

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
November 26, 1985

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. SWAN: — I'm pleased to introduce to you a former member of our association and now the chairman and chief executive officer of Farm Credit Corporation for Canada, Eiliv Anderson. He's seated in the Speaker's gallery. Would you stand, please.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Tax Measures Implemented by Last Budget

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. Mr. Speaker, on April 10th of this year the government opposite introduced what the finance minister called the most intelligent budget in Canada, a budget which included the biggest tax increases in the history of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Deputy Premier, considering the clear message in last evening's by-election in Regina North East, can the Deputy Premier assure the people of Saskatchewan that your government will soon repudiate the Minister of Finance's budget and roll back the unfair tax increases, particularly the flat tax and the sales tax on used cars and trucks?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, without dealing in specifics as it relates to the budget, there is no doubt that there is a lesson to be learned from last night. Last night, there's no doubt that there were at least two very good candidates — I say two because I didn't know the third one — and the people are always right, and they made their choice. And that message, Mr. Speaker, will not be wasted.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Agreeing with the Deputy Premier that there were two very good candidates, and agreeing that both of those candidates, including the candidate for the party represented opposite, attributed the result to the disastrous taxes imposed by the April 10th budget.

Are you prepared, Mr. Deputy Premier, to do something about that and announce the elimination of the property tax; announce that you will rescind the elimination of property taxes rebates for home owners and renters and farmers and small—business people, which was included in the budget of the Minister of Finance of April 10th?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, obviously I'm in no position unilaterally to do anything. We have a cabinet that sits around and talks about these things, and a caucus that advises cabinet, and the people from around the province who we consult. And all I can say at this point, Mr. Speaker, is that the message of last night will not be wasted.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the cabinet groups itself in Regina, on the occasion that it might, and considers these matters, will it take into consideration the fact that the April 10th budget increased property taxes on ordinary people, and a legislative measure brought in shortly thereafter gave substantial tax decreases to real estate operators and speculators in this city, and will you take that into account and decide that the care and concern which you showed to real estate operators should be shown to the ordinary taxpayers of Regina and Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, Mr. Speaker, while I don't agree with everything the Leader of the

Opposition has put forward, I will say that there is nothing that won't be taken into consideration at cabinet in keeping with the message that was sent to the government last night.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Reassured by the comment of the Deputy Premier about that, will he now say that among the options which will be considered by him and his cabinet colleagues, is the possibility of introducing a new provincial budget within the next 60 days, or better still, calling a provincial election which the people of Saskatchewan are calling for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, there was a message in the results of last night's by-election, Mr. Speaker. I would caution the members opposite to interpret that as being the message of Saskatchewan, and the answer is quite simply is: no, we will not be calling a provincial election within 60 days. I say that in a sense that it's not a commitment. There may well be, but it's not a commitment, and we are sitting here with a significant majority and a mandate that was given to us in 1982, and I quite frankly think that the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't be very happy with us to call an early election.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — A supplement to the Deputy Leader. Mr. Deputy Leader, you indicated to us that you were given a massive mandate to operate in Saskatchewan and to carry out the government role in Saskatchewan, and I think that's one of the things that showed up clearly last night in the by-election — that that mandate to cut taxes has been broken, and in fact massive tax increases have been set in place.

My question to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, is: when you're considering changes to your budget upcoming, whether or not you will include the elimination of the sales tax on used vehicles, which was a promise broken.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I suppose, suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, when cabinet deals with these matters in due course — and I expect sooner, rather than later — the decisions of cabinet will be made public at the appropriate time. All I can offer once more, Mr. Speaker, is that the message of last night will not be wasted.

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Deputy Premier. As the Deputy Premier acknowledges that a message was sent to the government last night, as has been alluded to, the massiveness of the tax increases during last budget is certainly an issue on the minds of the people of Saskatchewan. But also, Mr. Deputy Premier, the massiveness of the deficit which is predicted for \$1.25 billion, which is likely to be \$1.5 billion now, are you prepared to stand up here and advise the people that you will give some fiscal management to this province, that you'll give some fairness to the people of Saskatchewan, and not all to the oil companies and the banks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well again, Mr. Speaker, without getting into the debate and without acknowledging in any way agreement with the allegations of the member opposite, I will once more say — and I don't know how many times you can answer the same question or in how many different ways you can answer the same question, but I'm going to try and answer it the same way as I did before — that is to say that the message of last night will not be wasted.

Increased Insurance Costs for Certain Vehicles

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the minister in charge of SGI, or responsible for SGI, and it follows his decision this summer to drastically increase the cost of certain types of insurance coverage for school buses, emergency vehicles, ambulances, etc., taxis, and commercial trucks. Can the minister tell this House why these drastic rate increases were implemented by SGI?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there were not massive rate

increases in insurance. Number one, there were some increases, admittedly, on liability incurred by reinsurance companies, not by SGI. So the liability insurance costs today are certainly a concern to us. They are a world-wide concern. SGI is in a competitive business. We have to try to maintain and remain competitive with the other insurance companies.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. That sounds very interesting, Mr. Minister. When you talk about SGI staying competitive, is that why you increased your rates so drastically? Can the minister tell me about how much more it would cost for a private school bus operator? Some of my units are private; some still own their own buses. But how much more would it cost either one of them this year per bus? Say they have \$5 million coverage — you know those numbers — about how much did that increase?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I can't tell the hon. Member how much it has increased. I can tell him that SGI is still, in fact, subsidizing all of the school buses in Saskatchewan. Because the rate that we are receiving from reinsurance — and if you understand anything about reinsurance or about insurance companies, for that matter, I doubt that you would ask that question.

Reinsurance is rated by world—wide insurance companies. SGI by itself could not afford to carry, for example, 10 or 15 or 20 or \$50 million worth of insurance from one school bus company or other organizations which you are referring to. So we do have to pass it on, and the cost of that liability insurance has been going up and going up considerably. And we, SGI — when I say we, I say SGI — have been charged a much higher rate by the reinsurance companies, which we are in fact subsidizing to the school bus companies. So the rate that we are charging the school bus companies now is much lower, much lower than what we are paying for. So there is a very definite subsidy to the school buses.

MR. ENGEL: — One more question, Mr. Minister. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I thought that's why we had an advantage with having SGI. Isn't that supposed to be one of the advantages that they can shelter Saskatchewan people from natural disasters or major disasters like we had in India at Bhopal, or in Columbia? Why should Saskatchewan people subsidize on an international basis? Why can't you protect Saskatchewan people from outside influences which bear no relation to the reality of our own province?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, that's absolutely right. And I just said — if you had been listening, you would have heard me say that we are providing the insurance to these school buses and others, that other insurance companies won't even sell to them. I want to caution the member not to look outside of the province when you place responsibility for the increase in the rates. I want to caution him, because here in Saskatchewan we've had our own disasters which have added to an increase in the costs. Refer to the floods of 1982 and '83 for example. So we have to pay, we have to insure through the reinsurance market.

And you're absolutely right when you say that that's why SGI was established, and that's exactly what we're doing. Not only are we providing the insurance which other insurance companies won't do — because you can't even buy it from some of them — but we're providing it at less cost than what it's costing us to buy it. So we are in fact subsidizing it, which is exactly what you're suggesting, and that's exactly what we're doing.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Minister, can I have one more question? I said that was the last one, but I didn't expect I'd really get an answer. Mr. Minister, what does a flood have to do with a school bus? You initially pinned the increase on the education system because of a flood. When you take the category, even if you believe in a user pay, what catastrophe happened in the school bus area that would rate a 300

per cent increase? Or in ambulances? I haven't heard of major accidents in those various areas.

I think you are being competitive and you're trying to make Saskatchewan's insurance high enough so that your friends in the other insurance companies can still sell insurance. That's what it sounds like to me, Mr. Minister. You're not trying to provide cheap coverage. Why would a flood affect a school bus?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Property and casualty and liability insurance is provided for in the insurance market through reinsurance. I've tried to explain that to you and it all comes in the same packages. We have other examples in Saskatchewan of liability insurance that we've had to pay, awards that have been made by the courts, that I completely disagree with.

The court awards that have been made on liability claims are far too extravagant. We have some instances of that right here in Saskatchewan. We have other instances outside of the province that cost us money here in Saskatchewan, because it could be a product liability; it could be almost anything. You'll recall a derailment of the train carrying uranium in North Dakota not too long ago — Saskatchewan plates, Saskatchewan insurance.

These are the kinds of disasters that we are insuring, and our rates are going up because of it, but this is happening world-wide. Plus the fact that courts are making awards that are totally unrealistic, in my view. I can give you an example of awards that have been made costing \$5 million where there should have been \$500,000. Somebody has to pay for it.

