

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Sandberg: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and to all members of the Assembly, a group of 20 students from the Saskatoon Regional Community, which is located in Saskatoon Centre on 1st Avenue in beautiful down-town Saskatoon. Again it's my pleasure to have these groups of students come to visit the Assembly, and their teacher, Robin Stonehouse, is with them again. Robin has made many, many trips to the legislature, so it's good to see you again too, Robin.

And I might point out to members, Mr. Speaker, that on the floor with us today, also, is Cathy West who is a member of this group, and she's accompanied there, in the white, by Marla Kowalchuk. So a special welcome to you too, Cathy.

I'll be meeting with you shortly after 2:30, after question period, to discuss the goings on in the Legislative Assembly with you. I hope you've had a good trip to Regina. It's great weather, and I hope you have a safe journey home. So I'd like all members to welcome them here this afternoon.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parker: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the rest of the members of the Assembly, a group of grade 6 students who are visiting with us from Lindale Elementary School in Moose Jaw. Lindale school is located in the Moose Jaw North constituency, but I suspect a good majority of the students would come from farms surrounding the city of Moose Jaw, as Lindale is part of the Thunder Creek School district. I'd like to also welcome their teacher, Mr.s. Paton, and also their chaperon and bus driver, Mr.s. McNally.

I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Lindale school regularly brings students down each year to the legislature. And I'd like to commend the staff at the school for showing such an interest in the proceedings that go on in Regina in our parliamentary system.

The Lindale School, Mr. Speaker, is also making preparations for 1987, during which time they'll be celebrating their 25th anniversary. And I'd also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the staff and the school. I understand the enrolment at Lindale has more than doubled during the past 25 years while the school has been in operation.

I hope you've had a successful and enjoyable day down in Regina. I know you'll have an interesting time watching question period, and I hope each of you have a pleasant summer. Thank you. I'd like to ask all members to join me in welcoming them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to add my welcome to those from the member from Moose Jaw North. I had the privilege of being a student at Lindale School the year it opened in my grade 6 year when they began bussing in kids from the surrounding district.

Mr.s. Paton, who is accompanying the students today, taught my sister in grade 3 or 4. And every time I go back, there are many fond memories. And I'm just glad to see that the students of Lindale School are carrying on a tradition which I enjoyed there, of coming down to the legislature. And I wish you well on your trip home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a welcome to the Lindale School, and particularly to Mr.s. Paton. She was my teacher at Lake Valley, Saskatchewan . . .

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — . . . in grade 7 and grade 8. And it's a pleasure to see her here, and I extend a warm welcome.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Dispute with Saskatchewan Doctors

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health, and it deals with the unfortunate dispute between the minister and Saskatchewan doctors, the Saskatchewan Medical Association — a dispute which has, as the minister well knows, resulted in a withdrawal of health services in a number of communities.

Can the minister inform the Assembly whether he has finally decided to put the public safety ahead of his particular political strategies, and has he agreed to get back to the bargaining table with the doctors? Has he agreed to do that later today, and if so, when and where will the meeting be held?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think one would say there's a great dispute. There has been a bit of a breakdown in negotiations. The doctors have seen it adequate to withdraw services.

I phoned, as you know, Mr. Speaker — if you've been following the press and anyone else — repeatedly, day after day, I've been calling for the doctors to come back to the negotiating table. That hasn't transpired, so I took the initiative the other day to set up a meeting for this afternoon with the chairman, the president of the SMA, Dr. Craig Hubbard. He and I will be meeting. I'd just as soon, for various reasons, keep the location of the meeting not announced at this time. I think you would understand that from past practices, sir.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Supplementary to the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Premier shares the concern of all of us with respect to this breakdown in medical

services. My question is this: do you consider the health and safety of the Saskatchewan public a sufficiently high priority that you will involve yourself in the negotiations between your government and the Saskatchewan Medical Association, so that you can use the strength of your office to have both parties agree to a mutually acceptable settlement?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I have met with the doctors previous to this. The Minister of Health and I have talked with them, and I will be there as I feel is appropriate.

And I certainly will advise the hon. member that health care is extremely important to me and to this government in Saskatchewan. That's why we initiated the removal of direct billing in the province of Saskatchewan so anybody of any income could have full access to health care without discrimination associated with any sort of income. We initiated that because the previous administration didn't. And so we will stick to that, and it's very important. We've increased health care expenditures because it's very important, Mr. speaker.

