there would not be the impending upgrader there. And you couldn't in Regina, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the member for Regina Centre, you could not be looking forward to the upgrader in Regina, either. So I would congratulate the minister for his good work.



Mr. Speaker, another interesting criticism that we got from NDP dwelt with highways. And I'd like to just add my congratulations to the Minister of Highways for a job well done. It is most interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that our province, our province has the lowest percentage of highways in need of reconstruction in Canada, at 6.7 per cent — the lowest, Mr. Speaker. And further, it's interesting to note that Manitoba's TRIP (The Road Information Program) report shows that 27 per cent of their system is in need of reconstruction. Now that's our neighbour next door who opted some years ago, mistakenly, for the socialist way. They won't again. They won't again. But they did — 27 per cent compared to 6.7 per cent.

It's also worth while to note that Saskatchewan's unemployment rate in the construction industry is lower than all provinces studied by TRIP, except for Ontario, and that Manitoba's rate is substantially higher than ours. That's our sister province next door. Consider for a moment, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Department of Highways and Transportation spent \$222 million in the fiscal year 1984-85, and this level of expenditure sustained 7,000 direct jobs and 8,000 indirect person-years of employment. Mr. Speaker, I think, again, what the opposition says about one of our departments is untrue. The Department of Highways is doing a fine job and will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the NDP have not been pleased when our members have talked about their resolutions, and I won't dwell on them. But, Mr. Speaker, the only reason we do is because in the last two and a half years the opposition has been known to criticize every proposal but not give us an alternative. Now, given no alternatives in this House, no alternative solutions, we turned to their resolutions because as they are fond of saying they follow their party's resolutions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I turned to some of their resolutions — just a few of them — to see what they would do.

They're calling for an election, so I presume that the following will be the basis of their election platform. What is the basis of their election platform? Well first of all they're going to do away with the Public Utilities Review Commission. Now that was passed. That was passed. That resolution was passed at your convention. So you're going to do away with the Public Utilities Review Commission.

You are going to do away, for some interesting reason, with part-time employment. I have no idea why they're going to do away with part-time employment, but that carried also.

They're going to do away, of course, with the uranium mines, which would interest the two members left sitting in the House on the opposition side.

They're going to, Mr. Speaker, for agriculture they're going to limit the size of farms. Now I don't know how you're going to limit the size of farms, but they are. They're going to bring back the farm bank.

They're going to have full public ownership of all major resources — all major resources. This is going to be a great policy. The more I read, I think maybe we should have an election.

Then, Mr. Speaker, for those folks like orphans and widows, they're going to have an inheritance tax — another basic part of their new platform.

And then they're going to develop a more organic relationship with labour. And I trust that that means they're going to consummate their marriage. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if they're going to have one of them relationships.

There's an interesting one. There's an interesting resolution the NDP had, and it dealt with technology. And they're going to amend The Trade Union Act and they're going to put in a *status quo* clause. When you boil it down, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it means there will be no new technology. That is what a *status quo* clause is.

Those all passed. Every one of those motions or resolutions passed at their convention this fall. That's the alternative. I don't want to dwell on it, but I think, given the lack of alternatives in this House, that we should at least make it public what they want to do with the province.

Mr. Speaker, does the NDP believe in small business? And I suppose they do believe in small business, (a) if it's small enough, or (b) if it's big enough to nationalize.

Mr. Speaker, I can remember when I was on the city council in Regina, and one of their find projects in Regina was to build the Cornwall Centre. And they worked for years for this Cornwall Centre. And I can remember when they announced that Chartwood Developments were going to be the developer, we asked that at that time, "Why Chartwood?" Their answer to us, Mr. Speaker, is this: there was no developer in Saskatchewan capable of building the Cornwall Centre. There was no developer capable in Saskatchewan. No developer. There are developers in this city and in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, that have malls in Phoenix and have malls in Victoria and have malls all over the world, but the NDP didn't believe in them. The NDP didn't believe in them. Don't let the folks build at home. Don't let the folks build at home. Well I tell you, Mr. Speaker, those days are gone. Those days are gone.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, as the member from Regina Lakeview I want to congratulate the government on a number of things that have happened in the city over the last year.