Again you're right about the subsidy. We at least provide the insurance. At least SGI is providing the coverage which, if you went to a private insurance company, you couldn't even buy the coverage at any price. So we're giving the people of Saskatchewan the coverage, and we're giving them the coverage at a reduced rate because we are subsidizing it. We are paying more through the reinsurance market than what we are collecting on that insurance.

Use of a Public Relations Firm for Health Care Information

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I have a question of the Minister of Health, and it has to do with the blizzard of paper that is coming out of your office and going to hundreds of hospital administrators and people around the province who are not soliciting your vast volumes of propaganda that you're sending out at a great cost to the Saskatchewan taxpayers, can you tell me whether or not they're being done using a PR firm, and on the advice of a PR firm, and if they are, can you indicate to us which firm is doing this for you and how much it's costing you?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well I'm glad to see, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite realizes the magnitude of the speeches. I think his word was 'brilliant.' Thank you for the compliment, my friend.

What I want to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Assembly here, is that I suppose one of the things in health care that one has to look at in Saskatchewan is that it's one of the high priorities of the people of this province. I think to involve the people of this province, it is only right that one would institute a consultation process. And that is what I have done.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to tell this Assembly, that over the past three or four months we have had meetings of people — who have received letters and speeches — totalling 250 in North Battleford, 432 in Yorkton, and 451 in Humboldt, just two or three months ago. That is what these speeches are doing. They're asking people in Saskatchewan to come together with me, to sit down and look at the number one priority, Mr. Speaker, of health care in this province. And that number one priority is providing for an ever-increasing ageing population, so that these people who are pioneers of this province can remain in their dignity in their home, work with home care, special-care homes and so on, to provide what I call quality home care and health care services in this province.

If the member opposite thinks that's unreasonable, and he may do so, I would welcome other questions from him. But I tell you that I believe that that is a reasonable response to what is a pressing problem in health care in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Supplement to the minister. I would ask you again the name of the PR firm that is doing this for you and what their address is and how much money per month it's costing the taxpayers. That was the question. And if you want to talk about how much impact your speeches are having on the voters, I suppose last night is a good indication. But I would like you to answer the question very simply: who is your PR firm, and where are they located, and how much is it costing the public — who don't necessarily want these speeches sent out any more; would rather have equipment or beds and hospitals — how much is it costing the taxpayers at the present time?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, it seems strange to me that the member opposite would say the public do not want these features, that to come to consultation meetings, when you have 451 people turn up in Humboldt, Saskatchewan. I don't think that's an indication that the people don't want to come and talk about it.

The member opposite knows very well that the type of question he's asking is the type that you would get in estimates. I cannot tell him the exact cost. I can give him the assurance that I will provide this for him. But I just want to say once again, Mr. Speaker, that I believe, I believe strongly that going out and talking to the people of Saskatchewan about the needs of long-term care in the province of Saskatchewan is certainly something that the taxpayers support, and it may well be my next consultation meeting will be in Regina North East.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — A supplement to the minister. I can well be assured that you should be having consultative meetings in Regina North East after last night. But I want to ask you whether or not you can confirm whether this PR company is a Toronto-based firm operated by one Bud Sherman, the former deputy premier in the province of Manitoba, the PC party, and that it's costing us about \$14,000 a month to ship your speeches out — and I say to you, pure propaganda, to try to solve the problems that you've created by underfunding in rural hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I would love to take the rest of the day to discuss underfunding of rural hospitals with my colleague opposite, because I will answer this: as I've said previously, as to the amount of money, I don't think I can give that today, but as to Bud Sherman, the answer is no.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister very clearly, and straightforward, whether or not money is being paid for PR, for the Minister of Health's speeches being sent out, to a firm that is partially owned by one Bud Sherman, former deputy premier leader of the PC party of Manitoba, and has now a company based in Toronto?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Speaker, I told the member opposite that I would provide the information to him. I will stand by that. I will certainly do this.

As far as allegations about Mr. Sherman heading up the company, as far as the company not being a Saskatchewan company, the answer is no. The answer to, 'Do I use consultation firms?' I do it just the same as the members opposite did when they were in government.

Delivery of Crop Insurance Cheques to Farmers

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the minister in charge of Crop Insurance. Mr. Minister, farmers are hard pressed right across Saskatchewan both in the wet areas and in the dry areas. Farmers who have had their crops written off as long ago as July, Mr. Minister, because of the drought, are still waiting for their cheque. Can you give us a little update?

about how many cheques have gone out, and why there is a delay, or can you do something in your office to speed up this process just a little bit?

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm pleased to give the hon. Member an update on what is going on in crop insurance. Right now, there's been \$186 million have gone out to the farmers of Saskatchewan, and we're expecting a total pay-out of \$270 million. There has been to date . . . We're expecting approximately 60,000 claims, and there has been 39,000 claims processed. Last year at this time there was 36,000 claims processed, and we've sent out — I gave the wrong figure a second ago. I've done it by memory. The total money being sent out is \$196.048 million.

Last year, which was a record year, which we did the best in the history of crop insurance in getting money out to the farmer, was at the time, \$136 million. This year, \$196 million, and I'm very proud of the crop insurance employees, what they have done under very strange situations to get cash into the hands of the farmers. I think they've done a real good job.

I know there's farmers waiting patiently for their money, but it takes a long . . . The normal has always been an eight-week turn-around, and it's taking 10 to 12 weeks for the turn-around on account of 60,000 claims, which is very abnormal for the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you're going to increase Gerry Williams' salary by another 16 per cent with that great record.

What the farmers are really worried about . . . Those people that were written off in July — there were a lot of adjusters out in the field. There was 80 at one time working in Gravelbourg in the summer. Then it was readjusted again, and there's still more delays. There's people that had their crops written off that still haven't got their money. Now from July to today, in my numbers, is close to four and a half months. That's a long turn-around time, Mr. Minister. Why is there that kind of delay? Is there a reason? Are you waiting to send the money out when there's going to be an election announce, or what are you doing with this? That is too much of a delay for the farmers there. The small-business men are hurting; everybody is hurting because these guys aren't getting their money in time that they expected that long ago.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 115 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Regina North East

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly I'd like to introduce a Bill, An Act Respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Regina North East.

Leave granted.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill, An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Regina North East.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the Bill ordered to be read a second time later this day.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 115 — An Act respecting the By—election in the Constituency of Regina North East

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Regina North East.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, this Bill is in the traditional form of a Bill which is introduced following a by-election when the House is in session, and expedites the seating of the member. I thank the government for introducing this Bill at this time and we look forward, I need hardly say, to the seating of the member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and, by leave of the Assembly, referred to a committee of the whole later this day.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill No. 115 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Regina North East

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

The committee agreed to report the Bill.

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 115 — An Act respecting the By-election in the Constituency of Regina North East

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move the Bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 2:57 p.m. His Honour the Administrator, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne and gave Royal Assent to the following Bill:

Bill No. 115 — An Act Respecting the By—election in the Constituency of Regina North East.

His Honour the Administrator retired from the Chamber at 2:58 p.m.

(1500)

INTRODUCTION OF MLA FOR REGINA NORTH CONSTITUENCY

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have to present Edwin Laurence Tchorzewski, the member for the constituency of Regina North East, who has taken the oath, signed the roll, and claims the right to take his seat.

Mr. Speaker: — Let the hon. Member take his seat.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day and by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a member and Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan.

Frederick Arthur Dewhurst, who died on July 30, 1985, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Wadena from 1945 to 1975. He was Deputy Speaker from 1961 to 1962, and elected Speaker in 1962 — a position he retained until 1964. He was again Speaker from 1971 to 1975, creating the unusual distinction of serving as Speaker on two different occasions.

Fred Dewhurst was born in 1911 at Regina. He received his schooling in the Barrier Lake district of Saskatchewan. Former Speaker Dewhurst was a farmer in the Archerwill district until he moved to Wynyard in 1967, where he resided until his death. Fred Dewhurst was an MLA for nearly 30 years and brought to this legislature his knowledge, of concern for, Saskatchewan farmers.

Through the Saskatchewan branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, former Speaker Dewhurst represented this legislature at parliamentary conferences throughout Canada and many Commonwealth countries. He was host to the Canadian Regional Conference held in Saskatchewan in 1963 and 1975.

Fred Dewhurst, Mr. Speaker, was active with the Wynyard Community Clinic for many years. He was an active volunteer in the promotion of local community sports.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with the members of the bereaved family.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to serve in the legislature for a good number of years with Fred Dewhurst — about 15 — and I would like to add a few words to what the Deputy Premier has said about a quite outstanding career in this legislature.

