

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 21, 1986

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Hampton: — Thank you Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government following question:

In the period January 1, 1985, to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Elrose Review*.

I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Balcarres Local Exchange*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Assiniboia Times*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Biggar Independent*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Big Muddy Roundup*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Birch Hills Gazette*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

MIIn the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Canora Courier*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Carlyle Observer*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Carnduff Gazette Post-News*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Craik Weekly News*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Cut Knife Highway 40 Courier*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Davidson Leader*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Esterhazy Potashville Miner-Journal*.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall on Tuesday next ask the government the following question:

In the period January 1, 1985 to December 1, 1985, the amount spent by the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs in the *Estevan Mercury*.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. All members will be aware that oral notices of motions and questions have long been permitted in this House under routine proceedings. However, I want to point out to the member for Canora, and to all members, that this has been a courtesy extended to members, and is not a required part of the notice procedure. Also, oral notice, by itself, is not sufficient to constitute official notice. I refer all members to rule 38 in our Rules and Procedures which reads as follows:

Forty-eight hours' notice shall be given of a motion for first reading of a bill, resolution, or address, for the appointment of any committee or for placing a question on the Order Paper; but this shall not apply to public bills, after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the Assembly. Such notice shall be laid on the Table and be printed in the Votes and Proceedings of that day.

It is clear from this that the rules provide only for written notice. There is no provision for oral notice. As I said earlier, oral notice is a long-standing practice of this House, but is permitted only as a courtesy to members.

I also want to refer members to Beauchesne's Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, page 143, citation 395, as follows:

Oral notices for future proceedings do not generally exist in the House of Commons. It is useless for a Member to say: "Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will move a certain motion tomorrow." This would not give him any precedence on the next day and he would not thereby acquire the right to speak on matters not standing on the Order Paper.

To go on at great length reading oral notices into the record, when this is not necessary to effectively give notice, appears to me to be an abuse of a courtesy traditionally extended to members. A practice that is permitted as a courtesy only should not be permitted to obstruct the regular business of the House.

I thereby direct the member for Canora to submit any notices that he wishes to give by laying them on the Table as provided in rule 38. This in no way interferes with the member's rights to place items on the order paper. It is not my intention to prohibit the reading of oral notices in the future, but only to remind members that oral notices are permitted as a courtesy and will not be permitted to be used as a means of obstructing the House.

I would ask the member now to table his notices, and we'll move on to the next order of business.

An Hon. Member: — I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — You can't have points of order during question period. If the member wishes a point of order, he may rise before orders of the day.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of my colleague, the MLA for Turtleford and the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources, I'd like to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly a group of 30 grade 12 students from Debden High School. They are accompanied today by Sister Estelle Lavigne and Mr. Gerald Baron, as well as their bus driver, Mr. Richard Tremblay.

I'd ask all members to welcome them here today and to express our wish that you have a very enjoyable visit, and

I'll be pitch-hitting for Mr. Maxwell later on for pictures. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to join with my colleague in welcoming the students from Debden school. I had the opportunity of running into a few of them as I was hobbling up the steps on my crutches. They gave me a cheerful greeting, and we had passed a little time to discuss the hardships of the legislature. They thought I had a really rough day yesterday, so I'd just like to welcome them on behalf of my colleague, and good luck and a safe trip home. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Domotor: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, a group of grade eight students numbering 25 in total, seated in the west gallery. They're accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Jmaeff, and Miss Stang, and chaperons Mrs. Ellis, Mrs. Pfiel and Mrs. Pulvermacher.

I'll be meeting with them at 10:30 for photographs and drinks. I hope they find the question period informative and interesting and their day in Regina very satisfying. I wish them also a safe journey back. I wish all members to welcome them here today. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the legislature, some guests I have sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. These people are from the Western Christian College located just outside of Weyburn at north Weyburn, Saskatchewan. They are Dan Wiebe, who is the dean there, Ray McMillan, who is the chairman of the board of governors at the Western Christian College, and John Murray, who is the director of the building program.

For the members of the legislature's information, this college is a world-recognized college, and there are students from all over the world who attend there and certainly, obviously, from south-eastern Saskatchewan. It has a long and distinguished history. But they are also the kind of people who don't rest on their laurels, and they are, at this very moment, undertaking a very exciting expansion program. Weyburn and area is very proud of this college. We're very proud of the faculty and the staff there, and the students who greatly contribute to the life in our community. They are indeed a classic example of building for our youth's future.

I am going to be meeting with them in approximately one-half hour and I would ask all members of the legislature to join me in giving them a warm welcome here this morning.

Hon Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Caswell: — I would like to join with the member from Weyburn welcoming the students from Western Christian College. I'm very familiar with the college and

the people who run it, and my husband is as well. So I hope the member from Weyburn won't mind that I put my oar in and say, "Welcome friends."

Hon Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Salary and Expense Arrangements with Westank-Willock

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the minister responsible for Sedco, and with the government's record of bringing in outside help at some pretty fair prices. My question to you, Mr. Minister, is, and it deals with Westank-Willock, a Regina manufacturer which Sedco took control of it in the early '80s, '84, in fact, and which since that time the take-over has run up more than \$6 million of additional losses. This company is now owned by the Saskatchewan taxpayers, through Sedco, and how it spends its money is of great interest to all of us, particularly to the taxpayers.

Can the minister inform this Assembly of the salary and the expense arrangements that you've made with the president of Westank-Willock, a Mr. Gordon Campbell?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information, obviously, available now. I think the record of Westank-Willock, I think, is to be commended in the sense that over the last couple of years, work, particularly for the member from Regina North. They've been able to save 160 jobs at Westank, get them through some difficult times, Mr. Speaker, now to the point of having a very, very good opportunity to capitalize on some very exciting work in northern Canada, particularly in the Yukon, Mr. Speaker, where they look to have some great progress.

But with regard to the question, I will take your question under advisement. I will find out the information from Westank-Willock and get the information back to the hon. member.

Mr. Engel: — Can the minister confirm that Saskatchewan taxpayers, through Sedco, are paying Mr. Campbell about \$8,000 a month plus his expenses, and that in addition, until very recently, you paid him a trip a week back to Toronto, flying him back to Toronto every week. And further, can the minister confirm that until recently Saskatchewan taxpayers paid for a fully-furnished apartment for Mr. Gordon Campbell? And can you provide the cost of that additional arrangement?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Campbell was hired by Westank-Willock; he was not hired by the Government of Saskatchewan. That's number one, Mr. Speaker. Number two is, the NDP when they were in power wanted to shut that company down. This government did not shut that company down but tried to breathe life into that company, have in fact breathed life into that company, have preserved 160 jobs, and have allowed Westank-Willock now to become . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the minister

indicates that he can't remember the arrangement that he has with Mr. Campbell, and apparently therefore has a relatively short memory. May I remind the minister that on February 27, less than four weeks ago, you wrote a letter, sir, to Mr. Gerry Van Wachem which reads in part in this regard:

Regarding the handling of Westank by the current president, Gordon Campbell, after reviewing his expenses and salary for the year ended September 30, 1985, they do not seem unreasonable for the head of a company the size of Westank.

Now therefore when you wrote this letter on February 27, you had reviewed the salary and expenses of Gordon Campbell. Have you no recollection of what you reviewed when you wrote this letter less than four weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker. I was visited prior to that letter by one Gerry Van Wachem, wanting the Government of Saskatchewan to pay to him some tenfold more than was paid to his father to buy out minority shareholders. At that point in time he indicated if the government were not going to pay some tenfold price for those shares, that he would use whatever authority he had to try to blackmail it out of the Government of Saskatchewan. I indicated to that particular person that this government was not up to listening to blackmail by him or anybody else, and I stand by that and I'm proud of that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, whatever your dealings are with some member of the public may presumably be your dealings. What I am asking is this: did you review the expenses and salary of Mr. Campbell some time immediately prior to February 27, 1986 and can you remember what your review showed; and do you deny that they showed that Mr. Campbell got \$8,000 a month plus expenses?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I am not involved in the day-to-day working of Westank-Willock. But what I do look at, Mr. Speaker, is this: if a company can take a situation of having a very large loss in a corporation, turn that corporation around to the point where this year they will probably have a significant profit, create a lot of jobs, maintain a lot of jobs in the city of Regina, whoever the management is that can do that, if he can accomplish that, make a profit and turn it from a loss, then jolly well good for him.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, will you deny that (a) Campbell is paid \$8,000 a month in expenses, or was until very recently; and (b) if you deny it, or say you don't know, are you telling me that there are perhaps other people in your organizations that get \$8,000 a month plus expenses that haven't yet come to your attention?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I do not know what the man makes. I will undertake to find out what the man does make. I can, Mr. Speaker, advise this. I can advise . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can advise, Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Assembly this, that this particular person is turning this company around. And I don't know what he's making, but I'll find out and bring it back to this Assembly. But I can assure you this: he's making a lot less than David Dombowsky made and Jack Messer made, from the Government of Manitoba to peddle some phoney potash industry. And he's making a lot less money than David Dombowsky did when he worked for the minister, when he worked for those people when they were in government. Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to get that information. Any time somebody can take a company and turn it from a serious debt to a profit, and if he can get some money for that and do that, then jolly good for him.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Do I take it then, Mr. Minister, that you are denying that this man gets \$8,000 a month, or are you saying that you don't know? And secondly, I ask: is this the same person who was at the helm of Westank-Willock during the period 1984 and 1985, when their deficit, the accumulated deficit rose from \$6.8 million to \$9.4 million? Is that the same person who is turning the company around?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I will return and advise as to how long this person has been there. But I hope the hon. member would not expect that you can hire somebody and a day later he turns a negative return into a positive return. Business does not work that way. The members opposite somehow do not understand the way business works. They have no understanding, appreciation, or compassion for the way that business works in this world. Mr. Speaker, Westank-Willock is an important industry to the city of Regina. This government stands behind it. This government stands behind the protection of those jobs, and this government stands behind any company that can turn a negative situation into a potentially positive, ongoing, strong corporation in this city.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Minister, do you acknowledge that the loss of Westank-Willock in the year ended September 30, 1981, was \$152,000, and that since that time, accumulated losses since that time have exceeded \$6 million, under the guidance of your government?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can advise, Mr. Speaker, the following. I can advise the following, Mr. Speaker. This corporation, when it was drifted into negative situation, was run by the Van Wachems, the friends of Allan Blakeney. It was turned around by the member that would be referred to . . . is now turning that around and making a positive out of that company. And any time a Gerry Van Wachem comes to this government, tries to blackmail it, tries to blackmail it for money, we will not stand for it, nor should anybody else stand for blackmail here or any place.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that you are closing down hospital beds, you are unable to assist ordinary people with their living expenses, and people are going hungry in this province, how do you

justify \$8,000 a month plus a living allowance? How do you justify that, in view of your frugality on virtually every other front, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, in the last four years this government has not closed down hospital beds. In the last four years this government has opened and created a lot of hospital beds. It has also created a lot of nursing home beds, Mr. Speaker, again something that we're very, very proud of.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Operation of Nipawin Dam

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question, I believe on Tuesday of this week, from the Leader of the Opposition. The question was relative to the Nipawin hydrogenerating facility.