So, yes, I will be there if need be, and we will continue to make it a priority. And we will certainly protect the public and make sure, one, there is not extra billing, and that there is as good a health care as you're going to find any place in Canada in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hearings re Canadian Softwood Products

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. As you may be aware, Mr. Minister, today in Washington the International Trade Commission began hearings on a petition from the U.S. softwood lumber industry for a 27 per cent duty against Canadian softwood lumber imports.

Since nearly \$20 million a year worth of softwood lumber products are sold from Saskatchewan into the American market, can the minister tell us whether the Government of Saskatchewan was represented at today's hearing? And is so, are you able to table the government's presentation in respect to its submission?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member was aware of the process that is taking place in Washington, the interventions by the various provinces and by the various interests in Canada will be coming and will come down at a later date.

I can advise the Assembly and the hon. member that I, along with my colleagues of other provinces involved with the production of softwood lumber, will be meeting in Vancouver on this Friday with Mr. Joe Clark to co-ordinate the strategies that Canadian provinces, the Canadian government, and the Canadian industry will be taking with their representation to that international body to advance the argument, as was done in 1982, as to why those particular tariffs should not be imposed.

The hon. member, to go back to his original question: it was the initial hearings today; the hearings where you will hear evidence from the offended parties, if you like,

will come at a later time during this summer and late into the fall. And I can assure the people of Saskatchewan and assure this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan will be there. Saskatchewan will be there as part of a Canadian contingent, and Saskatchewan will be there protecting the interests of the softwood lumber in this province.

Mr. Koskie: — Supplement, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering whether the minister can assure us that at the hearings which were initiated today, whether it was not possible for members to put in objections to proceeding with the same matter that had been already heard. In other words, whether the matter in fact had been reviewed and all the details had been submitted at a previous occasion, and therefore it was a duplication of process. Is it not possible that the Government of Saskatchewan, or indeed the Government of Canada, would not be available at such a presentation?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — If the hon. member has been following the story, both in the media and is aware of the process that is taking place, the Canadian ambassador intervened on behalf of this country in that process to try to convince that particular regulatory authority that they should not once again hear this particular case, as they had in 1982, and ruled in favour of Canada as that there was no unfair trade advantage being imposed by Canadians.

That process is starting again. Canada will respond and Saskatchewan will respond, and, I believe, in a way that will be beneficial to the softwood lumber industry in this province.

I think the hon. member rises and raises that particular question in this Assembly, and what he is really saying is not so much, will we stand up for the softwood lumber industry in this province, but that the NDP, along with their people in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, the NDP in Ottawa have suggested to the national government, have suggested to the population of this country, that we should at this time cut off all trade negotiations with the United States; that we should go it alone; that we should somehow try to live on the small domestic market that we have in this country.

I think that is wrong; I think that is wrong-headed; and I think the NDP should re-evaluate their whole position as how we approach trade, not only with the United States, but with the rest of the world.

Mr. Koskie: — New question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm that, in spite of earlier promises of help, the Mulroney PC government is now refusing to provide financial assistance to the Canadian softwood lumber industry in the preparation of its case. And can you tell the Saskatchewan taxpayers what specific role your government will play in Canada's attempt to beat back the countervailing duty petition?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well again to suggest somehow that the federal government is not playing a role with regard to softwood lumber industry is completely wrong and demonstrates that the hon. member knows nothing of the process. The Canadian government is standing full

force behind the Canadian softwood lumber industry and the provinces wherein that softwood lumber industry is located.

The federal government, along with the provinces involved, will be appearing before the International Trade Commission to lobby its particular case, to advance its particular case, and to advance why the American argument was wrong in 1982 and is wrong again in 1986. To suggest that the federal government is doing nothing, is wrong. To suggest the Government of Saskatchewan is not prepared to do something, is wrong.

We in this province are looking after that forest industry. We believe that the U.S. market is absolutely crucial to this particular industry, and we will look after it.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the comments by a senior trade adviser to the U.S. Senate finance committee, Mr. Len Santos, to the effect that even if the American lumber companies lose this countervailing duty case, he went on to say that President Reagan will move to restrict shipments of softwood lumber from Canada.

In fact, Mr. Santos has suggested that this was part of the deal that President Reagan agreed to in order to get the U.S. Senate finance committee approval of the free trade talks with Canada.