Fred was first elected to the legislature November 21st, 1945, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the sitting MLA, the Hon. George Williams, who was then minister of agriculture. Fred was re-elected in 1948, and 1952, and '56, and '60, and '64, and '67, and '71. He served as Deputy Speaker from '61 to '62, and as has been noted, was Speaker on two occasions.

He served in the legislature for almost 30 years. Very few members have served that long. One would have to add it up in terms of months to see whether or not Fred was the longest serving member. He was elected in eight successive elections, and a quick check of my own, which I don't vouch for, indicates that nobody in the history of our province has been elected in contested elections more often than Fred Dewhurst. I think there would be one or two who would be in the same category.

Fred was a diligent member who served his constituents well, and brought their concerns to this legislature and to the caucus of the New Democratic Party and to the CCF before it. He had a sound knowledge of farming and farmers and what was in the minds of farmers, particularly farmers in that parkland area of Saskatchewan — and one thinks of Archerwill where he lived at this time — who were struggling following World War II, as they moved into modern farming and moved very rapidly into modern farming. Fred spoke for those people, and he understood them, and in many ways he represented them not only in word but in character.

When I think of Fred Dewhurst, I think of a number of incidents. He was a partisan in politics and didn't hide his partisanship. He believed in what the CCF stood for — I'm thinking on this particular occasion — and he wasn't bashful about saying so. And when Fred was chosen Speaker in 1962, the then opposition had grave doubts as to whether or not Fred could do the job. I recall Hammy McDonald, later Senator McDonald and a former leader of the Liberal Party in the province, having doubts and following the events saying, and being quoted as saying: 'I admit I was wrong; Fred has done a good job. I didn't think he could do it but he has — a good job of being an impartial speaker.'

Another tiny story tells us perhaps how. When Fred was appointed Speaker, he told some of his close friends — and the former member for Touchwood, Frank Meakes, verifies this one — he told some of his friends in the caucus, well now I've got to be fair and I may have to be tough on some of you to convince everyone that I'm fair, and that's what I'm going to do. People were convinced that Fred did his best to be fair, and essentially achieved that result.

Fred was recognized as being well informed on issues of parliamentary procedure and brought to them a sturdy common sense that made the rules work, as opposed to being simply rules for debate.

I want to mention a few incidents of Fred's life outside the legislature. He's obviously had an outstanding career as a legislator, and over 30 years in legislature doesn't leave you a lot of time for other careers. But as I indicated, he was an active farmer until 1967.

He was a tireless worker in the community where he lived in the Archerwill district. He was a member of the board of the Credit Union and the Co-op in the Archerwill area for many, many years. He served, I'm told, about 25 years on each board. When he moved to Wynyard, he continued his community service. Mention has been made of the fact that he served on the Wynyard Community Clinic for a number of years on the executive, and was president of that clinic. He had a real interest in young people which kept him young and kept him forward-looking right until the end.

He was president of the Arena Association in Wynyard for five or six years. He played a management role with the baseball team for many years. He generally devoted a good deal of attention to young people, including, I may say, young people associated with his own family — his own grandchildren.

Fred believed strongly that ordinary people can achieve great things by working together, and his life was devoted to putting that belief in practice.

In case I'm presenting Fred Dewhurst as a rather sombre individual, that's not the case. Diligent he was, but he wasn't solemn. He had a good fund of jokes which he loved to tell with a broad Yorkshire accent, some jokes which I would not venture to tell, not because they are risqué, but because they had an earthiness about them which it would be difficult for me to carry off in the way Fred did.

I recall he used to use one, varying a bit, and I will refer to it as Welsh, because I am Welsh and can say that, but he would say:

The dumb Welshman went in to get some pizza, and he bought a small pizza. And when asked, 'Do you want it cut?' 'Yes I'll have it cut.' 'How many pieces do you want it cut in, six or eight?' Answer: 'Cut it in six pieces. I don't think I could eat eight.'

That was one of Fred's stories that I've heard, rung with many changes on many times.

He was known to play a little stook now and then. One time he didn't think the day was complete without at least one game of crib. He learned to do a lot of things in life, but by my lights, he never learned to roll a cigarette, and he smoked some of the scruffiest cigarettes I've ever seen.

He was a very, very human person. All in all a good person to be with. He had countless friends, and I know they will miss him very much.

Fred died suddenly. In one sense of the word, that's the way Fred would have wanted it. He died when he was still very active with many endeavours, particularly with youth. But a sudden loss is always hard to take, and for that reason, we express our particular sympathy to Doris.

He married Doris Stewart in his younger years and had a daughter, Kathleen, and two sons, Lynn and Dale. And to Doris and the children and all the members of the family, I would want to express our sympathy.

Fred lived a life filled with service, service on the national and international level in the course of his offices and with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, but also a life of service among his friends and neighbours in the Archerwill and Wynyard communities, and particularly the young people of those communities. And for those reasons, I know, Mr. Speaker, that Fred Dewhurst will be remembered.

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to, at this time, join with the Deputy Premier and other members of the Assembly in the House to pay a tribute to the life of Mr. Fred Dewhurst and to offer my condolences to his family, his wife Doris, and his daughter Kathleen, two sons, Lynn and Dale.

As has been said, Mr. Dewhurst had a long and distinguished career in politics, spanning almost 30 years. I think to survive the rough-and-tumble life of politics for 30 years in itself partly explains the quality of the man, Fred Dewhurst.

(1515)

I think his great asset was his strength of character. He was known as a good and decent man who never lost touch with his constituents or the people of this province that he served for so many years. I got to know Fred Dewhurst well. I want to say that there was no phoniness about him. He remained true to his ideals and convictions to the end.

In his death, Saskatchewan has lost one of its finest sons. To his family I offer my condolences and say to them with death there is sorrow, but I am sure that they can take comfort in having shared the fullness of the life of Fred Dewhurst.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a privilege for me too, today, to take part in this debate to pay tribute to one whom I respected very much. There are not many of us left in this House that had the privilege and occasion to sit in this legislature with Mr. Dewhurst. I appreciated that opportunity. When I was first elected he was highly respected. He was the dean of this House then already. He proved to us that a politician can be a statesman, and the degree of credibility that he had achieved was achieved because of his personality and his character.

The last occasion I had of visiting with Mr. Dewhurst was when he picked us up at the Wynyard airport during the spring session when I flew up there. He looked so good, I was really shocked to hear of his sudden passing.

Although as Speaker he didn't have an occasion to practise public speaking, as such, in this House, he was a very able and popular and entertaining speaker. He was very popular on the banquet trail, and I remember him coming down to my area on a number of occasions.

During those early days when we first got elected — and there were quite a few of us rookies, including the new member that's just been seated today from Regina North East — to the rural members he took time and provided some very valuable counselling. I appreciated it very much. He was very concerned that we act and live and operate as members that had one purpose in mind; that was to serve our constituents. He taught as well.

To his many friends, and especially his wife, Doris, and the family, I would like to offer my sincere

condolence, and just say that he will be remembered by many for a very long time.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, had the opportunity to serve in this Assembly with Fred Dewhurst for a number of years and I came to know Mr. Dewhurst first well in 1969 while I was a candidate in the constituency of Humboldt. I had known him before that due to ball tournaments during the summer months, and I guess that was probably the only time he and I were on opposite sides.

Mr. Dewhurst was a gentleman for whom I had the highest respect. He was a sportsman, and he was a community man. His sincerity was unquestioned. He worked hard for his constituents, and he worked hard for his province.

When we first met in 1969 officially, he became, what we called then, a buddy for our constituency and my advisor as a candidate. His advice served me well, and I will always be grateful and will always remember him for that. I recall one thing he always used to say, and that is: remember that for people to be able to work together well they also have to know how to play together, as well.

I consider it fortunate to have been able to call Fred Dewhurst a friend. He will be missed. I join with members of this Assembly in expressing my condolences to the Dewhurst family, and for his distinguished career in public life, for his involvement with his family and his community, and with all of us his memory will go on.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition:

That the resolution just passed, together with the transcript of oral tributes to the memory of the deceased member, be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS

Leave of Absence for Members

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services:

That leave of absence be granted to the honourable members for Kelvington-Wadena, Moose Jaw South, and Thunder Creek, from November 25 to 28, 1985, to attend, on behalf of the Assembly, the tenth regional seminar of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Ottawa.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 1 — Concessions to Business and Fiscal Responsibility

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak to the motion which I will move at the conclusion of my remarks. I invite all members of the Assembly to join with me in supporting the motion.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have spent the last month or so talking with the residents of Regina North East, listening to their concerns, and talking to other people in this province. Each family, each man and woman, each neighbourhood, has specific problems. Each articulated them in their own unique way, but the overall message was clear — I felt, very clear indeed — and it's the same message we've been hearing all across the province in cities and towns and rural areas. I suspect that some of the government members opposite have been hearing the same message and have been hearing it just as clearly as we have.