Dealing with that question, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition indicated that the plant was operating at about 40 per cent capacity, and what was the cost to SaskPower, what was the cost to consumers, and what steps have been taken to make the non-Canadian designer live up to his commitments, etc. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, in order to answer it, I thought I'd put the question on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is as follows. There were two units at Nipawin hydroelectric station, have been available for operation at less than full load since 1985; November 18th for no. 1; December 11th for unit no. 2. These two units have produced in excess of 75 per cent energy available in the river flow since that time.

The non-Canadian designer and supplier has been very diligent and has spared no effort to arrive at a satisfactory solution. The supplier has done a considerable amount of testing at the factory and has worked very hard when work was being carried out on the units. All the work has been done at the manufacturer's expense.

The order for the turbines, Mr. Speaker, was placed by the previous administration. There were provisions to recover damages from the supplier; however, SPC has not taken any steps to initiate action in view of the responsible manner in which the supplier has pursued the problem.

There was a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and that was: when will the plant return to 100 per cent capacity? And the answer to that is, number one, unit number one is available to operate at full load at this time, but there is still some work required to finish the project completely. Modification to unit number three will commence on March 25th of '86 and will require 28 days of work. Modification to unit number two will require 28 days of work and will take place during May. By mid-June the corrections will have been made to all three units.

Based on current projections, Mr. Speaker, of river flows, these modifications will not result in any loss of generating capacity. This type of problem is not uncommon in hydraulic turbines and has been

experienced by many other utilities, including Manitoba Hydro, Ontario Hydro, and utilities in the United States and South America.

I hope that answers the Leader of the Opposition's questions, Mr. Speaker.

Shortage of Nurses

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health, and it deals with the all-candidates forum held in Estevan last night. Yesterday when I was driving to the Assembly I heard a news report that the minister wouldn't be able to make it to the meeting last night, but I'm sure that one of the reasons that we didn't sit was so the minister could attend the meeting. I wonder, could you bring us up to date, give us a little report on how that forum went and whether you made any announcement about the shortage of nurses which we're facing across the province?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I think, if one would realize that on many occasions the union of nurses have had opportunity to come to my office and discuss the concerns that they have over the past number of years, I had no intention of attending the meeting last night. The House was not sitting because of that situation.

And I have indicated in writing that I will be attending one of their meetings, and that at that point in time I will again explain to the union of nurses, and whoever else wants to attend, the position of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be brought to the attention of you and the members of this Assembly that, rather than attending a number of meetings, what I and my department are doing are sitting down and making the concrete plans of where and how the utilization of the nurses that have been allocated under the \$100 million will be applied to the hospitals of Saskatchewan. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that serves the public interest much better than me running around the province to some type of all-candidates meeting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health concerning his public announcement yesterday from his office that he would not be attending the meeting in Estevan because he would be sitting in the Assembly. This is a press release or a press report that was carried on the media, that you would not be attending the meeting in Estevan because you would be in the Assembly.

Now I want to know which of your answers is the truth. Which one is the truth? And I won't say that one of them is a lie, because that's unparliamentary, but will you tell me which of your stories is accurate — that you don't want to go to Estevan because you don't want to meet with the nurses, which is what you're saying today, or that you were going to be in the House? Which one of those stories is accurate?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems rather

ironical that the member opposite should at least try to say anything about the truth . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Order!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — That's the last gentleman that should talk about the truth . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I just asked for order, and it's impossible to hear what the minister is answering.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The member opposite is concerned about nursing positions. I would just remind, Mr. Speaker, you, the member opposite (who doesn't like to hear this), the Leader of the Opposition — I will remind them that in 1976, July 1st, a letter here right in my hand . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — He directs St. Paul's Hospital that they should decrease the nursing component by six registered nurses, by 2.5 certified nursing assistants, and by 2.5 nursing aides. That was on the 1st of July, 1976, when the Leader of the Opposition thought it was in the better interests of the people to put the money into potash mines and reduce the staffing standards in the hospitals in Saskatchewan. That's a fact.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Since that time, Mr. Speaker, we have put over 450 positions back into the hospitals of Saskatchewan. I have announced that there will be 500 enrichment positions. I have said that I'm sitting down with my department in consultation with the hospitals of this province and the SHA, deciding where those bodies will go, and that's what I'm doing, and I have indicated to the SUN in writing that I will attend one of their meetings, and I will explain the position of the government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — Mr. Speaker, I was at the meeting in Estevan last night and there was grave concern that the member from Estevan nor the Minister of Health were at that meeting.

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, there was discussion on the \$40 million that's been put into the system. Where was it put in, and where is it going to be spent?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I invite the member and anyone else in this Assembly to come to the meeting where I will present the government's viewpoints, and they will hear the answers right then.

Mr. Sveinson: — The concern raised is that the \$40 million going into the system will not arrive at the delivery end of the system, will not be used at the bedside for patients, but will be used to be spent on hardware — typewriters, computers, word processors, and other hardware in the hospital — much of which isn't used. The nurses indicated that this has been the record of this government. They suggest this \$40 million, there will be a

scrap over this by several bureaucrats in your department, and I ask you, sir, can you promise the nurses of this province and the patients in this province that this will be used for delivery of health care and not for hardware in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, obviously the member's statements are sheer, utter nonsense. He did not listen to what I said previously that over the last four years we have put in more than . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We have put in more than 450 positions into the hospitals of Saskatchewan. I have indicated that there will be 500 enrichment positions, as well as many other positions, because of expansion to hospitals that are taking place under this government, because of expansions to nursing homes, where there was moratorium before, that are taking place under this government, Mr. Speaker.

I can assure you that the decisions of where those positions will go will be made in concert with the hospitals of Saskatchewan because after all, Mr. Speaker, after all —and some of the members don't realize — that we have autonomous hospital boards out there that are charged with the responsibility of staffing the hospitals, and I detect in this Chamber here that some of the members opposite feel that those members of hospital boards do not have the best interests of patient care at heart. I would like that to go on the record because that seems to be what's coming through.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Sveinson: — Can the minister promise the patients in this province that that \$40 million will be spent on the delivery of health care and not on hardware — typewriters, word processors, computers, and other hardware — that isn't staff in hospitals, but will be spent on health care at the delivery end of the system?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite would have read the news release that I put out, it indicated where the money was going to be spent. Five hundred nursing positions to my mind is not typewriters. I can't see the connection. The member opposite is so ignorant of the technology in medicine, when I say there will be equipment, he thinks that's a typewriter. Mr. Speaker, that's an ultrasound, and there's quite a difference, my friend.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Final supplementary.

Mr. Sveinson: — Five hundred nursing positions do not cost \$40 million.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Again, if my friend would take the time to read and to understand before he babbles, he might learn a few things. The news release, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the money would be into staffing enrichments and staffing complements; that some of the money would go for new technologies, i.e., ultrasound.

And if you would like to know what ultrasound is, come and see me after the question period and . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, last summer this government was hiding from farmers. This spring you're hiding from nurses. If you people don't soon call an election, you're going to be hiding from small children.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please, Order, please.

Availability of Hospital Beds in Saskatoon

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, my question has to do with the availability of hospital beds in Saskatoon. If you're too frightened to go to Estevan, perhaps you've been in Saskatoon. Can the minister tell the Assembly the size of the waiting list for a hospital bed in the city of Saskatoon, and the size of the waiting list for elective surgery?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I can't give you that figure today. It changes from day to day, as you well know. But I can tell you this . . . I can tell you this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that that number changes constantly. I think anyone who understands the hospital system realizes that. So to say what is that figure today, I can't do that at this time. But will tell you and the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that two floors on the University Hospital, that an addition to St. Paul's, and a new City Hospital in Saskatoon will address those waiting lists considerably, and also in the \$100 million announcement for staffing and for equipment and also for initiatives to reduce the waiting list.

So to indicate that there's nothing being done on the waiting list is certainly a misconception and an attempt to lead the people of Saskatchewan, or to try and influence them in the wrong direction, because I can tell you that over the four years of the Devine government there has been more money into staffing than ever before in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

(1045)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 3 — An Act to amend The Change of Name Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Change of Name Act.

Motion agreed to, and by leave of the Assembly, the Bill referred to the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills.

Bill No. 4 — An Act respecting Small Claims in the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move first reading of a Bill respecting Small Claims in the Provincial Court of Saskatchewan.

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

Bill No. 5 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Small Claims Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Consequential Amendments to Certain Acts resulting from the enactment of The Small Claims Act.

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

Bill No. 6 — An Act respecting the Application to Saskatchewan of the Convention of the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move first reading of a Bill respecting the Application to Saskatchewan of the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! When we're doing business in the House and the Speaker is on his feet, I'm going to ask members to maintain silence.

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

Bill No. 7 — An Act to amend the Statute Law

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move, on behalf of the hon. member, first reading of a Bill to amend the Statute Law.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm going to ask the member for Regina Centre to maintain silence.

Motion agreed to and, by leave of the Assembly, the bill referred to the Standing Committee on Non-Controversial Bills.

Bill No. 8 — An Act to amend The Trade Union Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Trade Union Act.

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

TABLING OF REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I lay on the Table, pursuant to section 14(1) of The Provincial Auditor's Act, the Provincial Auditor's annual report.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Sveinson: — I believe your ruling earlier in question period this morning was somewhat unfair in that it does effectively muzzle a tool that the opposition in this legislature has, and has traditionally had . . .

An Hon. Member: — It's a method of abusing the rules.

Mr. Sveinson: — And it's a method, certainly, of abusing the rules of the House, by the Chair, I suggest, because . . . Well, we were only on our feet for 15 minutes. I think the discretion of the Chair to limit our debate and certainly put the questions forth to this Assembly was somewhat unfair, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, just to ask that gentleman over there to shut up while I'm speaking. And I realize you have the support of this House. But I believe in British tradition that the opposition does also have some rights, and 15 minutes of questions before question period is an abuse of those rights. Mr. Speaker, I would ask your Chair for an apology.

Mr. Speaker: — I would refer the member to the citations that I quoted to him and the different rules that were quoted in my ruling. My ruling is not here for debate. The ruling is for the direction for the House. And I would ask the member to go and study what I have said and then to act accordingly in the future.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I refer items 18 to 72 inclusive to motions for returns debatable.

Mr. Speaker: — Items 18 to 72, items for returns debatable.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Klein, seconded by Mr. Domotor.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to take part in this debate because I think it's clear that we're about to have a provincial election and that the people of Saskatchewan expect their political leaders to discuss the issues which will be offered and debated by the citizens during that provincial election.

