

May 6, 1986

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Legislative Assembly, some special guests today with us who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. I would like to introduce to all members of the legislature His Excellency Roger Denorme, Ambassador of Belgium, in Ottawa; and as well, Mrs. Ingeborg Kristoffersen, Counsel General of Belgium, out of Toronto.

It is the Ambassador's first visit to Saskatchewan. We're very happy that you chose a stop here in Saskatchewan to become more familiar with our province. And based on the numbers of meetings he's had with departments such as Agriculture, and Energy and Mines, and Science and Technology, and Economic Development and Trade, to discuss very important cultural and trade ties that we have with Belgium, he's had a very busy schedule, and I'm certain has learned more about our province.

I would ask all members of the legislature to join with me in giving them an especial welcome here today, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Public Hearings on Pricing of Domestic Wheat

Mr. Engel: — I have a question for the Acting Minister of Agriculture, the member for Weyburn, and it has to do with today's public hearings in Saskatoon of the special parliamentary committee on the pricing of domestic wheat. Can you explain why Saskatchewan government's position was presented by the Minister of Rural Development and not the part-time Minister of Agriculture or yourself? Why was the part-time Minister of Agriculture unavailable to make his presentation on behalf of Saskatchewan's farmers?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan was ably represented by Minister Hardy, who also chaired, along with other members of caucus, a cabinet committee on farm inputs and prices. I think nobody really, Mr. Speaker, has been closer to the views of the Saskatchewan farmer than that minister as a result of those meetings in rural Saskatchewan.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, I don't think from the Saskatchewan farmer's prospective that it matters who presents the government's view in that there was one presented — and it was presented loudly — and it came down firmly on the side of Saskatchewan farmers, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Well I suppose that depends on whose view

you are listening to. I looked at the government's presentation, Mr. Minister, and there was no mention of the need for the federal government to provide a deficiency payment to Canadian grain farmers. Some may argue that this is outside of the committee's special mandate, but it is a point which all members of parliament need to be told about and need to be lobbied on. The real problem out there for a farmer is the low price they are getting on 91 or 93 per cent of their wheat, not on 7 or 8 or 9 per cent of their grain.

Can you explain why the government failed to make a pitch on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers for a deficiency payment? Is your government in favour of a federal government deficiency payment, especially in light of the fact that one of the Tory MPs asked you — your group particularly — about their position on a deficiency payment?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier some few days ago addressed the issue of deficiency payments in this House. He has said he is in favour of them. He said he has already, prior to this hearing, raised the issue with the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board in Ottawa, saying at that time that although many of the initiatives that Prime Minister Mulroney has undertaken, as well as our own government, have gone some ways to making sure that (a) farmers get the crops in the spring, more needs to be done, and that is the context in which he has raised it with members and ministers in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Engel: — That is not accurate, Mr. Speaker. Why didn't you mention, and why didn't your party that appeared before the committee mention deficiency payments? They avoided and side-stepped the question.

The second point, and a new question now, Mr. Speaker, the second point that wasn't mentioned, and the committees out there hearing and asking for the issue on parity pricing legislation. Your government's presentation failed to take a position on parity prices, and that's why the committee was there.

Parity pricing would guarantee farmers their cost of production plus a fair return on their labour for a number of different products, including wheat. What did you tell these members of parliament about your government's position on parity pricing: are you for it or against it?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the committee's mandate was much broader than just a look at the concept of parity pricing, as the hon. member well knows. But then we shouldn't be surprised at the kind of rhetoric coming from benches opposite when these are the kind of members, Mr. Speaker, who on an occasion prayed for drought and prayed for grasshoppers and prayed for disasters to befall Saskatchewan's farmers so that they could make political gain out of it, Mr. Speaker.

Our track record in terms of the co-operation that we have enjoyed with the federal government speaks for itself. For years and years and years, Mr. Speaker, farmers, and members of this legislature when they were in government, asked the federal government for the

removal of capital gains tax, for the removal of the federal taxes on . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please.

Mr. Engel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The question was simple: are you in favour of deficiency payment, and why didn't you make a position on parity pricing because the Bill was there to listen to parity pricing? Those two. Are you in favour of deficiency payment, or aren't you? And are you in favour of parity pricing, or aren't you? You've never made either one of those positions this morning . . . and no wonder you talk about everything else under the sun.

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, we're in favour of keeping all options open that would help farmers in Saskatchewan. Our track record is clear. We are behind Saskatchewan farmers. We have stood up for Saskatchewan farmers in the past, and that's in sharp contrast to the kind of co-operation those members got with the federal government in Ottawa when the federal government then said to Saskatchewan farmers: why should we sell your wheat?

We'll take co-operation over confrontation any day, Mr. Speaker, any day, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Air Travel — Frequent Flyer Plans

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Deputy Premier.

The Public Accounts show, Mr. Deputy Premier, that last year your government spent more than \$1.138 million on air travel through one airline, Air Canada. And this is just the total for government departments, not including Crown corporations. And that means that the PC cabinet members and senior civil servants travelled more than 5.5 million miles on Air Canada flights alone last year. And so I ask you, will you . . . The Acting Premier will know that Air Canada and other airlines now offer frequent-flyer plans which provide free trips and other benefits to those who fly a specified number of flights or number of miles. My question, Mr. Deputy Premier, is: can you explain what the government's policy is with respect to the use of these frequent-flyer plans by cabinet ministers and senior civil servants?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the policy is that there is no personal gain as it relates to any of those kinds of plans, and I understand that many airlines have those kinds of plans. My understanding is that the policy is: it can only apply to gain reflected on government and not to the individual cabinet minister. Speaking for myself, I don't belong to any such plan, and I have never used any such plan.

Mr. Koskie: — Supplement. Are you aware, Mr. Minister, that based on Air Canada mileage that was put on by cabinet ministers and other civil servants last year alone, that the Air Canada frequent-flyer plan would have given out the equivalent of 80, 81 free round trips to anywhere in Europe; 176 free round trips to anywhere in North

America? And so what I'm asking you, Mr. Minister, is it the policy — I want to ask you clearly — is it the policy of your government to allow cabinet ministers and senior civil servants, who have made their original flights at taxpayers' expense, to claim these free benefits for their own personal use?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, those benefits are the benefit to the benefit of government. That was made clear in the previous answer and I make it clear again. You know, the broader question, Mr. Speaker, is the amount of travel. And I think the travel can be well justified in taking a look at some of the projects that have come to Saskatchewan because our cabinet ministers have gone out and about and sold Saskatchewan to people like Weyerhaeuser, Mr. Speaker, and to people like Phillips Cable, and to people like Shackleton Industries.

And these people, Mr. Speaker, are becoming a more and more important part of the Saskatchewan economic structure. We appreciate that they're here, and we appreciate that our cabinet ministers have gone out and sought these people, along with the co-operation of the private sector, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Koskie: — I want to get the minister's full assurance here, and I would ask you to check into the various frequent flyer plans by Agdevco. And will you report back to the Assembly on whether or not any employers in Agdevco has recently used any free trips to any parts of the world, other than on government business?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I've told you what the policy is, Mr. Speaker. As it relates to Agdevco, I'd be more than pleased to entertain those questions in the committee of Crown Corporations.

Mr. Koskie: — New supplement. I want to advise the minister that I am here, Mr. Speaker, talking about a very instant situation. And we cannot, in fact, ask these questions in Crown Corporations. So I'm asking the Deputy Premier: will you in fact bring back to this Assembly an answer to the question of whether or not any employees of Agdevco did in fact use for personal services these free flights provided at the taxpayers' expense?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I've already stated the policy . . .

Mr. Koskie: — I'm asking you a specific question . . .

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Will you listen to a specific answer?

An Hon. Member: — Yes, well you won't give him one.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — As it relates, Mr. Speaker, to the specific question, I would be more than pleased to check out the question that Agdevco and . . .

An Hon. Member: — Will you take notice?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Is that what I have to do? Do you want me to take notice? I'll take notice, and I'll provide the member with that information.

Delays in Answering Written Questions

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Government House Leader, and it deals with this arrogant government's difficult time in giving information to the opposition, as we have just seen in the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, by way of background, we are now day number 34 of the legislative session and we still have a number of written questions to be answered from almost two years ago that deal with the very issue we are talking about today, that is, government travel. I have here a list of a number of questions that were put on the order paper, orders for return, by the legislature, 1983-84 session as well as '84-85.

And some of the questions that we have put on the order paper were of interest to the taxpayers of the province. They dealt with government employment arrangements with the former PC candidate, Terry Leier. That question goes unanswered.

Another one — money paid out to various law firms by the government departments and Crown corporations. This is taxpayers' money going out to law firms that we have asked for and haven't received an answer.

Another question which is relevant, the out-of-province travel expenses of cabinet ministers such as the Premier and the former minister of Economic Development and Trade.

My question to the minister and the Government House Leader: these written questions — some of them are almost two years old — when do you suppose you would get around to getting answers to the Assembly on some of these important issues?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the members. I've been away for the most part of the last two weeks, and I don't know what has been tabled and what hasn't. I will undertake to find out where these are in the system and undertake to bring them on as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker.

I would have thought that members opposite would have been dealing with the real issues of the day, and that is the problems in agriculture, the job creation that's going on in the province, and so on. But they choose not to, and I suggest at their peril, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. As the Government House Leader, we know that we will be dealing with the rule 16 that talks about Expo as the major issue in the province of Saskatchewan in a few minutes. But he will try to get off of the issue of answering questions that have been on the order paper for two years by saying he hasn't been here for two weeks. But we have been fortunate to have a Government House Leader of different descriptions on different days. But if he wants to find out which questions haven't been answered, I could go through the list. I have them here if he's not aware of them. But I ask the question of the minister, we have issues like return no. 76 for . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. The member is making statements. I believe that you've raised the question and, if you have a different question, we'll take that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I do have a new question to the minister, and it deals directly with questions that have been on the order paper and have been called for by the Assembly. And I say again to the minister, the taxpayers have been waiting for between 18 months and two years for some of these answers. Can you tell me why you haven't taken the time to put these questions to the Assembly, tabled them, and given them to the taxpayers? What is the reason that it's taken two years to get the answers back?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's anything terribly unusual about the way that the questions have been answered. I can remember sitting on that side of the House . . . And, Mr. Speaker, since the member also raised the question about the issue of Expo, I would like to respond to that as well.

I know that not only members opposite, but, in fact, a government of their stripe in Manitoba chose not to participate in Expo. We take Expo as being a very important part of the selling of Saskatchewan. And we are very, very proud of our presence at Expo '86, Mr. Speaker — very proud of our presence at Expo '86. We see that as an opportunity to put Saskatchewan before the largest market on the face of the earth. The Pacific Rim will be there. It . . .

Distribution of InfoCentre Network Materials

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. And, Mr. Minister, the question deals with the InfoCentre Network which we have raised in this House before. Your government's plan to distribute \$85,000 a year to a former PC Party employee to distribute government brochures and other Conservative propaganda throughout Saskatchewan, grocery stores and shopping malls, is what I want to ask the question about.

You have already admitted, Mr. Minister, that this \$85,000 a year contract was awarded to this former employee of your party without calling public tenders. So my question to you, Mr. Minister, is this: where did the idea for the InfoCentre Network originate, and who approved this \$85,000 contract to Associated Business Consultants? How was the decision to award the contract made, and who made the choice?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that the member isn't reading from Hansard. However, I'll go through it one more time. Once again in his preamble he indicated that there was something other than information regarding government programs being disseminated through these centres. I would say categorically, that is not true, and once again challenge him to demonstrate some example of something that could be termed propaganda that is being disseminated through those centres, or possibly reconsider the statement.

The two proposals were considered, and we chose the proposal that was least expensive, and that is the way the decision was made as to how to proceed.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, how can you know whether you had the most economically beneficial one if you didn't tender?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure there's . . . Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some difference between a proposal and tender in the member's mind. I am telling him that we considered the two proposals and chose the most economical.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, what was the other proposal?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, there's so much noise coming from the opposition benches, I couldn't hear the question.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that's unfortunate because the noise was coming from those benches, and the minister knows it, on his side of the House, the people sitting around him, so he couldn't hear the question. If he would pay attention, he would know the question.

Mr. Minister, who made the other proposal for this project?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, once again I would emphasize in terms of the economy of the program, as I indicated last year in this House, that we will be disseminating this information at a cost of less than 2 cents a written piece of information.