First of all, I think that the most popular move over the summer was the announcement of the extension of the mortgage reduction plan until 1988. My seat, Mr. Speaker, is mostly residential, and those people felt that that extension, which gave certainty to them till 1988, was a great boon. Not only that, but I think it also helped the construction industry, the housing industry, who now knew that the mortgage rates would stay at 13.25, and that there would be no fluctuations up to 20 per cent of what we had while the NDP were around.

Mr. Speaker, after 10 or 12 long years of talking about it, I was happy to see the Minister of Highways complete the Lewvan Expressway, through my seat, something that had been talked about for 12 years, something that was completed in the first year.

Mr. Speaker, we were happy to hear about the announcement of the construction of the rehabilitation centre in Regina, something that was needed, something that has now been financed and not just talked about.

We were happy, Mr. Speaker, to see the completion of phase III of the Pasqua Hospital, a much needed facility in Regina.

We were happy, Mr. Speaker, in Regina to see the construction of a new WIASS (Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences) building where classes will start in January.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think more importantly we are happy to see in downtown Regina the private sector building the buildings that are down there — five new buildings going up, all private sector.

And, of course, we anticipate in the new year the beginning of the construction of the heavy oil upgrader at the Co-op refinery. That, of course, will have a good impact — a great impact — on Regina. It will provide thousands of jobs and will be a much welcome boost to the city.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the throne speech in general terms outlined what our issues are and what we will be looking at in this session of the legislature, and that is jobs and agricultural debt. My colleagues from rural Saskatchewan have outlined what is happening in agriculture, and we have a whole host of people in our caucus who are farmers and who know that sector.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined some of the good things that have happened in Regina that affect my seat. I am confident that his good work will continue, and I will be, of course, supporting the throne speech.

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

(1615)

**MR. PARKER:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy, Deputy, Deputy Speaker, and I say that without a stutter.

The city of Moose Jaw is a vibrant community, and since 1982 it has benefited from the policies of the Progressive Conservative government of this province. As the MLA for Moose Jaw North, I'm pleased to be able to participate in this debate in support of the Speech from the Throne and to have the opportunity to tell the legislature why I believe Moose Jaw is better off because of the government of Premier Grant Devine.

At the outset of my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I will shorten that — I'd like to draw to the attention of the legislature the fact that this year, 1984, marks the 100th anniversary, the centenary of the Moose Jaw School Board, the first school board established in the North-West Territories in 1884, and it goes without saying that the people of Moose Jaw are especially proud of the school system in the city, and as the MLA for Moose Jaw North, I wish to extend to them my very sincere congratulations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's now been over one week since the Lieutenant Governor came before this House to deliver the Speech from the Throne, and there's been ample time for each and every member of the legislature to review the Speech from the Throne and the accomplishments of the Progressive Conservative government.

From my vantage point as an MLA from Moose Jaw North, I first of all wish to discuss the impact of some of the policies of the government as they relate to the city of Moose Jaw. I'd like to speak briefly of Moose Jaw's business community.

Now as we know, the last significant contribution that the former administration made to the business community of Moose Jaw was the unforgettable reassessment that was introduced back in the late 1970s, and I would imagine for the people of the Prince Albert area and other areas of the province, they are going through some of the horrors that we went through in Moose Jaw, thanks to our friends from the former administration.

But the business community of Moose Jaw, they like the free enterprise and the entrepreneurial spirit of this government. The Heritage Canada Main Street project in the city of Moose Jaw served as an example to other Canadian centres. What we had was individual merchants working together to promote downtown Moose Jaw.

Through Heritage Canada, the city of Moose Jaw, and the Saskatchewan Department of Urban Affairs, this project has been and continues to be a real boon for the downtown part of the city. We in Moose Jaw are naturally proud of the revitalized downtown section.

The Saskatchewan Water Corporation headquarters are to be constructed in Moose Jaw at a cost of \$5.5 million. Now this is tremendous news for the people of Moose Jaw. The four-storey, 2,400 square metre building will serve as an example of this government's commitment to bring government closer to the people, and it also reaffirms our belief that Moose Jaw is a vibrant city to locate in.

Not only has the Water Corporation been promised to headquarter in Moose Jaw, but the construction is now under way, another example of a promise that was delivered to the people

of Saskatchewan by this government.