Unfortunately the government's throne speech failed to deal, in my judgement, with the issues which are uppermost in the minds of the public. The speech did not offer a plan of action for the future; it simply attempted to justify the record of the government over the last four years — what I would say are the shortcomings of the government over the last four years. It reads like a

campaign speech, and not a very good campaign speech at that. It was long, no one can deny that — perhaps the longest throne speech we've every heard — but almost devoid of content as to what will happen in the future; a great deal of content about what has happened in the past; next to nothing about what will happen in the future.

As I've travelled this province over the last four years, I have found a deep sense of disappointment with this government, with its performance. There is no question that in 1982 they promised a great deal, and there's equally no question that since that time they have failed to deliver on most of those promises.

Saskatchewan people keep telling me that they feel let down. Some of them say "betrayed" by a government which failed to keep some of its essential campaign promises. And we all remember what the essential promise was during that campaign — that, as they said, it's going to be good times for everybody — there's so much more we can be. Remember that slogan? "There's so much more we can be." No question that was their promise. And what have they delivered?

Well, I think we can ask very properly whether some of the specific programs they offered in furtherance of their program have been delivered. They promised a 10 per cent cut in income tax. Have you seen your 10 per cent cut in income tax? Rather, have you seen an increase in your income tax with the brand new flat tax, and a very unfair flat tax at that. No one can deny that with the flat tax as it now exists a person who is able to use a tax shelter for investing in the manufacture of films and video clips, whatever their content may be, is able to deduct that from his income before he calculates his flat tax; but if his brother makes a contribution to his church, that's not deductible. If someone else gives some money to OXFAM to relieve hunger throughout the world, that's not deductible. If someone else faces huge medical expenses and therefore has much of his income consumed by extra medical expenses, the normal deduction that income tax provides for that is not deductible for the purposes of the PC flat tax.

That is what they have selected as a fair method of taxation. And I say it's grossly unfair, and we will not stand still for that tax. We will act, as I will indicate later.

They promised to eliminate the provincial sales tax. Then they extended it to used vehicles. They collected the money. They recognized their error but said, we're keeping the money. They promised balanced budgets, and they gave us five straight deficits of a size that this province has never seen. Certainly in the last 40 years this province has not seen deficits that in the accumulated period would add up to any one of those Tory deficits. Those are massive deficits, deficits which will be paid for by our children and grandchildren.

They promised to stand up for Saskatchewan at Ottawa. Then they failed to defend citizens when the Ottawa government proposed to de-index old age pensions; in fact, they suggested that this was a great idea. And the member for Kindersley, the then minister of finance, wrote another one of his letters saying that this government, this PC government, proposed a

re-ordering of pensions so that pensions would be de-indexed for many of our senior citizens.

They failed to fight the record tax increases in the Mulroney budget. And they failed to say a word about the disastrous recommendations in the Nielsen task force report with respect to western agriculture. And they failed to say anything with respect to the proposals in the Nielsen task force and the proposals in the Wilson budget about the withdrawal of federal funds for medicare, hospital care, and post-secondary education. This is the government which said they would stand up to Ottawa and have not done so.

They promised a more business-like government, and they gave us Pioneer Trust, the Pocklington give-aways, record losses of our public companies — and we've reviewed another one today — and more debt in the last four years than has been seen accumulated throughout the life of this province.

They promised so much, but they didn't deliver. And with days to go before the provincial election, what are they doing? Are they attempting to deliver on their 1982 promises? No. Are they going to attempt to keep faith with the electors who sent them there in 1982 by reviewing their promises and saying, we will act? No, not a chance. They're out there offering some yet new promises, and we're going to have many, many announcements between now and election day.

I have no doubt that the Minister of Health will be announcing CAT scanners which he should have provided two or three years ago. I suspect by Monday or Tuesday he'll be announcing those. I have no doubt that he will announce extra staff. Four years after he becomes Minister of Health, he finds out that there's a problem and makes what — money available? Oh, no. No. An announcement — an announcement that he's going to do it.

I think that people are no longer satisfied with announcements from the government. They want to see the action. And if and when the government acts, they will mark that up to their credit; and if the government doesn't act, they will mark it up to their debit. And they have been marking it up, because four years is a long time.

Four years is a long time to deal with the problems that this province faces. And we have not seen them deal with the problems which they identified in the 1982 campaign to their satisfaction and have left undealt with. I could instance many, but I just take waiting lists.

In 1982, they waxed eloquent about waiting lists in Saskatchewan hospitals. And I would like any member in this debate from the opposite side to stand up and tell us, what major hospital has a shorter waiting list than it had in 1982? Is there a single one in Saskatoon? Of course there isn't. Is there one in Regina, any one of the major hospitals? Of course there isn't, because they haven't dealt with those problems.

Saskatchewan will not be impressed by another group of promises from a government which did not keep the last

group. And I think that people will ask whether or not the Progressive Conservative Party is essentially trustworthy when it goes to the public and speaks of what it's going to do.

People are saying, not again. People are saying, we are going to judge this government, not by what it says it's going to do, but what it has done when it had the chance for four years. People are telling us they can't afford four more years like the last four years . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

(1100)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — . . . four more years of unkept promises, of rising taxes, of record deficits, of incompetent financial management, and of a government which won't stand up for Saskatchewan in Ottawa.

And what I intend to talk about this morning are a number of positive commitments that our party will offer to the people of Saskatchewan. I don't want to spend my time talking about the shortcomings of the government because, frankly, that would take a great deal of time and would perhaps not be very productive, since that government is not going to be the Government of Saskatchewan for very much longer.

I will talk about commitments which our party makes, commitments which we believe we will honour when we next form this government — commitments which will deal with a fair tax system; new jobs and new job opportunities; protection for those in need, such as the unemployed or hard-pressed farmers; and a strong voice at Ottawa. These commitments come from people who have met with us, talked with us, and told us what they want their government to do for them. They believe things should be changed in this province. And as I go about talking, it's overwhelming — the comment by people that there have got to be changes; things are not going as well as they could, and we want some change.

So I'm going to outline a series of proposals to get the Saskatchewan economy growing and working again by supporting Saskatchewan families and small businesses and farmers. Saskatchewan people are telling me they're fed up with the current government's record of unfair taxes and rising unemployment and financial mismanagement and weak leadership. And they're asking, what are your alternatives? And I'll attempt to say what they are.

Under a New Democratic government, large corporations and the wealthy will be made to pay their fair share of taxes in order to get the Devine deficit under control and to ease the heavy burden of taxes on low- and middle-income earners.

The unfair flat tax will be repealed. I want to emphasize that. The flat tax as structured by the government opposite, which is grossly unfair, and which nobody over there attempts to defend except the member for Estevan who, in his attempts, says what the tax is supposed to accomplish but will not direct his attention to who pays under that tax and who does not; that flat tax as currently

structured has got to go. And under a New Democratic government it will be gone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Property tax relief for home owners, farmers, small-business people and renters will be restored.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We believe that the costs of education should be borne to a greater extent on the basis of taxes related to ability to pay, and to a less extent on property taxes. We believe this is particularly true at this time when many farmers and small-business people are hard-pressed and are being called upon to pay a much greater proportionate share of the cost of education because they pay greater property taxes per capita. We don't think that's fair in this time. We would like to see education paid to a greater extent from taxes based upon ability to pay, and we will do that through property tax rebates, and they will be restored.

The money collected from the unfair sales tax on used vehicles will be returned to the people from whom it was wrongly taken.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say in the weeks ahead about fair taxes, but from what I have already said, you will observe that I feel that the current government with its policy of loading more and more taxes on lower- and middle-income people and allowing many of the wealthy to go virtually untaxed — that's an unfair policy, and it will be reversed.

Now with respect to new jobs and new opportunities, it's disturbing to note that close to one in ten of Saskatchewan people is either unemployed or on welfare. New Democrats say it doesn't have to be that way. Under a New Democratic government, Saskatchewan small business would be encouraged to grow and create new job opportunities. And we will do this by giving to small business a long-term guarantee that interest rates will not exceed an agreed figure.

When I talk to small-business people, they tell me that one of the things which inhibits them from expanding their business, either by building capital assets or by increasing the amount of their base inventory, is that they do not want to risk the problems of fluctuating interest rates. If they could be given an assurance that for seven or ten years they would know what the interest rate was, they would act. They're not asking for large subsidies; they are asking for security that they will get, under a policy to be introduced by the New Democratic Party government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, we will work with municipal governments to eliminate the burden of municipal business taxes on Saskatchewan business.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, so you're all for business now.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I note some comments from members opposite, and I've talked to a great number of business people in this province, and most of them have a very low tolerance for levels of political rhetoric, and a very great affection for nice black figures at the bottom of the profit and loss statement. And they know when their profit and loss statement looked good to them, and they know when it doesn't look good to them, and they know that under the PCs they have not made the money they made before . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — And they want a restoration of a climate where they can do business and make a reasonable profit.

Mr. Speaker, we would introduce a policy of Saskatchewan first, contracts for Saskatchewan business, and jobs for Saskatchewan workers. Far too much of our tax money has been spent to do jobs that need to be done, but which has not resulted in contracts for Saskatchewan business or jobs for Saskatchewan workers.

It has been reported to me that a plant to be constructed in North Battleford is going to be designed by Alberta designers, a contract is going to be let to an Alberta construction company without tender, and that many of the employees who will construct this building will be Alberta residents. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is fair to us Saskatchewan taxpayers to provide sums to out-of-province business when those out-of-province businesses don't even have the common decency to build their facilities here by calling for tenders, so that Saskatchewan contractors at least have a shot at the job?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — This is what they tell me. If this isn't true, I know I will be straightened out, but I suspect that what I say is true and that Saskatchewan tax money is going to people who, as I say, offer not even the chance to bid to Saskatchewan business, and the chance of a job to many Saskatchewan workers.

Mr. Speaker, we would build public facilities that we all know we will need in the future. These would provide jobs for today and hard valuable assets for tomorrow. I look at Regina and I look at a hole in the ground that was there for the Regina General Hospital in 1982, and if any work has been done, it's been done in the last short number of weeks. Nobody denies that we need the hospital facilities. Some of the facilities which are to be replaced were built in 1908. But this government has simply not got around to building those facilities and providing the jobs which are needed. I talked to construction workers, and I've talked to some this morning who say that in his lifetime — and it was a person who knew the situation of his construction union — in his lifetime he has never seen more unemployed tradesmen in this city in his particular trade than he sees today. He was an ironworker, people who erect the iron framework for buildings.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that when we have a hole in the ground which has not moved, nothing has been done for four years, and when we have tradesmen who are out of work, and when we have hospital facilities that have been there since 1908 and desperately need to be replaced, and when we have a government that can't put that together and provide better facilities for Saskatchewan people and jobs for Saskatchewan workers, then we have an incompetent government that needs to be replaced, and will be replaced.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to protecting farm families. The fundamental problem facing Saskatchewan farm families today is price. Our farmers are not getting a decent price for the commodities they produce; a price which will at least give them some sort of a return on their investment and some sort of a return for their labour. Well, I don't know whether anyone in this House would deny that. Our farm families know that provincial governments can't do much of significance with respect to commodity prices, at least for grain. They don't really expect the provincial government to offer them some sort of a support price for wheat, oats, and barley, or other grains. They know that this is a national and an international problem, and believe you me, it is.