And the message is this: that the people of Saskatchewan want their government to provide solid economic leadership and not merely cheer-leadership. They want their PC government to stop its wrong-headed policies; to stop its fiscal mismanagement; to stop the irresponsible give-aways and concessions to big business; to stop mortgaging the long-term economic security of this province.

They want their provincial government to establish new priorities, correct priorities, and to commit that government to solve the urgent and pressing issues facing Saskatchewan people today. Issues like jobs and job security; job opportunities — particularly for young people. Issues like fair taxation and the crisis facing family farmers.

By now, of course, the fiscal mismanagement of the government opposite is legendary; wrong priorities and wrong policies; extravagant and wasteful; spending; poor planning — perhaps no planning at all — together they add up to four years of monumental fiscal mismanagement, and they have left Saskatchewan people bearing a heavy burden.

We have never had anything resembling this sort of performance in the history of our province. This province has had many tough years in its 80 years of history, but no government has ever responded to those tough years with the level of total fiscal incompetence which has been achieved by the government opposite.

The PC deficit was \$1.2 billion six months ago. I would expect that it's pushing about \$1.5 billion, and this spring I suspect it will be closer to \$2 billion. And if government members opposite doubt these figures, I know some of them, the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Government Services, or the Minister of Revenue, will enter the debate and give us an update on the fiscal condition of this province.

What have we seen? We have seen, of course, these results numbered in millions and now billions of dollars of red ink, but we've seen five-year plans that have lasted less than five months. We have seen the mismanagement of the Pioneer Trust affair. We've seen tax reform which was nothing more than tax increases. We have seen programs introduced and cancelled and re-introduced. I've lost count on where we are now with respect to the program for relief for senior citizens.

Last March there was a program which provided property tax relief for senior citizens and, particularly, a school tax rebate for senior citizens. That one was cancelled by the April 10th budget. It was realized, I think, that that wasn't going to fly, that something had to be done for 1985, so four or six weeks later something else was introduced, called a heritage program, which was the same one as the March one that was cancelled in April. In May it was put back in, but for only 1985. Now we have November, and we have yet a new one which, as I understand it, cancels the April one.

If anyone understands this — I know that somebody is going to clear my confusion. I doubt whether the confusion is only because of my mental infirmities. I suspect that some of it is due to the complexities — the complexities of the programs which the government has introduced.

The program introduced in March is, I think, gone. The one in April is, I think, gone. The one that was introduced in May will be gone, I think, by the end of December, and we're going to have another one. If this is thought to be prudent fiscal management, then that term takes on a different meaning than I ordinarily give it.

So we have seen these sorts of things over and over again. We have seen five-year plans discussed by the Minister of Health, where he was going to build nursing homes for five years, and three months later another is announced which isn't in the five-year plan, and I go around and say, oh, we've been promised this nursing home. And I say, it isn't on the list. Never mind, we have a promise. If this is appropriate fiscal management, then the words have taken on a meaning that I don't fully understand.

(1530)

Well, then, let's turn to their basic fiscal and economic strategy of offering concessions to big business. The resolution before us urges the government to cease its open for business policy, which was basically an open for big business policy of expensive and irresponsible concessions to big business. The policy was wrong-headed from the start. I suspect they would admit that now, because we simply haven't had any inrush of big business, and the economic programs which they have announced recently have had nothing to do with private enterprise. I look at that NewGrade upgrader, and I see it put forward as an economic development, and I note that it's going to cost around \$600 million, and I note that if it should fail — and I hope it will not; I don't want to be misunderstood on this point — but if it should fail, 100 per cent of the loss will be borne by taxpayers, and zero per cent will be borne by any private or co-operative business. Now that is an interesting result of a government which said that it was going to depend upon the engine of the private sector. Where, indeed, is the engine, and where is the private sector? They have found that their policy was inoperative and ineffective, but it has been very costly.

We've seen the \$300 million a year in concessions to big oil companies. We've seen very large loan guarantees to out-of-province companies like Manalta Coal — \$140 million of guarantees there — and the list goes on. And what are the results? Even with these massive tax concessions and guarantees — and I underline that we're talking about \$300 million a year in tax and royalty concessions to the oil companies — investment has declined. Investment has declined over the last three years.

In the last four years, investment, measured in real constant dollars, investment corrected for inflation, has actually gone down. Now that is not a very impressive showing for an open for business policy which was trumpeted and financed with massive tax concessions.

Retail sales are flat or declining. You are fortunate if you find a merchant who says that his sales are the same as last year. Most of them say they're a little worse than last year, and some say they're a lot worse.

The small business sector, ignored by your open for big business policy, is suffering, and if you don't believe that the small business people are suffering, you should talk to them some more, because they are. All across Saskatchewan, in Regina North East, but elsewhere in every community in this province, men and women are looking for jobs and they're looking for job security.

The irresponsible give-aways and concessions to big business have created a boom. We will concede that, but a boom only for big business and not for Saskatchewan working people, not for farmers, not for small business. You look around and see who is doing well in this province now. By and large it is not the farmers. By and large it is not working people. By and large it is not small business. By and large it is major resource companies, fuelled by huge tax concessions on the part of the government opposite.

The people of Saskatchewan have been disappointed by this government, bitterly disappointed. They will make that clear when they have the opportunity. The government has promised much; it has delivered, in their eyes, very little.

People are tired and frustrated with PC promises, tired of the empty slogans. And there's no absence of slogans. What there's a real absence of is any follow-up, and delivery that can be seen to benefit ordinary working people, farmers, and small-business people.

Saskatchewan people want their provincial government to re-order its priorities; to acknowledge the major pressing issues facing this province; and to show the determination and ability need to address those problems and hopefully to resolve some of them.

No one asks a government — and the people of Saskatchewan aren't expecting their provincial government to wave a wand and somehow solve all the problems. They're not that unreasonable. But they do want the government to acknowledge that their problems are there, to address them, and to come up with solid proposals for resolving them.

Government members opposite may trot out all of the statistics which they trot out from time to time when they're having their conventions and other pep sessions, but the hard facts are all around us, and many of these are buttressed by solid statistics.

Here in Regina, in the city which I represent in this legislature, there has been a loss of 4,000 jobs in 12 months. And I won't give you the sorry list of steel companies and bakeries and steel fabricating companies who have laid off people. You know that all too well. And the number adds up to 4,000 jobs.

And more important than any figure that I might give you of 4,000 jobs, are the human stories which you and I have encountered, you and I have seen, if you were campaigning in Regina North East as was I. You may have not run into these specific cases but you will run into cases like them in that constituency or some other constituency in the province.

The single—parent mother whose part—time job has been cut-back — and used to work 28 hours a week, is now only working 14 hours a week and can't get another part-time job. That story, or one like it, is all too common. The young electrician, skilled and experienced and eager to work, who hasn't had a solid job for three years. I got 10 weeks work by going to Pine Point, and I got another few weeks work by going somewhere else — in the Territories, or somewhere, where in a remote area he was able to get a short-term job. But as for a job which he could look forward to for three or six months, hasn't had it; the young people in university and technical school who want to work, and need to work, who are trained to work but can't find a job — and there are hundreds and hundreds of them. And they don't want talk. They want action. They want a government which will address that.

There's no absence of things to be done. Anyone who looks around this province and can't see things that need to be done to make this a better place in which to live, can't see things which would use, and could use, the talents and the enthusiasm of these young people who want to work — anyone who can't see those does not see this community as it really is. He or she has blinkers which have constrained his eyesight, constrained her vision, made it impossible to see what this community could be with a little bit of imagination and a lot of competent administration.

People want to see fair taxation. And you don't have to take my word for it; you can take the word of the Progressive Conservative candidate in Regina North East for that, who made it clear as she possibly could on television last night. They're not looking for tax reform, the sort of sham tax reform that the minister outlined in his April 10th budget. They're not looking for unfair tax increases. They want a tax system which is fair. They're prepared to pay for their share if they thought others were paying their share.

But you and I have seen newspaper reports, accurate newspaper reports, that say that the number of people with incomes of 50,000 and more who are paying no income tax in Canada has grown by leaps and bounds over the last 12 months. And keep in mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when they pay no federal income tax, they pay no provincial income tax either. These people with major and high incomes are not paying any tax while people with modest incomes are paying tax; and not only that, but they're having services and tax relief withdrawn from them, tax relief like the property tax rebates.

And they're having new taxes heaped upon them, taxes like the sales tax on used cars. So they want a tax system which is fair. They're not asking for freedom from taxation. I suppose all of us would like that, but we know in our heart of hearts that we have to pay our fair share, and we're prepared to do that if we believe that others were doing the same.

