

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ORAL QUESTIONS

Unemployment Rate in Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel like directing my first question to the Minister of Health to inquire about the epidemic which has obviously decimated the ranks of the government, but I will address my question to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Premier. And my question deals with the latest unemployment figures released by Statistics Canada this morning. Their report shows that in March there were 47,000 people unemployed in Saskatchewan, 1,000 more than the same month last year, and 5,000 more than last month of February.

Now with the kind of month-to-month jump in the number of unemployed shown by these figures, and with the kind of very large year-to-year jump shown, can you, Mr. Deputy Premier, tell us what specific government projects will be in place in the next week or two or three or four to provide some meaningful job opportunities for 47,000 unemployed people.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, while I have a great deal of sympathy for those among us who are unemployed, I would like to come at this from another angle, Mr. Speaker, and talk about the employed. Mr. Speaker, there were 11,000 more people working in Saskatchewan in March of '86 than there were in March of '85. There are 1,000 more people in Saskatchewan working in March of '86 than in February of '86.

Mr. Speaker, Regina has recorded a 0.7 per cent drop in unemployment in March and now stands at 9.3 per cent. There are 6,000 more people, Mr. Speaker, in Regina working today than there was one year ago. Services, Mr. Speaker, mostly small businesses, recorded the greatest employment growth — 3,000 more in March than in February, Mr. Speaker, and 7,000 more today than one year ago.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in actual numbers we have the second lowest, Mr. Speaker, the second lowest unemployment rate in Canada, tied with Manitoba at 9.5 per cent actual. The unemployment rate is up from February's rate of 8.7 but down, Mr. Speaker, from the 9.6 of March of 1985. The major cause, Mr. Speaker, for the change in the rate is the large growth in the number of people entering the work-force.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, there are 6,000 more people in our work-force in March over February, and there are 12,000 more people in our work-force today as opposed to one year ago. Our rate of increase, Mr. Speaker, in the labour force is double the rate of Manitoba, double the rate of Alberta, double the rate of Canada as a whole, and 15 times the rate of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the ministers when they answer questions to stay much briefer than that.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Minister, following that flow of figures, could you give us an explanation of why, when comparing province to province as you did, the facts will show that in job creation from March of 1985 to March of 1986 Saskatchewan stood eighth in performance, admittedly ahead of Prince Edward Island, admittedly ahead of Newfoundland, but behind every other province in Canada in the percentage of new jobs created. Can you explain that Mr. Deputy Premier?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, to get to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition just a few minutes ago, he said: what programs, and what will this government be doing in the very near future to see that there is an opportunity for these people who are today unemployed to become, Mr. Speaker, part of the ranks of the employed?

Well I want to talk a little bit about the Opportunities '86 program, Mr. Speaker, recently announced by the Minister of Small Business and Tourism. To date, there have been in excess of 5,400 applications requested by over 2,000 businesses for young people leaving university, entering the labour force, students, Mr. Speaker, — over 5,400 job applications to date by over 2,000 employers in the province of Saskatchewan. And based on the overwhelming response, Mr. Speaker, we expect the program to be fully subscribed.

Another thing that we are doing, Mr. Speaker, to provide . . . They asked the question.

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

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, some other things that are happening in Saskatchewan to provide opportunity, to provide opportunity that those members opposite would deny the people of Saskatchewan, and I talk, Mr. Speaker, about the Shand power project in Estevan; the upgrader in Regina; a paper-mill in Prince Albert; a fertilizer . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, to deal, not with the press release projects referred to by the Deputy Premier, but some very hard facts being faced by many citizens of this province, will the Deputy Premier indicate why his many success stories which he has recited here this morning has resulted in the number of employables on public assistance in this province increasing from a figure in 1982 of 4,400 to a figure of 1986 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Please — I'm making this very clear that the number of employables on social welfare in January of 1982 — I'll give the exact figure, 4,492, and in January of 1986, not 4,492 but 14,632 — these are employable people on social services. Would the Deputy Premier care to explain how those figures are consistent with the success stories which he was outlining at such tedious length?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asks a question about people on social assistance. I would be happy to provide some information to all of the members of the Assembly and to provide some information to the people of Saskatchewan, as well.

If I recall correctly, during the last years of the former administration the welfare rolls were ever going upward. Here in the province of Saskatchewan, of course, we've had an increasing population; we've had an ever increasing labour force; we've had migration into the province of people that are coming here because rates here are higher than they are in some other provinces. So we would expect naturally to see some increase in welfare rolls.

But what is really significant in terms of a statistic, Mr. Speaker . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well, they asked a question about the rolls and I'm going to give them the information. They might not want to hear this, they might not want to hear this, but today in the province of Saskatchewan — these are January '86 figures — there are 673 fewer people on social assistance than a year ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would think we are going in the right direction. We're going in the right direction with the number of people on social assistance. And we are going in the right direction with the number of people who have more permanent jobs in the province of Saskatchewan today. And when you take the kind of projects that the Deputy Premier talked about, which the members opposite oppose, I think that the future for employment here in the province of Saskatchewan is very bright indeed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Well with respect to all the people moving in and all the ex-cabinet ministers moving out of this province . . .

Would the Minister of Social Services care to explain why in January of 1982 the amount paid of assistance to employables was 2.2 million, and in January of 1986 it was 7.7 million? Would he care to explain that, having regard to the fact that he has reduced the allowances, and that the number of people has gone up from 4,500 to 14,500? Would he care to explain how his programs are operating to provide jobs for people?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, the former administration did absolutely nothing to attempt to get people off of the welfare rolls. And all you have to do is take a look at the welfare statistics during the last few years that their administration was in power. They continued to go up and up and up. And the last year that they were in power there were something like 50,000 beneficiaries who were receiving some form of social assistance. So, Mr. Speaker, I think what you have to do is you have to take a look at the trends.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm going to ask the members to retain some decorum in the Chamber. It's impossible to hear what the minister is saying. They listened to the question; I expect you to listen to the answer.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — And Mr. Speaker, I expect the members opposite will not want to hear that in the last few years of your administration there were only 4,000 permanent jobs created — 4,000. Ten thousand part-time jobs . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm going to caution the member from Quill Lakes to maintain some decorum in the Chamber.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — I'll continue answering the question. Four thousand permanent jobs, 10,000 part-time jobs under your administration. If you want people to have part-time jobs, that's what you'll get with the NDP. Under this administration, 21,000 full-time jobs in a three-year period of time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, that's why the people of the province of Saskatchewan today have a much brighter future in terms of employment than they would ever have under that administration.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Final supplementary to deal with the bright future, obviously appreciated by the Bank of B.C. and the member for Wilkie. Would the minister care to explain why the policies which he characterizes as a failure led to 4,500 people who are employable on welfare, and the policies which he describes as successes led to 14,600 employable people on welfare? Would he care to explain how this is a success story of his government, instead of the story of abject failure which it obviously is?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, the abject failure in this province was when that administration drove people out of this province who wanted jobs here and couldn't get them here. And everybody knows that. And I can tell the people of this province, that's exactly what will happen again if those people ever . . .

The Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — If those people ever return to office, we will see the bacon plant in North Battleford shut down; we will see the P.A. paper project shut down; we will see Rafferty shut down; we will see . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — We will see project after project discontinued, job after job opportunity lost, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly what will happen if that administration were ever to get back into power. I will reiterate the statistics: 4,000 permanent jobs created in their last three years, 21,000 full-time jobs. The facts speak for themselves. The choice is clear, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Situation in the Oil Industry in Saskatchewan

Mr. Sveinsson: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say that false optimism, certainly in the face of real adversity, is a characteristic of this government. In a recent publication of their *Saskatchewan Viewpoint*, the Minister of Energy

does, in fact, exemplify that false optimism.

My question is to the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker, and he suggests in that article, "No panic in the oil patch," published in the spring of '86. Further he says, the energy minister, Lorne Hepworth, says that despite recent price declines there will be no panic in his department or in the oil patch. I ask the minister: at what price level does panic set in, and how many jobs have been lost to date in the oil patch in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time that somebody in this legislature got around to addressing the question, because certainly this kind of issue is a lot more serious than humbugs and jelly beans, Mr. Speaker, because this is a serious issue facing the oil patch today. There is no question that as prices move down, the oil patch is threatened, and it's threatened in a serious sort of fashion.

From the outset we put in place an action plan to deal with it, and when that article was written, it may well have been that the price was 18 or 20, but as you and I full well know, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of turbulence in the market today, and it's moving up and down.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that from a government standpoint it is no longer good enough for us to look simply at the oil patch as a cash cow. We must look at it as an agency in an area of this province that can create jobs, and that will be the focus and the direction of this government as we work to help those people in the oil patch whose jobs and livelihoods are threatened, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sveinson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the budget *Estimates* just tabled by the Hon. Minister of Finance, it's indicated that over 1985 revenues we're going to lose approximately \$200 million from the oil patch in 1987. I suggest that at \$21 a barrel, where this was in fact based, we will likely lose closer to 400, or at least \$300 million in revenues from the oil patch. And I ask the minister where that shortfall will be made up, or will it simply become another part of the 1987 deficit?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — What the actual number will be of course is anybody's best guess. Obviously for budget purposes we had to put a number together. It was predicated on our best judgement. Our best judgement was this: at this point in time, and perhaps for the next two or three months, we are likely to see low prices. And by low prices I mean in this 10 to \$15 range. At the same time, as we move into the fall and through the winter, albeit these numbers are based on starting April 1, that we will see perhaps recovery into that 18 to \$22 range.

As we know in this business, no matter what guestimate or what guess or estimate you make, it's likely to be wrong. That's all we really know because who is controlling this is somebody outside our borders. That is all we know. But we have to make the best estimate. And I can tell you, insofar as what it means, we're not about to solve the deficit or the revenue implications of that on the backs of the oil workers and the families whose livelihoods depend on that oil patch. That is not what we are going to do. We are not going to knee-jerk react;

we're going to pursue a course of putting in place programs to maintain the jobs out there.

Ombudsman's Report Regarding Social Reform

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Social Services and it's based on the report of the Ombudsman, which clearly shows that the biggest abject failure has been the policy of that minister with regard to the question of social services and welfare. That so-called reform, Mr. Speaker, as is clearly indicated by the Ombudsman, is nothing more than political smoke-screen to cover up for the inadequacies of this government. In his report the Ombudsman calls for an independent review of the government's changes to the welfare system which he says, and I quote, "have created a lot of hurt and a number of serious problems."

Will you, Mr. Minister, accept the Ombudsman's recommendation and agree to appoint an independent and a qualified group, such as the school of social work, to review the impact of your disastrous changes?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of accepting the member opposite's recommendation or of accepting the Ombudsman's recommendation, and I'm going to tell you why, Mr. Speaker. And I hope the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, listen very carefully as I have some information that I think is very, very significant for the public of Saskatchewan and for the members opposite when it comes to the Ombudsman's report.