The information I have had from my department is that there were two proposals; that we chose the most economic. If it is important in the mind of the member opposite to have the name of the other proposal, I will take notice and bring it back.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, a new question. It is really interesting that the minister who has been asked this question for some almost two weeks now, yet does not have the information available when the question is asked. I think that tells us something, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Minister, since you refuse to answer the previous question, will you answer this one: can you confirm that this firm has also done work for the Department of Tourism and Small Business, and can you explain what that work involved, and can you tell us the amount of that contract?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I take a little difference. I provided considerable information and always very immediately on this. If it is the contention that I should have the information on the contracts awarded by the Department of Tourism and Small Business, his colleague has the complete list of consulting groups we used. I submitted that yesterday immediately after I was asked for it. I don't have at my fingertips information on all the people who have worked under contract at one time or another for the Department of Tourism and Small

Business, but I will review that again if that is the wish and bring that back as well.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, since you have taken notice, will you also undertake and take notice to tell us whether that contract with the Department of Tourism and Small Business was awarded without tender as well, and if so, who chose this consultant over others, and on what basis? Will you take notice of that as well?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I've indicated I will bring back information regarding any alleged contract and how it was awarded, and I will return with that information.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a supplement to the minister, and it deals with the contracts that have been given out to Associated Business Consultants. But while you take notice to see whether or not they have had any contracts in the area that was referred to by my colleague from Regina North East, will you also find out for us whether they did any consulting work for the Department of Health in the past three years? Will you find out that information and bring it back to the Assembly as well?

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, we have the Department of Tourism and Small Business in estimates. I think the opposition had my colleague, the Minister of Health, in his estimates for in excess of 30-odd hours. If there are questions regarding various contracts at the Department of Health, I think it's irresponsible to ask me to provide that information, and I'd suggest you redirect your question.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister in charge of government Supply and Services. This would be a contract that would have been done for your department, but work done for the Department of Health. And I would like if you could take notice of the question, and bring it back to the Assembly, whether or not this group or this company did work for your department which was done on contract to the Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Speaker, I provided yesterday the complete list of the contracts, the consulting work, that was done for the Department of Tourism and Small Business. I am fully prepared to do the same in Supply and Services when that department comes forward. As I indicated, those are the extend of my responsibilities. I am prepared to provide any information at all about any contract that any of my departments have provided; I can't provide more.

Mr. Sveinson: — Getting back to the original contract, I ask the minister, did he copy the Alberta NDP who recently put out a 15-page document, propaganda document, and distributed it to all the homes in Alberta? And my sources indicate this was paid for by the . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I shouldn't take notice of the question, but I can't respond for the NDP in Alberta or what they've done. However, I

can assure you on a very serious note that the information disseminated through those centres will be information relating directly — directly — to government programs. And if anyone on opposition benches has an indication or proof of anything different, I would be very interested in hearing it.

Federal Contributions to Crop Insurance

Mr. Engel: — I have another question for the Acting Minister of Agriculture, and I'm sorry our part-time minister isn't here. But currently the federal government contributes 50 per cent towards the premium of the insurance coverage of crop insurance, while farmers pay the other 50 per cent through their premiums. Can you inform this Assembly today, and confirm that Ottawa has served notice on the province that it wants to cut back on its contribution to crop insurance to as little as 25 per cent of the total cost, from the current 50 per cent? And if so, what has your government's response been to that request?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — My most recent understanding of that issue is that it was raised in the Nielsen reports. I have no knowledge that we've been served formally with that position because, as I understand it, the Nielsen task force was just that, to put forward proposals. Obviously we would not be of the view that we want to get into cost sharing in any new mechanism.

Mr. Engel: — Are you telling Saskatchewan farmers and this Assembly that the federal government has not suggested any changes in the funding of crop insurance, or can you guarantee that Ottawa's contribution to crop insurance will continue to be 50 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, as I've said, I have no knowledge that we've been served formally. I have at this point in time no knowledge, but I may not have the most recent knowledge. Certainly I have no knowledge at this point in time. I saw it raised as part of the Nielsen task force proposals, but, Mr. Speaker, it would not be in the best interests of this government or Saskatchewan farmers; hence, we simply oppose it.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Rural Underground Electric Program

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I have the honour, Mr. Speaker, of announcing details of Sask Power's rural underground electric program which is under way in various parts of the province. As part of a 20-year, \$630 million program announced last fall by Premier Devine, Sask Power will be rebuilding single-wire power lines . . .

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

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the statement being given by the minister deals with an issue that was announced by the government a year ago dealing with Sask Power's underground cable program, which I think everyone in the province already knows about. I think clearly the rules of the Assembly state that the statement has to be relevant, it should be current, and it should be of new interest to the public of Saskatchewan. And I think if

you look at it, Mr. Speaker, you will find that this has been discussed in the Assembly. Everyone in the province knows about it, and what we are seeing here is a pre-election campaign and the Assembly being used for that purposes. And I want you to rule on that point of order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, what the member says is quite true. And I don't object in any way, shape, or form that a ministerial statement should be current and of new interest. That's why I believe that the communities that are going to be affected this year would love to hear this ministerial statement.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I'm sorry. The member did speak to the point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, the commitment made by the government was that the program would apply to every town and every area of the province when it was made. We obviously know that it's going to apply to all the communities in the province over the next number of years. And I would just say to you that this use of the Assembly and ministerial statements to run their pre-election campaign, I think is a blatant misuse of the Assembly, and I feel that it's not warranted.

Mr. Speaker: — It's very difficult to rule whether or not the member's statement is in order or not when we haven't even heard it. He just rose to his feet to begin to make a statement . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order. When a member rises to give a ministerial statement, you can't expect me to judge that statement before I hear any of it. And it just started, and there was nothing but yelling in the Chamber, and I would ask members . . . Order, order. Order, order! When I'm on my feet, there's to be silence in this Chamber.

When the member rose to make his statement, I was listening. If there's a problem with the statement, then I'll rule it out of order, but I cannot rule it out of order before I've heard it. So I give the member the opportunity.

Order, please!

An Hon. Member: — Why can't I speak to the point of order?

Mr. Speaker: — You can speak to a point of order before I do, but not after.

An Hon. Member: — I'll just raise a new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Sveinson: — The minister, in answering the point of order, indicated the content of his ministerial statement which was outlining the towns and villages which will be applied under this year's program, so that you do know the content. Can you rule on that situation, sir?

Mr. Speaker: — I did rule on it. Order!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, as part of the 20-year, \$630 million program announced last fall by our Premier, Sask Power will be rebuilding single wire . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please! I'm going to ask for order on both sides of the House so that this point can be heard.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Sask Power, Mr. Speaker, will be rebuilding single-wire power lines in 41 projects throughout the province this year. Each of these projects will contain . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please! I'm going to caution the member for Shaunavon that I've just asked for order, and he's hollering again at the Chair, and I'm going to ask for order.

An Hon. Member: — He was not hollering.

Mr. Speaker: — The member for Shaunavon was hollering, and I'm asking for order. Absolutely. Proceed.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, over the 20-year period, Sask Power will replace 108,000 kilometres of overhead single-wire lines which will serve 72,000 farms. In this year's program, the farms included in the program are near the communities of Tuxford, Glentworth, Duncairn, Vesper, Blumenhof, Drake, Dana, Bratton, Ruthilda, Stranraer, Mayfair/Alticane, Adanac, Carlton, Birch Hills, Nipawin, Rocanville, Forget, Wilcox, Wauchope, Hinchcliffe, and Ketchen.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — The 1986 program is estimated to cost \$12.7 million, Mr. Speaker, a high percentage of which will be used to purchase locally supplied and manufactured material. Approximately 2.3 million will be paid to Saskatchewan-based contractors and engineering consultants.

The rural underground electric program this year will create 100 to 150 jobs, and for each year in direct employment, as well as spin-off benefits which will be felt by the service sector across the province.

The original farm electrical system has been in continuous service for approximately 30 years. During that time the electricity requirement by Saskatchewan farmers has more . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — . . . has more than doubled, Mr. Speaker, causing strained conditions on the capacity . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I don't think there's any excuse for the amount of yelling that's occurring, and I would ask for order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And to conclude, Mr. Speaker, the corporation will be rebuilding these lines on the basis of demand, maintenance, and service reliability, Mr.

Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister bringing yet again to the Assembly the announcement of a new buried cable program. I don't know why he stopped reading the list of names at B. You didn't get up to places like Shaunavon and Rosetown, and we were waiting in great anticipation to see when you would get to those towns. And I know that I wanted to know which towns in my constituency would be getting the cable, and I didn't hear any. But if it's like other programs you people have introduced, they will be totally based on politics — where the cable will be going — the same as this announcement today was.

The only question that I would ask is who's paying for the announcement, because it obviously . . . The time of this Assembly should be paid for during that time period by the PC party, because that's what ministerial statements have become. And I will predict we will be hearing more announcements about upgraders and fertilizer plants that are a myth in somebody's mind. But I just say to you that I find it upsetting that we would have to sit through re-announced programs that were announced a year ago, and that that would be allowed in this Assembly.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 2:41 p.m. His Honour the Administrator entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 17 — An Act to amend The Land Titles Act
 Bill No. 18 — An Act to amend The Builder's Lien Act
 Bill No. 20 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act
 Bill No. 21 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Dental Plan Act
 Bill No. 37 — An Act for the granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1987

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 2:43 p.m.

Question of Privilege

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I rise on a question of privilege. This is the first opportunity that I've had to raise this matter since it came to my attention late yesterday afternoon. I have provided the requisite notice pursuant to rule 6, and at the conclusion of my remarks if a prima facie case is found, I will be moving a motion asking for the House to find certain remarks of the member from Pelly to be in contempt of this House, and further to demand an apology from the member.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, a press release, issued under the name of the member from Pelly, accused the government of attempting to dismiss the legislative counsel and law clerk. That is, in fact, not an accurate reflection of the events that occurred at the Board of Internal Economy meeting. But that is not the issue that I'm wanting to raise with you, Mr. Speaker.

(1445)

What particularly concerns me about the press release is that the impartiality of the Speaker and his office has been called into question. Allow me to quote certain paragraphs of the release. Quote, Mr. Speaker:

The PC government is attempting to undermine the independence of the Legislative Counsel by forcing the office to report to the legislative assembly through the Clerk's Office, rather than directly to the MLA's.

A further quote, Mr. Speaker:

Independent officers like the Ombudsman, the Provincial Auditor and the Legislative Counsel are appointed to serve the public and all members of the legislative assembly, not the government of the day. As independent public watchdogs, they must be free to make recommendations, offer advice or take the government of the day to task, without fear.

The PC government has already threatened the effectiveness of these public watchdog agencies by constantly cutting their staff, and now it is attempting to get these agencies directly under its thumb.

Mr. Speaker, the only conclusion that can be drawn from these remarks is that the member from Pelly has suggested that the Speaker and the officers of the Table are not impartial. The suggestion made by the member is that if the law clerk reports through the Clerk for simply administrative purposes, somehow that means that the law clerk is serving only the government and not opposition members. The member from Pelly has also alleged that to have the law clerk report through the Clerk for only administrative purposes, is to put the law clerk under the government's thumb.

These are simply outrageous allegations, Mr. Speaker, and cast an improper reflection on the Chair. They are a direct attack against the Speaker's office and cannot be regarded lightly. They imply that the Speaker and the officers of the Table are under the thumb of government.

It should also be noted that the allegation that the independence of the law clerk is compromised is completely inaccurate. Opposition members know full well that there has been absolutely no suggestion by the Speaker, or anyone else, that the legislative counsel and law clerk would have to report through the Clerk in relation to the provision of legal advice or drafting. The opposite is, in fact, the case. However this issue should have been settled by the Board of Internal Economy and should not have been the subject of press releases.

Beauchesne's, Fifth Edition, at paragraph 52, in discussing what constitutes breach of privilege, says the following:

52. (1) The Speaker should be protected against reflections on his actions.

Maingot, in *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, makes a similar statement at page 315:

Any suggestion of partiality or bias on the part of a presiding officer, such as the Speaker, a chairman of a committee of the whole, or a chairman of a standing committee or special committee, automatically shows disrespect and amounts to contempt.