This government has also committed \$5 million towards the carbon filtration plant to improve the water quality for Moose Jaw and Regina. Almost immediately after the 1982 election, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government responded to the urgent pleas of the citizens of Moose Jaw and Regina and this area to address the serious concerns relating to the water quality and the water odour. We immediately implemented the Muirhead report, and we led the delegation of the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina to Ottawa to advance our plea to the federal government, and, as usual, it basically fell upon deaf ears. And the best offer we could get from the federal government we assisted and committed our \$5 million of the total project costs, and we're hopeful that it will address in, some measure, the concerns of the people who have urged us to respond to.

We believe in the future of young people in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and young people in Moose Jaw. That was proven and reinforced recently by the \$5.7 million addition for the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in the city of Moose Jaw. The Saskatchewan Technical Institute is a very significant factor in the city of Moose Jaw, and I'm certainly pleased to confirm to the — not only to the students, to the residents of Moose Jaw, but to the staff of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, the fact that under this government the STI is going to enjoy a continuous growth and will add another steady factor in the business community of Moose Jaw.

This is a traditional time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this legislature when members have the opportunity to state the accomplishments of the government, as well as our vision for the future. It's a time to review the progress made by the policies of the government, and as we all know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the head of the government is the Premier. In Saskatchewan, our Premier, Premier Grant Devine, represents the true spirit of Saskatchewan. There is a real sense of optimism and pride in our province, and a lot of that pride and optimism is because of the Premier. Simply stated, Premier Grant Devine is a true leader, in the most positive sense of the word.

Now I should remind the legislature also that the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the NDP, sits in opposition to this government, and for the record I'd like to remind this House of some of the Leader of the Opposition's statements on various issues, keeping in mind that this is an individual who once held a very responsible position in this province as the premier at one time. The Leader of the Opposition told a rally in front of this legislative building, a labour rally — he said organized labour in Saskatchewan should become more militant. Now I have to ask the House, how much more militant? What did he have in mind? To what extreme did he feel that labour in Saskatchewan should move to?

We already had a labour minister in the previous NDP administration who, unfortunately, was from Moose Jaw — an individual who had more strikes to his credit than Sandy Koufax. So, we ask ourselves, if the labour is to become more militant under the leadership of the former premier, does he feel they should become as militant, for example, as the coal miners' union in England? Where does he feel it should end?

The same MLA, the member for Elphinstone, has said that the old NDP government was too centralized, too distant, and too aloof. He bared his soul. But I warn the legislature, beware of a fox in sheep's clothing — an old fox, but a fox none the less.

I also remind the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, back in 1982 when we were faced with double digit the interest rates, and how all the young people of Saskatchewan — the young homeowners and the young farmers — will recall those very anxious months when they didn't know whether they were going to lose their homes or lose their farms; the effect that it had on the business community, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when young mortgage holders were faced with the decision of keeping their mortgage current at the expense of foregoing other bills, which had a direct

bearing on the accounts receivable of the small merchants, the small-business community.

Well, what did the leader of the NDP at the time have to say about double digit interest rates? Here's a responsible individual who's advocating militancy in the labour market. He's got our Heritage Fund. he's got our utility rates. Basically, he's got all our money. So when we turned to him, when the young people of Saskatchewan turned to him and said, "Mr. Premier, we need some assistance. We're into double digit interest rates. What are you going to do for us, so we can keep our homes and our farms?"

Well, the premier of the day said, and I quote: "Our position with respect to interest rates is that the first steps ought to be taken by the federal government." In other words, don't come running to me. Don't look to me for any help. I'm busy spending money in my own little, fun little capacities. I've got uranium mines to build. I've got things that I've decided are important for the people of Saskatchewan. You worry about your own mortgage rates, and you worry about your own farms. Don't run to me.

Well, that was the member for Elphinstone speaking in this House on April 2nd, 1980. He did absolutely nothing to help the farmers, the small-business men, and the homeowners against double digit inflation. And of course that's why he suffered such a humiliating defeat in April, 1982.