The Ombudsman's report is critical, as the member opposite says. However, the criticisms levelled by the Ombudsman are not supported by the facts, Mr. Speaker, and I want to let the people know what the facts are. And if the members opposite will look closely at some of the statistics in the report, they will get an altogether different picture.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to respond to the members' questions if they would be so courteous as to be quiet and listen. Mr. Speaker, income security, the branch of my department that deals with these particular matters, deals with approximately 10,000 family income plan cases, approximately 20,000 Saskatchewan income plan cases, and a number of other social assistance cases, for a total of about 55,000 cases in one way or another who receive assistance. When you consider that the Ombudsman states that he received 317 complaints about that system, you're talking about 0.5 per cent of the entire system. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, our departmental records show that only 31 of those complaints — only 31 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. It's impossible to hear in the Chamber if you're going to behave . . .

An Hon. Member: — But you went on for a long, long time.

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Well you asked a complex question, and it deserves a factual answer, and I'm giving you one.

Of that 0.5 per cent of the case-load that the Ombudsman was concerned about, there were only 31 complaints that

were serious enough to warrant a formal investigation by the Ombudsman. The deputy minister received 31 letters concerning welfare from the Ombudsman. Of these, 11 are outstanding, 15 were resolved as unsubstantiated complaints, and five were substantiated. So as of today, Mr. Speaker, we have five substantiated cases.

In light of that, Mr. Speaker, whether or not I have to choose between the Ombudsman's report or whether or not I have to choose between reports which talk about the people that are getting education and training and productive opportunities that will help them to build for the future, I have no problem whatsoever deciding between these people who are getting education and training — choosing in favour of them, and not in favour of this report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, the minister has trouble with complex questions. I therefore shall ask him a very simple one. Will you, Mr. Minister, accept the recommendations of the Ombudsman and appoint a qualified group to review the impact of those changes which you claim to be welfare reform? Certainly, if you do not feel that there is anything wrong with your so-called changes, you should not be afraid of having an independent body take a look at them and give you a report. Will you accept the recommendation of the Ombudsman?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, how typical of the members opposite. How typical of the members opposite. We're talking about a system that was out of control under the former administration. When he was minister of Finance, literally millions of dollars being wasted; taxpayers' money being wasted; no opportunity for people to get education and training. Now we have five substantiated cases out of a total of 55,000 possibilities. He's calling for some kind of study using taxpayers' money. That's irresponsible.

What is responsible, Mr. Speaker, is to carry on down the track of welfare reform to provide thousands of welfare clients with education and training and opportunities to build for the future and to ensure that abuses in the system are dealt with and are dealt with expeditiously.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Supplementary to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, can you explain to this House how you can define 4,500 employables on welfare in 1982 as out of control, but 14,000 in 1986 as not being out of control? Which system worked better? Your system, which has caused 14,000 employables to be on welfare, four times as much as were on in 1982? Which system do you think has worked better?

Hon. Mr. Dirks: — Mr. Speaker, when you look back to the former administration, they had people on social assistance. The question really has to be asked: what were they doing to get those people off of social assistance in that period of time, Mr. Speaker? Was there any welfare reform program to provide education? Was there any welfare reform program to provide training? Was there any welfare reform program to curb the abuses so that you could take the money that was saved to put it

into education and training for welfare reform clients?

Mr. Speaker, there was nothing like that under the former administration. Today I have a report in front of me, Mr. Speaker, that indicates very clearly, for example, that whether it's in Saskatoon, whether it's in Prince Albert, whether it's in Moose Jaw, it doesn't make any difference where it is, in this province today people are being trained to get off of welfare, and that wasn't the case under the former administration.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 16 — An Act to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Venture Capital Tax Credit Act.

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

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act

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

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

Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Builders' Lien Act

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a Bill to amend The Builders' Lien Act.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane, and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Shillington, that the Assembly do resolve itself into the committee of finance.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Assembly. It is with a great deal of pleasure today that I join in the debate of the March 26th budget presented by our Minister of Finance, and the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden has my sincere congratulations. He has presented to this Assembly and the people of this province a prudent and a progressive financial document that deserves the support of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and of the people of

Saskatchewan.

This budget document recognizes pressing economic issues of today with meaningful, Mr. Speaker, and I say meaningful programs and meaningful policies. And yet the long-term direction of this budget does consider economic reality by fostering a steady and a stable growth. That, Mr. Speaker, is a point that we should all take note of. As the economic reality of the 1980's takes shape, our province must be in step and on time, from a fiscal point of view. The Minister of Finance's budget does indeed do just that. It builds on what this government has done, with a clear vision of what needs to be done in the future. Again to the Minister of Finance, I say, my congratulations, sir.

Before I go further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my thanks to those people who have placed confidence in my abilities and as well to those who assist me in carrying out my duties. Since becoming minister I have enjoyed a very busy and rewarding introduction to cabinet and to departmental responsibilities. And I would like to now extend my thanks and appreciation to Premier Devine for placing his trust in my abilities. I admire our Premier for his leadership style and for his leadership qualities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Premier Devine is a living embodiment of what Saskatchewan is all about, and as I work alongside him as my cabinet colleague, that impression is reinforced with me each and every day.

Premier Devine has entrusted me, Mr. Speaker, with a very, very important portfolio, and I pledge to you, Mr. Speaker, and I pledge to the people of this province that I will discharge my duties in the best interest of the Saskatchewan people, with your leadership, Mr. Premier, as my guide.

Mr. Speaker, there is another group of people who I wish to acknowledge at this time. The people who work in the Department of Highways and Transportation deserve my thanks as well. From the deputy minister and throughout the organization I have been impressed, Mr. Speaker, with literally every person I have met.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited most of the department's district offices and, as well, the offices in Regina here. And just about every individual that I talked to in the department has had 10 years or 15 years or 20 — service or more, of tenure with the department. It is truly a testimony, Mr. Speaker, to those civil servants' professionalism and dedication to public service. And I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to meeting many more of the departmental employees. And I look forward to working with them in providing service to the people of this province for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make special mention of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company and its employees. As you well know, STC celebrated its 40th anniversary on April 1st of this year. And I would like to offer my congratulations to STC on reaching this milestone in history. To all STC employees, past and present, I would like to extend this government's

appreciation for building an enviable record of success and an enviable record of safety. We look forward to many, many years of continued good service from the employees of Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to provide details of the \$100.6 million construction program for the year 1986. I do have a copy of the details of this construction program that I will be tabling following my speech.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that this year's construction program, in total, has 96 grading and paving projects which will affect 74 different highway locations. This year, Mr. Speaker, more than 950 kilometres of highway will be improved. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there are seven major bridge projects on the array. These will include various bridge redecking and major upgrading projects. As well, the completion of the Meridian bridge north of Lloydminster will be on the program.

And I should add, Mr. Speaker, that those people in the Meridian bridge area can expect grading and paving of Highway No. 17 north of the intersection with Highway No. 3 for a total of 13 kilometres. That stretch of road leads right up to the new bridge.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, construction of four-laning will start this year between Lloydminster and Marshall on Highway No. 16. This stretch of road, Mr. Speaker, is one of the busiest in the province. And I know that all area residents and, indeed, the Yellowhead Highway Association are pleased that this busy road will be four-laned.

An Hon. Member: — Where are you four-laning?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — If the member opposite would care to listen, I will repeat: we are four-laning this year between Lloydminster and Marshall on Highway No. 16. Another four-lane stretch of road, Mr. Speaker, and for members of the opposite, another four-lane stretch that I am announcing today is a 22-kilometre — if you'd care to take note — a 22-kilometre stretch on the Trans-Canada from west of Webb to 5 kilometres west of Gull Lake.

This represents a continuation, Mr. Speaker, of our efforts to four-lane the Trans-Canada. Over one-half of the Saskatchewan section of No. 1 is now four-lane. Over one-half of the Saskatchewan section of No. 1 is now today four-lane, Mr. Speaker. And this project takes us one step further towards our goal.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to major bridge work and four-laning, this government has made a commitment to improving roads affected by increased industrial traffic. One project, the four-laning east of Lloydminster, I have already mentioned. Two more projects will be started this year. A 13-kilometre stretch of road between Regina and Pilot Butte will be graded this year. Known locally as "old No 1," this project will service an increased traffic anticipated with the new Regina oil upgrader. Another industrial road that will be improved this year is from Rocanville to the PCS potash mine. That 14-kilometre section of road will be paved.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more important sections of road throughout Saskatchewan that could be announced in my speech, but I will let the construction listing speak for itself, Mr. Speaker. But I would be remiss if I did not mention the extension of Highway No. 41 from Wakaw to Melfort.

This year, Mr. Speaker, grading work will be completed from east of Wakaw to Highway No. 20 and paving of this section will commence this fall. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, grading will start on a 13-kilometre stretch from the junction of Highway No. 20 east to the fine little village of Yellow Creek. Mr. Speaker, this is an important highway for the people of that area, and I am pleased that progress will continue towards its completion.

Mr. Speaker, before ending this portion of my speech, I would like to note two very important facts. First, there is an ever-growing emphasis on resurfacing work on our highway system. If you look closely at the construction listing, you will note that there are 18 resurfacing projects. In the last three years the resurfacing budget has increased 55 per cent to more than \$19 million this year.

Coupled with an increased emphasis on resurfacing, the maintenance budget has also been increased by 4.3 per cent to \$87.2 million. In the past four years nearly 4,500 kilometres of highways have been improved in the province of Saskatchewan. And it makes good economic sense, Mr. Speaker, to protect and care for that investment, and increases in resurfacing and maintenance budgets most definitely demonstrate that fact.

Mr. Speaker, on those same themes of protection and care, I would now like to turn to the subject of safety. In 1985 the traffic fatalities experienced another decline. That sad total has dropped to 214 in 1985 from 221 in 1984, and we are encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by this trend. And we remain committed, Mr. Speaker, to reducing the traffic fatalities on our streets and highways.

And that commitment extends, Mr. Speaker, beyond improving our highway system. Public education and leadership is very, very necessary. And I would like to take this opportunity to make a public thank-you to Mr. Terry Simpson and the players of the Prince Albert Raiders. This past year the department launched a multi-media safety campaign, and Terry Simpson and his players assisted us in getting the message across to the people of Saskatchewan that hockey is a contact sport, and driving is not.

Members of this Assembly should know that the general driver handbook that was revised in 1984 uses the sports theme to instruct beginning drivers. Mr. Simpson and the Prince Albert Raiders' organization deserve our thanks in the cause to reduce accidents, injuries, and fatalities in the province. As a model of success in sportsmanship, they have done a superb job in delivering our safety message to the people across this province.

By demonstrating leadership, and by better public education, it is our belief that we can accelerate the downward trend in accident statistics. Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks on the highways portion

of my speech, I have an important announcement for small business.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance's budget has placed great confidence in Saskatchewan small business to create jobs and stimulate our economy. And in highways and transportation we are doing our part for small business. Last year we introduced a new signing policy for small businesses that were located some distance from a provincial highway.

To complement that project, or that policy, we will be introducing legislation that will allow small businesses to advertise adjacent to provincial highways. And I should add, Mr. Speaker, that care will be taken to ensure that highways safety will not be affected. There will still be no signing allowed near or adjacent to intersections, and we will ensure that the placement of signs will not be a safety hazard, and that it will be done in a very orderly manner.