And the people of Saskatchewan want their government to acknowledge and address the farm crisis, and that's what it is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a farm crisis. Farmers are suffering from the triple threat of high input costs, low commodity prices, and instability. And across this province on farms and rural communities, people want to hear the Premier say he's going to Halifax with a list of specific things which he wishes the government of Canada and other provincial governments to agree to when they meet later this week in Halifax.

They don't want a premier to say that we need a disaster program, but have no ideas of what it should be. They don't want a premier to say that we need some greater economic stability in the farm sector, but have no specific proposals. All of us know the objectives. We've had those iterated and reiterated time and time again. What the farmers want is for the Premier to go there and say: these are the seven options; I opt for this one; this is my choice; will you agree? That moves the debate along. That gives us some prospect of getting agreement.

I note that the Premier, in some of his releases, has indicated that there might be federal-provincial agreement on something by spring, and the something was a mere idea without any specifics of any kind. It would be my comment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in the field of federal-provincial relations, unless you put something specific on the table, you're not going to get anybody to agree to anything in three to four months. No one can give an instance of someone letting fly a trial balloon and having a well-rounded program three or four months hence. Nobody can give one.

I note that the member for Morse will be entering the debate. We will look forward to his intervention because there are a lot of things with respect to farm issues in that part of Saskatchewan which have been raised with me when I'm in that area, and I know will be raised with other people when they go out and talk to farmers in that area.

Across the province people are looking for some specifics. Some specifics have been offered here at the provincial level. We now want to know what the Premier is proposing for the federal-provincial level which is going to be discussed later this week.

Farmers, like other ordinary people in this country, know that there's a billion dollars to give a tax break to Gulf, and the Reichman's, and Conrad Black, and all those who participated in that little scam know that there's a billion dollars to bail out banks. Now they want to know whether there is any money to assist farmers, and they've got a right to know. They've got a right to know whether there's money, and how much, and they have a right to know that their provincial government is pressing; and pressing hard, on the federal government to see that some money comes through for hard-pressed farmers.

Saskatchewan people want fairness from their government. They want it from their federal government, and if they don't get it from their federal government, they want the provincial government to press for it, and they want it here in Saskatchewan from their provincial government. They've seen what they perceive to be unfairness, a double-standard — one standard for the government and its wealthy friends, and another for the ordinary people. And people are saying that that's not right, it's not fair' it's not reasonable.

(1545)

And I think people have reached that very firm conclusion that if we're in for tough times in Canada, that everybody ought to share. If somebody has to sacrifice, then everyone should sacrifice, then everyone should sacrifice. And when people see farmers going bankrupt at record rates and see the stock exchange at record

heights; when they see the banks doing very well indeed and small merchants in farm communities in this province doing very badly indeed, they say something is not right; something is not fair.

My New Democratic colleagues and I have been doing our best to listen to the people of this province. I know that my colleague, the member for Regina North East, has been listening. I believe that some PC members opposite have been listening, and I believe that we could do better. I'm not now putting that in partisan terms; I'm saying we as a legislature, and we as a government, and we as a province, could do better.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan want leadership from their government — solid, progressive, economic leadership — and because of that belief that I share that this is what they want and that should be reflected in this legislature I move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Regina North East:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to cease its policy of mortgaging the long-term economic security of the province by its irresponsible practices of expensive concessions to big business and by fiscal mismanagement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I so move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's good to be back. I am very proud to represent the citizens of Regina North East in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank those people in Regina North East whose support yesterday in the by-election allowed me to represent them and to take this seat in this legislature, and I look forward to representing all of them in the months and weeks and, hopefully, years ahead, with all the energy and all of the abilities that I have.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to join my New Democratic colleagues in the official opposition. They may be few in number, Mr. Speaker, but they are the most hard-working, most conscientious, and most effective opposition caucus I have ever seen in this legislature. I'm proud to join them as the first of many new additions to the ranks of the New Democratic Party in this Assembly. And I'm also proud, Mr. Speaker, to rise today to join in supporting the resolution put forward by our leader, the Leader of the Opposition.

Over the past year I have had the privilege and the opportunity to visit with thousands of my constituents in Regina North East, and I have listened to their concerns. Each in his own way, they have sent a message to this government — what the Premier has called a strong message, indeed. And simply put, Mr. Speaker, that message is this: the people of Saskatchewan want their government to acknowledge those issues, and they want their government to resolve those issues. And they want this government, Mr. Speaker, to understand very, very clearly that the people have examined its record and they have rejected it. And the reasons for this are many and they are summed up in the resolution before us.

They are concerned about mortgaging the long-term economic security of our province. They're concerned about the ever growing deficit. And the worst thing about this deficit which they are most concerned about, is that they are indebted now by some \$1.2 billion with nothing to show for it. When you take out a mortgage, Mr. Speaker, you have a house. It's a debt and it has to be paid. We have a mortgage which we and the next generation and maybe the next generation will have to pay for, and we have nothing to show for it.

Mr. Speaker, waiting lists in hospitals are growing, there are holes in our roads, and we have a deficit that supposedly was supposed to make things different.

Mr. Speaker, they are concerned about the give-aways and the concessions to big business — give-aways and concessions to big business while small-business people are being ignored. And there are a lot of small-business people in the constituency of Regina North East. I spoke to many of

them and they feel strongly about this.

And the other message, Mr. Speaker, that came loud and clear, was the concern about the fiscal mismanagement of this government. We seem to have come upon us now a government of crises, a government that sits around waiting for a crisis to develop and then scrambles around and flounders around trying to find a cure, without any direction about where it's going, without any kind of a plan for the future.

What the people of Regina North East — and in their way they were speaking for the people of Saskatchewan — were saying was they want positive economic leadership and they want leadership with results. They want jobs. They want job security and job opportunities, and that's what the constituents of Regina North East are telling me and have been telling me for a year, and that's what they are telling this government.

They want fair taxation. The Leader of the Opposition talked about fairness, and I'm glad he did, because the people of this province feel betrayed. They feel betrayed by the Conservative government that talked about tax reform, but in fact brought the biggest tax increase upon them in Saskatchewan history. They want fairness, just simple fairness, Mr. Speaker — not privilege for just a few, Mr. Speaker. They want fairness for all and opportunities for all.

I ask the members opposite who sound like they want to get into this debate — and we will give them that opportunity — I ask them: why should there be millions of dollars for Pioneer Trusts and Canadian Commercial Banks, and oil companies, most of whom are not from this province, large oil companies who are making very huge profits, thank you very much?

But in the constituency of Regina North East there should be a single father with four children — the oldest is five and the youngest is three months — who is desperately trying to give those children a break. But he can't get any furniture for his house, as hard as the social worker may be trying to provide them, because the regulations in the new reformed social assistance plan does not permit him to do it. That is not fairness, Mr. Speaker. That is unfair and it's unjust and it has to change.

The people of Regina North East were saying that they want solid economic leadership. They don't want talk; they don't want slogans; they don't want rhetoric, not empty promises, but action. In a word, they want economic leadership, which is one of the things that the resolution speaks of.

And I know that many of the members opposite campaigned hard in the recent by-election, and I ran into them everywhere. Nice conversations. But I believe, at least I hope, that they began to listen to what they heard, and if so, I urge them to heed the message that those voters sent to this Devine government yesterday, a message that was strong and it was loud and it was clear. And they may have listened, but I only hope that while they listened, they took the trouble to hear.

I've talked about a number of things in the last weeks, and I will continue to do so in the weeks ahead. I've talked about health care issues, and I've talked about education issues. But I want to take a moment now in my concluding remarks to talk about a couple of the key issues that I have been concerned about and our members on this side of the House have been concerned about throughout that campaign, and will continue to be concerned, and that is jobs and taxes again. These are the two concerns of just about everyone I have spoken to in recent weeks and over the past year.

People are concerned about the lack of new jobs and opportunities, especially for young people. A few days ago, and it was widely publicized, Statistics Canada released the latest unemployment figures for Saskatchewan, and they showed it today in Regina. There are 4,000 fewer people employed than there was one year ago, and that's not a very proud record.

And the government talks about the upgrader, and that's fine, that's great. It will provide 80 full-time jobs. That's about the same as the number Regina lost when Dominion Bridge and Native Metal Industries closed a few months ago. And so while the upgrader is useful, it's not going to solve Regina's unemployment problem. It will help, and it is welcome, but it is just not enough.