This Progressive Conservative government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, immediately brought in the 13.25 per cent Mortgage Interest Reduction Program after the election in 1982, the best program of its kind in North America. Then we brought the low-interest loans for young farmers. We addressed the needs of young farmers and responded in a very positive manner. This is what you call leadership, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I'd like to continue a little bit more on the pronouncements of the Leader of the Opposition. He told this House back in 1972, and he said and I quote:

We believe that very soon our resources will be attractive enough that we can develop them without massive public subsidy.

Then he immediately turned around, he and his NDP administration, and spent millions, literally hundreds of millions of dollars, a massive public subsidy, on resources.

We all witnessed the frenzy of the NDP in their anxious bid to take over the potash industry in Saskatchewan. And, of course, uranium, we all know about uranium, Mr. Speaker. They spent hundreds of millions of dollars on uranium. And then they turn around, naturally, and they decide they want to end it all. They're not really concerned about the tens of thousands of young people that would be out of work, unemployed. They raise their voice in the legislature when the question of unemployment comes up in question period and we find that it maybe drops from one month to the next, from 7.8 per cent maybe to 7. Maybe it goes up to 7.9 per cent. And the members opposite become very irate and all of a sudden very responsible and concerned about unemployment.

One weekend in Saskatoon, they said, "I think we should just shut down those uranium mines. I don't think that we made a good move when we spent \$600 million." There was no concern given to the young members of the working force in northern Saskatchewan. They could fend for themselves just like the homeowners had to when we hit double-digit inflation and double-digit interest.

It's just another example of what we call double standards, Mr. Speaker. And I guess the last quote that I'll give you from the Leader of the Opposition best explains his double standards. He told the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, and I quote:

So you have to be more definite in public than, in fact, you feel mentally. And having done that, when you go behind closed doors you say, "That's my position, but I may be wrong. Have you got some arguments?"

Now that was a quote from the Leader of the Opposition: one position for the public and another position when he's behind closed doors. This is a responsible individual that the people of Saskatchewan had as their premier at one time.

It's little wonder that the *Ottawa Citizen* once described him as no better than a local parish pump politician — the legislative voice of Nadine Hunt. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan rejected him on April 26th, 1982, and I can predict to this House that there will be no last hurrah for the Leader of the Opposition. His ideas are old, his policy is extreme, and his touch with reality is questionable.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, the present Premier of Saskatchewan is truly representative for the optimistic spirit throughout this province. In two and a half years Premier Grant Devine has made very positive changes for Saskatchewan. He believes in the greatness of Saskatchewan.

I'd like to quickly review some of the great achievements of this government under Premier Devine. The lowest taxes in Canada — there have been major tax reductions since the brother mentality of the past is now history and shall remain history. There is record development in our oil industry — a record \$4.2 billion in two Saskatchewan oil upgraders.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, human concerns, human needs are the reason why caring and compassion are the Conservative way. Mr. Speaker, the opposition likes to exploit human misery. They like it when they can make light of the problems of unemployment. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the opposition would not be happy if there were no unemployment.

This government, Mr. Speaker, had the courage to take job creation on head-on. We won't engage in a numbers scam like the opposition. We won't treat human beings like statistics and numbers to exploit the fact of unemployment. Real jobs is the goal of this government. Sure, there are unemployed people. We certainly recognize that. We didn't ignore it. Since day one of this government, we've had the courage to develop jobs and continue to develop jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the talk and rhetoric of the opposition is cheap, very cheap. The talk of the opposition does not create one new job, not one. The actions and policies of this government create meaningful jobs. That's the difference.

Mr. Speaker, as the MLA for Moose Jaw North, I'm proud to speak in support of the Speech from the Throne.

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

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I join with hon. members in speaking on the Speech from the Throne debate. I'd like to particularly commend the mover and seconder for excellent presentations.

Mr. Speaker, too often during the debate the opposition has failed to come to grips with reality. They have attempted from time to time to ignore their own record and some of the terrible economic damage that it's caused. They've failed, and I say very pointedly, Mr. Speaker, to discuss their own proposals.

I've never seen an example of political schizophrenia before, Mr. Speaker, but I've seen it today

and over the last few weeks from the NDP. And all we have to do is take a look at the blues and we will find out that the NDP really don't know if they're coming or going. First of all, the Leader of the Opposition puts a resolution on that no more debt financing is basically what he's saying, resolution number one, no mortgaging the long-term economic security of the province. He has said from time to time that he would deficit, but now he says no.