(1045)

I would at this time like to thank my colleague, the Minister of Small Business and Tourism, for his assistance in this matter. We know, from talking with the small-business community of Saskatchewan, that this change will be of greatest benefit to rural communities in our province. We trust that the emphasis given to the small-business sector by the Minister of Finance, and this policy change for highways signing, will give these hard-working people the opportunity to create jobs and to improve their service to the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my comments on the highway side of the department budget, and I would now like to address the transportation side. On a national and provincial perspective, transportation today is experiencing unprecedented change. The federal Minister of Transport's freedom to move discussion paper has stimulated a transition to less regulation, Mr. Speaker. The federal minister is also preparing to re-write the National Transportation Act.

Furthermore, the federal and provincial ministers have started the process that will result in a national safety code for the transport industry. In each of these areas, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has been proud to participate.

As part of a re-regulation package agreed to by the council of ministers, we will be introducing two key reforms in our provincial trucking regulations. Effective April 14th of this year, the reverse onus test and the ease of entry commodities will be available. These two key changes will reduce costly and unnecessary regulations.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, these two changes will maintain the provincial industry's competitive edge. Our provincial counterparts are moving in the same direction, and it is essential that our regulatory environment be compatible with them. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that these changes will not be at the expense of safety or at the expense of fitness. The Highway Traffic Board will still give prime importance to the ability of a firm to provide the proposed service safely and fairly.

Mr. Speaker, safety is also being addressed at the national

level. By the beginning of next year a national safety code will be implemented. This code will give the transport industry a minimum set of safety standards that will be recognized by all provinces. The national safety code will ensure that differing safety requirements will not become the next regulatory barrier to better service. More importantly, a national safety code will ensure that the safety of the industry and the public will not suffer as a result of re-regulation.

Right now the council of ministers has committed five task forces to assemble a working draft of the new code, and the transport industry has been invited to participate and contribute to this worthwhile project. It is encouraging to find, Mr. Speaker, that there is a new period, a new period, that is very, very significant, of federal, provincial and industry co-operation. I say thanks to co-operation between the all-interested groups. Our province and our country will pass through this transition period with improved service and a healthy and a competitive edge.

My announcements regarding reverse onus and ease of entry commodities demonstrates to the highway transport industry that we are committed to the re-regulation process. I would like to thank the highway transport industry for their co-operation in this phase of our re-regulation implementation. I look forward to more co-operation in the development of a comprehensive national safety code for our province and for our entire nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now turn to some important issues for Saskatchewan transportation users that are being conducted at the federal level by my colleague, the Minister of Transport. The first issue is the review of the Western Grain Transportation Act. The Government of Saskatchewan, through my department, has been involved in this review. We have submitted a detailed brief to the grain transportation agency who are conducting the review, and we have made various representations to the review committee.

We have stressed the critical importance that the percentage of costs of rail transportation of grain to be borne by the grain producers must be directly related to the grain producers' ability to pay, and the remainder of the costs being borne by the federal government. We will closely analyse the revisions to the Western Grain Transportation Act when they are announced by the federal government to ensure that the interests of Saskatchewan producers are protected.

The second involves the review of the National Transportation Act. The Government of Saskatchewan, through my department, has been involved actively in this review. We have submitted a detailed brief to the federal Minister of Transport, and we have included several recommendations that there must be a reasonable access and rates to remote regions, that the role of transportation and economic development must be recognized, and that captive shippers must be afforded protection from monopolistic carriers.

We will be carefully scrutinizing, Mr. Speaker, the new transportation Act to ensure that Saskatchewan shippers,

receivers, and travellers obtain a fair deal from the national transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, this brings a close to my speech. The budget for highway construction that I have announced will continue to protect and maintain an important investment and asset in the province of Saskatchewan. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, the highways construction program recognizes the needs for new bridges, four-laning, and industrial road development. To that, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and thank a very important Saskatchewan industry. The road builders of our province have built a solid reputation of excellence and co-operation. They are prime examples, Mr. Speaker, of the risk-takers and the job-creators of our province, and I, Mr. Speaker, am very, very committed to their free enterprise spirit. Today's construction budget has sustained nearly 4,000 road-building jobs. Jobs and opportunities are the key emphasis of the Minister of Finance's budget, and the highway construction contribution is very much in keeping with that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I will now table the construction listing document for the members of the Assembly. And I want to add that I do offer my complete support of the budget address by the Minister of Finance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Katzman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Speaker, before I go into the address I was going to make this day, I would like to compliment the Minister of Highways on respecting the recommendations and the desires of the people around the province over the last year or two, who have informed him some of the things that they would like, and some of the highways they would like to build. While his staff is in the Chamber — and I had the pleasure for two years of working with them — I once again would like to thank them for the cordial assistance they gave me while I worked with their department.

Mr. Speaker, my speech today is about revenue, and how the former government took money out of the pension plans of the people of Saskatchewan who put their funds in, and how they used those, not in the spirit of what pension plans are about.

Mr. Speaker, I will use the public service pension as my example. These are the employees of the government who, by all normal means of pensions, the government should be putting in an equal amount of money as what the pensioners are putting in to give them their benefits.

Let me go back and take a couple of years for an example. In 1976, Mr. Speaker, the people who paid into the pension plan put in \$8.573 million; paid out of the plan that year was \$7.805 million; \$768,000 was taken out of the people's pension money right into the general revenue of the former government to balance their budget.

Let's go to 1977. We had the same again, Mr. Speaker.

The people who work for the government put in \$12.240 million; the pensions paid out were \$9.756 million; they took \$2.484 million into the general revenue to balance their budget. Now, Mr. Speaker, not only did they balance their budget by doing that, they did not put in one cent of \$12.24 million they should have put in to start.

Now let's go back a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and let's take this pension plan from 1927. Let's go back and find out why this pension plan, Mr. Speaker, why is this pension plan approximately . . . the public service pension . . . \$1.6 billion — \$1.6 billion in the glue? Why? Now we're just picking on one. I mean, we can start with the teacher's pension, which is 1.3, and quite a few more.

Yesterday the speaker said government should pay their bills on time. He said that in this House when he spoke — the member from Regina Centre; let's go back and look. Did he pay his bills on time when they were the government in 1978? The people put in 14.418 million. The government didn't match it. They didn't put their 14.890 million. They paid out only 12.635 million, Mr. Speaker. They took 1.783 million into their budget to balance it. And as I've always said, Mr. Speaker, if we continue following through the 19 pension plans, you will find when the NDP were the government of this province, they didn't have a balanced budget since 1975, no matter what bahooley they give us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Katzman: — Let's go to 1979, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've got to go back to yesterday a little, Mr. Speaker, and remember that the member from Regina Centre didn't want me to speak all day. I guess I shouldn't have told what I was going to speak on because he didn't like to be told the truth. Mr. Speaker, 1979: 15.357 million put in by the employees of the Government of Saskatchewan; paid out 23.832 million. Well, the government finally had to put a little money in.

Now let's go back and let's look at what happened over the history, as I said earlier. The pension plan that we have today for employees who came in since 1977 have been matched dollar for dollar for dollar. In 1978 the employees put in 453,000; the employer finally learned; he put in 479,000. Mr. Speaker, let's go back . . . I believe it was last year if my memory serves me correct. The deficit that had to be picked up by the present government and is built into the present deficit that we have, was \$54 million for back — \$54 million roughly for back payments that were required. All the years, if the NDP and the Liberals, who were government prior, would have put their fair share in as required, that plan would have sufficient money to pay out the pensions of the people who were retiring.

An Hon. Member: — What's going to happen in 1990?

Mr. Katzman: — In 1990, one of the members has just asked me — in 1990 the estimate is the government of that day will have to put in \$200 million. I repeat, the estimate is: in 1990 the government will have to reach \$200 million out of the revenues to pay for unfunded liabilities created by a government who was using the pension plans of the citizens of Saskatchewan to balance

the books.

Mr. Speaker, I know there's a lot of other people who are going to want to speak today so I'm going to cut what I had — about an hour's speech — down to a lot less to allow other members the privilege of talking.

But let's go into other plans. I understand that prior to 1980 even the teachers' plan was not funded as is supposed to be. And the teachers' plan today, Mr. Speaker, has \$1,347,720,000 that it is basically short by the actuary decisions and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, what I am basically trying to make the point of here is that Saskatchewan has not had a balanced budget for many years, no matter what Allan Blakeney and the little tribe of Indians that run around . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I would caution the member not to use members' names but use their positions.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize. No matter what the member from Elphinstone says, and the little cheering group that he has running around beside him.

(1100)

Mr. Speaker, if we go through all the extra money that they have taken out over years, and how much they are short, let me first say, in the public service pension plan, from the numbers that I have derived, they didn't put in \$183.241 million. Now remember, Mr. Speaker, if you put money in the bank or into certificates or something else, it usually doubles itself in seven years. Remember, this pension started in 1927, and in 1965, when I accrued the '27 to 1965, they were already behind \$3.455 million.

They didn't start to correct the problem then, and the problem got worse. I guess you have to say that in '77 they started to make a cure, and you must give them credit for that. But they did not match the public service who were here prior to 1977.

Since we have been government, we have been matching on the side of what the people pay into the one plan, which is the public employees' superannuation plan, which is better known as the cash plan. We have also been putting funds in to make up for their shortfall, and as I said it was approximately in the neighbourhood of \$54 million in the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, while they were doing this, if you take a look at the annual reports of SaskTel, for an example, you will discover, when they were government in '73 I believe the year was, we owned 34 per cent of SaskTel. Well that sounds not bad. When they left government, we owned only 20 per cent of SaskTel. They mortgaged 14 per cent more of our ownership. Today I am informed that we now own more than 20 per cent, and we have been doing a lot of improving — private lines will be coming to farmers, and many other things.

But that's not the worst one, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about Sask Power. Sask Power you have to look at a little

differently, and I wish the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was here so he could holler and scream a little as I give him the facts of life.

When they built Coronach, they did not bring the deficit for the construction into the budget. They didn't show it as a debt for Sask Power. It did not come as a debt for Sask Power until after they were defeated as government. They put that deficit in an outside construction account, which they say we can't do. It's improper of us to build things and then bring them in once it's completed. But yet when they built Coronach and when they committed to other projects, Mr. Speaker, they had committed Sask Power to over 110 per cent of their equity in debt. They had Sask Power into 110 per cent of committed stuff even though they only showed they had about a 90-some per cent debt. But they had committed it.

Mr. Speaker, if you're going to do it, don't accuse somebody else of inventing the game if they continue to do it. And that's what they did. Mr. Speaker, the decisions that were made prior, they put a debt burden on the people who use the major corporations — SaskTel, Sask Power.

Hopefully we will start to bring those around. As I look at the information made public, Mr. Speaker — made public as not before, but now made public — the predictions of Sask Power must be placed before PURC. It is now out in the public realm what they believe is happening, when they believe it will happen, and why they must do things. It is not hidden behind the cabinet door by those who are around that magic table.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is, when you want to condemn somebody, check your own house first. He who has never caused the sin is the one that can throw the stone. And he who sits on that side with eight other members was part of the major deficit this province has and will be paying and will be much larger than the deficit we have had during rougher times. During good times, they spent and spent the money; they took the money away from people as they put it into pension plans. They didn't put anything away.

An Hon. Member: — They didn't put it into pension plans either.

Mr. Katzman: — They didn't put it into pension plans either.