As House Leader, Mr. Speaker, and as a member of this House, I have a duty to protect the integrity of this institution. The Speaker and the officers of the Table must be protected against reflection on their actions, Mr. Speaker. When their motives are questioned, we must rise to their defence. This is part of our British parliamentary tradition. To fail to do otherwise would be destructive to our democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to find a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege, and should you so find, I will move the following motion:

That this Assembly finds the remarks of the member from Pelly contained in the press release, dated May 5th, 1986, reflecting on the impartiality of the Speaker and the officers of the Table, to be in contempt of this House and demands a retraction and an apology from the member.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the issue that the Government House Leader has raised here, a question, a very serious question, of privilege. I have not had an opportunity to be involved with all the discussion, but I have been informed, as obviously the caucuses will do when they're referring matters to the Board of Internal Economy — because it is the board that basically runs the Assembly and takes care of a number of issues that come up on a daily basis and is chaired by the Speaker.

The issue at hand here is the question of privilege of members and what is discussed here in the Assembly. And one can say, if there are accusations made inside the Assembly and members dispute what one member is saying, I think there is obviously a rule that applies to that. And I say that if the Government House Leader has a dispute with the member from Pelly as to facts that have been given out, Mr. Speaker, I think, if you would refer to page 12 of *Beauchesne's*, you would find that section 19 clearly outlines what should take place in this instance. And it clearly states that:

A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

And it goes on to say in (3), or section 19(3):

Statements made outside the House by a Member may not be used as the base for a question of privilege.

When I complete my remarks, I would like you to take

that into consideration.

But I think there have been allegations made here by the Government House Leader that need some background. And I would like to take some time to read into the record some exchanges of letters that have taken place on this issue, because I think the matter is being side-tracked on to a very lesser issue, a dispute between the member from Souris-Cannington and the member from Pelly.

And I would like to take the time of the Assembly, now that it has been raised, to raise the issue that is at hand here. It is the basis of the challenge of privilege by one member to another.

Now this has been going on for some time where we believe there has been a process in place to put together what is called by some a "department." Now we don't believe that there is any such thing as a department that deals with the running of the Assembly, with the Ombudsman, with the legislative law clerk, or with the individuals who work in this building. We don't believe there is a department. We think that each area, the library and others, have a distinct role to play.

Now there have been things happening over the last year or two that lead us to believe that there is a major change taking place. And in order to give background to this I want to read to the Assembly a letter dated April 16 to one of the members of the Board of Internal Economy from our caucus, Mr. Engel, which is from the Speaker. I think when we get done reading this, there will be . . . And the we replied to this letter. And I would like to get all of this on the record, because I think it's important when members and others who may be watching this issue develop, before they make up their minds as to whether or not, in fact, there is anything to the allegations made by the Government House Leader. This letter, and I will quote — it's dated April 16, 1986:

Mr. A.W. Engel, MLA, 265 Legislative Building, Regina, Saskatchewan, S4S 0B3.

Dear Mr. Engel: I am writing to you to raise a matter of concern and importance. Members will recall that on July 16, 1985, the Board decided to accept responsibility for the Office of the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk due to a reorganization in government. The incumbent, Ms. Merrilee Rasmussen was retained. Since that point in time, Ms. Rasmussen has refused to follow my instructions and, I feel, the policy direction set by the Board. I am troubled by this situation and am thus raising it with the Board.

I will outline some background to the whole situation. In April 1981, the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures recommended to the Legislative Assembly that a Board of Internal Economy be established. The Board was to set (the) policy for all agencies reporting directly to the Legislative Assembly such as, the Legislative Assembly Office, Sergeant-at-Arms, Director of Hansard and Legislative Library. Apparently the Committee, at that time, considered adding the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk and

Ombudsman to the list of agencies under the Board but opted to wait and see if the experiment with the Board was successful. The Legislative Assembly adopted the recommendations of the Committee and the Board was established.

Section 68.8 of The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act outlines the powers of the Board of Internal Economy. The Board has the power to "make recommendations for the organization and (the) staff establishment for the Legislative Assembly Office and the Legislative Library" and "to approve and review administrative policies and procedures in relation to the operation of the Legislative Assembly Office and the Legislative Library" and to "advise upon and give directions in relation to any matter that the Board considers necessary for the efficient and effective operation of the Legislative Assembly Office and (to) the Legislative Library."

In 1982, the Board authorized a reorganization making the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly a "deputy minister" with administrative responsibility for the various agencies under the Speaker. In 1984, I asked the Legislative Librarian to report to me for administrative purposes through the Clerk which she has done with very positive results.

It is my opinion that the various legislative agencies under the Board are working well as a team and do respond to the direction given to them by the Board and myself as Speaker.

Last fall, the Board agreed to accept the Legislative Counsel and the Law Clerk as part of its mandate and The Legislative Assembly Executive Council Act was amended to authorize this change. Section 68.32 states that the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk is to be appointed by the Board on recommendation of the Speaker. The duties of the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk as set in the Act are as "may be provided for in the Rules of the Legislative Assembly or that may be prescribed by the Speaker."

When this change was made last fall, it was, I believe, quite clearly understood that this change meant that the Office of (the) Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk would become part of the department under the Board for administrative and financial purposes. The Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk would obviously still retain its historic independence in the field of professional advice and legal drafting for Members and the Legislative Assembly.

After these changes in the Act were approved by the Legislative Assembly, I asked Ms. Rasmussen to work with the Clerk and to work as part of the Legislative team in the field of departmental administration and finance. Part of this team-work involves a weekly meeting of the Legislative managers, including the Clerk, the Legislative Librarian, the Deputy Clerk, the Sergeant-at-Arms,

the Director of Broadcasting, (the) Director of *Hansard* and others. This meeting is found to be useful for the managers to keep up-to-date on the happenings in the Legislative Assembly as it pertains to the department. The meetings deal with the administrative and financial matters and do not pertain to professional advice given by officers of the House to Members.

Both the Clerk and I have met with Ms. Rasmussen on several occasions seeking her cooperation in working with the department. To date, she has refused to do so. On March 21, 1986, I, as Speaker, wrote to Ms. Rasmussen instructing her to attend the management meetings and to participate in the Department. Ms. Rasmussen's response is that she will not attend meetings and she will not follow my direction.

The reason that I am raising this issue with the Board is that if disciplinary action is to be taken with regard to Ms. Rasmussen's apparent lack of cooperation and insubordination, it must be taken by the Board. If it should come to the point of dismissal, section 68.22(1) and (2) state that the decision would be made by the Board on recommendation of the Speaker and a "statement of the reasons for so doing is to be tabled in the Legislative Assembly forthwith."

I recommend (want to) to the Board that an instruction from the Board be issued to Ms. Rasmussen directing her to be part of the department for "administrative and financial purposes" including attendance at the management meetings, stressing that this direction (is) in no way infringes on her power or freedom to give advice to Members of the Legislative Assembly. This direction is the same as that followed by all other officers of the Legislative Assembly.

I further recommend that if Ms. Rasmussen refuses to comply with the Board's direction within two weeks of the decision of the Board (what decision I don't know, I want to read that again).

I further recommend that if Ms. Rasmussen refuses to comply with the Board's direction within two weeks of the decision of the Board and the communication of that decision to Ms. Rasmussen, that she be removed from office and a statement be tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

I make these recommendations knowing the importance of the independent nature of the role of the officers of the Legislative Assembly. I am also aware that all (the) employees of the Legislative Assembly are obliged to follow the direction of the Board and (the) Speaker as authorized by The Legislative Assembly and Executive Counsel Act.

I have called a meeting of the Board for Monday, April 21, 1986 at 11:00 a.m. in order to discuss the serious and troubling matter. Sincerely, H.J.

Swan, Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you will be well aware of that letter and the response that came back on . . . Well I will first say that my colleagues on the board went to you and got that meeting delayed because of problems we had with what we saw to be an infringement on the operation of the counsel — it writes the legislation for members of the opposition and that sort of thing, and advises us from time to time — that we had problems with that.

And you delayed the meeting, and subsequently a letter came from the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Allan Blakeney. And I would like, for the record, to read that letter into the record, because it outlines very clearly some of the concerns that we saw at that time. This letter is dated April 28, 1986. It's addressed to the Hon. Herb Swan, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Province of Saskatchewan, Room 129, Legislative Building, Regina, Sask., S4S 0B3:

Dear Mr. Speaker: I am writing with respect to your letter dated April 16, 1986 to my colleagues on the Board of Internal Economy, Mr. (Allen) Engel and Mr. Lusney.

In view of the very serious nature of the contents of that letter, (that's referring to your letter, Mr. Speaker) I have decided to write to you directly. Mr. Engel has made available to me the minutes of the Board, but I am not fully aware of its deliberations.

I believe the central issue here is the independence of an (the) Officer of the Legislature, the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk.

(1500)

As we view both custom and existing legislation, the Office of the Legislative Counsel exists as an entity totally separate from the Legislative Library, the Office of the Clerk, the Ombudsman, the Provincial Auditor or other offices or officers of the Legislature. We believe this was done not by accident, but rather to underline and ensure the independence of the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk in rendering advice to all Members without fear or favour.

In order that each of the principal officers of the Legislature be able to fulfill effectively the duties prescribed by statute and by the Rules, it is important that each be independent officers of the Legislature itself — independent of the government of the day, and independent of each other. (And) taken together, they do not constitute a hierarchical "department". (as was referred to in the letter).

I was somewhat surprised at the first paragraph of your letter, where you indicate that on July 16, 1985 the Board decided to accept responsibility for the Office of Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk. My reading of the proposals put forward at

that time was that the Office would have been abolished and replaced by a new position of Law Clerk created by the Board. We do not regard this as a mere matter of wording. As we see it, there is a position of Legislative Counsel created by statute with duties defined by the Legislature and reporting to the Speaker. We regard this as particularly important to the Opposition. The Government has platoons of lawyers available to it, the Opposition has none.

Therefore, an organizational structure which ensures the independence of the Legislative Counsel is of prime importance to us. On this basis we welcomed legislative changes which put into statutory form the past custom.

I was also surprised to read, in the first paragraph on page two of your letter, that the Board authorized a reorganization making the Clerk a "deputy minister" with administrative responsibility for the various agencies under the Speaker. I would appreciate your referring me to the Board minute that explicitly sought to accomplish this.

I note in paragraph four on page two you state that it was clearly understood that the Office of Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk would become part of the "department" under the Board for administrative purposes. If you are stating that it was so understood by Members of the Legislature when the Bill was passed, I must say that I recall no such understanding. I would appreciate your referring me to material on which this conclusion was based.

This issue is neither minor nor irrelevant. The concept of viewing all agencies reporting to the Speaker as somehow constituting a "department" is novel and without statutory base except as may be encompassed by the reference to duties as "may be prescribed by the Speaker". It is surely drawing a long bow to suggest that because the Speaker has the statutory power to prescribe duties of several separate Officers of the Legislature, he can constitute the several offices into a "department" in a way clearly not contemplated by the legislation.

I am not, of course, suggesting that arrangements could not be made to combine for administrative purposes. Indeed, as you know, we have no objection to the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk being an officer of the Legislative Assembly and subject to the Board with respect to budget and administration. I am suggesting, however, that any "department" analogy with a hierarchical relationship between Officers of the Legislature is not supported by the legislation.

Since we put a very high premium on the independence of the Legislative Counsel and since this has not always, in our view, been recognized (e.g. the proposal to replace the Office with a Law Clerk without statutory base), we are

concerned about any move that might impair the co-equal status of the Legislative Counsel with other Officers of the Legislature, which I believe is clearly provided for in the legislation.

Accordingly, I would ask that no steps be taken which would impair the ability of the Legislative Counsel to operate in the independent way contemplated by the existing legislation.

Finally, I believe that the principles of natural justice would require that before any potential disciplinary measures be considered, Members must be given an opportunity to review any relevant correspondence regarding this issue. (Signed) Yours sincerely, Leader of the Opposition.

I read those letters into the record, Mr. Speaker, so that we would have some background to see how this has all evolved and how what was said by the member for Pelly was well within any purview or within his rights to say.

I see no reason why there could possibly be a case of privilege. There is nothing in the press release that shows any disrespect for the Speaker. What it does, clearly, is refer to a statement made by the Speaker, or a recommendation.

And I want to quote that one again because there was a recommendation made in advance to the meeting by the Speaker that if certain things didn't happen, or if they did happen, that the individual referred to would be dismissed. And I, along with the member from Pelly, continue to express concern about that recommendation being made.