But what are the other members in the NDP saying? We go to number three. One of our northern members says that there should be a great deal more money spent in the North. And then the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg comes up with that pie in the sky, 41.5 billion, \$30 to every acre of farm land in the province of Saskatchewan. He disagrees with his own leader. He disagrees with his own leader who doesn't want any more deficit financing.

Then we go to the next resolution requiring massive more expenditures on highways, even though \$200 million is being spent now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, the clone of the Liberal party keeps wanting to interrupt me. But, Mr. Speaker, he stands in this . . . (inaudible) . . . folded up in 10 minutes in his speech today and said, I've got nothing positive to propose. I have no suggestions. I'm just a new member of the Liberal party, says the member from Regina North West. I don't know what's going on either. That's what he said. He stood up for 10 minutes.

A year ago he stood before this House, Mr. Speaker, and he told all his constituents in Regina North West how good the government was doing. The next day he said, boy, I think the Liberals are going to win. I'd better get on side. He jumped over, and then he didn't even stand up and give us, did not give us one positive suggestion as to what the Liberal party stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I go on . . . I go on, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, the Liberal member wants to shout me down, but the message is loud and clear, Mr. Speaker. Every single NDP resolution in this House says spend massively more money — every single one of them on the blues, except for the Leader of the Opposition. As I say, it's an example of political schizophrenia.

But when they spent the money . . . Let's take a look at what happened when they spent the money. They spent over \$600 million in uranium. They now stand up and say, oh, we made a mistake. We made a terrible mistake, Mr. Speaker, is what the NDP are saying. And they want the public of Saskatchewan to stand up and trust them to spend another cent of the taxpayers' money.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the public is too astute and too smart to let the NDP just roll the dice and say that they can spend \$600 million and turn around a year later and say, oh, we made a mistake. We're going to cancel the uranium industry. That's what the NDP, that's what their record says.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP can't be trusted with the public's money because, Mr. Speaker, they don't know from one day to the next, when they were in government, whether they were doing the right thing or not. It's not till they get in opposition that they stand up and say, oh, we made a mistake; oh, we were wrong — \$600 million on the one industry alone. They admitted a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, other members have listed from time to time in the debate some of the activities going on in the province of Saskatchewan. And the public understands one very simple fact: that the population of this province has increased dramatically over the last two years, and that more people are working today than there were two years ago in the province of Saskatchewan. And that's what the public understands and that's what the public respects, Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, in very community there are major new projects.

In Prince Albert, a technical school that the NDP had 10 years to put up — 10 years — and every time they said no to the people of Prince Albert. They said no to the people of Prince Albert. Mr.

Speaker, the Conservatives said yes.

They talked about water for I don't know how long, Mr. Speaker. But did they every do anything about it? No. No, they did nothing. But the people of Moose Jaw, Mr. Speaker, know full well that their city will be the headquarters for the new water Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker. Moose Jaw was not ignored, will not be ignored, by this government.

Buildings going up in Saskatoon — Saskatoon now, if it's not the largest city in the province, very soon will be, Mr. Speaker. That would not have happened, of course, under the New Democratic Party, who look to major government buildings in the city of Regina as the sole solution to their answer to economic activity — that, of course, plus buying the resource industries, the highly volatile resource industries.

I can go on as to the activities going on in the city of Regina. A major expansion to Ipsco — Ipsco, Mr. Speaker, which the employees now realize depends to a large extent on activity in the oil sector, activity that would not have happened under the New Democratic Party. And if we take a look at their record today, if the New Democratic Party were in office in this province, Ipsco would have been shut down for the last year. That is the record, Mr. Speaker, and that's what their proposal would have meant.

The uranium industry would have put approximately 3,000 people directly and indirectly out of work if the NDP were in office in their threat to shut it down. They would have shut northern Saskatchewan down, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a little difficulty from the northern members who stand up in this House and say, we support the closing of the uranium industry; put the people out of work in northern Saskatchewan. They support the party that does it. you have to accept what your party says.

They stand up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and they oppose totally the efforts of this government to develop and diversify northern Saskatchewan with tourism and the wild rice. They stand up and oppose it. They stand up and oppose it, Mr. Speaker. It's rather difficult to take with any seriousness — and I know the people of Saskatchewan are having the same difficulty — the NDP concerns, the sudden concerns about jobs.