You know, Mr. Speaker, and this may interest the members opposite, that overall construction activity in our city has fallen off. In the first 10 months of this year, the total value of building permits issued in Regina was 24 per cent less than for the same period last year, and that does not strike me as being open for business. And you know, lo and behold, it took a long time, but after seven weeks of no representation the Premier finally discovered that there really was a Regina North East, and we heard campaign promises again of new schools, of bicycle paths, of swimming pools, and the like. But the people who I spoke to wondered, and they wondered this: could they believe the politicians who were speaking for the government when they looked at their track record? They asked, can you believe their promises when you see what they've done?

And this is the same government which back in April announced, for example, that it had increased provincial government grants to the city of Regina to help with the repair of city streets and improvements to other city services. That was in April. Now I have documents from the city of Regina which show that, in fact, this government cut provincial grants to Regina by nearly 6 per cent this year, and as a result nearly \$17 million worth of city projects and hundreds of jobs have been left in limbo.

So how can you trust a government to keep its new promises when they won't even keep those they made six months ago? This brings me now to the second key issue, and that is taxes. In 1982 the Conservatives promised to cut our income taxes and the people's income taxes by 10 per cent. Instead they introduced a whole new level of provincial income tax, what they called the flat tax, which people pay and they pay in addition to their regular federal and provincial income taxes.

In 1982 they promised to eliminate the 5 per cent provincial sales tax, and instead that was extended to include the sale of used vehicles. And even the Premier's candidate in Regina North East made it very clear last night that those policies were wrong, and I agree with her.

Now in 1982, Mr. Speaker, those members opposite promised to slash — not to slash people programs and services. But this year we saw the elimination of the property improvement grant which amounted to the biggest, most unfair property tax increase in the history of this province. And people talked about that in the months past, because that's money out of families' pockets, and money out of the city of Regina economy and the provincial economy.

In this city alone that took \$10 million out of consumers' spending power, and that means less economic activity and fewer jobs in this city. That means that our businesses are not going to receive \$10 million of consumer dollars that would have been spent this year in our stores and our shops and our restaurants. And that means that workers lost jobs, because with economic activity there are jobs for people. And unemployment continues to grow.

And so you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether it's the state of our health care system, or educational system, or the lack of new jobs and opportunities for our young people, or taxes, this Devine government had a lot to answer for yesterday. The voters of Regina North East sent the Premier and his members a strong message that its performance has been disappointing and its priorities must be re-examined.

(1600)

And my priority will be to deliver that message in this legislature on behalf of my constituents day in and day out; to fight to get this government to create jobs and opportunities; to reapprove funding for our health care system and for our cities and for Saskatchewan—owned small businesses, and for other vital sectors of our economy; to speak out to get the government to roll back its unfair income and property tax increases.

The people of the constituency of Regina North East wanted a member of the legislature who would speak for them, and not someone who would simply apologize for the government. And I can assure them that as an MLA I will not seek confrontation for confrontation's

sake, but neither will I stand silent while the government's policies continue to hurt the people of the constituency of North East Regina and the people of this province of Saskatchewan.

And for that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and for the reasons that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, I am pleased to support the resolution before us and I urge all members of the Assembly to join with me in supporting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I first would like to congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your new position, and I look forward to working with you, at least in the short time — I would think maybe short time, depending on when they call elections here — that I'm going to have the opportunity to work with you.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate the new member, the new member for Regina North East, taking his place in the House today. And the last time of course that you and I did business together in this Assembly was some time ago. I haven't noticed a great deal of difference in you other than the fact that when you speak you now face east instead of west. Other than that, of course directions do change. I'll be the first to concede that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — But not if I have anything to do with it, of course.

I certainly, as I said, would wish you well and I'm sure you're not going to have any grave difficulties in your opening few weeks here in the Assembly.

I want to take a moment to deal with the resolution that's before the House, placed by the Leader of the Opposition, of course, and seconded by our new member for Regina North East. The resolution, in essence, deals with this government's fiscal responsibility and whether or not we are dealing in a very fiscal way and a very economic way, if you like, with the taxpayers' dollars. It says, in fact:

That this Assembly urge the Government of Saskatchewan to cease its policy of mortgaging the long-term economic security of the province by its irresponsible practices of expensive concessions to big business and by fiscal mismanagement.

So I suppose, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's the basis by which the discussion should proceed, although on initial at least examination of the debate, I find that the discussion seemed to be centring more around the election of the new member for Regina North East than it does around the resolution. I'm kind of betwixt and between as to whether I should talk about the by-election or talk about the resolution.

I suppose that the whole argument comes to the by-election because they feel that their victory there is solely on the issue of the government's mismanagement of the province, as they have put it. I, of course, would want to take exception to that, but not so much as it relates just to the by-election in Regina North East.

It would be interesting to note, mind you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the new member for Regina North East has been on record two or three times in saying that this government is arrogant and so-called cocksure of itself, and not listening to the people, and insensitive. Judging from today's activities here in the House since it opened this afternoon, and the kinds of comments coming from the opposition, it would seem that the arrogance is in the opposition and not in the government. They are, I think, a little more exuberant about their victory than maybe they should be. After all, this was just a by-election. This was not a general election. I would want to remind members of that. Don't get too excited yet, my goodness sakes. The big one's yet to come, as they say.

So let's deal with the resolution, and let's see where the facts are. What have I been hearing coming from the opposition? I've been hearing concerns about jobs — whether or not this government has been doing a good job in the job market, if you like, in creating jobs and opportunities for people in the province of Saskatchewan.

I hear them talk of massive tax increases. The new member for Regina North East alluded to that, too. He said, 'the largest tax increase ever perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan.' Well, I'm asking myself: now where is this big tax?

What else? 'You're not a caring government.' Well, I challenge you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and of course, the people, to meet the members on this side of the House. They're not exceptional people. I think they're fairly ordinary. They're caring; they're concerned about their province or they wouldn't have ran in the first place. You know, those are the things that I see, not just in our members on this side of the House, but I believe the same to be so of the NDP in opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe that they ran sincerely to change things in a way that they thought was for the interests of the people of this province. I believe we feel the same way. I don't think there's any difference in that.

I take a little exception with that, that in some way the NDP are caring members, and we as Conservatives are not caring members. For my part, I care a great deal and I have for a long time felt a great amount of care for the people of this province. I wouldn't have given 10 years of my life for this political process, for this democracy as we know it, if I didn't care for the people of this province. Surely I wouldn't have.

What else do I always hear from the NDP? Now we've heard about these massive tax increases that they say that the people have had to bear, but then we hear about this terrible deficit as well. My, you shouldn't increase the taxes. The smallest tax increase — there's a great hue and cry from the NDP in opposition. And yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they turn right around and come at you sometimes in the same day and say, oh, terrible deficit. The new member from Regina North East alluded to that too, today — \$1.2 billion deficit. He's concerned about the deficit and he's concerned that we might increase taxes.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how can he have it both ways? Now that's jiggery-pokery, and we all use that term quite explicitly. Quite frankly, I don't think any one of us has a monopoly on that phrase, jiggery-pokery. I'm not sure who invented it, but it seems to me it was the Leader of the Opposition when he was the premier. Now I think that we felt he was playing jiggery-pokery, and maybe it came to be it was true, because we're now government and he's in opposition.

The other thing, of course, that we hear quite consistently is, of course, the NDP damn the multinationals, you see — those terrible people in big business. You have to ask yourself what kind of a day would any one of us have if we got up in the morning and vowed to ourselves we were going to go the whole week and never deal with a multinational. Well I'll tell you, it'd be pretty hard to prepare for Christmas. You couldn't go to the Bay. You couldn't go to Eaton's. You couldn't go to Sears. You couldn't go to Zellers. You couldn't go to Radio Shack. I mean, where could you go?

And you have to ask yourself where farming would be in Saskatchewan. Why, you couldn't drive a John Deere tractor, nor a Massey-Ferguson. No, you couldn't do any of those things. After all, those are multinationals. And if you don't like them, you shouldn't deal with them.

Now, of course, the NDP in opposition had a different way of dealing with this business of big multinationals, big business. What did they do? Well, they said, look at, the smart thing to do is: we'll be the big business ourselves. So they created big government. You know, you talk about concern about big multinationals. I'll tell you! What about the big government? It takes and spends \$600 million — and that's a fair amount of money, \$600 million of taxpayers' money — into uranium development. And now what have they done? They've changed their mind on all of that. Close it down — 600 million.

Now I've identified, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of the things that these people in the opposition, the NDP opposition, are consistent in saying. Now let's deal with some of the facts. Of course I would want the new member for Regina North East to be very cognizant of what I'm saying here this afternoon, because, you know, it's going to be useful for him. I would think that sooner or later he may have to answer some of his own comments.