They know that European farmers get massive subsidies from their federal governments or their central governments. They know that U.S. farmers get massive subsidies from their government, and that these are now going to be so structured under the new U.S. farm Bill that, not only will the farmers get massive subsidies, but that the subsidies will not be in the form of higher prices for their product, and the product will be sold at low prices. That's the import of the U.S. farm Bill, and that is what it means for Saskatchewan farmers.

This is why we must have a federal government in Canada which will stand up for Saskatchewan farmers. Heretofore the U.S. government has, in effect, supported the price of wheat, and the U.S. support price — I'll call it that — meant that the world price of wheat was supported. That support price has been drastically lowered. We can confidently expect that the world price of wheat will drop significantly.

(1115)

The short question now is this: what is the federal government going to do for our farmers? Is it going to act as European governments have, as the United States government has, and, according to some news reports, as the Australian government is now doing? And we have had no indication.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our party favours action by the federal government along this line, and we would accept either one of two approaches. The first would be a parity price for a given number of bushels. And you will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that that's the proposal put forward by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities at their recent meeting.

This has the advantage of providing a floor price for a given number of bushels for Saskatchewan farmers. It would be for Canadian consumption, and it would in effect be paid for by Canadian consumers as opposed to the federal treasury — a simple parity-pricing proposal for those commodities consumed in Canada. I am using wheat as an example, but I'm not proposing to confine it to wheat. The same principle applies with respect to other commodities produced.

Another proposal has recently been put forward by the Canadian Wheat Board advisory committee with respect to wheat board grains, and that proposal is for a deficiency payment. That would mean that farmers would get a lesser amount, \$6 a bushel, but for a larger number of bushels. Either will serve to give farmers a minimum return on their investment and something for their labour. One of them is urgently needed to be acted upon by the federal government and it will not be acted upon unless pressure is mounted by the prairie governments to have the federal government act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — And I say that the Government of Saskatchewan has the responsibility, the clear responsibility to select one of these options to press the federal government to act, so that this basic problem of farming in Saskatchewan, the price of our commodities, is dealt with and is dealt with by the federal government in support of our farmers as it is by the federal government of the United States, the national governments of Europe, and as it is reported by the national government of Australia.

But yet I've heard nothing from members opposite, nothing to indicate that this pressing problem is being acted upon and that action by the federal government is being urged by the Government of Saskatchewan.

If you consider it for a moment, it is really grossly unfair to ask Canadian farmers to compete with the treasury of the United States government, the treasury of the central governments in Europe, and in the course of so doing get disastrously low prices of their products. This is what is being asked of Canadian farmers by the PC governments at Ottawa and Regina and it is grossly unfair. It is a new situation. It is a situation which has arisen only since the U.S. farm Bill. It will only come into effect on July 1, if I have my date right, and only at that time will you see a substantial drop in world grain prices. You can already see it on the Chicago futures market. They know what's going to happen. They know that Canadian farmers are being asked to compete with the United States treasury and the treasuries of national governments. I say it's unfair. I say it's time that the Government of Saskatchewan pressured the Government of Canada to do what other national governments are doing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — A member opposite has asked, what is our solution. We have suggested that as a minimum measure, as a minimum measure, Canadians ought to be asked to pay fair prices for the agricultural products grown in Canada and consumed in Canada. Now that's the idea of parity prices . . . (inaudible)

interjection) . . . Well members opposite suggested it would be 10 per cent. Even if it's only 15 per cent and they only got \$10 a bushel on 15 per cent of their production, that would be of some assistance.

Another possible approach is the deficiency payment to bring farmers up to \$6 a bushel on a much larger percentage of their total production. One is proposed by the SARM as a reasonable solution; the other is proposed by the wheat board advisory committee as a reasonable solution. We are not here saying, we are wedded to one and only one.

We believe that the parity pricing one is reasonable for two reasons: one, it asks consumers not to live off the backs of farmers who are having their prices driven down by an international contest between the United States government and the EEC. We are seeing a game of vigorous international competition, based not upon costs of production, but upon the length of the purse of each of those major countries in the world. And I think that under those circumstances it's not unreasonable to say to other Canadians, well at least it's only fair that you pay the costs of production.

The fact that the EEC and the United States are in a war because the United States has got fed up with the EEC marketing agricultural products which are hugely subsidized, and they're determined to discipline the EEC by driving down international prices — and that's what's going on — I ask whether or not it isn't reasonable for Canadian consumers to pay a fair price based upon the costs of production for the food they consume that is grown by their fellow citizens, the farmers.

And I think that that is reasonable. And members opposite are suggesting that it's a socialist solution. I take it that they would equally say the same with respect to the current dairy farming set-up we have in Canada, and that if they had their way they would dismantle the Canadian Dairy Commission and put it all up for competition, and they would allow American dairy producers to clean out our dairy industry.

I take it they would do the same with respect to poultry and that they would not have any price supports for poultry. And I see the member for Prince Albert nodding his head — yes, indeed. I take it the Canadian egg marketing agency would be gone.

I take it he does not approve of the activities of the Canadian Wheat Board to the extent that they take grain off the market and hold it and try to sell it at a time which is opportune for the farmer. They're stating their belief in unrestricted free enterprise agriculture. And I say that that is unfair to our farmers. It would be all right if everyone was competing on a level field, but there's no competition competing on a level field when our major competitors in the EEC and the United States are subsidized to a huge extent by their governments.

Well I say that when a country like Canada sees its major producers under attack, not because of anything we have done, but because of a war between the EEC and the U.S., our government, our national government, has an obligation to step up and give them some help. And

certainly we would pressure the Government of Canada to do just that.

I turn now to a further question and that is the question of input costs. While farmers do not expect their provincial government to guarantee to them a price for wheat sold on international markets, they do expect the provincial government to act with respect to input costs which are able to be affected by that provincial government.

We have a provincial government that has an opportunity to act with respect to utility rates, with respect to fertilizer costs, chemical costs, fuel prices. And I want to say that utility rates, fertilizer, chemical costs, fuel prices have all gone up in recent years when the value of farm commodities has gone down.

It's time for the government to take action with respect to these. It's time for them to do what they can to assist farmers with respect to input costs. And I can tell you that a New Democratic government will act to assist farmers at this difficult time with respect to input costs. We will reduce the price of farm fuel by a minimum of 32 cents a gallon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We will introduce measures to cut the cost of farm fertilizers. We will pressure the Mulroney PC government to make possible the development of low-cost generic farm chemicals. It is pretty clear, I think, that the generic farm chemicals — their day has come. Generic chemicals, when they were developed in Canada, with respect to pharmaceutical generic chemicals or drugs, kept down the price to a very significant extent. And no one denies that. Now the time has come for us to have generic farm chemicals, dealt with on the same basis as generic pharmaceutical chemicals, and we will see a significant drop in the price of farm chemicals. And it can't come too soon for hard-pressed farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the matter of the Nielsen task force report. I wonder if members opposite have taken the opportunity to look at that report and see what it offers for Saskatchewan farmers.

I know that the view across the road, across the aisle here, in the hands of the members of the Progressive Conservative Party, they seem to feel that the PC government at Ottawa is doing just fine; that the proposals put forward are just fine. Keep up the good work, Brian, I think is the quote attributed to the Premier. Well I want to point out what some of this good work consists of so far as the Nielsen task force reports is concerned. And, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, Mr. Nielsen is not just anybody, he's the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada. He's Mr. Two — number two in the Mulroney government. And here is what his reports are saying about what ought to be done for farming.

Well, "accrual accounting should be implemented." Here's an interesting one, "accrual accounting should be

implemented." Some farmers have calculated just what that would mean for them. In any year when they have a good crop but cannot sell all of that crop, they would have to pay income tax on the crop in the bin before they've got money for it. Now I think that that is pretty difficult for farmers at this stage of the game, to suggest that they ought to turn to accrual accounting. That's what the Nielsen task force says.

Here's another. If the Canadian Wheat Board sells grain to customers whose credit worthiness is not high and there is a risk of loss, we are asked by the Nielsen task force report to accept the proposition that the Canadian Wheat Board should have to pay a risk premium to the government for all credit grain sales, the same as private firms.

(1130)

Well I don't think that's a good idea. Members opposite may think that's a great idea, but I think that the Canadian Wheat Board does not have a bad record of credit sales, and nothing that I have seen suggests that farmers should undertake yet another load of premiums to be taken off the amounts they'll get from the Canadian Wheat Board simply to satisfy Deputy Prime Minister Nielsen and his report.

Then we come to western grain transportation. Here is another proposal. They don't care for the \$660 million Crow benefit subsidy at all. They say that first the subsidy shouldn't be paid at all; there's no economic rationale for it. Secondly, if it is paid, it should be paid to the producers and not the railway companies. And I want to point out the consequence of that. If it's paid to the producers and not the railway companies, the Government of Canada will have no opportunity to pressure the railway to give proper service to western Canadian farmers. If it is paid to the railroad companies, that sort of a hammer will allow the federal government to require the railways to serve western farmers as they have not always done in the past. That is point number one.

Point number two is that if we have subsidies, as they will be labelled, the Crow benefit paid to farmers, we cannot expect other countries with whom we negotiate under the GATT negotiations, which have been referred to in this House —and the Premier has said we must have GATT negotiations on agricultural products . . .

An Hon. Member: — Do you agree?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — The member opposite asks whether I agree that we should have GATT negotiations on agricultural products, and I emphatically agree. I say this: but if we pay subsidies directly to our farmers, that makes our negotiating position much harder. And if we pay them to the railway companies, it makes their negotiating position much easier, because half the countries in the world subsidize their transportation systems and cannot suggest that is a subsidy to producers. But not half the countries in the world pay direct payments to their producers, unrelated to production. And that, I suggest is one major reason why, at this time when we're moving into international trade negotiations, we should

not be paying that Crow benefit to farmers directly.

Now one other point needs to be made with respect to Deputy Prime Minister Nielsen's report, and that is that he proposes that federal money for rail rehabilitation in rural Saskatchewan be discontinued. And I think that rail rehabilitation in western Canada is important. It's an important national objective, just as surely as building ports on our east coast and west coast are important national objectives, just as surely as building airports all across this country are important national objectives and have been paid for by federal money, just as surely as building the St. Lawrence Seaway was an important national objective built by federal money.