Let's take a look at what we've accomplished and are attempting to accomplish, and I think that we should remind the people from time to time as to the NDP record. Would there be heavy oil upgraders in Saskatchewan if the NDP were in office today? The answer is a resounding no because, Mr. Speaker, they were more concerned about playing one city or town off against another, creating divisions, trying to raise expectations, dashing expectations.

They promised an upgrader in Moose Jaw. They promised one in Regina. They promised one in Saskatoon. And they promised one in North Battleford. They promised one in Lloydminster, and I think Cut Knife. I think the only place that didn't get the promise of an upgrader was Shaunavon, and only because they thought the member was going to make the promise and he forgot, Mr. Speaker, — the only place in the province not promised an upgrader.

Mr. Speaker, did the NDP even consult with Consumer Co-op Refinery in Regina as to the possibility of a major expansion and an upgrader? No, they did not. It was too logical. it was too obvious, Mr. Speaker. And it wasn't a \$3-billion project that they could dangle around. They had to make a decision, if they had gone to the Consumer Co-op Refinery in the city of Regina.

Let's take a look, Mr. Speaker, at what the NDP proposals will do for job creation in this province.

Here's what the NDP stood up and promised at their convention. They want a 6.50 an hour minimum wage. A 6.50 minimum wage is what they promised. What was defeated, Mr. Speaker — but I understand not by a very wide margin — was the proposal for 70 per cent of the average provincial wage to become the minimum wage. Do you know what that would have done? And one of the candidates in Regina, Mrs. Atkinson or Ms. Atkinson, is proposing 70 per



cent of the average annual wage as the minimum wage in Saskatchewan. That will be over \$7 an hour minimum wage. That's the NDP commitment and the NDP.

That, Mr. Speaker, overnight will put 10,000 people out of work in this province — 10,000 people out of work — 3,000 with uranium, cancelling the upgraders. And remember we've all heard what they're going to do with the upgraders. They're going to cancel them because they said you can't give the money to the big multinationals like Consumer Co-op Refinery, that you can't give the money to an Alberta oil company, even though Tommy Douglas is on the board of directors. The NDP will cancel the upgrader, and I think the people of Saskatchewan, they're upset enough now, and they fully recognize, Mr. Speaker, that putting the NDP in would create severe economic dislocation and will put literally thousands of people out of work in the province of Saskatchewan.

(1645)

And then they're going to revamp Sedco according to a resolution at their annual convention. They're not going to give a government loan to a business unless that business supports democratization in the work place. Can you imagine a small-business man in Saskatchewan being forced to . . . I don't now whether it's compulsory or whether it's one person, one vote, before they make a decision. That is one their agenda, Mr. Speaker: compulsory democratization in the work place or you don't get any government loan.

The did, and I find it somewhat regrettable, make one firm commitment for job creation in the province of Saskatchewan, and that is they are going to convert the community clinics to abortion clinics. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that that may have been one of the most tragic resolutions passed by a political party of any political strip. Mr. Speaker, first of all, it's illegal. It's contrary to the Criminal Code of Canada, but the NDP don't care. The NDP don't care. As one of their prominent members was quoted as saying, "The only thing good out of that convention is I'll do down and invest in one of these community clinic abortion clinics." That, Mr. Speaker, was the one job creation.

I will say that there was one slight period during the convention where the NDP — and I suppose it was a very small meeting — where they fully admitted, fully admitted in their workshops, that they were responsible for continued forestry and fishery resource depletion. and that's in their workshops, Mr. Speaker. They fully admitted that if there's a problem in the forestry industry and the fishery industry in this province today, that they accept full responsibility. And I'm glad the hon. members from northern Saskatchewan are two — forthright as they are — that are taking it to northern Saskatchewan and admitting to all and sundry that they were, in fact, responsible.

Mr. Speaker, everything the NDP proposed at their convention, and every course of action that they have stated in the debate today, means a job loss — means a job loss. Mr. Speaker, I find that tragic. I find it tragic for the NDP to take that position, and I also find it tragic that the NDP takes its anti-business position through its convention, into this House, into this Assembly, trying to destroy any climate where business can prosper and create the jobs that this province needs.