And I would just like to read the third last paragraph of the letter of April 16th, which says:

I further recommend that if Ms. Rasmussen refuses to comply with the Board's direction within two weeks of the decision of the Board and the communication of that decision to Ms. Rasmussen, that she be removed from office and a statement be tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

I think we can argue over who is making strong statements or pre-judging what will happen in a committee. But I think that I will have a hard time believing that there is any case of privilege. And that the member from Pelly was perfectly within his rights making the statements that he did and expressing his concern about changes that would be made in that position that would give it less flexibility and less independence to work for members of the opposition.

Now we all know that we're in the dying days of a government's term of office. No one knows how the election is going to go. We all like to get . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I think the member is straying from the point in raising election issues. The point that's here is a very serious point, and I've been listening patiently, but unless you have something further, directly to the point, then I would ask that you end

your remarks.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The reason I raised the issue, and I won't refer to it again, is simply to point out the fact that who is ever in opposition, that this position is ultimately important that it be independent. And members opposite who were here — Mr. Speaker, you will well know this — that the independence of this individual to advise, consult, and to help with legislation being written is absolutely crucial to the operation of this Assembly.

And for that reason I'm saying, not knowing what is going to happen, our point is that in order for this Assembly to operate and function properly, that this position must be maintained in its present form, and statements made by the member from Pelly to protect the integrity of the position were warranted. And I applaud him for taking and putting forward a strong view to maintain the independence of that office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I've listened to the comments from both sides of the House. I did receive notice today, prior to 12 o'clock, from the House Leader. I will take under advisement the comments that have been made from both sides of the House and bring in a ruling at a later date.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Saskatchewan Participation in Expo '86

Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite seem to be a little testy today, Mr. Speaker. They didn't appear to like our ministerial statements and during question period, they . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. The member is rising on the motion under rule 16, and I would ask him to stay to the motion and present the motion.

Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just saying that the members opposite in question period today didn't feel that Expo happened to be a major topic or a major issue, and yet I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it certainly is a major issue. It's a major news item right now. It's being played, not only right across our province, not only right across our country, but right around the world. And the member opposite speaking from his chair, that probably won't get into this debate, Mr. Speaker, can't understand the importance of Expo and how it could help the northern communities in Saskatchewan, and I guess he really doesn't care. But the Leader-Post headline the other day kind of said it all: "The gates to Expo '86 are open."

All the hard work, all the planning, all the preparation and anticipation will now pay off, and pay off handsomely to those that are participating. As we all know, it started with a royal event, and it was officially opened by Prince Charles and Princess Diana of Wales. And again the members of the opposition, speaking from their seats, obviously no regard for royalty. It's unfortunate, but

perhaps they should have some.

But, Mr. Speaker, our motto: Saskatchewan Expo '86 — "A Presence to be Proud Of"; it now takes on a new meaning, a new meaning for all of us here in Saskatchewan, whether we be from the South or whether we be from the North; a presence and a proud presence. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan will have its own pavilion at this magnificent international exposition.

It was pride in Canada that brought Man and His World to Montreal as Canada hosted this exposition in 1967. And throughout the world people are still talking about Montreal and about Canada. And now Vancouver and Canada will again be in the world spotlight. And it's this pride in Canada, this pride in Saskatchewan, that prompted Saskatchewan to participate, Mr. Speaker.

Others, too, are very, very proud to participate — seven provinces, two territories, 54 nations, as well as three states and 37 corporations. After all, this international exposition will attract people throughout the world. It will, in fact, open their countries or their corporations to the entire world.

(1515)

Yesterday the members opposite chose to elaborate, for instance, on Manitoba and their NDP government. And yet I ask why, and I wonder why Manitoba isn't participating in Expo. We're all proud to be Canadians. We're all proud of our prairie provinces. Yet Manitoba will have no presence.

Do they have no pride in their province? Do they have no pride in Canada? Do they have no faith in their future? Do they not want to open Manitoba to the world? What a glorious opportunity they missed when they chose to stay at home, to close their doors. Or maybe, just maybe, Mr. Speaker, they're hoping to get a free ride at the expense of Canada.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to repeat our motto: "SaskExpo '86, A Presence to Be Proud Of." We do have pride in our province, Saskatchewan. We will proudly display and promote ourselves six months of a world-class promotion.

Originally, as the SaskExpo corporation was established, I served very proudly and with much interest, Mr. Speaker, in my role as vice-chairman. And I watched as our presence was developed, as our plans unfolded, and eventually as everything for us became a reality.

And what a marvellous way for us to enhance several areas of our government. I think primarily our sales missions on tourism, where our government has gone out to the entire world, you might say, and certainly in North America — sales missions in Denver, in Minneapolis, and Los Angeles — together with the private sector to promote Saskatchewan.

And now that Saskatchewan is becoming just a little bit better known, as far as it relates to tourism, we have this magnificent opportunity — Expo '86, where millions, an expected 16 million people, will go through Expo and

determine all of the participants and players where they would like to visit. And we will be able to give them first-hand indication of Saskatchewan and try to encourage them to come to Saskatchewan for a visit.

Another very important feature of SaskExpo, Mr. Speaker, concerns the missions of trade that were taken by our government right around the world, again opening up our province to the entire world. And now, through this pavilion, people will learn even more about Saskatchewan, more about the opportunities that we can present to them and what they can really come in to see in Saskatchewan and what it's all about.

Imagine! People from the entire globe will be coming to our doorstep to see what's happening in Saskatchewan. This magnificent event and our participation in it will help cement all of the work that has been undertaken by our government in the last couple of years. It will prove indeed that Saskatchewan is open for business because we're out there selling our presence, and we're proud of it.

No longer, Mr. Speaker, is Saskatchewan the best kept secret in the world, as was done by the prior administration, just a closed shop that we didn't want anybody to come in and see. We didn't want them to come in and spend their money here in Saskatchewan. We didn't want to display our people, our hospitality. We didn't want to display our culture and our food. No, no, we didn't want anybody to do that. Well, Mr. Speaker, we do. We very much do, and SaskExpo '86 will help us do that job.

People from all around the globe will have a chance to see firsthand our culture, our Saskatchewan entertainers, taste our traditional foods, enjoy our hospitality, and learn what a great way it is to come to Saskatchewan to visit, to see our great province. They're also going to have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to come and deal with us as it relates to trade or looking for investment.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, it's the first time Saskatchewan will have our own pavilion at a world's exposition. Never before has our province had such a unique opportunity to tell our story to such a large world audience.

We are participating in Expo mainly for three reasons: to promote a place which is second to none in resources, in capabilities, in products, and in people; to invite and welcome visitors, investors, and new citizens to our province; and to celebrate our talents. Expo '86 will provide a world stage for our artists and artisans, for our actors, our dancers, and our musicians. Imagine 6 to 800 native people from Saskatchewan, entertainers, will have the opportunity to perform live before an international audience.

A major objective of our government is to raise the profile of our province internationally. The Pacific rim represents a tremendous market for our products and a source of investment capital.

Expo '86 is an exposition of firsts, setting many new records. Expo '86 has surpassed the Los Angeles

Olympics in corporate sponsorship. May 2nd of 1985 marked the opening of Expo Centre, the first time that a pavilion has opened one year in advance. And tickets for Expo '86 went on sale one year in advance in British Columbia. Never before has a world exposition been so well developed in its early stages.

Canada invites the world to Vancouver, and Saskatchewan will be there. Mr. Speaker, our pavilion is one of the highest observation points on the Expo site, approximately 10 storeys, and it is truly a magnificent landmark. It will accommodate 1000 visitors per hour, and includes a welcome court, innovative exhibitory, a theatre, a visitor service and performance and food service areas. The ascent to the observation deck will explain a working grain elevator, with the descent simulating a ride into a potash mine. Our neighbouring international pavilions include Japan and Australia. And the interesting part of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that the government, together with the private sector, are making SaskExpo happen.

To enhance the Saskatchewan pavilion's design and exhibitory, a corporate participation program was developed. In order to tell the Saskatchewan story, it is essential that the partnership between the public and the private sectors, that partnership that our government so firmly believes in, is on its best display at SaskExpo, and it is a major element of our message.

Mr. Speaker, on August 4th, the soon-to-be-famous Saskatchewan Expo train will leave Saskatoon and Regina for Saskatchewan Day in Vancouver, which will be held on August 8th. There will be a football game there that day between the Saskatchewan Roughriders and the B.C. Lions, and those travelling on that train, Mr. Speaker, will be presented with ambassador kits, our own Saskatchewan ambassador kits developed by the Department of Tourism and Small Business, and they will be given the opportunity to promote tourism to Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan entertainment and fun events will be happening all over the Expo grounds as well as in our own pavilion. Some of the entertainers that will be participating include the Saskatchewan Chamber Orchestra; Solstice, of Saskatoon; the Great Plains Dance Troupe; Deborah Lauren; the Balfour Collegiate Dixieland Band; and the list of talent goes on and on, far too many to mention. But to name a few more: the Gabriel Dancers from Saskatoon; the Prince Albert Boys Choir; Winston Wuttunee of North Battleford; and the Esterhazy and Yorkton High School Band, Mr. Speaker.

And our host and hostesses, in addition to their enthusiasm and talent, they bring seven languages to our pavilion: English, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese, Filipino, and French. Another benefit for us, Mr. Speaker, is the world business showcase, and it's a unique, high-profile trade and investment show at the Canadian pavilion in Vancouver during Expo.

So those are a few of the highlights, Mr. Speaker, and while the Leader of the Opposition is travelling in our province, changing his mind about all kinds of policies — here he doesn't like the bacon plant; in North Battleford,

he does; here, he doesn't like the paper plant; in Prince Albert, he does. It would be curious, Mr. Speaker, to see what he's saying truly about our participation in SaskExpo because everybody across the province that I have travelled, the four corners, burst with pride at our participation and think that it's one of the best things that this government has ever done. So it's going to be curious to see what the members opposite have to say about SaskExpo and how it has created excitement and enthusiasm throughout our entire province as we being SaskExpo at Expo '86.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to move:

That this Assembly commends the Government of Saskatchewan for its foresight and initiative in ensuring that Saskatchewan will have a major role in Expo '86 and also in the world business showcase and, as a result, will be in a position to benefit from the many opportunities that will be available in the areas of trade, business, agriculture, tourism, culture, and the development of high technology.

Mr. Speaker: — Does the member have a seconder?

Mr. Klein: — Yes, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I neglected to tell you that it would be seconded by my colleague from Yorkton.

Mr. McLaren: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am indeed pleased to be able to second my colleague's motion of Expo '86, and especially Saskatchewan Expo '86. And I want to talk a bit about the benefits of the next Expo or a trade fair, an . . . (inaudible) . . . and to do with trade and business.

I'm pleased because SaskExpo '86 is already proving, in a matter of only being open two or three days, to be not only a great success for Saskatchewan but the talk of the entire country already. And why is that, Mr. Speaker? It is, I suggest, because the Saskatchewan pavilion is showing the world that we are a new Saskatchewan, a new Saskatchewan with energy, new vibrance, and renewed confidence.

And at this time I want to commend the SaskExpo '86 corporation headed by my colleague, the Deputy Minister, and the committee that thought of the theme and the design of our pavilion at Expo, the architects that put that plan onto paper and, of course, our contractors that actually built the pavilion on the site.

(1530)

And let's look at the Saskatchewan reunion held on April 25th and April 26th, Mr. Speaker. Over 13,000 former Saskatchewan residents turned out to acquaint themselves with the new Saskatchewan — 13,000, Mr. Speaker, who were so fed up with the lack of opportunity in this province under the former government that they packed their bags and left. Now they are excited about Saskatchewan, and many are talking about coming home because they can see that initiative and opportunity is flourishing here once again in this province.

Let's just look at the Saskatchewan pavilion. My colleague from Regina North mentioned the 10-storey tower that looks out over the whole panorama of Expo '86 — symbolic, Mr. Speaker, of the new Saskatchewan attitude. We are looking to the whole world with confidence. We are showing our stuff, and we have a lot to show, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, agriculture is the very foundation of our province, and that's why this government is showing the whole world Saskatchewan's pavilion in the form of a gigantic grain elevator. But we're also much more. We have the largest reserves of potash of any jurisdiction in the world. And that's why, when you travel down the tower, you will be shown the great story of Saskatchewan potash industry.

We are at the forefront of many high technological fields, and one of them we show off — the largest fibre optics network in the world. And I say in the world, Mr. Speaker. And it is important that the world knows that we have these talents. We are inviting them to buy our products, and Expo shows them our products are number one. Whether it is the display and explanation of our world-standard agriculture or the exhibit of our mining capabilities, Mr. Speaker, we are number one.