These transportation facilities were paid for by all of us as Canadians. There's no reason why our basic railway network should not be paid for similarly. And I think when Nielsen suggest this, he is suggesting that benefits which Saskatchewan people and prairie people ought to get from their transportation system be withdrawn, and there is no similar proposal that benefits from a nationally financed transportation system be withdrawn from people in Vancouver or Halifax or elsewhere.

Now I turn to PFRA, and here's another one that I have not heard any quarrel or demur come from members opposite. The proposal is to totally dismantle PFRA. The proposal is that small water projects and tree seedling programs be discontinued totally. And as for community pastures, they be turned over to the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Why is the member on his feet?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to introduce a class.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for allowing me to interrupt his address.

I'd like to introduce 12 students and their teacher, Mr. McHenry, and chaperon, Mrs. Smith, from the Wolseley High School, who are visiting our Chamber today. I had the very good fortune of meeting with them a little earlier, discussing some of the aspects of government, and touring the building. I hope you enjoy your day here and have a very safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to the member. I just didn't see the note. In the course of my remarks I didn't see the note indicating the member's students had arrived.

I was turning to the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration and the PFRA, and noting that Deputy Prime Minister Nielsen's report would have us dismantle that and discontinue the tree seedling and the small water projects completely, and that so far as community pastures were concerned they would be either provincially owned or privately operated.

Well I don't see any great problem with having them provincially owned, but I certainly think that the private operation of community pastures, except on a co-operative basis by producers, would not work to the benefit of Saskatchewan farmers.

I now turn to western grain stabilization and the further proposals of the Nielsen task force report with respect to that. And it says the government should not permit higher limits on the coverage above \$60,000, and I'm not at all sure that that is for the benefit of Saskatchewan farmers.

Moving down to crop insurance, they want higher premiums for farmers.

An Hon. Member: — 20 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, if the premiums escalate by more than 20 per cent, participation may drop. But we can get another 20 per cent out of the farmers if we try hard; a longer-term federal objective should be to shift the higher share onto the producers. This is offered by Deputy Prime Minister Nielsen's report. There's been no demur from government opposite, no suggestion that these proposals are not in the best interests of western agriculture.

They're talking cash advances. They don't want interest-free cash advances. They say this subsidy does not have a positive development impact. And we have not hear of any demur from members opposite with respect to whether or not the cash advance program, interest-free cash advances, should be dismantled. And this is what the task force proposes.

On fuel tax rebates. And I want to read to you, Mr. Acting Speaker, just what is said about this:

There is no convincing rationale for continuing to subsidize farm energy costs in this manner.

This, Mr. Speaker, at this time in the history of our farming industry. Subsidizing is . . . That is the word they use to talk about the rebate of taxes otherwise collected. And they say there's no convincing argument. They're not convinced that farmers are in trouble. They're not convinced that our farmers need a fuel rebate. And they're certainly not being encouraged to be convinced by anything being said by members opposite.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time we had a government in this province who is prepared to stand up to Ottawa, prepared to speak for Saskatchewan farmers in Ottawa, and when there is a New Democratic government in this province, as there will shortly be, there will be a government which will stand up for farmers in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I now turn to other aspects of our program. While this government has talked a lot over the past four years about family and compassion, its actions have hurt Saskatchewan families who are most in need. Rising unemployment, a crushing tax burden — these have put increased pressure on many, many families. Each month in this province, thousands of families depend upon the food bank to get their food for their families — food banks which weren't even in existence in this province four years ago. I applaud those people who are operating food banks, but I deplore the circumstances created by the government opposite which make food banks so necessary for the very survival of so many families in this province.

In the world's bread basket, people are going hungry. That's remarkable, that's immoral, and that's wrong. And it's time we had a provincial government dedicated to providing opportunities for all, opportunities for ordinary families who are now having to depend, some of them, on the food bank, and not just opportunities for other big-business men, whether it is Manalta Coal or Peter Pocklington or some other friends of theirs who is getting a multimillion dollar gift from the government opposite.

Under a New Democratic Party government, there will be changes in our approach to seniors. Saskatchewan seniors, age 60 and over, who are often the poorest in our society, will be provided with a guaranteed minimum income. I want, Mr. Acting Speaker, to explain this. Our proposal is that there be a supplement on the incomes of people between the ages of 60 and 65 to bring them up to the minimum level of income which they could expect when they reached age 65.

You will be aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when people in this province reach age 65, they have an effective minimum income based upon the old age security payment, the guaranteed income supplement, and the provincial supplementary payment. That, Mr. Speaker, represents a minimum income that someone in this province can have when they're 65. We believe that there ought to be a supplement which brings people between 60 and 65 up to at least that minimum income. And we believe the time has come to start that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, a number of people who are undoubtedly going to enter the debate are getting over-anxious, but I would like very much to explain this proposal because I think the time has come for us to say to people who are getting less than the minimum they would get at age 65 that we will support them.

Many of these people in times past may or may not have been able to enter the work-force, but because of what are surely difficult economic conditions they find it very difficult to compete in the work-force. And I am not at all sure that we are not doing the right thing for everybody to assist them to have this minimum level of income — and it's not overly generous — so that they would, if they wish, be able to withdraw from the work-force. And then they would open opportunities for younger people who are also seeking employment.

We are, in our society, reluctant — and I think properly reluctant — to support people who are thoroughly employable, who want to work, and to support them by payments which might be thought to discourage employment. And that's a problem. We don't want to see people suffer, and on the other hand we don't want to discourage people from seeking employment.

An Hon. Member: — We need more jobs now.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We obviously need more jobs, but if some people have to be out of the work-force, surely people between the ages of 60 and 65 who have minimum incomes ought to be assisted to leave the work-force if they so wish. That is our proposal. We believe it is a humane proposal, and we believe it is one which will also indirectly offer job opportunities to younger people who are ready, willing, able, and anxious to work.

(1145)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will improve and extend the home mortgage protection for Saskatchewan families, and we expect to have during the course of the next weeks an opportunity to outline in some detail our proposals for dealing with home mortgages, not only . . . not only . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order, please. Order, please. I think there's a little bit too much noise in the House, and the speaker cannot carry on. Would you please respect the speaker.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — We will have an opportunity over the next few weeks to outline our proposal, and the proposal will deal, not only with mortgages as seen from the position of the person who owns or is buying the house, but also mortgages as seen by those who would like to see house construction stimulated in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, members will be aware that housing starts in this province are very sluggish indeed. They will be aware that in 1984 housing starts were lower than any year since 1971. They will be aware that in 1985 housing starts were almost as low as that, just barely moved up. And they will be aware that because of difficult economic circumstances in this province, partly due to the ineptitude of the government opposite, we are going to have to stimulate housing construction. And that will be part of our proposal which we will outline in the weeks ahead, a proposal which we say will give protection to people who are buying houses, and encouragement to those who wish to acquire and build houses.

We will increase the health care staffing levels. No one, I think, can deny, except perhaps the Minister of Health, that levels are, in many of our major hospitals, too low, that they present a threat to those who are working there, and very possibly to patients who are being served.

And I point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the government opposite has had four years to remedy any supposed deficiencies which they say they inherited — four years to act — and no reference to what may have

happened 10 or 20 years ago is going to wash with the Saskatchewan public. You've had your four years to create the health system you felt should be there. You haven't done it, and you're going to answer to the public for that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will improve home care services. Members opposite are unaware of what has happened with respect to some home care services. I want to recount what has happened to me in this province and in my city over the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order please. Order. It's almost impossible for me to hear what the hon. member is saying, and I'm sure it's almost impossible for the rest of you in this House to hear what he's saying. So I ask both sides of the House — both sides, both sides — to please calm down and allow the speaker to carry on.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to talk about home care because something has been brought to my attention which I think deserves the attention of the government opposite.

People who used to offer a home care service through organizations like the Family Service Bureau, and similar organizations who offered a home care which had a health component but also a family support component, tell me that since home care has been transferred to the responsibility of the Minister of Health he is unwilling to pay for support services for families that do not have a health component.

And many of the organizations which used to be able to help families under stress no longer have money because it's been cut off by the Minister of Health, who will not pay for support for families unless someone in the family is sick. And I don't think that's good enough. I don't think that's good enough.

Many people are under stress because . . . they may not have specific physical problems; they're under mental stress; they are unable to cope with all of the economic and social pressure with which they're faced. They need the sort of support which was previously available but is now being denied by the Minister of Health.

Now we will provide our working families with affordable, and accessible, quality day care. And I'm sure that other colleagues of mine will have an opportunity to enlarge somewhat on that particular proposal of ours.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are just some of the positive commitments which our party has made to the people of Saskatchewan and which we will be putting forward to the people of Saskatchewan over the next short number of weeks. They are commitments based upon our consultations with the people of Saskatchewan over the last four years. They're commitments designed to get our provincial economy moving forward again, and they are for the benefit of all Saskatchewan people.

We will be offering a government which has certain very,

very simple principles, but I think principles which are not now part of the thinking of the government opposite and which the people of Saskatchewan want to hear about. It will be a government dedicated to fair taxation, to job creation, to a commitment to financial management, and to compassion for those in need — people like the unemployed, people like farmers under stress — and committed to standing up for Saskatchewan's interests at Ottawa.

Now these, Mr. Deputy Speaker, stand in stark contrast to what the public are being offered by the government opposite: a record of unfair taxes, of rising unemployment, of waste and mismanagement, and big business policies. Is there any doubt that people who are being offered guarantees of millions of dollars, private firms like Manalta, to buy coal mines we already own, this is a big business government and a government characterized by preference for the wealthy, and weak leadership.

We, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will offer the people of Saskatchewan a different alternative, an alternative based upon fair taxes, job creation, financial management — competent financial management, and standing up in Ottawa for the interests of Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people are saying that they can't afford four more years like the last four years, and that's why they're looking for positive alternatives to the government of the day. And we will be putting forward a positive alternative of getting Saskatchewan working again, getting an opportunity to give our young people some hope for the future, and getting the farmers of this province with some confidence that they'll be on their farm two or three years from now. This is what we need, and this is what our New Democratic government will be dedicated to providing.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, all of this will be discussed on the hustings. All of this will be able to be explained more fully, just as soon as the government opposite gets enough courage to call an election. And I urge the government to pluck up its courage — it's already been in office about four years — pluck up your courage and give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to pass judgement on your government. Give them a chance. And I say, once they have a chance, they will say to you, you have had your four years. You have done what you are going to do; you must answer for it.