Mr. Speaker, they've just said it again, what they would do to the upgraders. It's a give-away to the multinationals. Husky Oil has become a multinational. Tommy Douglas is on the board. The NDP — not one cent to the upgraders — not one cent to the upgraders, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP are critical of virtually every farm program that's come down. They opposed the legislation introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, one that will give the farmers the breathing-room that they so desperately need; one that recognizes the realities; and one, Mr. Speaker, that recognizes this government will, in fact, help the farmers. They say, oh no, they're dead set opposed to it. They're going to vote against it. The NDP vote against it. I make the prediction, when it comes down to the vote, that the NDP will not have the courage, Mr. Speaker, I think they're going to talk a lot, but I'm prepared to make a wager that the NDP end up

seeing the vote, or voting for the government on its farm land protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, what do other New Democratic Parties say? The NDP in Ontario think it's great legislation. The NDP in Alberta support the Conservative government of Saskatchewan. It's only the NDP in Saskatchewan, it's only the NDP in Saskatchewan in their terminal negativism opposing everything, Mr. Speaker, that would oppose a sincere effort to help the Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I will respond shortly, in the next two days, to some short-term job initiatives by the Government of Saskatchewan. We will, Mr. Speaker, be announcing a new program which will target 4,500 additional jobs. Mr. Speaker, we have every confidence that those short-term initiatives will be announced. We will be announcing over the next few months approximately 80 — 80 new businesses, projects, business opportunities that have opened up and will open up in the province of Saskatchewan.

The throne speech debate has shown one thing, and that is that the NDP have run out of ideas, even though they've had two years in the wilderness to rethink their positions. But the NDP oppose initiatives by this government to create jobs, to create opportunity, to create technical training. It's an amazing thing to me, Mr. Speaker, when an opposition party can stand up straight-faced and say, we don't want any more technical training because the jobs aren't there, when there are literally thousands of studies which show that it's the trained young people, those with the skills, that have the opportunities, Mr. Speaker, to get the jobs.

And at the same time they are so negative to the other side of the coin, and that's trying to create the demand in the business community which requires a positive approach, not a negative approach, but a positive climate for investment and economic development.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the public has been asking over the last six months: what do the NDP really stand for? And they are getting the answer in spades. The NDP mean no more jobs. The NDP mean the shut-down of sectors of our economy. The NDP means more government ownership of farm land, and limitation of farm size, Mr. Speaker, and I strongly suspect that that farm size limit will be less than six quarters of land if the NDP ever get their opportunity to limit farm size in Saskatchewan.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, instead of joining with the people of Saskatchewan and the government of Saskatchewan in creating a positive climate for economic development and joining with the government and the people of Saskatchewan in saying: industry, you do have a chance in Saskatchewan, that we're not against you; instead of joining with the government and the people of Saskatchewan and saying, yes, that is a sincere effort to help the farmers, take advantage of it; Mr. Speaker, all we have seen is, as I say, political schizophrenia as they take both sides of issues.

Mr. Speaker, we have not seen in this session to date one positive suggestion for job creation from the NDP or the Liberal parties — not one. And, Mr. Speaker, they have had the opportunity in this debate to put their record on the table before the people of Saskatchewan, and I say that it's a political tragedy that the two parties can stand up and say, "We have nothing to offer. We can only criticize and oppose." Mr. Speaker, they have made a travesty of the throne speech debate.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

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

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**Yeas — 41**

Muller	Schoenhals	Myers
Birkbeck	Currie	Rybchuk
McLeod	Sandberg	Hampton
Andrew	Klein	Gerich
Bernston	Dutchak	Schmidt
Lane	Embury	Tusa
Duncan	Martens	Meagher
Katzman	Young	Glauser
Pickering	Domotor	Sauder
Hardy	Muirhead	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Petersen	Sutor
Garner	Hodgins	Weiman
Baker	Parker	Morin
Hepworth	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	

**Nays — 8**

Blakeney	Koskie	Yew
Thompson	Lusney	Sveinson
Lingenfelter	Shillington	

**MOTIONS**

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance:

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such members of the Assembly as are the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance:

That this Assembly will, at the next sitting, resolved itself into a committee of finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty and to consider the ways and means of raising the supply.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:02 p.m.