And I can think back, Mr. Speaker, in 1983 when I journeyed to Vienna, Austria, to attend the potash conference of the world of producers and marketers. And while over in Vienna, Mr. Speaker, we could not find anywhere a brochure or a pamphlet or any reading material about Saskatchewan. We saw it from all the other provinces, from Canada itself, but it was very obvious that Saskatchewan was lacking in its promotion of itself to the world markets.

It is exciting to be a part of all this. And you should know, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people are a part of it. The only way of the members opposite, the way of sending a few government friends and bureaucrats to represent Saskatchewan — that way is gone, Mr. Speaker. No, this government is working with all the people of the province.

And my colleague mentioned the people that were going to be going to Expo '86 to entertain. The Balfour Collegiate Dixieland band will be there representing Saskatchewan; the Prince Albert boys' choir will be there; the Saskatoon Gabriel dancers will be there; and from my home town of Yorkton, Mr. Speaker, the 100 marching band will be there to entertain the visitors from around the world of their band-playing ability and their marching.

We also have a class of 31 students from the Yorkdale Junior High School that are leaving shortly to spend some time at SaskExpo '86. And on a personal note, Mr. Speaker, I found out last week that my daughter, Coralee, who is taking dancing in Toronto, will be performing at the pavilion in August. And needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be there to see Expo '86.

We, Mr. Speaker, have 6 to 800 artists and performers from every corner of the province who will be there,

doing Saskatchewan proud. They are the heart and soul of our province, and they will help with the other parts of Expo to show the world that Saskatchewan is a fun place to live and a fun place to visit.

Never before, Mr. Speaker, has such an effort gone into promoting Saskatchewan tourism. Never before, Mr. Speaker, has Saskatchewan ever even attended a world expo. No, Mr. Speaker, the NDP would have no part of it, and today still would not have Saskatchewan there — very obvious from the comments from across the way while my colleague from Regina North was speaking.

They say we should let the world come to us, that we should stay locked up in our houses, Mr. Speaker, and wait for the telephone to ring. Well let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, prior to politics I was involved with a company that went out world-wide to sell our product. And I can assure you that you don't sit behind your desk waiting for a telephone to ring. You get out and you sale your produce. You get out and you spend money. And I've been listening for four years of this tremendous visitation and holiday around the world that our ministers are taking. Let me tell you that it is done by going out and seeing the folks, talking to people, making them sure that they understand what you product's all about; that you will service the product; that you will be there when you need the help that they need to sell our product, and so on.

I made four trips to Australia, which I'm sure the members opposite would think that it was a paid holiday. Let me tell you, we worked. We attended the shows in Gundagai in New South Wales, and Orange County. We attended the world fairs in Algiers. We went to the SIMA exposium in Paris. And that's the only way that you can get around to sell you product. They're not going to come here and, as I say, let the phones ring and we'll go out and sell you your product. You get out and work at it. And this business of holiday paid trips by the taxpayers have made me sick over the last four years, and I just can't believe that the members opposite would even believe that business can come and trade can come with us sitting on our prats here in Saskatchewan.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba is staying away from Expo. But Saskatchewan people are not afraid of working and playing on the world stage, because we have the resources, talents, and people second to no one in the world. And I say second to no one, Mr. Speaker, and the NDP should wake up and recognize that fact that that is so, that it isn't an NDP Saskatchewan any more. That's the difference.

And we are finding out that people around the world realize that. The quiet and the humble farmer's image is not what we are all about. We are a dynamic people about to face great challenges. From potash mines to fibre optics, from wheat fields to the Churchill River, this province has been put back into the hands of people. We have faith in our ability to create opportunity and to protect today as we build for the future.

And how do we do that, Mr. Speaker? Does the government sit back and say, we know what is best for everyone. We don't need the people. That's the NDP

way, and that is why they could never have built Saskatchewan and built the Saskatchewan pavilion. And we listen to the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. It is my duty to inform the member that his time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This motion before us today shows the Devine government's misplaced priorities. We could be debating issues of substance and importance to all the people of Saskatchewan, to farmers and to business men, but instead the PC government opposite — through their member who is running away from his seat in Regina North, the former small-business minister — is congratulating the Devine government for Expo '86.

But today Saskatchewan people are not primarily concerned about '86 — Bill Bennett's political ploy in B.C., Mr. Speaker. No, Saskatchewan people today are talking about the real issues facing farm families and working people. The real issues facing — like my seatmate is going to be talking about shortly, about Northerners — the real issue facing our small-business men and women in Saskatchewan. But does the government really believe . . . Do you really believe, in the depths of your heart, that 47,000 unemployed people are going to live it up at Expo? Do you really believe that? Do you really believe that?

Does the Devine government really believe that 62,000 Saskatchewan people who are depending weekly on their welfare cheques, that they're going to be living it up at Expo. And with the lowest grain prices since the '30s, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are Saskatchewan farmers planning to take a little holiday in Expo '86? Do you really believe that?

I note that at its annual meeting the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce has expressed concern about the provincial deficit. What is the deficit, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The actual deficit that this government has run up, like my colleague has said, \$9 billion, and yet Expo '86 is the top priority. Expo '86 is the priority. Where are your priorities?

The other day we had a motion before this House and the priority was: let's cheer Brian Mulroney. Today the priority is: let's cheer Expo. Well I want to tell you, Brian Mulroney failed. Expo isn't going to fail because it's not up to Saskatchewan. Expo isn't up to Saskatchewan. It's a world show that's going to go, and it's not up to us whether this resolution is passing today or not.

But we can, however, quite easily understand the Devine government's interest in international trips and international junkets by their cabinet ministers . . . And the member that just sat down talked about his trips to Australia. He talked about where he went and how they are out to sell. And I can understand why he'd do that. I can understand why he'd do it, and I would just ask the member for . . . the Deputy Speaker to listen carefully because this has to do with your priority and with Expo. This has to do with the resolution before us.

In my constituency . . . And if the member from Moosomin would have as big a heart as he has a mouth, he would run again and help his people in Moosomin. But the member from Moosomin can yack away with his big mouth, sitting on his seat.

But the people from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg describe this government in two ways: join the Devine cabinet and see the world; or they say, the Devine government is not here for a long time — they're just here for a good time. And that's why we have resolutions like this today, because all they're thinking about is a good time.

It's hard to keep track of just how many international trips PC cabinet ministers have taken, and how this PC government is entertaining its fifth year. But there clearly have been well over 70 such trips — places like Denver . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. The trips that cabinet ministers have taken during the term of this government are not related to the motion before the House. And if you can relate the trips of the cabinet ministers in the past four years to the motion before the House, you may continue, but I don't see that at this point.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time is so short. We have only 10 minutes. I have used some of that time already. And I want to tell you, you know what's in this resolution; you pass it. I'm not going to read the resolution to you.

But the two former speakers talked about showing off Saskatchewan, showing off and getting around and seeing Saskatchewan, and the important thing is to get out and to live it up. And that's what this resolution is all about: let's go to Expo and celebrate Saskatchewan — let's live it up!

And the people of Saskatchewan are neglected. We can go to Denver, and we can go to Chicago, and we can go to Atlanta, New York, and Washington, and Hong Kong, and Paris, and London, Tokyo, Saudi Arabia — just to name a few. And they're living it up like they want us to go to Expo and live it up. No wonder the Devine government does not want to answer any questions about international travel by ministers. They don't want to talk about details like that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order! The member persists . . . Order! The member persists in talking about alleged trips cabinet ministers have taken to various parts of the world. It is not dealing with the motion before the House.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are wasting my time by always standing up.

There are priorities of this government where we're talking about Expo and celebrating, and the government is refusing to answer questions about how much money they're spending on their celebrations. They refuse to answer questions about their international market consultants. They refuse to answer questions about all the

things that are priorities to this government.

But yes, we have a resolution before us to pat us on the back about Expo. I've got reservations to go to Expo, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have reservations to go there, but I'm going there like I went to Montreal and like I went to Seattle and like I went to many world fairs. And it's great to see a world fair. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that all members will agree that congratulating the Devine government for Expo '86 in Vancouver is not what this Assembly should be spending its time on today. That's all I'm saying.

I am surprised and disappointed that this motion before us fails to deal with pressing economic problems facing Saskatchewan people. The Devine government's economic policies and failures, which have made conditions so tough for small-business men in this province — and yet they want to congratulate themselves for Expo. They've made conditions tough. The Devine and Mulroney governments' failure to address the grave problems of commodity prices — and yet we congratulate ourselves on Expo.

I want to tell you that the deficit is a big problem in Saskatchewan. We should be discussing ways today on how to deal with the deficit, not on how to deal with a resolution like this. That's the point I'm trying to make. And if you can't see it, that's why you're in trouble in your seat, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(1545)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. We're not discussing the position of the Deputy Speaker in his riding, which, I might add, isn't that bad.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — If the member would stick to the motion being discussed, I would not have to rise to interject. Please stick to the motion being discussed, and I will allow you to speak freely.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, you showed your priorities loud and clear. Our priorities are this: I want to move an amendment to this motion because we're wasting the House's time. And you know it, and I know it, that this is not a time for congratulations.

On last week Friday we took the whole day to congratulate Brian Mulroney for bringing up wheat, which he never did. He never did. You took the whole time out. Today we're taking the time again. We should be talking about a motion that I am moving, that's going to be seconded by my colleague from Pelly:

That all the word after "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

That this Assembly regrets that the provincial government has placed a higher priority on international junkets by cabinet ministers than on addressing the major economic problems facing Saskatchewan people today, including unfair taxes (to the member of Consumer Affairs), unfair

taxes, including jobs, and the financial crisis facing farm families and small business.

That's what the debate is all about today, Mr. Speaker. This House is here for a reason, not to pat ourselves on the back and paint what a great time we're going to have. We'll all have it, anyhow.

I move this motion, and I know my colleague, the member for Pelly, is going to second it, and I'm sorry that you interrupted me so many times through this little talk because that's what's the topic today. This is what's before it today, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And if you want to stand up in this House and brag how safe your seat is, you haven't been following Gordon MacMurchy around. Because I want to tell you . . . I want to tell you this is what's the issue today.

I'm glad to have the privilege of moving this motion today, and I know we'll get back on topic when we have the good motion before us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member had already taken his seat. He can't get back up again and speak on the same motion. The Hon. member knows it.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it's a well-known rule of this House that members are not to drag the Chair into the debate, and that has happened on three different occasions from the NDP opposition — a flagrant breach of the rules, Mr. Speaker.

And I ask you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to either take the opportunity to defend the Chair, which you have every right to do, or in the future bring the rules to the attention of the NDP opposition that seem to have forgotten all about them and are flagrantly abusing the privileges of this House.

An Hon. Member: — I would like to speak to that point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The member from Shaunavon.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, after that volley of attack on the position of the Speaker by the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, as trying to instruct you how to carry out your duties, I find it amazing that you would stand for that from that individual. But it's not unusual. With this arrogant government, to try to push the Speaker around is not surprising.

But I would just say that the issue that the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was referring to . . . I watched the proceedings and I noticed the Deputy Speaker say, on his feet, that he was not in bad shape in his constituency. And I would just ask you for a ruling on that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether or not you find your comments as to how you are doing politically in your seat, from that Chair, is appropriate or not. I think that's the point of order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I've listened to the points of order, and I would thank both sides of the House for their concern about the position of the Chair, and that it be unimpeachable, and that it be protected. And I thank them for their concern. In the future I believe all parties should be very careful in the remarks they make in their speeches.

The motion before the House . . .

Mr. Young: — Mr. Speaker, an entirely different point of order that was brought up earlier. The amendment as read into the record by the member from Assiniboia, in my . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I must interrupt the member as the motion must be put, and after the motion is put he will have an opportunity to raise his point of order. But the motion is as follows:

Moved by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and seconded by the member for Pelly:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

regrets that the provincial government has placed a higher priority on international junkets by cabinet ministers than on addressing the major economic problems facing Saskatchewan people today, including unfair taxes, jobs, and the financial crisis facing farm families and small business.

Mr. Young: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my point of order is that the amendment as put forward by the member from Gravelbourg has absolutely nothing to do with the motion that's now under rule 16. It has nothing to do with the pith and substance of Expo. It's to do with other matters whatsoever. And if, Mr. Speaker, this were to be allowed, it would allow people to put things on to rule 16, on to motions before the House, without complying with the rules that are required, the notifications and the printing of rules.