And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the people of Saskatchewan pass judgement on the government which is now in power, it will be the government which is no longer in power, and there will be a New Democratic Party government in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Shortly put, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time is now to call an election. Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that some of these issues can be more fully debated, I propose to move a motion. I move:

That the motion before us be amended by adding the following after the word "session" in the final line:

but regrets that the government has failed to take immediate, positive steps to make the tax system fair for working families and farm families; failed to create jobs and opportunities for Saskatchewan people; failed to stand up for Saskatchewan in vigorous opposition to the Mulroney government's threat to medicare and threats to Saskatchewan agriculture; and that this Assembly therefore calls on the provincial government to get Saskatchewan working again by immediately repealing the unfair flat tax; refunding the unfair sales tax on used vehicles; restoring property tax relief; guarantee stable interest rates for Saskatchewan small business; to work with local government to eliminate the municipal business tax; to reduce the price of farm fuel by 32 cents a gallon; cut the cost of farm fertilizers; permit the development of low-cost, generic farm chemicals; provide a guaranteed minimum income for Saskatchewan seniors 60 and over; and increase health care staffing levels.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I so move.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Morin: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to take part in the throne speech debate of the Devine government today. I'd like to begin my remarks by congratulating the mover and seconder of the throne speech who have taken their time to make comments on the thrust of the throne speech that we're here to debate, a document which I believe is a building block and a cornerstone in proceeding with the progress of our province.

Mr. Speaker, before I get on with some of the remarks that I want to make about the good people of The Battlefords and the growth that we're enjoying under a Conservative administration in our region, I just simply can't proceed without taking a few moments to remark on the previous speaker's comments.

We heard a lot of rhetoric in his comments about how they were going to stand up for the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I heard a shudder through the province when he said that, because the history of them standing up for this province, his national energy program, and it is the constitution and land bank and just an abysmal disaster of programs that they've tied us to.

We heard them talk about farmers, Mr. Speaker, and their solutions to farmers was to buy their land and turn them into tenants. We heard them talk about writing off the education portion of property tax. They don't even support the ownership of private property. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province don't believe that tirade that we just went through and nor will they believe it come election time.

(1200)

I had the opportunity to go through the Regina newspaper, Friday, March 21st and the headline is, "NDP election goodies sampled." They listed out 18 or 19 things, and the only addition on the paper that they didn't list was any other thing we can think of to buy your vote. Mr. Speaker, I want to run through a few of these things.

They are talking about a guaranteed annual income for people 60 years and over. When did they suddenly get concerned? In the last seven years that they were the government of this province, what did they do for seniors on supplement? The lowest income senior that we have — \$5. Five dollars in seven years. What's that? Seventy cents a year. You couldn't even buy a cup of coffee on what they gave them.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about looking after families, families with mortgages. And they say, we'll do better than Grant Devine did. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we came to this House, mortgage rates were 22 and 23 per cent, and we wrote them to thirteen and a quarter per cent. And people said, yes, we need a little help. And now that they're down around 12 per cent and falling, they say, we'll help you, we'll make it better.

Well where were they when we needed them, Mr. Speaker? They said, I'll tell you what. When interest rates were 22 and 23 per cent, they said, I'll tell you what — if you lose your house, we'll buy it back and rent it to you; no problem.

They talk about giving back taxes. When they came to power in 1971, the personal income tax rate in this province was 32 per cent. When they were thrown out, the income tax rate was 51.5 per cent. They added a tax on gas. They added a tax, Mr. Speaker, on everything but fresh air. And the only reason they didn't do that was because they couldn't find a way to regulate it.

We have removed the tax on gas. We have removed the tax on children's clothing. We are working to dismantle an unfair tax system that they helped to create. We increased the personal exemption for people in their income tax, and we lowered the rate of tax from 51.5 to, I believe, it was 50.5 per cent.

And these fellows talk about giving money back. They talk about giving money back. Well in 1972 they tried and imposed a thing called succession duty in this province. And succession duty, Mr. Speaker, is a tax on widows and orphans at the time of bereavement when they've lost a loved one. And they taxed them to the tune of \$28 million. And in 1977 they did away with that. And how much do you think they gave back? Not one red cent, not a penny.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the talk from these people about how they're going to look after farmers, farmers know how they're going to look after them. They're going to make them peasants. That's what they're going to do. They're going to make them tenants on their own land. That's what they're going to do with them.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about looking after people's home mortgages. They know better than that. The people of this province know better than that. They talk about standing

up for this province. Their solution over the years whenever there was an issue that faced this province was to run into the corner and hide and turn their head and cower — not to have the courage to go out and develop markets internationally.

Today the former premier says we have to compete internationally. He supports GATT. Well you never know what he's going to do from one day to the next, because he's against trading with the Americans. And we trade nearly \$6 billion a year out of Saskatchewan with the Americans. He doesn't want to talk to them. Half of the trade that we do is with them. But today he kind of thinks that might be a good idea.

Well a few days ago he was on, I believe it was *Big Q Country* in Saskatoon, saying, I'm going to put the tax back on gasoline; and I wouldn't rule out other tax increases. Well now he doesn't know if he'll do that. And in 1976 he laid off 400 nurses, I believe the number was. Well now he's going to put a few more back. And then he spent 800 million on uranium mines, and now they're going to shut them down.

I mean it depends on who you talk to on what day of the week to know what they're going to do. And I think the people of Saskatchewan would like a little more consistency; they'd like a few people with their feet on the ground, a little better than the gentlemen across the aisle here, to be running this province.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this province know that there has been growth and development and prosperity in this province for the last four years during difficult international times. And they will follow in our lead, because they have the power and the courage and the belief in themselves to build this province, not to follow those guys over there and run into a corner and hide every time there's an issue that faces them.

Mr. Speaker, in going back, having stood in this Assembly for the last four years and looking at what we've done, and reading those throne speeches it became apparent to me that this government has really developed issues in three different areas.

First, with families. We hear people talk about health and education and taxation and all of those things, but really you can lump together and you can say: what does it do for the family? Well, Mr. Speaker, in my area, in my part of the province, we did a great deal for families. At a time when it looked like they were going to be losing their home, we saved that home with 13 and a quarter per cent interest rate. And a few weeks ago when there were a couple of bumps up in the interest rate, my phone rang and they said, you know, Myles, I'm thinking of going and buying a house, but I'm a little worried about the interest rate; and I think that program expired, didn't it? And I said, no, we extended it to 1988. And they said, that's all I want to know. I can live with 13 and a quarter per cent, and if I'm protected to there I'll take my chances. So housing purchases continue in our area. We have growth and we see that.

In terms of education, Mr. Speaker, we have a school in my riding which was built in 1905 or '06. And they tried for years and years with the former administration to get a new school built in the town of Battleford. And do you

know what they were told? We'll look into it; we'll do a study. Well, Mr. Speaker, during the last couple of winters when it was a little cold, the children in that school had to wear their boots and mitts. And the gentlemen opposite wouldn't spend a penny to give the children of Battleford a new school.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're building that school, with \$2 million. And last winter, Mr. Speaker, when they're doing up the design, and while the gentlemen opposite's consultant said, oh, we really don't need a new school here, the lights were falling down — pulling out of the roof. I think they needed a new school, and we got them a new school. And we have thanked the Minister of Education and her compassion for the young people and her vision for what they can be if they have decent education and proper facilities to learn in. The young children of Battleford are going to have that new school, and it's being constructed this spring and this summer.

Mr. Speaker, we hear an awful lot of talk over there about health care. Well, Mr. Speaker, in our riding, in the riding of The Battlefords, we have seen advancements in health care under this government that we were never able to attain under the other guys.

We live in the north-west corner of Saskatchewan in my riding, Mr. Speaker, and you're aware of that. We have always been required under the former government to run into Saskatoon for our needs, anything a little special. We changed that. Diabetics, for example, in my corner of the province, now don't have to drive to Saskatoon. We run a diabetic awareness clinic out of the Battlefords Union Hospital. And the money to run that came from the Minister of Health, the Hon. Graham Taylor, because he recognized the advantages of giving regional hospitals an expanded role in the province of Saskatchewan — that everything didn't have to go to Saskatoon and Regina. And he has carried on with that commitment to regional hospitals with his recent announcements. And we are having greater access to health care in this province than we've ever had, and we're having it at a regional level where there are also economic spin-offs to the local communities. And I support that. And we have supported that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Morin: — In terms of health care and looking after our seniors, Mr. Speaker, in our corner of the world, in our corner of this province, we have run pilot projects with home care, pumping thousands and tens of thousands of dollars into expanding that service to help people in their home.

Through a local initiative I was able to get senior citizens who are capable of living independently in their home, I was able to get their walks shovelled in the winter-time, Mr. Speaker, for them at no charge to them, at no cost. And those seniors who shouldn't have been out shovelling their snow or taking the chance to slip and break a hip or do whatever damage they could do on there, we've got that looked after for them, to keep our seniors in the Battlefords area healthy and in their own home and independent, as they want to be.

The Minister of Health has announced more nursing positions. And again, in the Battlefords Union Hospital we had an intensive care ward, Mr. Speaker, a beautiful ward, fancy machines. Fancy machines. I have no idea what they do but it looked very impressive when you walked in, fancy gismos, rooms all glassed in so the nursing station could watch what was happening in the room. It never opened — never opened because the former government wouldn't give them money to staff it. That's open today, Mr. Speaker, and the cost on that is \$415,000. Eleven nurses looking after people in an intensive care ward in north-western Saskatchewan because the Minister of Health cares about the health care of our population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Morin: — Mr. Speaker, in 1982 when I campaigned I talked to senior citizens in nursing homes, in seniors' accommodation, and they said to me, you know, we're not doing too badly. We'll get by, and we're old. But we worry about our grandchildren. Where are they going to find jobs? Why do they have to go to Edmonton, to Calgary, to Vancouver, to Toronto? Why can't they stay home?

Well you know, Mr. Speaker, I ran over the numbers from the Saskatchewan Health statistics the other day. And, Mr. Speaker, we have 800 more young people from the ages of 20 to 40 living in Battleford and North Battleford than we did in 1982 — 800.

And there was a great deal of concern in our area that all we were doing was becoming a senior citizens' complex and all of the economic activity was rushing into the major centres of this province. And we've reversed that trend and we're now a growth area in the province. And who do we have to thank for that? Did that ever happen when the NDP were in government? Never — never.

We have manufacturing taking place in our province, local people starting manufacturing shops, employing up to 70 people, since the change in government. We have a company in the town of Battleford run by local people, owned by local people, that is manufacturing and exporting not only around North America but internationally. I talked to them last week. They've got a deal signed; they're shipping products to Barbados.

And how old are they? Thirty months old. Thirty months. Would they be there when the NDP were there? No, Mr. Speaker, and I'll tell you what. I talked to them. When I spoke to them, they were telling me about their deal in the Barbados. They're a little concerned. Because they said, you know, Myles, if the government ever changed, we'd just have to turn the key in the door. And the 24 people from the town of Battleford that we hire would be unemployed. And the biggest concern that people in the north-west corner of the province have is what would happen if there were a change in government.

(1215)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little more about growth and development and economic prosperity in The Battlefords, but prior to getting into those comments I

want to talk just briefly on what the member for Shaunavon said yesterday in his throne speech debate.

He indicated that the Pawley government in Manitoba had taken over a province with one of the highest levels of unemployment in the country and had reduced that down, and that the reverse situation had happened here. And because he seems to have a little trouble with the facts . . . I won't say what they call him in North Battleford but I will tell you the facts according to Statistics Canada.