Mr. Speaker, the past serviced debt which must be paid is \$2,115,363,294. That's for past service. And if we continue to match, as we have been doing, we will not see, which they left us with, the future of \$898,597,130 of deficit built up, which if you're following their plan would have built. But fortunately, the former minister of Finance and the present Minister of Finance are putting funds in so hope that deficit would not build.

Mr. Speaker, just on that point alone, as the member from Qu'Appelle has said earlier in his speech, if they would have left money behind to just grow revenue and interest on terms deposits in a credit union or any one of those organizations, it would have looked after these problems. But no, Mr. Speaker, they spent the money like a drunken

sailor on shore leave, and that's why we have a 2,115,363,294 past service deficit and if it wasn't for the foresight of our two ministers of Finance, we would have also built another 898,597,130.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is that when the NDP were defeated they left this province with a 3 billion deficit built in the pension plans. They built a deficit . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I should answer the member from Regina North West. His comments would suggest that the hidden deficit of ours, I just read to you, it was over \$3 billion, plus the deficit, that when we took power they left a 3 billion plus, plus . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no in the pension funds. The 3 billion basically in the pensions plus the billions of dollars that they had left in the equity in the Crowns. But remember when you talk about Crowns, there was equity to balance but they had took the equity and spent it and brought our deficit further in the hole.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I was just going to touch on some of the numbers. Basically there is an employee saving account which they have never done the proper thing with. There's the labour service retirement pension which they have never done the proper thing with when they were around prior to 1976. They have not done the proper thing with the teachers' pension, judges' pensions, anti-tuberculosis pensions, Saskatchewan Transport Company pensions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you'd come to public accounts once or twice, Mr. Member, who you are on public accounts, more than once or twice, you would know about these because there were all tabled in public accounts but I realize . . . The liquor board pensions and the workers' compensation pensions.

Mr. Speaker, all I'm trying to say is, there is a deficit of over 3 billion in the pensions . . .

An Hon. Member: — What about the members' pensions?

Mr. Katzman: — Yes, the members' pension is also about \$16 million in deficit. There's pension deficits for over \$3 billion, Mr. Speaker. They have taken the Crown corporations and mortgaged them during their years as government — in fact, mortgaged one over 100 per cent of what that corporation was worth and committed future debt.

Mr. Speaker, those were during the good years, the years when money was flowing. And the only thing they did was buy things like used holes in the ground. Farm land, they took it away from people — and that of course, when you want to talk about farm land purchasing, Mr. Speaker, you have to go back to the *Regina Manifesto* and refer to. That was the way they intended to own the province. They believed that they should own every business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to one other topic today. Mr. Speaker, what I must do here is quote a speech of mine in this House, April 23rd, 1980. Now why would I go back to 1980 for a speech? Well in those days, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan built buildings and they put a value on them of a dollar, and so forth, but they didn't charge departments rent. What they

did is say, oh, in Yorkton you've got so many square feet and in Uranium City you've got so many, and Vonda, in St. Walburg, and Stanley Mission, in Pelly. Be they the Department of Highways construction shops or be they the Sturdy Stone Building in Saskatoon, no department paid rent. What happened is everything was absorbed in government services — everything was absorbed in government services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in April 23rd of 1980, the former minister of government services and Labour and I got in a debate. And the member from Estevan, Mr. Larter, and I were also in the debate. But what Mr. Snyder said . . . Sorry, what the member from Moose Jaw said on page 2145 of April 23rd: "We don't charge consumer affairs. This bill is paid directly . . ." And he goes on to say how it's paid by government services, and so forth. All I am trying to say is with the new Crown that will be put together, for the first time we will know the honest truth of what it really cost for a department.

(1115)

Now what's happened in other provinces where they have gone to this formula that says, department manager . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You know the member from Pelly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is chirping from his seat. I remember the Pelly by-election when I was there, and it was the only time that a man was quoted in a newspaper as saying, why do you vote for the NDP? The comment was, I vote for the NDP because they pay me not to work. That's what was said; it was the headline in a newspaper, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's what you did. That's what you did. That's what the voters in Pelly said when they were voting for that member — they pay me not to work; that's why I'm voting for him. And there was a picture of the man with the big trucks in the newspaper.

An Hon. Member: — Sit down.

Mr. Katzman: — You know, the member, from his seat, says, sit down; yet he forgot that his own member took the whole day yesterday and didn't allow anybody else in. There's 64 members in this Chamber, and every member has the right to speak, but your members don't want to let our members speak.

Mr. Speaker, as I started to say . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I started to say, Mr. Speaker, is, with this new system, the Health department, the Highways department, Social Services department, all departments will show in their estimates what the cost of all that space they use is.

Now what's happened in the province of Manitoba, British Columbia, where they have done some of this? Do you know that most of those big, lavish offices have got smaller? Because they chose. They wanted more people rather than more space. And so people got to work rather than more space. So what's happened is, the governments have given more service to the people and less service to some of their larger offices for people.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to — if I would have had the opportunity to speak yesterday, but the member from Regina Centre chose to monopolize the day — I would go

through some of the departments explaining what it would mean. But being that this is the . . . I have several of my colleagues I would like to get into debate, I will refrain from doing that.

All I will say is to the minister: read, if he wishes, the debate of April 23, 1980, government services estimates, where we discussed the value of putting a value on space so everybody pays their way and you don't hide in somebody else's budget.

Mr. Speaker, obviously you can tell I'm going to be supporting the budget, because I believe the budget started along the way that it should go, for two or three reasons. First of all, it's starting to recognize the problem with the pension plans by putting funds in. Next of all, it's starting to recognize that office space in a building is worth something. It isn't just worth a dollar; you must put an honest value on it for the people of Saskatchewan. Second of all, it addresses the future of Saskatchewan by building on the strengths of Saskatchewan for the future of this province.

And yes, it might have a deficit, Mr. Speaker. But why does it have a deficit versus the other kind of deficit that I spoke of at the start? It has a deficit when it says, we will put the bank roll of our province to assist our primary producers, our farmers. It says, we will use the bank roll of this province and the credit rating and the borrowing power of this province to make sure that if our primary sector is safe, then our people in the cities will have jobs, our transportation will have jobs. And every time, if we have to prop anything up, you prop up your prime sector because it is the engine of progress. It causes everything else to go.

The members cry, fix the highways. You need money to do that. And what you need is the economy moving. Their way of economy-moving is: government does everything and only government can do everything. Our way is saying: the government, the private sector, the people, together we work; together we benefit; together our province grows.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said earlier, there was a deficit left by the former government. He whose house is clean can throw stones. And even the WCC's house isn't clean because they're already announcing promises that nobody could live with or pay for.

Mr. Speaker, what I've just said, as I said a moment ago, I will be supporting this budget. And the reason I'm supporting this budget is very straightforward. It looks to the future for Saskatchewan; it looks for the future for the people of Saskatchewan; and it takes us upon the road to become one of the greatest province in this country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I definitely will support the budget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure today to enter into the budget debate.

First of all, I'd like to congratulate my colleague, the

Minister of Finance, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, on the fine job and the great amount of effort which I'm sure that he and his staff put into drawing up this budget.

In talking today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are several areas I'd like to talk on. First of all I'd like to touch a little bit on leadership, because I think that's something that is essential that we talk about in this House and that the people of this province talk about. I think it's definitely one of the reasons that I am here today as a member of this legislature, is the leadership of our Premier, the Hon. Grant Devine, the member from Estevan. Because you have to think about the potential of this province when you offer yourself up as a member to be elected to this legislature. Because if you don't think about potential and about growth, then what are you doing here as an elected member of this legislature?

I think our Premier is the epitome of someone who thinks about growth and potential of this province and where it can go and where the people of this province can go. And I think that's the main reason I'm here. I think it really came home to me last summer.

My high school had a 75th anniversary and I looked around at that class of 128 that graduated with me in 1969. You know, after three or four years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you couldn't find hardly any of that 128 in the province of Saskatchewan. It made you start to wonder and it made you start to think, why, under a previous Liberal administration, and after a long haul of the previous NDP administration, that none of my graduating class were in this province. And it's one of the things that the Premier always talks about, about providing the opportunity for people to come home to our province and prosper and work at jobs and raise their families.

So anyway, last summer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had this 75th anniversary celebration at Central Collegiate in Moose Jaw. And as I got looking around the room and meeting my former class-mates, it was amazing the number of them that had come home to Saskatchewan since 1982 — people who had come home and started up their own small business, or come home and got into the family business, or had come home to the family farm.

And it really made you think, Mr. Speaker, and it made you know, that the things that the Premier of this province has been talking about for the last four years are starting to work. Because it's growth, it's potential, it's development, and it's moving ahead. And it's having the right attitude, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because attitude is 90 per cent of doing things. Once you've got your attitude straight, you can move ahead.

And you know, I've heard members around this Chamber from the opposite side knock the growth and the potential and the development which we've been trying to put forward in this province. And they say, times are tough; you shouldn't be doing that. You should be cancelling these projects. That's exactly the time that you show the confidence; that's exactly the time that you move ahead, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is when things are against you. You don't stop. You keep moving.

When I hear that people in this Chamber knock something like the Rafferty-Alameda dam system in south-eastern Saskatchewan, it really makes me wonder what they're doing here. They've only got to go back 50 years ago when that whole area down there was dried out, when there was no cattle feed, when there was no water anywhere for anything. And the fact that we can get another country to come in here and invest millions of dollars to help us solve a 50-year-old problem, to me is development and growth and potential.

When I think about a pulp-mill that has been a drag on the province, on the taxpayer of this province, for years and years and years, and some company wishes to come in here and become a good corporate citizen and invest hundreds of millions of dollars and hundreds of jobs to make that thing go, and expand it, and get out into the world market-place where we know that the product can be sold, and people in this Chamber decry that type of development. And I wonder why.

And then I think of an upgrader — an upgrader for our oil, an upgrader that will supply fuel to Saskatchewan farmers and Saskatchewan families. And yesterday we had the news that a large international chemical and fertilizer firm wishes to come along and marry in with that upgrader and provide fertilizer products to farmers in Saskatchewan — something that we've never had before. And yet I hear negatives, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hear negatives from that side of the floor.

Any time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have a fertilizer plant within 15 miles of my farm and I'm not having to get fertilizer from Medicine Hat or Alberta or Pocatello, Idaho, or Toronto, Ontario — that has got to be positive. It's growth, it's development, and it's potential for the farmer in this province. And yet people in this Chamber decry that type of development, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I wonder why. What are their motives? Why stop?

And that is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel so good about being here and supporting a budget that is on track. When I look at agriculture, my industry, how I make my living, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I see the agriculture budget doubled for this year. I see an ag development that talks about irrigation and talks about research; that talks about moving ahead in the province of Saskatchewan. It talks about an ag equity corp and the members opposite say, ah, funny, baloney. For the first time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a government in this province has tried to form a vehicle where people can invest money in this province and in agriculture. For the first time we're setting up a vehicle for people, Saskatchewan people, to invest in the primary and the number one industry in this province — agriculture.

And that is far different, Mr. Deputy Speaker, than a government which said, we will buy that resource; we will buy that resource, and we as a government will control it, but we do not create one more job. We do not create one more dollar for investment in this province. All we do is put people in a virtual serfdom situation.