So to allow this amendment, Mr. Speaker, that has absolutely nothing to do, and no relevance whatsoever to do with the motion before the House, i.e. Expo, would allow people to circumvent the rules and put things under rule 16 . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Would the House please calm down. I'm having difficulty hearing the member raising a point of order.

An Hon. Member: — With the member for Moosomin yelling in your ear, it's no wonder.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — There are more members than that who are causing an uproar in this House. So let's just have some quiet, please.

Mr. Young: — The point I was trying to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the amendment is out of order. And I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is out of order for the

following reason: it has absolutely nothing to do with any bit of the pith and substance of rule 16, as printed in the blues, which deals with Expo. The amendment has to do with other things totally unrelated to what we have printed in rule 16.

And if the Chair were to allow this amendment to pass, in my suggestion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would be allowing people to put things onto the blues without going through the hoops that one has to go to to get things onto the blues. And in that it has nothing to do with the printed rule 16, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is entirely out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I have listened to the member's point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have here the amendment that was moved to the main motion. And I just say to you that it's not dissimilar from amendments that have been moved by the Conservative MLAs in the past. It's been a tradition to be able to move this type of an amendment. And I want to quote from it:

That all the words after "Assembly" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

regrets that the provincial government has placed a high priority on international junkets of cabinet ministers.

I don't know what could be more relevant to the debate. Cabinet ministers spending over a million dollars last year to Air Canada, I'll tell you, is an issue. It's more of an issue than whether or not we're going to Expo.

And I want to go to Expo; my kids want to go to Expo. But for gosh sakes, I don't know whether we should spend the time of the Assembly discussing what our holidays this summer are. And the amendment that was moved talks about addressing the major economic problems of Saskatchewan, including unfair taxes. And we've had the used vehicle tax that was imposed by this government, the flat tax, and the removal of the property improvement grant.

Now I'll tell you, if you ask the farmers in my constituency which is more relevant, the amendment or whether or not I'm going to Expo — and I'd like to go; I don't know whether I'll be able to afford to or not — but I don't know how it is important to the economic development of this province whether or not I'm going to Expo, which is what the members over there are cheer-leading about.

The member who was from Regina North and is now from Regina South gets up and cheers about how he's going to Expo. Well good for that individual, good for him. He will have lots of time after the June election to go to Expo. But I don't how we're wasting the time of this Assembly to decide his travel plans for the summer. That's why the amendment that was moved by my colleague that talks about political junkets, a million dollars to Air Canada last year, is perfectly in order.

And you raised the point of order; now you don't want to talk about it. Well I say to you, as you yell from your seat,

that we will not be stopped from moving amendments. And what is happening here is that we have a massive majority government attempting to stop the opposition from moving amendments to motions, a motion that says and talks about going to Expo. And we're not against Expo. Everybody wants to go to Expo. But how do you explain using the taxpayers' money — and it's been increased a number of times — to pay this Assembly to discuss our travel plans . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Souris-Cannington is yelling at the Deputy Speaker, how long are you going to let them talk? Well they can't muzzle the opposition. They've tried to over and over again, and we're going to be debating this amendment because I think it's perfectly within order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I've listened to the point of order raised by the member for Saskatoon Eastview, and I must inform the House that I find that, according to the traditions of this Assembly, the amendment to the motion is in order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. Will you please allow the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster to begin his remarks.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It appears to me that the NDP are all of a sudden against Expo '86, as they've been against everything else and flip-flopping all over this province. I would like to say and suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the paint is still peeling off the walls in this Assembly from the member from Assiniboia and his colleagues, the members from Shaunavon and the Quill Lakes.

I'd like to say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Saskatchewan today is one of the most talked about provinces in Canada and, indeed, throughout the world.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — I want to say that, and I want to follow it up through the fact that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the first time in the history of Saskatchewan we've partaken in a world's exposition — for the first time in Saskatchewan history. And I would like to indicate to you that people from all over Saskatchewan are totally excited, because as they travel to Expo . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. I'm having difficulty listening to the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, and I'm sure other members must be too. I ask once again for order in the House.

Mr. Hopfner: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm glad that you could finally quiet down the members of the NDP.

I would like to say that the people in my riding, and indeed throughout Saskatchewan, are totally excited about being able . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well there they go again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they're cutting into my speaking time here. I've sat here quietly. I've listened to the members of the opposition speak, and

now they won't let me speak in this Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, are you going to allot me some extra time, or are you going to quiet down the other side of the House? Thank you.

Anyway, getting back to it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say that throughout Saskatchewan the people, as they go to British Columbia, as they travel to British Columbia and they get to visit the Expo site, they are going to be proud to be able to identify themselves with the fact that Saskatchewan has participated in one of the largest shows that ever occur in the world, one of the . . .

(1600)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. I would ask the member from Regina North West to please keep quiet.

Mr. Hopfner: — You talk about children. I would like to say that there's some of these people in the Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . Never mind. I won't get into it.

Anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's to a point where I think that as these people travel through the exposition in Vancouver, that they are going to be thrilled to be able to identify that we are from Saskatchewan, we were from Saskatchewan, and we are participating on the world scene. I think that is one of the most lucrative measures that any province could ever take, is to participate in such a large screen.

I'd like to say that the members opposite . . . The member from Assiniboia said that we've misplaced the priorities of this province. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it comes to the priorities, I would genuinely think that from the cost reductions to farm inputs that we've been able to — and it's going to tie into Expo — that we've been able to pass on to our farmer friends, they are going to be able to take time off to travel to Expo and to take part in seeing what we are trying to do as a government and as private corporations, trying to sell Saskatchewan so that the world will know from one commodity to the other, and which ties in the abundance of agriculture, that it will indeed benefit all of the people of Saskatchewan. I would like to say that when the member from Assiniboia indicated that people in Saskatchewan are not interested in Expo '86, I would tend to think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he ought to go home and talk to the people of his riding, and he ought to travel around Saskatchewan, and he ought to talk to the people of . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg is quite aware that terms such as "lying" are unparliamentary and not to be used, even if they are not on their feet at the time. And I caution the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that the next time he will be on his feet apologizing to the House if he persists.

Please rise now and apologize.

Mr. Engel: — You said next time. But I was trying to draw to the member's attention that I didn't say that. The record will prove. But I said he was lying so as to get your attention. Because I was hollering across the floor that I

didn't say the people of Saskatchewan don't want to go to Expo. I never said that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I find the member's explanation incredible, and that he would state to the House that he would call somebody a liar in order to get the Chair's attention — I completely refute that type of action, and I ask the member not ever to carry on those kind of remarks again in this House.

Mr. Hopfner: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, accusations such as the member had made towards me . . . I probably would remind the people that they can read back into the . . . because as he was speaking I was writing, and I have it word for word what he said, so they can read the *Hansard*.

I would like to say that people of Saskatchewan, as I talk to the school children in my riding, they're ecstatic. They're telling me, you know, mom and dad and I, we're all heading to Expo this summer. Well you know, that to me, when I can look back into the '60s when Expo was in Montreal, that's when we were children, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And by gosh, some of us could not get to Expo, and I was one of them.

I'm excited now. I'm excited now about going to the Expo in Vancouver. And I hope that as many, many children, and as many parents can take their children, and as many other individuals in the province can take advantage of seeing this great exposition. It not only creates an interest, but they can bring back the information to the ones that were not able to get away.

I would like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Expo is going to create a great economic spin-off for Saskatchewan, not only for what's happening in Vancouver itself. But I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that from the east coast to the NDP Manitoba, I want to say that through the initiatives of this government, by eliminating the tax on clothing, the gasoline tax and everything else, people are going to take their time to travel through our province, are going to take the time to stop and buy clothing. You know, I can remember, as people were travelling back and forth, the only stop anybody would really make mention was that they would stop in Alberta to buy clothes, etc., because they didn't have to pay the E&H tax in the provinces.

But this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has taken that initiative for all these Expo people, these Expo travellers, to be able to travel through this province to enjoy the less tax, the less tax . . . Oh, what's the word I'm looking for? It's just a phenomenal feeling that they have, that they're just going to feel great about it.

I know that in NDP Manitoba right now, as they're travelling through, the businesses are advertising in their local papers and they're saying, Expo travellers, as you're travelling through, stop and shop at our stores. You know, they're excited. They want to sell more goods. And they're advertising even the tax-free, the 5 per cent tax-free on clothing.

This is the excitement this kind of thing is creating. I'd like to say that the NDP have never participated in an expo before. They'd never have thought of it. You see, Mr.

Deputy Speaker, that's excitement. That breeds excitement, you know. And when the member from Assiniboia said that we did nothing for farmers, and we did nothing for small business — well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, eliminating the gasoline tax, eliminating the tax on clothing, that means that people can travel to Expo. That puts extra dollars in their pockets. You see?

So when it comes to the fact of the economic spin-offs to this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it does mean that the people from the East Coast through Manitoba, as they travel through this province and they're going and when they end up in Vancouver, they're going to be able to tell the people in Vancouver just exactly what Saskatchewan is all about. They're going to be able to tell the people that Saskatchewan is one of the prime provinces to travel through in Canada.

I would like to say that the NDP are ashamed, and that's why they yell so much across the floor. They're ashamed that they . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. I must interrupt the member; his time is up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the members opposite talking about Expo, help using the time of this House to debate something that could very easily be debated outside of the House. They can use the press releases that they use every other time to try and promote their pavilion at Expo. We should be using the time of this House to deal with some legislation and some economic programs for the province of Saskatchewan. But no, we deal with Expo.

They have spent throughout the country hundreds of thousands of dollars to promote Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. The member from Pelly is attempting to make some remarks to the Assembly and is finding it very difficult with the decibel level, particularly to my left.

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, they have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars. They have in place international marketing consultants that are there to promote Saskatchewan and the products that we have here. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government is doing. And they have people in place to do that.

But today they use up the time of this House, saying that somehow Expo is going to do all the things that are necessary for this province, somehow it is going to improve our economic situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that many people believe that. I don't think that very many people really believe that.

I listened to some of the members, and the member from Yorkton talked about all the things that this province has done and how they have to promote that at Expo. And he talked about potash and how when you go up in the elevator they'll be showing you something about potash in there. And he talked about fibre optics, and he says that we are number one in the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are number one in the world. We were, under the New Democrats, because we didn't need Expo to promote fibre optics or potash. People were well aware of what Saskatchewan was capable of, and what we had in this province. They were well aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and we didn't need Expo to do our promotion for us.

But they have chose to use Expo to promote some of the things that have been in place here for years. That's what they're using Expo for now. Instead of going out and selling some of the products that we have and use some of the consultants that they have out there and make sure that we improve the benefits for Saskatchewan people, they don't use those consultants. They don't use the different avenues that are available to them, but they use Expo. They have spent millions of dollars to put up a pavilion at Expo to try and promote Saskatchewan, and promote mainly things that have been in place before this government came to office.

Mr. Speaker, some of the members have criticized Manitoba for not being part of Expo or not having a pavilion there. Well, I suppose Manitoba made a conscious decision. They made a decision saying that what we need is some economic benefits in our province, and we can't necessarily improve that by going to Expo and spending millions of dollars at Expo to build a pavilion.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are others that agree with Manitoba, because when you look at what the Royal Bank says about Manitoba, I think you will find that Manitoba has made the right decision, given the economic situation that they're in, mainly because of the Tory government that was there previous to them. And, Mr. Speaker, the Royal Bank says that Manitoba is expected to lead the nation in economic growth during the 10-year period, followed by Ontario and Quebec. Manitoba is going to lead in the 10-year period.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, they have decided that their priority is going to be to improve the economic situation in Manitoba. And that's the area that they have been working on, and that's what they have done. They have made that decision, and I agree with them, Mr. Speaker.

We today in this province are \$2 billion in debt in the Consolidated Fund. Our total debt, what the Crown corporations which this government has built up, is almost \$9 billion. Prior to '82, our total debt in this province was only 3.3 billion, and now it is almost \$9 billion. And they are saying the most important thing to deal with in this House today is Expo — Expo. That's what this House has to do today. That is the most important thing that we could be doing in this House today.

(1615)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many people in Saskatchewan disagree. They talk about us saying that people don't want to go to Expo. Well, Mr. Speaker, I

disagree with them, because I think there are people that want to go to Expo. And I don't say that they shouldn't. If they can afford to, I say they should go to it.