In November of 1981 in Manitoba the unemployment rate was 6.1 per cent. In February of 1986 in Manitoba the unemployment rate was 7.9 per cent . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you very much. The member from across the way indicated that they have the highest per capita debt in the country.

One thing he didn't mention in addition to that is that they have a tax on employees; they have, I believe, a tax on savings accounts; they have a \$2 billion deficit; and they have nothing to show for it. They have a tax on gas, they have taxes on everything else, and they have reduced any taxes to their people; they have nothing to show for it.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1982 the unemployment rate in the province of Saskatchewan was 6 per cent and in February of '86, since 1982, it has gone up to 7.6 per cent, so there has been a bit of an increase, a moderate increase. But in comparing the two I think the thing that one should consider is that the two droughts that we've had, terrible droughts in our part of the country, have not affected Manitoba.

Now if you look at the tremendous growth in employment that we've had and the tremendous growth in job creation and you look at the times that we've gone through, the worse economic recession in 50 years nationally, internationally; two droughts — and people in Saskatchewan are doing better than they have ever in history.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in The Battlefords we've benefited from that and we plan to continue to benefit from that. And I'd just like to quote . . . I had the good fortune to put out a householder to my community a little while ago and I'll quote from it:

The number of new businesses in The Battlefords from 1982 to date had increased dramatically.

And they're not all big businesses. They don't all employ 20 people, or 50 people, or 100 people but they employ . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll get to him. They employ, 3, 6, 10, 7. Some of them are sole proprietors, but the total of those small businesses is 556 people to the end of 1985. And since then we've had 15 new companies open and they employ a considerable more number of people.

And I believe that when I add the number of employees that they have to the number that have opened since 1982, that I will climb over the 600 new employees in new businesses in The Battlefords, and that is a record. Never before in history has there been that much activity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Morin: — And that, Mr. Speaker, doesn't include the expansions that have taken place in companies that were operating prior to 1982. And as we all know, money spins off money and jobs create jobs. And if we've had 600 new jobs created by new companies, then we must have had roughly half that many again created by companies who are already in place, as they expanded.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to take a minute and go through this little document that I published for my constituents. On the inside leaf we see ground breaking on two senior citizens high-rises. And what did the people of The Battlefords say when we broke the ground? They said, we didn't even think we could get them. The Mayor of Battleford, who is a highly placed individual in another political party, stood up and said, we have Myles Morin to thank for this and the Grant Devine government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Morin: — And he said that in the past we never had any access to government. He said when we wanted something we had to go to the NDP with our cap in our hands and on our knees, with our hands out and beg for a little something. He said, you know what, Myles Morin walked into the council chambers and he says, fellows, I think we can get this and I want you to apply for it, because I believe we can deliver. And he says, we thought it was a joke. And here we are a few months later breaking ground, and he said, I can't believe it. We have to turn them away, he's bringing so much stuff in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of thing that can happen all over this province, if we believe in the future of it, and if we believe in the people and the courage that they have and the drive and determination that they have. But it will never happen if we let those guys across the road regain the reins of power in this province. Their attitude is, go and hide in a corner every time there's a controversy.

Mr. Speaker, I've a letter in here from a retired schoolteacher and I'd like to read it to you. It's addressed to the Hon. Grant Devine, and he copied me on it. It's dated November 1, 1985, to the Hon. Grant Devine.

Dear Sir: The Ukrainian community of the Battlefords wishes to express its appreciation to your government for the \$150,000 grant covering part of the publishing costs of the first volume of the Ukrainian encyclopedia. Because Ukrainians in their homeland are not privileged to develop their language and culture, any assistance beyond its border is vital to its survival. Your contribution is noted with deepest gratitude.

We believe in the culture of this province. We believe in the areas that just because my forefathers came from Poland or France or wherever they may have come from, that we don't have to forget that. We can build on the strength of every nation and every nationality that we brought in.

Mr. Speaker, on the back page of this document, I show pictures of our progress. Old buildings, vacant lots that there's been nothing happening in for the lifetime that those people were in power, are now sprouting new businesses, creating new jobs; and, Mr. Speaker, we've only just begun.

On the front page of this — and I don't want to take a whole lot more time — but on the front page we talk about Gainers. Mr. Speaker, I talked at length about the small-business growth and job creation in my community. But what we need in the Battlefords, and what we've needed in the Battlefords for years, is a corner-stone industry to build on. We could never get one with the NDP because any time something came around, any time there was an opportunity, they killed it or they bought it. Well we landed Gainers bacon plant and we worked hard to get that bacon plant. And the mayor of the city of North Battleford and myself and the economic development officer and the people from this government put that deal together, and we're proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, it tears at my heart when I hear the Leader of the Opposition say that an NDP government would kill that project. He said that in the paper, and he has said that here today publicly in his remarks to the throne speech. And, Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine it — 200 jobs for the people of The Battlefords, and opportunity to build. We've made that announcement.

I've been contacted by two meat packing plants from eastern Canada. I'm dealing with both of them. They think, by gosh, with the amount of feed grain you guys grow, and with the amount of livestock you produce, that you would be a good place to locate. You've got a river and we need water. You've got a good quality of life. You've got a good transportation network. You're on rail. You've got good people to work there with, a good work ethic.

And, Mr. Speaker, with the Gainer's bacon plant and with another meat processing plant, there are a million things that we can do up there. Mr. Speaker, we can get a packaging facility to feed off of two different plants and there will be enough activity there to support that. The things that it does in trucking; the things that it does for the hotel industry; the things that it does for motels and restaurants, and on and on.

It gives farmers an opportunity to feed, to grow a diverse crop. It gives farmers an opportunity to walk their grain off the land through livestock which they've done in this province for years, but haven't over the past few years, while hog production fell like a stone under the NDP; when cattle production fell like a stone under the NDP. We can build on those things, and we can grow, but we can't do it with people over there who are going to drive a stake through the heart of every opportunity that we bring into this province.

Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Allan Blakeney, is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member in addressing the Leader of the Opposition should address

him as that or by his constituency, but not by his name.

Hon. Mr. Morin: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your correction. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly has tried to suck the life-blood of job creation out of our region, and he has proven, proven beyond . . . If there was any doubt in the people of The Battlefords minds that they cared one iota about our well-being, about our future, it's been dispelled. Because not only did he say once publicly that he would squash that program, that it was a headline in the newspaper, he repeated it here again today. The member from Athabasca reiterated that and the whole group here seemed to think that the people of The Battlefords don't deserve to grow. They don't deserve any opportunity.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we believe in opportunity and they believe in welfare. And I believe the people of The Battlefords would rather have an opportunity than welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Morin: — Mr. Speaker . . .

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about housing in your area.

Hon. Mr. Morin: — It's booming. The member asks, how's housing in your area? It's booming. Thank you very much. In fact, since you mention it, I've been talking to the contractors, the average and small contractors in my area, and they're so optimistic about what's going on in our area this year that they figure we're going to have the biggest record year of construction ever. And you know what it's predicated on? I appreciate the member raising the question because, you know what it's predicated on? Bacon. And I know that the member from Regina North East understands enough about economics and home building to know that if we squash 200 jobs in my riding there won't be a lot of home construction . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Oh, the member for Athabasca says they're all from Alberta. Well, I'll tell you I had the pleasure of speaking in the member for Athabasca's riding the other day, at a nominating convention, and the joke going around was the member from Athabasca is frightened because we saw him in town today and we haven't seen him for four years. I was a little worried when I heard the member from Athabasca speak because I've always thought he was a reasonable man, but he's been spending too much time with the NDP because he's starting to sound like them.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity not only in The Battlefords but across our province, to build. We have an opportunity to realize on the dreams of our forefathers if we have the courage to go out there. We can fill the National Hockey League with kids from Saskatchewan who compete internationally and on a world level and are heroes and winners, but we don't believe, because of the NDP, that we can compete anywhere else. We can only compete on the ice. My colleague, the Minister of Culture and Recreation, a world champion in sports, but they don't think we can compete in trade. We live on trade — we live on trade — \$6 billion a year with the U.S. alone, and they want to kill it.

(1230)

Well, there's nowhere we can't go in this province if we believe we can go there, because we have the resources and the people and the opportunity to do it. Only one thing can hold us back — only one thing — and that's the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Speech from the Throne, and I will be opposing the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The amendment that was put forward by the opposition has a seconder who has spoken prior, and therefore we would have to have a new seconder proposed for that amendment.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, I will second the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure once again to rise in debate on the motion before the House. I, too, along with my other colleagues that we've heard, would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the member for Regina North and his colleague, the member from Humboldt.

I would like to spend a few moments today in a couple of areas, Mr. Speaker. Number one, I'd like to say a few words about what our government, the government of Premier Grant Devine, has done for the constituency of Weyburn and the people who live in that constituency, and as well say a few words about the importance of the oil industry in terms of preserving and creating jobs for Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency . . . And this very morning you will know that I met and introduced to the members of the legislature some people from the Western Christian College, who are busy building a new facility there, several new facilities, in fact. And it's an example of the kind of spirit in and around Weyburn, where they're building projects for the future — future not only of this province, Mr. Speaker, but the future of our youth.

As well, Mr. Speaker, one other major, important area in Weyburn is the Souris Valley Regional Care Centre, a very high-quality, well-run institution for level 4 patients, Mr. Speaker. It's a facility that all the people of Weyburn are very proud of. But it's also one that every taxpayer, I would suggest, every taxpayer in Weyburn who is aware of it certainly, who every time they drive by it they also know — and it bothers them — that there's a great deal of empty space that's not being utilized in that facility. And every taxpayer believes that it would make a lot of sense to utilize that facility. And I too, Mr. Speaker, am of that same view.

I know the Minister of Health has had a committee that's examined waste space in this province. And I've had an opportunity to have many of my colleagues through that building and see that available space. And I also know that the minister is giving it every attention that he can in

terms of making fuller use of that space for the people of Saskatchewan, for the people Weyburn. And although I cannot stand here today and make any commitment about further utilization, it is certainly a very, very high priority with me, Mr. Speaker, as MLA for the area.

I would also say in passing that it's with regret, in fact, that I have learned that Bernie McCallion, who has been the administrator there, has moved on to a new job in one of the large hospitals here in Regina as the new administrator. I wish him all the best as he undertakes this new job. He's going to be sorely missed in Weyburn, not only as the administrator there, but he was very much a community person, as was his entire family. And I can also say, having had consultations on this with the Minister of Health, that he is regarded as one of the best administrators in Canada. And we are going to sorely miss him at the Souris Valley.

There's a lot of things been happening, Mr. Speaker, in Weyburn constituency. The priorities of the people there have been the priorities of this government. Fillmore, town of Fillmore, their hospital nursing home complex which they've been working at since 1973, had the cash in the bank since that day. Well very shortly, Mr. Speaker, we're going to be turning the soil out there on that project as it gets under way.