And I really wonder when I look at the members opposite here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the member from Shaunavon, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg,

the member from Pelly. These are people that were here in the good times. They represent agricultural ridings, rural ridings. I wonder what was going through their head as money in this province was flowing in from our resources and it was being used for various things, but not one dime was put away for an eventuality, which comes upon this province in regular cycles — whether it be drought, grasshoppers, low commodity prices.

(1130)

If you've been in the farming game for very long, you know that this thing happens. And when you're a province that has 40 per cent of the arable land in this country, and you're a province that has agriculture as your number one industry, why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in those 11 years, was no provision made to set something aside for that number one industry? Not one dime; not one set of planning. Was there an ag equity corp put in place? No, there was land bank. Was there an ag development fund for irrigation and research? No. Was there a new ag college proposed because that is the number one industry in this province? No. And that is why I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the members opposite have such a low credibility rating in rural Saskatchewan right now. I suppose you can excuse a few of the members because they know very little about that industry, even though they like to talk a lot.

It tells me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have . . . we just have to not stop thinking of growth in this province. We have to continue because you don't stop rural gasification just like that. They disagree with that program.

You know, if I had to stop the programs that are under way in my constituency right now, after 1,300 kilometres of gas line was put in, people would say to me, you're absolutely crazy. What are you doing out there? Because that gasification has significantly lowered the costs to my agricultural producers. And you don't stop; you use your resources and you keep moving ahead.

You don't stop improving Sask Power and SaskTel delivery to our rural residents. You go ahead with buried lines so that our people out in rural Saskatchewan have the same abilities, they have the same opportunities as those that our urban brethren have enjoyed for many years.

And I also in this budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, am very pleased at the route taken as far as generating extra revenue, because when you tax banks and you tax large corporations, I think you're fitting in very well with the middle ground in this province — with the farmer, with the small-business man, with the people in the middle-income brackets — who we, through our various tax reductions and taking the tax off of various things, have helped that middle-income group and the lower-income groups in our province.

I can only say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that out in my constituency, out in rural Saskatchewan, this budget has been very well accepted. It's been classed as a good budget by the farmers of this province. It's been classed as a good budget by the small-business men in my constituency. And it's been classed as a good budget by

the people in the small towns in my constituency. And for that reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support that budget.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. The Chair recognizes the member from Morse. Order! Is the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg referring those derogatory comments to the Chair? Is he? I would caution the member to watch the language, the parliamentary language, in the House, the neutrality of the Chair, and the decorum of the House.

I ask the member again from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg: were those comments made towards the Chair?

The member from Morse.

Mr. Martens: — As I began my remarks today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to point out . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. A point of order has been asked for.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, the rules provide the Speaker recognizes the first person on his feet. The last person on his feet between those two was the member for Morse.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I may refer the member from Regina Centre, the rules state as of page 99 in *Beauchesne's*, not the first one to his feet, and I may read to you, but the one "that catches the speaker's eye."

Order. Order. If I may continue with the ruling. First of all, "There is not official list: . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order. Order.

There is no official list of speakers with an order of precedence in the House of Commons. Any member who wishes to speak may rise and endeavour to catch the speaker's eye.

. . . (inaudible interjections) . . . If you are questioning the neutrality of the Chair in terms of allocation of time, in terms of numbers of members of this House from the three various parties, I will be more than happy to invite the Speaker back . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Call back the Speaker.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to, before I go into the main part of my remarks today . . .

An Hon. Member: — A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Please be seated, member. I call back the Speaker to rule on your point of order.

An Hon. Member: — I'd like to speak to that motion before the Speaker returns, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The member is out of order. Please be seated.

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, this morning just before you returned, the member from Thunder Creek concluded his remarks. At that point in time the member from Pelly and the member from Regina North West rose quickly in their seats. The Deputy Speaker appeared to see both of them. A second or two later the member from Morse stood up. The Deputy Speaker looked at the member from Morse and recognized him. It appeared clear, I think, to an impartial observer that the Deputy Speaker had in his mind a prearranged order of speakers, and I suggested to him that was contrary to the rules of order. He then said if we didn't like his ruling, he'd call you back, and indeed he did. But I would ask for a ruling on the matter which occurred.

Mr. Speaker: — It's difficult for the Chair to come back and say who was first on his feet, as you can all appreciate. What you sometimes see from your chair and what you see from this chair are not the same thing . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order, order please. Order! Order. When I'm on my feet you're to give me the opportunity to speak.

I believe that if the member says the person in the Chair saw this person first, then there is no point of order. That's what he tells me, that that's who he saw first, then that's who he has given the right to speak. There will be opportunities for others to speak.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martens: — As I begin my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I want to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Sveinson: — My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I have been to my feet four times in the Assembly this morning. I know, and members of the opposition know, on at least two occasions I was the first one to my feet. I am difficult to miss, and I suggest that if he hasn't seen me rise this morning, possibly he should have his eyes checked because I have been up on every occasion. And I would ask you to rule fairly for the opposition and allow us into the debate.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a new point of order but the same point of order. The member from Morse as recognized. When he has completed speaking, someone else will be recognized.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to, as I begin my remarks today, talk a little bit about some of the things that have been in the news, and I want to just outline a little bit of them. What I want to say is this, there was news in the *Leader-Post* the other day that I thought has fairly significant impact in my constituency, and that is that Ottawa puts a hefty duty on beef imports. And for the people in the south-west part of Saskatchewan, that has a fairly significant impact.

And I want to commend the Minister of Agriculture for the kinds of things that he has done in relation to the federal government. This, in my opinion, indicates some of the

kinds of things that our Premier has put together, as it relates to the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I'm going to ask the member from Quill Lakes to withdraw the statement that he just made about the Chair.

Mr. Koskie: — What statement, Mr. Speaker, are you alleging that I made in respect to the Chair?

Mr. Speaker: — The member was just saying that the Chair was unfair. And I'm asking you to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Koskie: — Well I want to know exactly the words that you are alleging that I have said that's an affront to the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: — From his seat, straight at me sitting here in the Chair, and saying that the Chair was unfair. And I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I was referring to what appeared to be unfairness by the previous Deputy Speaker, not yourself.

Mr. Speaker: — That's still the Chair., and I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Koskie: — I think we have an entitlement to enter into the debate also, and I find it very difficult that during the day . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I have asked you to withdraw one statement. This is not a time for debate, but rather a time for correction, and I ask you to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Koskie: — I am prepared to withdraw that statement. I would very much like to know, for clarification purposes, what I am particularly alleged to have said that I'm withdrawing.

Mr. Speaker: — The member knows what he said — what he said — and he called it straight to me. And it's not on the record, and I know that. But you are stating that the Chair is unfair, and that cannot be allowed in this Assembly. And I'm asking the member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Koskie: — It's your interpretation that I have alleged that you have been unfair, and I withdraw it if that's your perception, but I'll say that I did not perceive it to be that.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't ask for that kind of withdrawal. I ask for an unequivocal withdrawal.

Mr. Koskie: — I'll withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martens: — I want to indicate to the House here today that I am pleased with the response of the Minister of Agriculture, our Premier . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Martens: — I want to, again, Mr. Speaker, ask . . .

We cannot carry on the business of this House with this much hollering and yelling.

An Hon. Member: — There isn't any business. We're now going to close her down.

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

An Hon. Member: — We've been shut out.

Mr. Speaker: — The member that has been recognized has the right to speak, and I'm going to ask you that you maintain some decorum.

(1145)

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to indicate to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I'm going to caution the members that we can't have this kind of order — and for the last time I'm cautioning you.

Mr. Martens: — I want to indicate to this House today that I am pleased with the way the Minister of Agriculture, the former minister of agriculture, the member from Weyburn, has helped the livestock industry in the province of Saskatchewan. We have for a long time, Mr. Speaker, put the emphasis on the grains sector in agriculture, and rightfully so. We have 40 per cent of the arable land in Saskatchewan.

We have, Mr. Speaker, the concept that grain is the only part of the agriculture sector that needs to be recognized. And in dealing with the problems that arose when the European Economic Community put the emphasis on the kinds of systems that they have over there, with supply management, that the people over there were subsidizing their beef to large amounts, the Canadian government announced that they were going to put a duty on Danish and Irish beef.

And for the people in Saskatchewan I think that's a very good thing to have done. It's going to be there for 120 days, and I want to commend the Minister of Agriculture, the former minister of agriculture, for their role in encouraging the federal government to do it. It is just, I believe, one more example of the kinds of things our provincial government can do in conjunction with the federal government.

The Canadian Cattlemen's Association were looking for a 40-cents-a-pound duty tariff on the cattle moving into Canada. I think this even surpassed their estimation of the impact of the . . . of the negative impact that it has in the country of Canada.

I know that when the agriculture caucus went to speak with the federal government, we did have a meeting with Mr. Wise at the time, and we indicated to him that we were going to very much appreciate . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I have asked the members to maintain some decorum and I hear nothing but shouting, and I'm asking for order.

Mr. Martens: — We were going to ask the Minister of Agriculture for Canada to put some emphasis on the beef industry in relation to the kinds of things that were happening as far as the EEC moving cattle into Canada. It has, in my opinion, been a very good thing for the people of Canada to have a government that is prepared to listen.

And I know, as after the federal budget came out, the Minister of Agriculture for Canada was in Swift Current and we discussed this to some extent, and I appreciate the amount of work that he's done there.

I want to go on to some other things that I think are of some significance. One of those things . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm going to caution the member for Regina North West that this is the last time I'm going to ask you to be quiet this morning.

Mr. Martens: — I want to just go into a little bit of background in one other thing, and that has to do with the venture capital corporations in regard to labour.

Mr. Speaker: — I've also cautioned the member for Shaunavon.

Mr. Martens: — I want to just indicate to the House that in the past week we have had some people into our agriculture caucus meetings, and one of those meetings we had was a group of fellows who worked — and there happened to be a lady there, too — who worked for the provincial government. And they were concerned about the problem that arose when they were asked to pay a little bit more into the SGEU union. The one gentleman there indicated that in this month's cheque that he got, the union had taken off for dues \$90. We did a calculation while they were sitting there and on a 12-month basis that would be \$1,080 a year, Mr. Speaker, and that, in his opinion, was not what he wanted to see happen with his money. He indicated to me that there were 275 or up to 300 people that were in the same category as he was and that represents a volume of dollars of \$300,000 a year. I just wanted to read a little bit that appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* here on March 28 of '86.

And the government has gone a step further with a venture capital endeavour. Offering investment in venture capital corporations to the labour sector was a gutsy move, although it may be a wasted one.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that what we have here is a situation where people would like to do something like that but they feel a little bit of intimidation by the union and its representative. It goes on here:

The response from the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union president indicates organized labour is not interested in investing in provincial business. It's not for us to risk members' hard-earned dues and funds in venture capital issues. Financing strikes is obviously considered more productive.

If you take a look at what the union tried to do and what they did after the agreement was reached, they've lost a

lot of support in the various areas in my constituency for the kinds of things that they have done.