But, Mr. Speaker, how many people in this province will not be able to afford to go to Expo? How many people, because of the government that's been in this province for the last four years, are going to have to say, we can't go to Expo? We won't be able to go to Expo, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleague was trying to give me more information on just how serious a problem we do have in this province. And I think it is a serious problem because there are many farmers that won't be able to go to Expo. They have had to borrow money and they are on the verge of going bankrupt, and they aren't going to be able to go to Expo. There are thousands and thousands of people in this province that are unemployed because of the poor work-make projects of this government, that they will certainly not be able to go to Expo. All the people that are on welfare — doubled in this province since '82 — they will not be able to go to Expo.

So there are many people in this province, Mr. Speaker, that certainly will not be able to take advantage of Expo. And those people are probably wishing that those millions of dollars that this government spent on the pavilion at Expo would be better spent to try and improve the situation right here at home in our own province.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government should be doing. But no, they say that somehow Expo and the pavilion there is a lot more important.

Some of the members would be well advised to look at what really is happening in this province, and what the situation really is, what is happening to small business. Many of the small-business people are finding it difficult, and they are finding it very difficult especially in the last four years. They are at a point today where if the economy of this province doesn't improve then they are going to have to be forced into bankruptcy. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a sorry day in this province when we allow a lot of our small businesses to where they get to that situation.

That is happening with small business; it's happening with farmers. It is happening with people that are unemployed where they have difficulties feeding their families. And yet, what do we find as the very important issue in this House today? Not how we can improve the economy of this province; not how we can keep the tourists here spending money; not how we get the people employed that are unemployed. We should be putting these people to work.

If we put those people to work, that would bring back to this province a lot more money than Expo or any pavilion at Expo ever will. But no, they won't address those problems and they won't address the issues that are serious at this point.

And they won't address the solutions that are very obvious, Mr. Speaker. They are very obvious because we have given some of the solutions to them. We have told them what should be done. We told them that we need

work for our young people. We have to create jobs for them so that when they get out of university they have somewhere to go; that they don't have to go into the welfare lines in order to survive or go back to their parents and beg for them to look after them.

These are educated people that should have the opportunity to get ahead, to find a job and advance themselves in this society. But no, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the food banks and the soup kitchens are what this province would like to see, and what this government would like to see in Saskatchewan. And that's been happening over the last four years. And I think that's something that we should not accept at all in this province.

Mr. Speaker: — It's my duty to inform the member that his time has elapsed.

Mr. Young: — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I enter this debate. One a personal note, I'll be fortunate enough to be able to attend Expo this summer.

But I think we must draw our minds to what this motion is. It annoys me, Mr. Speaker, how the NDP can pervert a motion so terribly as this one. The motion before the Assembly is commending the Government of Saskatchewan on its foresight and initiative in ensuring that Saskatchewan will have a major role in Expo. The NDP try to pervert that into an issue as to who's going to Expo or not.

Well certainly there will be people, as the member from Pelly points out, who won't financially be able to afford to go to Expo. And I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1967 there were people who were unable to afford to go to the exposition in Montreal, but that certainly has nothing to do as to the righteousness of having the exposition. And to try to make the issue as to what people are going to be doing in their summer vacations is certainly not the issue, and is certainly not the motion that's printed on the blues, Mr. Speaker.

I think that Expo is going to be a wonderful event and I think that our government must be commended, as the motion reads, in being a major participant in Expo. There have been circumstances, Mr. Speaker, beyond our control, that are going to make Expo, in my submission, a bigger event than what was anticipated even a matter of six months ago.

We have the terrorism situation and instability in Europe which is going to result in many more Americans coming to Vancouver for exposition then would have likely been there had the situation in Europe and the Mideast not blown up as it has. We have just last night, Mr. Speaker, two inches of rain throughout most of southern Saskatchewan — it tapered off as you go north — and that, Mr. Speaker, is going to result, in my submission, in more people from this province going to Expo. And in the end, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be a bigger event then what was anticipated.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, on my tractor with some pride on May 2nd, when CBC broadcast live the opening

ceremonies of Expo. And I noted, Mr. Speaker, the comments of the broadcasters as to the warm reception that the Prince of Wales and the Princess of Wales received when they opened the exposition. And I noted, Mr. Speaker, with some disgust here in the House, and it really bothers me — I know the background from which I come from, and a lot of my constituents have considerable respect for the monarchy — and when the member for Regina North East made mention in his remarks, when he spoke earlier than me that the fair had been opened by His Highness, the Prince of Wales, and the Princess of Wales, the members from the NDP . . .

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

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The member referred to the member from Regina North East as having said something in the debate. I have not yet spoken in this debate. I intend to if they give us the opportunity, but I have not yet had an opportunity to do that. So I think he should withdraw what he said.

Mr. Young: — If I may speak to that point of order. It's conceded I meant Mr. Klein, the member from Regina North. He was the one that spoke, and if I misnamed the seat, is was a Progressive Conservative member of the House, the member from Regina North, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I would ask the House to come to order. There's just so much conversation that it's impossible to hear.

Mr. Young: — As I was point out, Mr. Speaker, he . . .

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

Mr. Speaker: — State your point of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I was listening with interest to the debate and the member from Saskatoon was referring to the member for Regina North East, talking about an attack on the monarchy.

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Young: — Mr. Speaker, to get this little issue straight here, the member from Regina North, the former minister of Tourism and Small Business, mentioned in his remarks on this motion that the fair had been opened by His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, and the Princess of Wales, to which, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, particularly the member from Athabasca and the member from Pelly . . . Cumberland, mentioned "big deal." They said, "big deal." That's what they said from their seats, Mr. Speaker, and that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think that both sides are being a little touchy on the issue and I would ask you to get on with the debate.

Mr. Young: — In any event, Mr. Speaker, I for one am proud that the royal couple took it upon themselves to open up Expo and if that is not the position of the members opposite, so be it. I'll get on to another topic.

But I think that that is something that bothers me. And it deals with Expo, and their position on Expo and on the monarchy is something that I just can't imagine.

The question is, Mr. Speaker, if there had been an NDP government in this province, would we be participating at all, or in any event to the extent to which we are in Expo in Vancouver? And I think that it's very clear that we wouldn't be. We can get that from how the NDP government in Manitoba is participating in Expo and the reaction of the NDP members of this legislature, what they think about Expo. They don't even want to talk about it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we can be very, very proud of our participation in that event, and it is something that is certainly going to benefit Saskatchewan.

Tourism is our second largest industry in this province, and if we can in any way make Saskatchewan a tourist destination by our activities at our Expo pavilion, then the benefits that we will be reaping over the long term from our participation in Expo will well pay the cost of our pavilion at that exposition fair.

Certainly I think for many years to come, Mr. Speaker, that American tourists — and we must remember that they have 10 times the population we do — are going to be looking more and more to Canada as a tourist destination because of the instability and the terrorism that's taking place in other areas of the world.

I think for a long time to come, Mr. Speaker, that that giant pool of tourists re going to be looking towards Canada. And if we can take this opportunity in Vancouver to point out the benefits of a summer vacation in Saskatchewan, those people coming up here will provide us with so much more benefit than we're going to receive from our costs of our pavilion in Vancouver that we will long reap the benefits of that investment. And again, the foresight of our government in participating in such a large way in Expo must certainly be commended, Mr. Speaker.

I must say as well, Mr. Speaker, that I'm very proud to be a citizen of a country like Canada and a province like Saskatchewan, of the peaceful nature where we can hold such an event and not run the risks that I think would be inherent in having such an event in many, many other countries of the world. We're one of the few countries left, Mr. Speaker, that can hold an event such as this with moderate security precautions that I'm sure will be required.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the organizer of Expo, the chairman, Jim Pattison, is a former Saskatchewan resident. He's from Luseland, Saskatchewan, and for all the people from the Luseland area, I must congratulate you all for providing Canada with that individual, and him and his efforts in putting on Expo under budget are certainly something that also must be commended, Mr. Speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the flip-flop that we see the NDP . . . Expo, I predict, is going to be a smashing success and undoubtedly the NDP will then come onside and say, well, we were for it all the time. But if we look, Mr. Speaker, we see that the NDP Skelly, and the mayor of

Vancouver, who is a former NDP member, what their position on Expo was and it was very negative. They fought it tooth and nail all the way. Even to this very late date, Mr. Speaker, the NDP in British Columbia are boycotting and downplaying and bad mouthing the exposition. These birds here are singing the same song to this date.

When, Mr. Speaker, are they going to see the light, that it's going to be a smashing success and come onside and support this very worthwhile exposition and a very worthwhile showcase for Saskatchewan and all of the resources and talents that we have available here. I think it's sad, Mr. Speaker, to see how they can be so slow to come onto side on such a marvellous thing as what will be taking place this summer in Expo.

(1630)

Expo, as many of us know, Mr. Speaker, have broke records in the number of participants. Certainly we don't have Manitoba; we don't have Poland; we don't have Russia. We don't have a lot of backward-thinking countries participating, but all in all, Mr. Speaker, there are 54 international participants in Expo which is going to make it one of the largest fairs available.

I went Mr. Speaker . . . I had the fortune two summers ago to — on my own nickel, I might add — go to the world's fair in New Orleans, Louisiana. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, the American states that participated in the world's fair in New Orleans did well by it. I remember the pavilions of Mississippi, and I remember the pavilions of Texas. There were certain states who didn't participate, Mr. Speaker, and I think that those states were the losers, as I think, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan would be a loser if we had an NDP government and we weren't participating in this particular exhibition.

I think, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba in the long run is going to be a loser by not participating in Expo '86, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, the American tourists are having fewer and fewer places that they can go for their summer vacation. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when we get right down to it, the circumstances that I say are beyond our control, that are going to bring about a high attendance at Expo, particularly the rainfall that we've had in the last couple of days . . . I know, Mr. Speaker, your own town of Rosetown didn't do very well, but others did.

What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, at Expo is to promote Saskatchewan as second to none in resources, products, capabilities, and people. We have to invite, through the auspices of Expo, people to come to Saskatchewan as a final tourist destination. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that having been at Vancouver and British Columbia for Expo, looking at our pavilions, it's unlikely that in 1987 they'll go back to the same province again. And certainly, trying to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. It's my duty to inform the member that his time has elapsed.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me today to get involved in this debate on a motion put forward by the Conservative government

and an amendment offered by my colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

I want to must make a short statement to you, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the House, about the statement that the member from Saskatoon Eastview just made about my colleague from Cumberland and myself, insinuating that we said from our seats derogatory words directed at the monarchy. I don't know for sure, Mr. Speaker, whether that statement is worthy of comment, but I do say that it's derogatory and it's a slanderous statement, and I just leave it up to him whether he wants to apologize or not.

We're here today debating Expo '86, and I want to say that I'm very proud to be a part of Canada and taking part in Expo '86. And when I hear statements coming across the floor that we have a province, Manitoba, that has not taken part, Mr. Speaker, in Expo '86, I want to say that it's not just Manitoba that does not have a pavilion there. There are other provinces in Canada that do not have pavilions.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, it's too bad in the name of unity — and we all talk about Canadian unity; we talk about regionalism — and I just say that it would be a lot better as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure my constituents would agree with me, that we have one pavilion, a Canadian pavilion. We don't have to have every province out there trying to outdo each other. Each province and the two territories can be a part of the Canadian pavilion. And I just wish that that would have taken place and that we could have had a Canadian pavilion with the 10 provinces involved, and the two territories, and we could show the type of unity that we have in this province. Not disunity; we want unity. And that's what Expo is all about . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — . . . is to bring all the world countries together in one large pavilion and to try and show the world that we are all the same and that we can work together.

But what does Canada do? And that's why we have this major argument in here today. We hear all the disruption that we've had today over the pavilion that's been set up by Saskatchewan in Expo. Well let me tell you, if we would have had one pavilion, and if all the 10 provinces and the two territories would have been involved with Canada . . . We see all the massive advertising that's going across this nation, and it's done by the Canadian government. And it could all be done by one, in the name of unity. But let me tell you, when I see the type of disunity that I have seen in this House today, the type of arguments that have gone back and forth, the type of accusations that have been brought into the House — especially the last one by the member from Saskatoon Eastview against my colleague from Cumberland and myself from our seats — I think that that takes away disunity. That destroys what Canada is really all about.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in the short time that I have left, that I have a number of my constituents, and I know my colleague from Cumberland has, up in northern Saskatchewan — senior citizens, students, and the like,

who have been saving their money, who have been working on projects just so they can go down to Expo '86 in Vancouver, so that they can take that trip. And they've worked hard and their parents have worked hard to pay for these tickets. And they're proud of that.