What about jobs? I just got a little bit busy early this afternoon and put some information together. Jobs alone: we have said repeatedly that we are number one in job creation in this country. When I heard the Leader of the Opposition today, and the new member from Regina North East, speak about jobs, they spoke about Regina. When they referred to jobs, they just spoke about Regina, the city of Regina. Well I'll tell you, if you're only concerned about Regina, you're welcome to it. This government is concerned about more than just the city of Regina. We're concerned about the whole province. We're concerned about jobs for every nook and cranny of this province.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in July alone Saskatchewan's labour force grew by 6,000 persons to a record 512,000. You never hear the NDP opposition speak about how the labour force is growing in this province. You never hear about that. The fact of the matter is, the labour force is growing faster than this government can create jobs. That gives you an increase in the unemployment figures as a percentage. So it depends whether you're talking about actual numbers or percentage, and there's where the jiggery-pokery comes in, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm not playing jiggery-pokery, I'm giving it to you straight — numbers and percentage. I'm going to concede that, yes, as a percentage it's gone up, but let's not forget that the labour force has grown, as I said, to a record 512,000 people.

Since our government was elected to office, the Saskatchewan labour force has grown by almost 60,000 — 60,000 persons more in the labour force since we became government. We would have to find that many jobs just to account for the increase in the labour force. Since July 1984, the total number of employed persons has increased by 18,000, and this is a year-to-year rate of employment growth that ranks first in Canada.

Our employment growth rate of 4 per cent is four times that of Manitoba's rate of 1 per cent. There's a lesson for Saskatchewan voters in socialist Manitoba's record as compared to our record, or at least you would think there was a record that should be noted by Saskatchewan voters. Obviously it wasn't noted in Regina North East, and I have to assume that the people in Regina North East did not get that kind of information. And if they did not, I think that's unfortunate; I think that's very unfortunate. There's a record that's four times better — four times better than NDP Manitoba.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the concern they have to create jobs for young people. Well what about the success of the Saskatchewan-Canada job creation program, Opportunities '85? This program created 38 per cent more summer jobs for students in '85 than it did in 1984, with 11,000 student jobs created — 11,000 student jobs created. Students are young people. That's not good enough for the Leader of the Opposition. That's fair enough. It's not good enough for us either. If we could create 22,000 jobs, we would, and of course that's on the premise that it's the government's responsibility to create jobs. And of course that could be debated, and maybe we should do that as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that's enough said on jobs. Let me conclude it this way, that if one is honest and candid, not just with themselves and with their colleagues in this institution, but with the voters, they will come to the conclusion — a truthful conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker — that we have done a good job in creating employment for the people of this province. That has been done.

(1615)

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to move into something that's equally important, as I said. I hear these cries coming from the NDP in opposition about these massive taxes — massive taxes. Let's take a look at what the tax record is, the tax story, if you like.

Under a Progressive Conservative government, of course, there is no gas tax whatsoever. Under the NDP you had a gas tax that went to finance SGI. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that tax isn't required to finance SGI any more, because the minister responsible for SGI has cleaned up SGI. It's a very efficient running corporation now, a government Crown corporation. In fact we made more money in SGI than we did in the potash corporation due to the downturn in the export market in the United States of potash, and a downturn, generally speaking, in the world markets. And what was due to two things: good management in SGI — and that contradicts the resolution by the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the new member for Regina North East — good management by the minister responsible for SGI. Good management, you understand, good management to the extent that we literally had to do something and that brought about, of course, the good driver bonus.

Taxes on corporations — this one I really like. Taxes on corporations. Our corporate tax here is twice what it is in NDP Manitoba. NDP Manitoba, they don't know anything about taxing multinationals. Well, it could be they don't think like you people. It could be.

You want to talk about tax increases? The Premier of Manitoba, since he became Premier, has had not one or two or three or four or five, but eight tax increases since he became Premier. Eight! Eight tax increases, and I want to remind the member for Shaunavon that he is also the same Premier in Manitoba — NDP Premier, Mr. Deputy Speaker — that increased the sales tax. Now you people are talking about tax increases. Well you should know something about tax increases because you're looking at your buddies across the line in Manitoba. They know about tax increases.

Taxes on large corporations here in this province increased to 16 per cent, bringing in \$48.8 million more than the NDP government. All right? Now we're talking about tax increases. Our corporate tax increase here is bringing in \$48 million more than it did under an NDP administration.

So I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where are the massive tax increases? What about the NDP's record in these massive figures, if you want to use them that way? Massive provincial income tax rate increases from 34 per cent in 1971 to 52 per cent in 1982. Ten years of NDP administration and your provincial income tax rate increased from 34 per cent to 52 per cent. Now I wonder if the member for Shaunavon heard that. Your provincial income tax rate in 10 went from 34 per cent to 52 per cent. Now that's a tax increase! Is that not a tax increase? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I believe that stuff because it is absolutely truthful. I wouldn't speak it if it were not.

The problem is, now I'm getting a few jabs from the NDP because it really hurts them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to hear some of the truth laid out. It's a lot easier for them to get up in the House and speak about whatever they want, way whatever they want. They don't have to answer to it. They can say, look, we don't want to have an increase in taxes; we don't want to see you reduce the deficit, though. And I ask the question: where in heavens would you get the money?

Well now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, believe me, it gets worse. It gets worse — not for us but for the NDP, because they don't understand and they don't want to understand. Our tax cut record is unmatched.

Tax cuts — let's take a look at them. Gas tax amounted to \$450 million; children's clothing, 9 million; home quarter tax, 16 million; special incentives, 6 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Be that as it may, yes, that tax is gone. I told you I'm being honest and candid. That tax is gone. But that tax at that time amounted to \$16 million. Manufacturing taxes, \$4 million; elimination of the tax on Sask Power rates, which you people had on. WE took it off. Do you understand? We took it off Sask Power, not you. What did that amount to? Six million dollars. Special E&H taxes, 300,000; livestock tax credit, \$5 million; irrigation equipment, 200,000.

Now those are tax savings, you understand. And what do they add up to? Over a half a billion dollars in tax cuts by this government, a Progressive Conservative government. And I've got to sit here and listen to you talk about massive tax increases by this government. There's no massive tax increases coming from this government. There's just, as I've identified, over a half a billion dollars in tax cuts

— tax cuts . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Of course I believe it.

Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new member for Regina North East wanted to know about the \$1.2 billion, and I'm going to give him some information. He wants to know about that \$ 1.2 billion. What did he say? I just jotted it down. I just wrote down here, 'Ed,' you see, and I wrote a line under it, and what did he say: '1.2 billion and nothing to show for it.' That's what you said on your first day in the House, that we've got a \$1.2 billion debt accumulated since our election in 1982 and that we have nothing to show for it!

I wonder if this means anything to you at all. I wonder if it means anything. We as a government spurred the largest drought assistance scheme in Canada's history. Various programs put \$312 million into farmer's pockets; closed the deal on a \$650 million heavy oil upgrader. That's a 3,000-job facility and it's the envy of the nation, and I might say it's the envy of the NDP as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We established a \$400 million education endowment fund. That equals \$6,000 for each university student and \$1,400 for high school students.

We extended the home mortgage program. More than 40,000 residents have received \$60 million so far — the first and the best in the nation. And for the new member for Regina North East, that's nothing — so far, that's nothing.

We boosted the farm purchase program. Some 5,000 young starting-out farmers are now receiving rebates to 8 per cent, but that's nothing to the new member for Regina North East and the NDP in opposition.

We provided clean and fresh water for the city of Regina. The government was able to deliver on that. You bet we did. An upgrader and water for the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: — So I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's something amiss. You know, I heard that there was a message sent . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I heard, Mr. Speaker, that there was a message sent, the NDP said there was a message sent, and I heard the government respond that the message was received, Mr. Speaker. Well I was a little late picking up my mail and I haven't examined the message yet, but when I do, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be examining very closely that message, because there seems to be something that wasn't included in the message, and it includes the \$1.2 billion deficit that this NDP opposition is so concerned about and where they indicate that they have nothing to show for it.

Well, what else? This government, of course, banned extra billing. No, not the NDP, they couldn't do that, but we were able to do that — set up a health capital fund with an additional 300 million to upgrade medical facilities province wide — first in Canada.

We created the Employment Development Agency and a \$600 million development fund for that.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on because there's just two or three more pages here of accomplishments of this government, and I might add that what I've just said recently is the accomplishments of this government just since November of '84 to date — just since November of '84. Mr. Speaker, it becomes very obvious to me that this opposition is very successful at speaking to the people about anything but what is factual — but anything that is factual.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Bicycle paths?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, bicycle paths. You like to talk about and make joke of that and say, well, that wasn't a big issue. The jobs were the big issue. Jobs were the big issue, and I've dealt with the job issue. We have looked after that. You're concerned about it only in the city of Regina, and if your concern stays there, well then, that will be your fate.