I want to just preamble a little bit about the things that were there in the provincial government when we took office in 1982. What did we have then, Mr. Speaker? We had at that time interest rates that were going up. They had been going and escalating from 1979, '80, '81 and '82, and the people in my constituency were asking, where do we go for help? What do we do for help in this area? Homes were being threatened. I recall the former government indicated that they would save the home. They put a bill in, froze the opportunity for people to take it away. It wasn't altogether bad, but that was not addressing the root of the problem.

The root of the problem, Mr. Speaker, was the interest rate was escalating at such a rate that the people couldn't afford to make their payments anymore and that was what the problem was. And when we came in in 1982 we did that. We fixed that at thirteen and a quarter per cent interest and we are doing that today, and we're doing that on into 1988. And I think that that's an important part of what we have as a provincial government here, as a Conservative provincial government. And I appreciate the Minister of Finance for the kinds of things he did in that area.

Home owners were not the only ones that were having a problem. Agriculture was suffering from the same sting that was going on from '79, '80, '81 and '82, and that, Mr. Speaker, was a problem that we had. As the interest rates were going up, the cost of production was going up. We had, in 1973, an inflation cycle that was matched by probably none in the history of this country, and that inflation cycle caused serious problems to occur in agriculture. The interest rate was causing a problem to all sectors of agriculture, and that didn't matter whether you were talking about the farmer, whether you were talking about the agriculture business sector, or whether you were talking about the bulk dealers, whatever. They were all affected by the costs of the interest rate.

As we go along in the time from 1981-82 we saw, as we came into power in 1982, that something was going to have to be done. And that is a part of the programs that the Minister of Finance has dealt with in this budget, and we've done it in previous budgets. I'm going to address that a little later.

One of the key things that was pointed out in dealing with the kinds of things that happened in my constituency in 1979, '80 and '81, we had serious, serious problems in the oil sector, far more serious than what they are today, Mr. Speaker. And one of those things is they did not have confidence in the government to provide the economic environment and the climatic conditions for the oil industry to grow. In my constituency that is extremely, extremely important.

As I travel through the southern part of my seat, down towards Shaunavon, the farmers told me this year — this winter — they told me: don't allow the oil sector in this province to go down, for some very simple reasons. We do not want to be in control of the Canadian — or we do not want to allow the overseas, middle-east oil

companies to determine how the oil in Saskatchewan was going to be developed. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have a serious problem in our oil industry today, and it's recognized. The Minister of Energy just mentioned that today in question period. But we have, I believe, Mr. Speaker, a serious problem, and it's being addressed.

The second thing I want to point out is that at the time when they were doing it they were addressing it from the back in. What they did was they allowed people to drill dry holes and they were taking those dry holes and they were giving them the opportunity to hire people they didn't need. And that was causing a serious, serious problem in 1979, '80 and '81.

What we have initiated in the province, and the Minister of Energy was in my constituency just the past week, talking about the various things as it relates to the oil industry — and one of the concerns that was raised by these people, the small independent service kinds of people in my constituency, is: we don't want the government to put their finger into this business. And they said that more than once, of all of the people that we had there to that meeting, be very, very careful in what you do in the oil industry because we don't want to have the government involved in it.

And so that investment that was being taken out of the province of Saskatchewan at the time when we took over is prepared to sit and wait to see what goes on as far as the international oil scene is concerned. And they recognize that it is not our problem. They recognize that it is far more serious than that.

I want to just indicate one other thing here about the health care program in the province of Saskatchewan, and that has to do with the nursing home construction. I have been involved in municipal politics before I become involved in the legislature, and one of the things that I noticed as I was reeve of the municipality, I had people coming to me asking to have the council consider developing a nursing home or senior level 4 care facility in the town of Cabri.

That was between 1973 and 1978 when I was involved in the municipality, and in that time frame we have what I would see as a classic example of what we have with a former administration. They placed an emphasis on telling people about what they were going to do, but they never put their money where their mouth was. And they even decided that they were going to put a moratorium on nursing home facilities in this province. The result was that people who have traditionally worked in that area through the hospital board, the chairman of the board, has time after time after time and continually, through these years, had a glimmer of hope that maybe we could some day get a nursing home or a level 4 facility in the town of Cabri.

And Mr. Speaker, I am happy that they have already begun the planning process for next year as to how they're going to integrate that into their hospital. And I think that those are the kinds of things that are very important.

Maybe I didn't hear it correctly, but the Leader of the

Opposition indicated it wouldn't be in his budget. That's the kind of thing, I think, that we need to emphasize here, Mr. Speaker, and that's very important. They will do the same thing again if they're elected. They will have a moratorium on nursing home care. And I think it's extremely important that we recognize that, as people of Saskatchewan. That's what makes us different. We listen, and we do something about it.

I want to go on to another area that deals with the change of the attitude of this government in its relationship to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

(1200)

I believe that there is a very important feature here in our examining what is necessary, and we did that last year in our budget — the four pillars in our budget. They addressed agriculture, they addressed education. And that's what I want to deal with a little bit of pointed things. We have the development of various facilities in Saskatoon: the geology building that is continuing to be constructed; we have the addition to the University Hospital; we have the addition to the facilities there of the agriculture building, and as that is expanded into what I believe could be a potential for an extremely important function in agriculture.

We have travelled the province for three weeks, Mr. Speaker, dealing with various sectors of agriculture, and one of the things that came up very, very strongly was research. It was extremely important. Everywhere we went, people talked about research. They said it is absolutely necessary. And here I think is where you need to tie it into education.

The research is absolutely necessary. We need to encourage, I believe in a far greater way, a better method of providing counselling to high school students, to people who are capable of providing the education and counselling direction for people to enter the agriculture research field. And we need a far greater expansion of that. The people in the province realize that, and I think it's extremely important. They need to have that kind of initiative to tell them: look, agriculture is the driving force of this economy in this province and I think we need to take a serious look at how we motivate that. And one of those things is through education, and the other thing is through research. The total direction that we take has to be done in that direction because research will give this province the status it needs.

One of those example of the kinds of things that research can do is the veterinary infectious disease organization which has initiated some of the international relationship of the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I would ask the member to withdraw that statement. We don't allow that word. The member for Regina North West. I'm asking . . . You called "liars" across the floor. You're saying they're all liars. We don't allow that in this House. Do you care to withdraw it?

Mr. Sveinsson: — I think "admires" was mentioned, not "liars."

Mr. Speaker: — All right.

Mr. Sveinsson: — Admires and liars, just in case there's been an oversight.

Mr. Speaker: — Withdraw the word "liars."

Mr. Sveinsson: — And "admires." I'll withdraw them both.

Mr. Martens: — I want to continue, Mr. Speaker, into the recognition of the people of Saskatchewan, into the two areas of research and education. Where do we go when we have serious problems in this province? We go back to the people and we ask them: which direction shall we take?

In the very first budget that was introduced in this House, the Minister of Finance at that time decided that the people . . .

An Hon. Member: — On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Raise the point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Yesterday in the debate, the member for Regina North used the word "liars," and at that point, you didn't ask him to withdraw it. Today the member from Regina North West is said to have used the same work, and you asked him to withdraw it.

My point of order is one of clarification as well. Can you give a ruling whether we have one set of rules for the members of the governing party and one for the opposition? Or is it a rule that when people use the word "liars," they are to withdraw it; and if that is so, would you ask the member for Regina North to now withdraw that remark, because everyone heard it yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: — I believe the member is right that I didn't ask the member yesterday, and I perhaps should have. It's a word that should not be used.

An Hon. Member: — Do it now.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the members, when I'm on my feet, give me a chance to complete what I'm saying? In the future any members who use the word will be asked to withdraw.

An Hon. Member: — If they sit on this side.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I said any members.

Mr. Martens: — I'm going to continue, Mr. Speaker. The budget that we began with in this House asked for a mid-course correction in relation to the changes in direction that this province needed.

One of the things, I think, that was very important was that the implications of the gas tax removal. I think that was a very key point in developing the strategy that was necessary, in taking the amount of taxes away from the people and putting it right back into their hands to use it wherever they wanted. And we have had that kind of initiative develop through the past four years, and I think

it's a very important feature.

The mortgage protection program that we had was a part of the development of the stability in the home mortgage market-place, and I think that the 50,000 families who receive that, and are going to receive that till 1988 — that security is very well placed.

The other thing that I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that our farm purchase program has given an extremely important initiative to the people of my constituency. And I just want to indicate that we have had a lot of benefit in my constituency in the past three years that we've had it, and \$1.5 million has gone into my constituency on that very thing — that we lowered the rate from whatever it was down to the 8 per cent, and that has been a \$1.5 million benefit in my constituency. I think for the people of my constituency we want to thank the Finance minister for continuing that program and that is a very important benefit in agriculture. And it doesn't only impact in mine, it impacts throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to deal with the increase in benefits to the people of Saskatchewan as it relates to health care, the nursing homes in the province of Saskatchewan that are being built today. I just want to use the example of the one in Saskatoon where they are building one facility that will give us the kinds of places for seniors to spend their last time here. In that one development we have more than what they did in five years. I would expect that that is a very important feature of the kinds of things that we want to do. Saskatoon is very, very appreciative of the fact that they are doing that. It's not only in my constituency where they're doing it, but they're doing it throughout the province.

I thought there was some significance when the president of the University of Regina here was asked to speak in a number of states in the United States and various provinces in the country of Canada in relation to the kinds of things that we are doing with providing a direction for the budget in university education — in facilities, in the kinds of things we're doing in relation to program development. I think those are the kinds of things that are very important.

The emphasis as I've discussed here has two things that I think we want to look at. One was the opportunity and one was the protection that dealt with the kinds of things that were available to the people of Saskatchewan. I think those two things are very, very important.

I just want to go to the opportunity side. We created a very positive climate for growth, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this economic development, job creation. And we heard that this morning in the question period about the kinds of things that our job creation program is doing. We heard it from the Minister of Urban Affairs; we heard it from the Deputy Premier. I think that those are keys in providing an optimistic climate for us to develop the kinds of things that we need to have as a growth sector in this province.

We, as government on this side of the House . . . And the Minister of Finance's budget pointed to the fact that we need to have a development of the kinds of things for opportunities, for young people, for older people to have

the kinds of things that they would like to have in their life-style — and the opportunity to work is one of those places.

We have done something else. We have built on our natural strengths. I just want to point out how we've done that in agriculture. The research side is being emphasized. We put, in the soil testing lab for example, in this province, \$400,000 for construction. The other thing that we did is we put in \$100,000 per year for the kind of impetus needed for the development of a better construction, and also for the employment in that area — \$100,000 for the people of Saskatoon to have in their city.

I want to talk a little bit about the small business in my constituency, and I think it's extremely important. They have done an awful lot of the kinds of things that are a benefit to the constituency that I live in. I have about 13 or 14 small communities in my constituency, and those communities, Mr. Speaker, provide a backdrop for a number of things. They provide a backdrop for community involvement as it relates to a social climate, an economic climate.

And I believe that the opportunity that we have given to these people as it relates to the 8 per cent money on loans up to, getting it up to \$100,000, I think this gives an opportunity for those small businesses — the IGA stores, the other food stores, the small shops that we have, the machinery dealers out there, the repair shops, the bulk dealers.

I think all of those people recognize the importance of that. They don't only recognize the importance of that, Mr. Speaker. The farm purchase program, I believe, provided in this province one of the first corner-stones of protecting the family farm.