And I can only congratulate the people of Fillmore for not ever giving up. They never gave up on that project, Mr. Speaker. They had a vision. They had to get through hurdles — like the NDP's government previously had a moratorium, Mr. Speaker, as you will know, on building new nursing homes. That was a real slap in the face for them. But that project is on schedule. Sod will be turned and the \$1.9 million contribution from this government to make that their vision a reality.

Stoughton. It's the same thing. They're just about ready to move into a brand-new nursing home there, more beds, a new facility, the Newhope Nursing Home Lodge, virtually complete, Mr. Speaker. We expect that the people there will be moving into that in this next month.

Education, Mr. Speaker. Fillmore. New facilities at their school. Long awaited and much needed.

In Weyburn. Classic example, Mr. Speaker. A classic example of using business to create jobs in the province. Business, the small, the engine of the economy, creating jobs. Canada Wire & Cable. Very exciting times for them, Mr. Speaker. The last couple of weeks they've had projects that ultimately over the next five years will probably lead into the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contracts that's been awarded to them.

In fact the headline in the local paper, the *Weyburn Review*, just this week, Mr. Speaker, had something to the effect that, because of the government contracts, Canada Wire & Cable will double the work-force, Mr. Speaker — double the work-force. Good news for Weyburn. Good news for Canada Wire & Cable. They've been a very good corporate citizen, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate them for their aggressiveness in pursuing these contracts.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Canada Wire & Cable in

Weyburn, it goes without saying that it means jobs, jobs, jobs.

And, Mr. Speaker, what about the farmers in the Weyburn area? I was not that long ago at a meeting that was, for the most part as far as I could tell at least, organized by the NDP. They were there to talk about how the government —erroneously I might add, Mr. Speaker — about how the government of Premier Grant Devine has done nothing to help the farmer.

Well there is no need for me to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, what Premier Grant Devine's government has done for the farmers of this province; no need for me to reiterate because a young farmer there said it all. A young farmer at this meeting said it all. He listened to all this doom and gloom and negativism coming from the NDP supporters there about how the farm economy was falling apart, about how we had this crisis, and about how the governments weren't helping. And finally he could take it no longer, Mr. Speaker, and he stood up in front of the crowd there — he was at the back — he stood up, he says, I've been farming the farm I am on today for many years, and before that it was in our family, I think he said it was in the order of 78 years. He said, I want to tell you people here today that we've never had as much help from any government in the entire history that that farm has been in our family as we've had in the last six months from the government of Premier Grant Devine and as well from the federal government. Unequivocally, Mr. Speaker, never had as much help as they've had in the last few months. I think that says it all, Mr. Speaker.

But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that farmer, like many others out there, they're not looking for hand-outs. They just want a little help to get them through the downturns, whether they be drought, or flood, or grasshoppers. That kind of hope and optimism . . . The spirit is not broke out there in rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker; we've helped them get through this time. And that kind of optimism, Mr. Speaker, was reflected in the Regina Bull Sale this week.

The farmers out there aren't . . . Even though there's been no grass for the last couple of years and hay supplies have been low, did that break their spirit? Did that cause them to fold up their ranches and close up their tents and quit this business of farming and ranching? I say, no. In fact, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in, I think, 60 or 70 years, I heard on the radio, prices at the Regina Bull Sale have been the highest that they've been since the early hundreds in this province, reflecting, I think, once again the optimism out there.

Well we've been behind the farmers, Mr. Speaker, whether it was droughts, or floods, or debt problems, or interest rates, or grasshoppers because our government's priorities have been the things that I've just described to you happening in the constituency of Weyburn. It was health care, in building nursing homes. It was the people's priorities; it was the people in Weyburn's priorities, and it's our government's priority. Education, new schools, jobs — jobs at Canada Wire & Cable — and help for our farmers, which leads me to the area of my portfolio, Mr. Speaker.

As you will know, it has been experiencing a downturn. Prices have fallen dramatically in the world oil markets. It's equivalent of, Mr. Speaker — to put it in terms that are more easily related to by many of our people — it's like the price of wheat going from \$5 a bushel down to \$2 a bushel in a matter of some eight weeks. And it's largely, if not entirely, due to the action of Saudi Arabia, one of the major OPEC countries, where they've decided to try and discipline the market a little bit out there.

Of course I am like any other consumer; I'm all for low gas prices, Mr. Speaker. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, this causes me very grave concern because of all the jobs that are threatened, not only inside the oil patch, but the jobs of people outside the oil patch that are impacted upon as well. And I think of jobs at Ipsco; I think of jobs at the Saskatoon oil field manufacturing. So it's not just an oil patch issue, Mr. Speaker. This is a Saskatchewan issue.

Why am I concerned, Mr. Speaker? Well, unlike the NDP we view the oil industry and the oil patch as the engine of jobs and economic growth in this province. It's vital — not only to the life-blood of the province — but it's vital to the life-blood of the families and the workers who enjoy their livings from that industry. Thousands of jobs, Mr. Speaker, depend on that industry staying healthy. Thousands of families depend on that industry staying healthy.

And how are we going to attack this problem, Mr. Speaker? How have we been attacking it? Well, we're going to use the same recipe to solve this problem as we used in 1982. My colleagues and myself embarked on meetings across the province, meeting not only with the chief executive officers and the chairmen of the boards and the Calgarys of the world, Mr. Speaker, but we're meeting with the rig workers and the Swift Currents and the Estevans and the Weyburns and the Kindersleys and the Lloydminsters of the world to get their views on what maybe governments can do, albeit that it's largely a global problem that we deal with. But it worked in 1982; we consulted with the industry; they know best. It worked then, Mr. Speaker, and I think if there's anything that we can do, it'll work again with that kind of recipe.

And I can say, Mr. Speaker, absolutely, unequivocally, that I'm not here today to provide answers, because I haven't finished all these meetings yet, but I attack this problem with an open mind, and I can say as well, unequivocally, that all options are open. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the fundamental fact in Saskatchewan today is that this industry has been good to this province. It's our number one source of revenue. It's a major creator of jobs, and there are a lot of communities that enjoy the spin-offs from that industry.

And just, Mr. Speaker, as Premier Devine and our government stood behind the farmers in their downturns, and just as we stood behind the home owners when interest rates went up to 20 and 22 per cent, we will stand behind the workers and their families in the oil patch today; we'll stand behind the Ipsco workers, and we'll stand behind the people in Saskatoon at the plant there. We are not about to turn a deaf ear on an industry that has

been so good to this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition today stood in this House and talked about standing up for the future, standing up against Ottawa, standing up for the farmers. But, Mr. Speaker, has he once even breathed a mention of a word about standing up for the workers in the oil patch? Has he once even questioned, Mr. Speaker, about the jobs that are threatened in the oil patch because of the world oil price scenario? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is: the silence has been deafening, the silence has been deafening.

And why, Mr. Speaker? Because the NDP view the oil companies and the oil patch workers as a threat, as nothing more than a bunch of big, bad oil companies. Well at least that's what they say when they're in Nipawin, Mr. Speaker, or when they're in Saskatoon. but now the hon. member for Shaunavon, if he gives an interview to *Pipeline*, which is read in Estevan and Weyburn by the oil field workers, what does he say? Well, you know, maybe this oil royalty holiday isn't so bad, and maybe there isn't a \$300 million give-away. But when he goes to Nipawin, and if they need some new road or something, hey, we'll stop that \$300 million give-away to the oil companies, and that's how we'll find the money to build your new road. And if he goes to another town down the road, the member from Shaunavon says, yes, we'll build that for you because we're going to shut down that \$300 million give-away to the oil companies, and we'll build that for you.

(1244)

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many times they've spent that \$300 million give-away that doesn't exist across Saskatchewan. But it's a different tune, Mr. Speaker, when they're in Estevan and when they're in Weyburn. And I understand the hon. member for Shaunavon is going to be in Weyburn as a guest speaker at another banquet down there, and it will be interesting to hear what he has to say in the heart of the oil patch. It'll be very interesting indeed, Mr. Speaker.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what I have heard as I've toured the oil patch. What have I heard as I've toured the oil patch since oil prices went down? The two things I consistently hear, Mr. Speaker, the biggest threats facing the oil patch today, Mr. Speaker, are two things — two things, Mr. Speaker. The first one is the threat of continued low oil prices. It has them and me extremely concerned, Mr. Speaker. But what is the second biggest threat facing the oil patch today, Mr. Speaker? The second biggest threat today, Mr. Speaker, facing the oil patch is the sniff — even the sniff that the NDP, people like the member for Shaunavon, even the sniff that those guys might get close to the levers of government again. And I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker — and my words can be checked out by those in the industry — capital investment is being held up in this province today because there is some view that they may even get within a 50-mile radius of those levers of government and the valves of the pipelines of this province. That, Mr. Speaker, is as big a concern as the low oil price scenario out there for them.

I can see why they say that, Mr. Speaker, because the oil

patch has just come through a banner year, and I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker, we're committed to maintaining the health of that oil patch economy out there.

Mr. Speaker, just as they've been hypocrites when it comes to dealing with the question of oil resource policy, they've been hypocrites when it comes to dealing with farm policy. Where were they when farmers were facing 22 per cent interest rates? Where were they when farmers were calling for capital gains tax removal? Where were they when farmers were dealing with high fuel costs?

Well, Mr. Speaker, needless to say, I'm proud of the record of this government. I am proud of the Premier of this province because he understands farming, he understands families, he understands the life-blood of this entire economy. He understands about building for the future, he understands about jobs, and he understands about opportunity.

So needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I'll be supporting the motion, not the amendment. And although, Mr. Speaker, I have more to say and I would like to take . . . I will want to say it at a later date. I beg leave at this moment to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I would just briefly describe why this motion is on the order paper. It is simply to provide for the putting of the votes on the question of the throne speech at Wednesday afternoon, 30 minutes prior to adjournment, and then providing for sitting Wednesday evening for the delivery of the budget speech. Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the Minister of Energy:

That in accordance with Rule 13(4), unless the debate has been previously concluded, Mr. Speaker shall, at 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 26, 1986, interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the address in reply to His Honour's Speech, and

That notwithstanding Rule 3(3), this Assembly shall on Wednesday, March 26, 1986, sit from 2 o'clock p.m. to 5 o'clock p.m. and from 7 o'clock p.m. to 10 o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have leave of the Assembly to proceed with private Bills, second readings, so that we can move these two private Bills down the order paper.

Leave granted.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 01 — An Act respecting the Canadian Bible Society, Saskatchewan District

Mr. Baker: — Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 01, An Act respecting the Canadian Bible Society, Saskatchewan District, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Bill No. 02 — An Act respecting Medical Services Incorporated

Mr. Glauser: — I move that Bill No. 02, An Act respecting Medical Services Incorporated, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:51 p.m.