Now, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm being asked if I read the newspaper this morning. I hardly believe that's relevant to the resolution before the House today. What I believe is relevant is that the items that I have identified, that the NDP raised in their debate on this resolution, and that they raised repeatedly in these matters of tax increases, it's not true. In the matters of our not creating jobs and opportunities, it's not true. In the matter of not being a caring government, it's not true. In the matter of the deficit not being justified, it's not true, unless you want to take a host of programs that we've provided for people during tough times and scrap them.

Is that what the NDP want this government to do? If they did, then would we be a caring government? I say because we have \$1.2 billion in itself exemplifies that this government is a caring government. We're not about to put excessive taxes on the people of this province. We have been doing that by way of increasing corporate taxes and getting the oil industry and the resource industry healthy. And now we're taking the profits from that to assist agriculture, which is of course very essential to this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it becomes a question in this Assembly of who plays the game of jiggery-pokery the best. And really quite frankly, and I say this very candidly and with all respect to all members, I don't know that it's in the best interest of the people of Saskatchewan. They are given random sets of figures, as I identified one in particular, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Deputy Speaker was in the chair — the question of the jobs where the NDP in opposition like to use the percentages. And of course we're being at least honest in saying: look at, there's a percentage question and there's the actual jobs, the numbers. And when you take them both into consideration, we are number one in job creation and we're proud of it.

Debate adjourned.

(1630)

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, what I propose to do with these motions for return debatable is to drop all of the motions in each department except the last one. The way this is set out here, there are two difficulties: (1) it requires a whole lot of work and paper shuffling to get it out item by item and the amendment that we will offer will, in fact, provide more information than is being asked for. So on the first series dealing with Tourism and Small Business, and this is seeking information relative to advertising in papers across the province, I would ask leave that we drop all items 1 through 98, or up to return no. 102.

The Orders of the Day being called for return (Nos. 5 to 102, 104 to 198, 200 to 272, 274 to 346, 348 to 499, 501 to 543, 545 to 579, 581 to 583 and 585 to 679 inclusive), they were dropped.

Return No. 698

MR. LINGENFELTER moved, seconded by Mr. Engel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 698 showing:

Regarding the period January 1, 1984 to June 12, 1985: (1) the number of out of province trips made by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following (a) air fares (b) hotels (c) meals (d) taxis (e) gifts (f) gratuities (g) entertainment (h) expenses (I) miscellaneous.

HON. MR. BERTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I'm told that this information is a little difficult to give in this form. In item number (3) 'in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred,' asking for a considerable breakdown here and I'm told that that is either very difficult or impossible. I'm not entirely sure. So in order that we can give the information that the members want, Mr. Speaker, I would amend this motion:

By deleting all the words after 'trip' in subsection (3).

I move, seconded by the Minister of Supply and Services.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, if I could indulge the House just for a few moments —

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Order, please, just until we have the amendment.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, on this term, that has been available for the member to prepare for the Assembly for a good number of months. To be led to believe that he is not able to get us, for example, the destination, the purpose of the trip, in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to the costs incurred for each of the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, and miscellaneous, I think is one of the reasons that last night the people in Regina North East were telling the government that they simply weren't listening to the people when they wanted information about the spending priorities of this government and the fact that we're \$1.5 billion in the hole.

(1645)

I want to make it very clear that this kind of information is needed not by the opposition members, because we don't need the information. We're asking it on behalf of the people who are paying for your trips — the trips that the Deputy Premier indicated yesterday were all for a very good reason.

In fact, I would like to quote his answer yesterday in answer to a question from the member from Quill Lakes. I quote what he said at that time when we asked about a trip that he had taken, a whirlwind trip around the world that cost literally hundreds of thousands of dollars. Well, prepare the information and give it to us and prove me wrong. You said:

Mr. Speaker, I should advise the member — and I shouldn't have to; he's been around a long time — that that kind of question should be put on the order paper as an order for returns — in fact, in number 678 (the one we're presently dealing with, Mr. Speaker), on the blues today. And according to the staff people that assist me with these House Leader's duties, I'll probably have it in your hands this week.

Now for that minister to stand in his place today and say that he is going to get information as it stands in the order for return simply is not acceptable. And you, Mr. Minister, are going to have to bear the political ramifications of this kind of an arrogant and overbearing government in terms of the travelling that you do personally and other members of the cabinet because we have heard over the last number of years the trips that have been taken, for example, by the minister of Highways to Maui for road builder's meetings, and your trips to Beverly Hills, and I have here a little ad that I just happened to have with me that refers to the Beverly Wilshire Hotel — which you indicated you had stayed at for some hundreds of dollars a night — that talks about affordable luxury at the best location of all in Los Angeles, Beverly Hills.

And I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your action in refusing this kind of information to the opposition and to the people of Saskatchewan is not acceptable. But having made the point I will leave it with you, but it's going to continue to be an issue in Saskatchewan until you clean up your act, and I'm not speaking to you personally but the whole of this cabinet.

The travelling record of this government is something indeed to behold, and I say again — to Saudi

Arabia, and Palm Springs, and California, and Vienna, and Maui. And the list goes on and on, at a time when the government is saying restraint is in order and working people can expect zero per cent increase, I think is scandalous, and at a time when we have \$ 1.5 billion in debt, you should be leading the charge in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. We're dealing with an amendment and an amendment is a fairly narrow area. I believe the member is wandering quite far and I would ask him to stay on the subject.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I appreciate that the amendment is narrow. The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan is the fact that many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars is being spent of travel at a time when others are being told that their taxes will have to be increased. I say it's unfair and, Mr. Minister, I would ask you that you would change your plans and your Christmas holidays that many of your ministers will now be planning, in order that other people in the province will not have to pay as much taxes, and possibly do without over the Christmas season.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 33

Birkbeck	Hepworth	Rybchuk
McLeod	Schoenhals	Gerich
Berntson	Dirks	Schmidt
Lane	Currie	Muller
Taylor	Sandberg	Meagher
Duncan	Dutchak	Glauser
Pickering	Embury	Sauder
Hardy	Domotor	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Muirhead	Johnson
Smith (Swift Current)	Hodgins	Baker
Myers	Weiman	Morin

NAYS — 7

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Lusney
Tchorzewski	Koskie	Yew
Engel		

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 699

MR. LINGENFELTER moved, seconded by Mr. Engel, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 699 showing:

Regarding the period January 1, 1984, to June 12, 1985: (1) the number of out of province trips made by the Premier of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following (a) air fares (b) hotels (c) meals (d) taxis (e) gifts (f) gratuities (g) entertainment (h) expenses (I) miscellaneous.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, for all of the same reasons, and in keeping with the long—standing tradition of this Assembly, as I well recall when I was sitting on that side of the House and asking for similar information, I move, seconded by the Minister of Supply and Services, that

motion for return no. 699 be amended as follows:

By deleting all the words after 'trip' in subsection (3).

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, here again I just want to refer to what the return asks for and what the amendment will do. Basically, this is in regard to the period from January 1, '84 to June 12, '85, and refers to the trips out of province taken by the Premier of Saskatchewan. As it now stands, section 3 of this request asks for, in each case, the total cost of the trip separated according to the costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares (b) hotels (c) meals (d) taxis (e) gifts (f) gratuities (g) entertainment (h) expenses (i) miscellaneous. What we are doing is taking away the important part that many people would like to know and that is what the detail of the expense account would be.

We accept this amendment. What we are then saying is that in each case the total cost of the trip, period, and we are deleting the part that would break it down into where the money was actually spent. And I think here, in the case of the Premier, he should be setting the example for the rest of the civil service, because I'm sure when they put in their expense accounts they are required to detail out what money was spent on, and I'm not going to belabour the point but I would say to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, that you're hiding something. The people can obviously see that by your amendments and we'll leave it at that.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 32

Birkbeck	Hepworth	Gerich
McLeod	Schoenhals	Schmidt
Berntson	Dirks	Muller
Lane	Currie	Meagher
Taylor	Sandberg	Glauser
Duncan	Embury	Sauder
Pickering	Domotor	Zazelenchuk
Hardy	Muirhead	Johnson
McLaren	Hodgins	Baker
Smith (Swift Current)	Weiman	Morin
Myers	Rybchuk	

NAYS — 8

Blakeney	Engel	Lusney
Tchorzewski	Lingenfelter	Yew
Thompson	Koskie	

Motion as amended agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Corrigendum

On page 3685 of Hansard 66A Monday, November 25, 1985, the names of the pages should read: Angèle Chabot, Cheryl Delparte, Sheila Fayant, Ronald L'Heureux and Gary Sparvier.

[NOTE: The online transcript for Monday, November 25, 1985 has been corrected.]