One of the . . . The second most important feature in the budget announced by the Minister of Finance was the 6 per cent money at \$25 an acre. And that, Mr. Speaker, those small businesses in my constituency really, really appreciate that.

It provided an opportunity for the farmers in my constituency who were affected by drought to have a time when they can say, look, we can pay my bill to my co-op or my Imperial Oil agency or my Shell dealer, and that's the kind of thing that's important. They had the opportunity to do it and we provided it.

And the 47 to 50,000 farms in Saskatchewan who have the opportunity to use that really, really appreciate it. And as we went around the province on our cabinet committee, they told us that in a very, very definite way.

(1215)

I want to just point out another thing that's good for small business, Mr. Speaker, is the pension plan — the pension plan that we have announced that will give an opportunity for these small businesses who have not been able to afford the chance to provide a pension for their employees; for their employees or for their employees to do it themselves — or for their own pension. A lot of these small-business men have not been able to do that.

The other thing that I think is extremely important in this pension is that part-time employees can finally have an opportunity to take advantage of a pension. And do you know who it affects most, Mr. Speaker? It affects the women in this province probably more than anyone else. And I think that that's an extremely important function. It's recognizing the need of developing this kind of a positive attitude in relation to the small business in my constituency. But it also addresses itself, Mr. Speaker, to the point where the small farmer, the big farmer, can have an opportunity to provide an additional kind of a pension plan for himself. And I think that is extremely, extremely important.

I want to take a look at some other things in the small-business side of the agenda that we placed in our budget. And I want to take the opportunity to say that the people in the agricultural sector are very pleased with the opportunity that we have in the venture capital corporation, placing it so that agriculture can be involved in it. We had the introduction of that Bill today in the House. I think that it's extremely important that agriculture will deal with venture capital corporations in intensive livestock operations and in other places. And I think that's an extremely important feature in what the Minister of Finance has provided for in our budget initiative.

There are a couple of things that I want to add as it relates to things that are rather striking. And one of the things is this, Mr. Speaker. It's finally quiet enough so that we can discuss this on a rational basis.

An Hon. Member: — All the opposition is gone.

Mr. Martens: — You're right. It is.

The exemption, Mr. Speaker, of the 5 per cent sales tax on E&H. I think I can only explain it this way. I went into a shop on Saturday after the budget, and of course there was Good Friday in between, and I bought myself a hat. And I said, look, how has business been in the last few days? He said, you know, Mr. Speaker, I have done more business in the last two days, Thursday and Saturday, than I did in any day since the 1st of January.

You know, as this thing impacts, as it goes across the province, you're going to have more and more of this coming to light all the time. Because the east side of the province is going to have the people from Manitoba coming in to buy. The establishment . . .

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

Mr. Martens: — I'm going to list some of the things here, Mr. Speaker, that I think are important. I went down through 19 of them, but I want to point out before I do that: I think that the announcement yesterday by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and the Premier, about the upgrader working in conjunction with the Sask Wheat Pool, Federated Co-op, and the company from France, I think is a step in the right direction that we need to take.

That was another one of the things that we heard in that

cabinet committee that we travelled around. You need to get a fertilizer plant in this province to reduce the prices. And that's the kind of thing, I think, that is absolutely necessary.

I'm just going to list these things as they deal with my constituency. As I said before, the exemption for E&H tax on clothing, I think, is an extremely important thing. The pension plan is an important thing for home-makers and all of those kinds of people who need it. The first-time home buyers, of \$3,000, a grant for that. The provision of 8 per cent money for small business. I think that is an extremely important feature. The health expenditure increase in the budget as it relates to hospital facilities, as it relates to all of that building going on in Saskatoon — the university, the City Hospital, St. Paul's Hospital — it's a benefit to my constituency.

And, Mr. Speaker, they're not doing it only up there; they're doing it in my constituency too. Funding for elementary schools, and this is an extremely important part. In 1982 we had a school built in my constituency and it was at Stewart Valley. In 1986 we're going to have another school built and that's in Neville, Saskatchewan. And there were children there who were in fire traps for 50 years because they didn't have the proper facilities in dealing with the education. And I think it's extremely important. And the other thing that I think is important, Mr. Speaker, is that those people have placed an emphasis on the community in relation to the school board. They have organized themselves into a community group to place an emphasis on the kinds of facilities that they build, and I think that that's important.

Agriculture. Agriculture has provided for this province some extremely important things, and I've mentioned some of them. But we've gone over what they ever expended by what we have increased in this year. And I think, Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of things that we need to take a serious look.

And I, Mr. Speaker, for one, and the people of my constituency, will be supporting the budget in the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to get up and speak in this debate on the budget. Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that we have a government in this province that would use every method at their disposal to try and keep the opposition from speaking on this budget.

Last night they adjourned the House when we could have been sitting and debating this budget that they say is so good. Today they wouldn't give us the opportunity to get up and speak on it. They wouldn't give us the opportunity to get up and speak on it until we are almost out of time. That is all they give us, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this province know what kind of government this is. They have seen a government that is very close to what we have in this province, and they've seen it on TV the last couple of weeks. They've seen it going on in the Philippines. And

now we have it here in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the people of this province are not going to accept the kind of actions that this government has been using in this House, nor what they are doing to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — One would hope that there'd be an election so that the people could voice their opinion and could decide who they want to run this province. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we're going to see an election. This government is scared. They don't have a Premier in this province that can make a decision and stick to it. He keeps changing his mind from day to day depending on what his pollster says. That is how they put together this budget, Mr. Speaker, and that is how they run the government.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Pelly, the good people of Pelly that I'm proud to represent, know what this government has been doing. They talk about all the good things that they are going to do but nobody will believe them because none of that has been happening. They have — deliberately, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker — made sure that nothing, nothing at all in any of their programs, comes into my constituency. But that's fine. The election is coming soon; the election is coming soon, whether it's this week or this month, or next month, or three or four months from now, it is coming. And I know that people are confident that we will see a new government in this province and that then they will get some of the things that they rightly deserve in that constituency. That's some of the building of their roads, the highways, the buildings, the nursing homes. All of those, Mr. Speaker, will eventually get built. They'll eventually get built.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about all the things that they are doing for farmers, because it appears that's the only area that they are going after right now. They're going after rural Saskatchewan thinking that they can give them a \$25 loan, another debt, and somehow that's going to buy them some votes. Well, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this province knows that an additional debt is not going to help. You cannot borrow yourself out of debt. And that's all that this government is doing, providing more money that the people can borrow. And what do they do? Get deeper and deeper until there is no return. That is what this government is doing for agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

They talk about all the good things that they have done; they talk about a forward-looking Premier of this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, he is looking so far forward that he can't even see what's happening around him in this province.

They say that the young farmers want to look ahead. Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree, young farmers want to look ahead. Young farmers want to know what is going to happen to them, not only this year, but what the prospects are for next year, the year after that, and the year after that. That, Mr. Speaker, is what farmers want to know. They want to know what governments are going to do for them.

We have put forward a program — part of a program, Mr. Speaker — that we think is going to help farmers. And, Mr. Speaker, we will have more help for farmers. There is no question about that. Farmers are important, farmers are important to this province as are many other people in this province, Mr. Speaker. But this government has not done anything of any significance that would turn around the economy in this province. What do we have? A \$2 billion debt. That's what they have given this province over four years — \$2 billion; 2 billion in the consolidated fund. And as the member for North West says: it's eight and a half. Well it's 8.7, which is true. That is the total debt of this province; that what they have done.

And now they've created another Crown corporation that they will be able to hide more debts in, a Crown corporation that they could borrow money through to try to cover up some of these promises they make, and have a debt there that won't show up in a budget. That's what this government is doing. They are trying to hide the debt, so they create another Crown corporation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many things that this government could have done that would have helped. But no, they certainly did not do any of that. They have been the ones that have been promising and promising and promising. And now we see, four years after they've been in power, promise after promise, day in and day out, on projects that are never going to happen.

The member for Morse was talking about the fertilizer plant in Regina. They're going to tie this on to the heavy oil upgrader, an upgrader that's not even there. There is nothing in the plans that I have seen yet that says that upgrader's going to be up this year or next year. And what have they done? They have promised a fertilizer plant to be tied to that project.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that could be five years down the road, maybe 10 years, before we see it. That is the kind of government we have. Nothing but promises, but promises that will never be kept because they haven't kept any for four years, and they are not likely to keep all of those that they are promising on the eve of an election.

Mr. Speaker, one of the members has said that they would want government to stay out. The farmers and everybody wants government to stay off their backs, to get off their backs. Well, Mr. Speaker, they're not only on their backs right now, but they're there and they've got both hands in the people's pockets right now. That's what this government is doing.

(1230)

When you're paying over \$200 million a year in interest, then that money has to come out of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. And every cent of that has to come out of the taxpayers. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government has given to the people of Saskatchewan over four years — billions of dollars in debt and interest payments that the people of Saskatchewan can hardly afford to keep on paying anymore.

Mr. Speaker, they also talk about all the unemployment

they are creating — unemployment that does not seem to be visible anywhere. When we look at what the unemployment is today, what we have for unemployed people, it's around over 40,000 people. In '82 it was only in the 20,000 range, now it's 40; it's doubled. The same thing happened to welfare. We've got over 60,000 people on welfare. People, some of them that could be working, but the jobs are not there.

The jobs are not there because this government would choose to bring in corporations and give them the resources of this province. Corporations like Manalta — Peter Pocklington that got \$10 million for nothing of taxpayers' money — Manalta that \$145 million of a government-guaranteed loan which didn't cost them any money. The taxpayer will be paying for it. The Weyerhaeuser, the big deal they're bragging about now, with \$248 million — doesn't cost the company anything. The taxpayer will put up that money. That is what they are doing for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

And they are saying that somehow this is supposed to be good for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you the people of Saskatchewan are not going to believe that. They will not believe it because they know that all these give-aways are costing them money. It has cost them money to give \$300s of millions to the oil companies every year at a time when the oil companies were doing good, the price was high, and some of that money could have come back to the people of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, they did not take that money and give it to the people. They gave it . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Under rule 14(3) it's my duty to interrupt the debate and give the Minister of Finance the opportunity to close debate.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciated the comments of the member from Pelly. I think he was misinterpreting, though, what his constituents were saying. What they're telling us is they didn't get anything out there for 10 years, and they're prepared to elect a Conservative to be able to get something done for the constituency. I'm sure that the message will be given loud and clear to the hon. member in the days ahead.

It's been a very interesting budget debate, Mr. Speaker, because the opposition have been attempting to talk about everything except for one thing, Mr. Speaker: they've refused to talk about the budget. And I'll tell you why they've refused to talk about the budget. I'll tell you why they've refused to talk about it. I'll tell you why they have gone a full week and a half now and never once asked the Minister of Finance a question about the budget. I'll tell you: why they haven't done that is because everybody else in the province of Saskatchewan except the little nine over there believe it's a good budget, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Every group around the province believes it's responsible. Even the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, which is certainly no friend of this government in most cases, Mr. Speaker, says in its

editorial of March 28th that, "On balance, given the economic situation Saskatchewan finds itself in right now, it was a responsible approach."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, press coverage, and comments by those affected by the budget, headlines: "Workers get a chance to create more jobs." For the first time in Saskatchewan's history the trade union movement has a challenge. It can take advantage of the challenge and create new jobs and lower taxes for its members, or it can miss a tremendous opportunity, a chance for the trade union movement to create some 1,000 new jobs, Mr. Speaker.