But I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that all of my constituents and all of my colleagues from Cumberland and all the citizens of Saskatchewan would have an opportunity, not only to see the displays in Vancouver that's put up by Canada and the provinces, but the displays that are there from all over the world.

I know they will remain, and they will have an opportunity, hopefully in years to come. But I think that that's important that the citizens of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to go to Expo '86 and to have a look at just what's there, what all the world expositions look like and how they're operated and to see the different types of individuals who are going to be looking after the displays and the talent that comes from all countries.

And I know that Saskatchewan is going to be involved, and I know that the citizens of Manitoba are going to be going to Expo, Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether they have a pavilion there or not. They're going to be going. They're taking part. They're part of Canada. So to stand up in the House and suggest that just because Manitoba didn't spend their money to set up a separate pavilion, to suggest that they won't be taking part in Expo, I think is wrong. Because I know that they will be, and I know citizens from Manitoba who are planning to go out there. So I think that's wrong.

But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have many constituents in my constituency that would love to be able to go out to Expo '86 if they only had the opportunity to go, if they only had an opportunity to go. And there is so many of them in northern Saskatchewan in my constituency that do not have a job and do not have the type of money that it takes to go out to Expo.

I know a lot of them are working on it, and there's going to be many trips taken this year by constituents of mine. But there are many of them that will not be able to go because of the regional disparity that we have in our country. And I think that that just goes to show you the type of, not only regional disparity that we have in Canada, but right here in our own province.

I know it's going to be a lot easier for the citizens who are living down in Regina to be able to go to Expo than it is for the citizens, the senior citizens and the students who are living up North, close to the Northwest Territories in Stony Rapids and Black Lake and Fond-du-Lac and places like that. It's going to be tough, Mr. Speaker, for those citizens up there to be able to take part in Expo '86. And I know that they all want to. Thanks to the television media they will have an opportunity to see what's going on down there. But that's as close as a large percentage of them are ever going to get to it because of the fact that they just haven't got the type of funding, and they live in a geographical region of our province that costs so much money to be able to get out to Expo '86 and to Vancouver.

I was sad to see this House, today, when we were

debating such an important issue, Mr. Speaker, get into such turmoil and such arguments and political slander thrown across the floor. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that here we are, we have a motion that it says that Expo '86 is there, you want to congratulate Saskatchewan for taking part in it.

We feel with our amendment that more priority should be put on providing jobs for the citizens of Saskatchewan. We feel that there should be more priority to solving the crisis that many families and small-business men and farmers and Northerners alike are having today. That's why we put this amendment in.

And I think that that's our job as an opposition, to make that very clear, that that was our role here today, Mr. Speaker. It most certainly wasn't here to get into the role of slandering one another and all the shots that were being thrown across the floor.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for having the opportunity to take part in this debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my colleagues as well; it's nice to be appreciated once in a while.

An Hon. Member: — You're always appreciated.

Hon. Mr. Schmidt: — I'm not always appreciated, contrary to what they're saying.

Mr. Speaker, Expo is an important event. I'm very pleased that Saskatchewan is there. I'm also very pleased that when I take my children there this summer that I'll be able to say to them, there is the Saskatchewan pavilion, and they will recognize it although they're only seven and four years old. They will recognize it right off the spot because it looks like a grain elevator, and they know a grain elevator. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that what we are doing at Expo from Saskatchewan's point of view is something that we can be proud of.

And if I have any disappointment at all, it's that I'm afraid that the pavilion isn't going to be big enough, and that we underestimated the popularity of our pavilion. I understand that the tower will elevate 250 people per hour, and I predict that there will be line-ups through the entire summer because it will be one of the most popular pavilions in the Expo site.

Now when we planned for Saskatchewan, we planned for the best, but we didn't realize at all that our pavilion would be so popular and so well thought of. I forecast that the line-ups will be phenomenal, and I hope to get through that line-up and see it, as thousands of other people will.

Now with respect to why we should be so proud: it's because it is a joint effort of all of Saskatchewan. The taxpayers have paid \$6.5 million, and initially I wondered if it was worth it, and now, as I indicated, I think we should have spent double that because we're going to get double our money out of it. And in addition,

it's a world showcase. Not only is it something to be proud of, but that \$6.5 million will come back to Saskatchewan tenfold. Not only that, my colleagues opposite who don't like business, big or small, who don't like trade . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. It's my duty to inform the members that the time allotted has elapsed.

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 8 — Promotion of Positive Image of Saskatchewan

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I plan at the conclusion of my remarks to move a motion respecting Economic Development and Trade and Tourism and Small Business promoting Saskatchewan, and it's going to be seconded by the member from The Battlefords.

In dealing with a number of aspects as it relates to these two departments in dealing with the economic development in the province of Saskatchewan, I want to take and just briefly put into perspective a couple of things that deal with this kind of a motion.

First of all, I believe that what we have done in this province that relates to small business and economic development: we have offered in a sense a degree of protection for the small-business operators.

The second thing that I want to discuss is how we have improved the opportunity, through the various departments of government, for business in Saskatchewan to develop a greater accountability by the people of government in relation to the people of Saskatchewan.

(1645)

And how does this come about, Mr. Speaker? This comes about because of a very concise, precise demonstration of leadership. And I believe in this government today we have a Premier that leads this province as a very energetic, dynamic type of person, and I believe that that is a part of the essence of who Saskatchewan is and what they are.

I want to outline some of the things that we have done and are doing in relation to the economic development of the province, dealing with the small-business aspect and how it relates to various other areas. I want to just dwell on these briefly.

There is probably in Saskatchewan in the rural community one of the most economic diversified types of items taking place each year as we have been a government in this province, and that's the aspect of natural gas distribution. We have, as the Deputy Premier announced today, just had an extension into the underground cable for electrical services, for single-line service, and I think that that's an exceptional kind of a program.

Another area that we have taken a serious look at — a Crown corporation to do things in Saskatchewan — is

SaskTel providing an underground buried cable in the province. What has this done for economic activity in the province, Mr. Speaker? It's clear to the people of Weyburn, it's clear to the people in Moose Jaw, that it has a direct economic benefit to them. Besides, Mr. Speaker, it has a direct economic benefit to the people in my constituency who work at supplying lines and installation services in relation to the development as it goes along.

We have other aspects that I believe are important in economic development, and that's how we interrelate government with building hospitals, nursing homes, dealing with those kinds of items. I believe we are taking a leadership role in those through the Minister of Health and through the Premier of this province. I believe that that's the kind of thing that people want to see, where those kinds of activities exist.

How do you go about dealing with these, Mr. Speaker? You deal with these from the aspect of reducing the complicated ways that you have to deal with government, in reducing regulations. How does business go about dealing with government? You reduce the regulations that have been stumbling blocks to them in the past. And I think that that's a very important feature.

If you go to the small business, I believe that one of the key things that we have introduced — we did this last year — we introduced the nine and five-eighths interest program. This budget that we announced just early this month, or the past month, is that the small business will get an 8 per cent loan up to \$100,000, or rebated interest down to 8 per cent up to \$100,000. And I believe that that is the kind of thing that we need to have far more of in this province, giving an opportunity for small business to take advantage of that. And in my constituency, where many, many small businesses exist, that's the kind of thing that I think is extremely important. On Saturday I opened a new business in the town of Cabri, and I know that this is a part of what they would like to have and are continuing to look to. They have had an extremely important contribution to make, these small businesses in our communities, and I believe that that's important.

How do we deal with things on a larger scale? I believe that things like the Regina upgrade are an important feature. The inclusion of an anhydrous ammonia plant in conjunction with that, I believe, has the support of the rural community in this province, it has the support of the Sask Wheat Pool, the Federated Co-op — unique in its entry into the fertilizer business.

The other things that I'm going to mention are the Rafferty dam, the power project down there. I believe that that is an important feature. It's co-ordinating the kind of international relationship that we have with people outside of our province, and dealing with the kinds of support we can be to them and they can be to us. I believe that it is very important.

I want to also mention that economic development is an interprovincial kind of a relationship. It deals with things like promoting processing in the province, in the Battlefords, and I'm sure the member from Battlefords will mention the Gainers plant in North Battleford.

We introduced things that relate to economic development in our housing program, and I know that the people are taking a very serious look at that.

Programs that we are dealing with in agriculture that relate to economic development in the pre-processing stage — livestock investment tax credits, the tax credit as it relates to fat cattle and hogs and sheep — those are very important in relation to the economic development that we have in this province. And you will note, Mr. Speaker, that these have increased, in view of the fact that the declining numbers in the province have occurred.

I want to take one more item in the business side that I think is important, is the venture capital corporation aspect in its dealing with the kinds of tax credits you can get in establishing businesses in this province. It takes the kinds of initiatives that people have in this province, the dimension of capability that they have, and I believe that those are extremely important.

We had, or I had an occasion just the other day to deal with a business in the town of Herbert. And I went there and I said: these are the programs that you can use. You can use the venture capital corporation; does it suit you? Can you use the employment development kinds of things that you have there? Then you can have the entrepreneurial type program where young people can become involved.

You have the opportunities for access for people who are unemployed, for people who are on welfare. These are opportunities that are made available to businesses and to business people. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things that we want to tell the world. And as we had the discussion earlier about Expo, those are the kinds of things that we can tell the world.

I believe that in the past couple of years we have done a number of things that relate to the kinds of things that we need to tell other people about, the kinds of things that we are, what we can provide for them, and where they would like to go.

For example, the Department of Tourism and Small Business have initiated an ambassador kind of a program where they provide a kit to those people who are leaving this province. If you're planning on going to Expo, take one of these kits along and spread the good news that Saskatchewan is a good place to come to. That's the kind of thing that we need to do. That's the kind of enterprising thing the people of Saskatchewan are prepared to put together.

Come back to Saskatchewan: develop this province. Come back to Saskatchewan and be a leader and a developer in whatever you are good at. That's the kind of thing that promoting Saskatchewan gives. That's promoting the industry, that's promoting the development, and all of the good things that we can provide for the people of Saskatchewan.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of please to move the motion.

I move, Mr. Speaker:

That this Assembly commends the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade, and the Government of Saskatchewan for initiatives taken in promoting Saskatchewan throughout North America and the world.

Hon. Mr. Morin: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate having the opportunity to rise in the House today and second the motion of my friend and colleague, the member from Morse. Hopefully the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg will be quiet long enough for me to make my few brief comments that I want to make here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in particular this motion fits in with the things that we were discussing earlier in the House today, Mr. Speaker, and that was with the Expo '86 and Saskatchewan's participation in there. In terms of promotion, Mr. Speaker, it really has two aspects as far as a province like Saskatchewan is concerned.

One thing is we're looking to bring business in and create opportunity and jobs at home. And the other aspect, or the other dimension to the problem, or the promotion opportunities that we take and make, are to develop markets for our products outside — not only outside of our province, but also outside of the country. And certainly this government has taken great strides to do that, to create jobs at home and to bring opportunity back to the province of Saskatchewan.

Now what we've seen today, Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day, with discussions about Expo — and I want to bring this up because it's very relevant — part of the Saskatchewan pavilion at Expo is targeted directly at marketing the province of Saskatchewan. We have a promotion there, one promotion in particular, that targets opportunities in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the member from Quill Lakes likes to carp from his seat, but no doubt he'll have an opportunity to get into this debate. If his mother ever taught him any manners, he's long since forgot them, so hopefully he'll be quiet for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the Expo pavilion is to market, show off to the world, opportunities that present themselves in Saskatchewan, to give people an opportunity to come in here and help us develop and build the province and create jobs for the people of our province.

They pay a lot of lip service to that. But clearly, by the way they've ridiculed that project today, their pronouncements again today that they're against such projects as the Weyerhaeuser paper-mill in P.A., the Gainers bacon plant in North Battleford, on and on; Phillips Cable; the list goes on and on. They've ridiculed the upgrader in Regina and the fertilizer project.

And I want to talk at length on all of those projects, Mr. Speaker. I see we are running near 5 o'clock and I would therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

ADDENDUM

The House was to have sat at 7 p.m. Monday, May 5, 1986 to continue the day's proceedings. Due to a power failure just prior to 7 p.m. it was not possible to carry out the business of the House, so progress was reported and the House adjourned at 7:08 p.m. until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, May 6, 1986.