"Small business ecstatic over the budget, and that goes on. "The commitments in the budget outlines pleases home builders." "Saskatchewan school trustees very pleased with the budget." "Hospital boards extremely pleased with the budget."

Saskatchewan people all over this province — farmers, small-business men, home-makers, everyone, Mr. Speaker, is very pleased with this budget. They believe it to be a responsible budget and a fair budget. And they are taking that message loud and clear, I believe, to the opposition, because they haven't talked about the budget. They are certainly taking it to the Conservatives from one end of this province to the other, that they believe the course set by this government is the correct course.

And let's see, Mr. Speaker, what teachers say. Let's take a look at the *Star-Phoenix*, April 3rd, Thursday: "Education seen facing better times. Province makes it a priority." — Mr. Frank Garritty. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan, as I say, believe this budget to be fair, and they believe this budget to be a responsible one.

The budget reiterates the climate that we are trying to create in this province, the climate that this is the best place to do business and that this is the province of opportunity in Canada. And the budget has followed that consistent thrust established by this government some four years ago, a climate of optimism, because the people of this province are fundamentally optimistic about this province. And they're beginning to resent more and more the negative doom and gloom coming from the official opposition.

Small business believes that this is the province of opportunity and are telling it to us loud and clear from one end of the province to the other. For the first time this province will be committed to a Saskatchewan pension plan, and as the budget made clear, and as this government has made clear, home-makers will be included in the Saskatchewan pension plan. And some \$5 million has been allocated, Mr. Speaker, in one of the most progressive initiatives of any government in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We've also seen over the last week and a half another political situation develop. We can all recall the events of the 1982 election that for the first

week and a half the NDP ran around this province saying this province can't have thirteen and a quarter per cent mortgages to help home owners; this province can't take off the gasoline tax. They said that for two and a half weeks in the campaign.

Then when they found out what the public wanted, and what the public were saying, they did a complete flip-flop, and all of a sudden they're promising free eye glasses every month, and free false teeth for everyone, and I'm sure we'll hear that again in the next election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Free hair-pieces, I suspect that the hon. member from Pelly is going to come out with. Free hair-pieces for the people of Saskatchewan — that's about the only thing you haven't promised, the only thing you haven't promised. And I suspect and I predict — I predict that the election promises of the NDP will include free hair-pieces, free false teeth, and free eye glasses . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Another one they've been promising is to take the property tax off education. They've been doing that every election since '71 and it doesn't have any credibility.

But let's look at what they've done. All of a sudden they start to see that the polls are showing them going down, down, down, down and the Conservatives going up, up, up. And what happens? All of a sudden they forget about all this talk about the deficit and they start promising and giving away the farm. And let me tell you, all of a sudden . . . It used to be promise-a-day Pawley and Manitoba who squeaked out with less than 1 per cent of the popular vote. What they are saying on the streets of Saskatchewan and in the farms, it's billion-dollars-a-week Blakeney, a billion-a-week Blakeney giving it away.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — And he's trying to say he's worried about the deficit. Let me tell you, the thought, and a lot of their policies have obviously been published in panic and prepared in panic . . . Let me tell you what the public reaction is to some of their promises.

An Hon. Member: — Pretty good.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — The hon. member from Pelly is taking the same ostrich-like approach that he did prior to '82. If you believe that, you'll believe the Easter bunny, to quote the Leader of the Opposition. Oh, but what do they call it in Saskatoon? Crazy Al's discount house — come and get it; get your promise here from the NDP. We'll promise you anything to get back into power. We will be totally irresponsible to get back in power, says the NDP. We don't care, says the NDP, about this province. We will do absolutely everything and promise absolute everything to try and get back into political power.

Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are having no part of that. And I think we see proof of it. The night of the budget we heard the litany from the Leader of the Opposition about all this 7 times 7 times 7 times 7 times 7 — \$7 billion promises that they're throwing away. And he said it again in passing the next morning. But has anybody heard about it since?

If there was any pride in the program — if there was any

pride in the program — every political observer could pick this up by watching how parties responded. And let me tell you, they've been deathly silent about their so-called program because they know, they know that it is being criticized from one end of the province to the other. It's being seen as not only unrealistic, it's being seen as foolish and stupid, and that strong words are coming from NDP themselves. It's being seen as damaging to those people who already own their homes, who will see sharp drop in values of their homes. The home builders are attacking it and saying it's foolish and unrealistic. And it's being attacked, as I say, from one end of the province to the other.

The home builders, what do they say? They say that it's foolish and it's unrealistic. I'm surprised, quite frankly, that the Leader of the Opposition would hold this fuzzy-headed program up as the corner-stone of the election. I hope it is. I mean, I happen to like '82, and we're seeing the same thing happen all over again — of the craziness of the members opposite when all of a sudden they start to panic.

Costs at least \$175 million a year — a year! And what do the housing industry people say? Quote Mr. MacPherson in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* of March 27:

I have been unable to find a single industry insider who believe it to be true that the program will cover its cost. Most of the housing industry and the real estate people regard it as a blatant attempt to buy votes. Most believe the housing industry is in pretty good shape right now, and most think that there are a great many better ways to spend the public's money.

I suggest to the hon. members that policies prepared in panic collapse just as quickly as they're prepared. And I suggest that the hon. members abandon that policy before you're laughed right out of the province because, Mr. Speaker, that's what's starting to happen.

As I say — as I say — we will see a series of unrealistic proposals from the NDP over the next months. And as I say, when we notice the actions of the opposition over the last week, that there's been a deathly silence. They won't defend their housing program because they know it's ludicrous and they know it's unwise and they know that they are being unrealistic.

(1245)

They've also lost their credibility about talking about the deficit, and from one end of the province to the other the NDP are saying, how can we criticize the Tories about the deficit when we're making all these foolish promises? And you don't hear the NDP out there talking about the deficit anymore, and the reason is they are thoroughly embarrassed. And they know, and the average NDP supporter knows, that the \$2 billion worth of promises made already would lead to bankruptcy in this province, and it's total irresponsibility on the part of the opposition. Fortunately the average NDP members know that.

But what do they propose to do about it if — if they ever happen to take office? Who's the only leader — who's the

only leader that is promising to raise taxes? The Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the New Democratic Party, is going around saying, we may have to raise taxes year after year after year. He doesn't even say it just once. He says in every year he may well have to raise taxes.

And we're getting the message out to the people, Mr. Speaker, that there was a very strong signal given to the small-business community in Saskatoon and Regina when the NDP invited the NDP Minister of Finance to speak. Usually the NDP Minister of Finance in Manitoba invited him to speak to the small-business men. Now it's not common for political parties to bring in people that have brought in very unpopular taxes, unless they're giving a message. And what happened with the NDP in Manitoba? They brought in a payroll tax, a payroll tax that every small business has to pay in Manitoba whether the business is making money or not. And the more people they hire, and the more people they employ, the higher the tax goes. Tell me the logic of that in terms of trying to create jobs. In trying to create jobs in Manitoba, the more jobs you create, the higher your taxes go.

And the NDP gave a very strong message to the small business when they said they will bring in a payroll tax in the province of Saskatchewan. And I predict that small business will reject any concept of a payroll tax in this province. They also bring in the NDP Finance minister from Manitoba who raised the sales tax from 5 to 6 per cent. They also brought in the NDP Finance minister who slapped a 3 per cent tax on everybody's insurance premiums. You can't even take out life insurance in Manitoba without being taxed, and they brought in the NDP Finance minister, because they're sending a quiet message to the people in Saskatchewan that they endorse those taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen the debate over the last week to come down to this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The government made it clear what the economic direction was, and where the tax cut should be, and if the hon. members believe that the sales tax reduction is unpopular, I hope you keep believing it. I hope you keep believing it because the people on the west side of the province are already noting an increase in retail sales because people are not going to Alberta. And on the east side, including into the constituency of Pelly, the small-business man is recognizing that people are coming from Manitoba to buy in the province of Saskatchewan for the first time, Mr. Speaker. Not only has that helped families, it's also increased the business activity in the province of Saskatchewan. But they opposed it, and we're going to get to vote very, very quickly find out whether the NDP support or oppose the elimination of sales tax on clothing under \$300; we will know in a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker.

They've also opposed — they're going to shut down uranium mines, they've made that clear. They are now publicly on record opposing Gainers bacon plant in North Battleford, and the people of North Battleford are objecting to the NDP. And even their own candidate up there is saying: oh, oh, hold it, hold it; I don't agree with Allan Blakeney. They're unravelling over there, Mr. Speaker. They come up in Regina and they say they are

not going ahead with the paper-mill in Prince Albert. They say it's a black day for the forest industry. They've attacked it. They said they would do exactly to the paper-mill what they did to the Meadow Lake-Dore Lake mill, and what do they do, Mr. Speaker? They opposed it, and they say they'll shut it down. And what do the NDP candidates say up there: oh, I don't agree with Allan Blakeney on this. They're panicking, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I would just ask the member to cease using the opposition leader's name.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well I apologize for that, Mr. Speaker. The issues are becoming increasingly clear. They try to get away with saying one thing in Regina and another thing in North Battleford. They say one thing in Regina, they try and say the opposite in Prince Albert. They say one thing in Regina; they say the opposite in Shaunavon. They say one thing in Regina; they say the opposite in Saskatoon. And let me tell you, it's catching up to you and it's catching up to you in spades. And the people are starting now to look at what you're really saying, and they are finding you wanting.

And I said before to the hon. members opposite, one thing is loud and clear coming through the surveys, through the polls and through what the people are telling us — they don't want you back in government; they don't want you back in power; and that they believe that it's this government under Grant Devine, Premier of this province and Leader of the Conservatives, that will build this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — We will continue to build with projects that will create diversification and we will continue to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Blakeney	Koskie
Tchorzewski	Lusney
Engel	Shillington
Lingenfelter	Yew

Nays — 24

Birkbeck	Maxwell
Andrew	Muirhead
Berntson	Rousseau
Lane	Young
Taylor	Hopfner
Duncan	Weiman
Katzman	Rybachuk
Myers	Caswell
Dirks	Baker
Klein	Glauser
Currie	Gerich
Martens	Swenson

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 24

Birkbeck	Maxwell
Andrew	Muirhead
Berntson	Rousseau
Lane	Young
Taylor	Hopfner
Duncan	Weiman
Katzman	Rybchuk
Myers	Caswell
Dirks	Baker
Klein	Glauser
Currie	Gerich
Martens	Swenson

Nays — 10

Blakeney	Lusney
Tchorzewski	Shillington
Engel	Yew
Lingenfelter	Sveinson
Koskie	Hampton

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

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

**Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Advanced Education and Manpower
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 5**

Item 1

The committee reported progress.

MOTIONS

Election of Deputy Chairman of Committees

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, before adjournment, I wonder if I might have leave of the Assembly to move, seconded by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade:

That C. H. Glauser, Esquire, member for the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair, be elected deputy chairman of committees of this Assembly.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:05 p.m.