Are you aware of those comments, Mr. Minister, and do you find this kind of back room deals in keeping with the spirit of free trade negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have never found throughout the last four or five years that any bureaucrat properly spoke for the President of the United States, and I doubt that the bureaucrat is going to speak for the President of the United States today.

Funding for Spraying Against Grasshopper Infestation

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture, and it deals with statements made by the federal Minister of Agriculture yesterday where he indicated that in dealing with the most severe outbreak of grasshoppers in many, many years, that he was prepared to put money into the farmer's pocket for the cost of spray, but in fact none of the Premiers in the affected areas, Alberta or Saskatchewan, had made submissions to him that that kind of money be forthcoming.

Mr. Premier, I wonder, when that kind of a statement is made by the federal government, whether or not you have taken the opportunity in the last 24 hours to appeal to the federal government for cash and assistance in chemicals for spraying of the grasshoppers this year?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get the specific statement or quote before I comment on it. I would say that if the federal government is prepared to spend additional money in agriculture, any province in Canada will be prepared to look at it and to explore the possibilities. So I would like to know exactly what the federal minister said and, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would show me the specifics, I would be glad to

respond in some detail.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Supplement to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that this is a strange process where the federal minister has opened up the treasury for Saskatchewan farmers and the Premier wants to check the details of the suggestion. What I would like to ask you, Mr. Premier, is whether or not you have made a request to the federal government to give assistance in this disaster that's happening in the southern part of the province, including part of your own constituency. If you're not able to stand up for your own constituents, maybe we can give you a hand.

But the question is whether or not you have made a submission to the federal government for assistance in the severe outbreak of grasshoppers that farmers are facing this year.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we are in constant negotiations with the federal government. And if, if the federal minister has said that he would be prepared to co-operate with provinces . . . I was with the federal minister 10 days ago, Mr. Speaker. We had a whole conference together and we talked about grasshoppers; we talked about drought; we talked about disaster relief and everything else. If he said that he would look at co-operative programs with the provinces, it's as a result of us bringing it to his attention. So it isn't something that was brand-new. I mean, I met this Minister of Agriculture with him and my colleagues for two days in Ottawa 10 days ago, and we explored all these possibilities. So if he's saying that he's prepared to look at joint programs, it's as a result of the things that we've done already. So you know, as usual, you're just a little bit behind; I mean you're 10 days behind in terms of the negotiations that have been going on.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Final supplementary to the Premier. Will you join with the opposition in sending a telex to the federal government today, this afternoon, asking for a payment of chemicals to help fight grasshoppers this year? Will you join with us in a telex to the federal minister?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's fair to say that the opposition does not always acknowledge the several hundreds of millions and billions of dollars that we have put forward so far in co-operation with the federal government. So now they're asking me to join with them in asking for additional kinds of money when we have provided a list of programs and money that is the largest in Saskatchewan's history, and certainly in Canada's history for any particular province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it's necessary that I join with the member of Shaunavon to get any sort of response out of the federal government because the relationship and the success rate between the province of Saskatchewan and the federal government in agriculture has never, ever, in the history of this province been better.

Deficiency Payment for Western Farmers

Mr. Lingenfelter: — A new question to the Premier, and it's another area that affects farmers — and here again, I'm

wondering why you're not standing up stronger for the Saskatchewan farmers — and it deals with the request made by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Western Canada Wheat Growers and the New Democratic Party who are calling for \$2 billion in deficiency payment for farmers.

I wonder, Mr. Premier, why, on the one hand, we have on May 2 your caucus voting against deficiency payment, and then talking about \$1 billion in deficiency payment when you go to Manitoba. Why are you refusing to join with the farm groups in Saskatchewan and the New Democratic Party in calling for \$2 billion in deficiency payment for the farmers of Saskatchewan and Canada?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, again the member opposite doesn't give the whole story. I have asked for several billion dollars in assistance to Saskatchewan farmers and we have, as a result, received several billion. I have also asked for more, and I asked for \$11 domestic wheat, and we've received 10 in terms of a recommendation. And I asked, along with the other western premiers, to have a deficiency payment or equivalent export subsidy of \$1 billion so that we could negotiate from a position of strength when we're talking with the United States on their export subsidies and their farm bill.

Now you put together the money we've received in a western grains stabilization package, in drought payments and the freezing of elevator tariffs and freight rates, and all the money that we've put together, plus \$1 billion to protect our export wheat, plus \$11 or \$10 a bushel domestic wheat, and you've got a combination of several billion dollars that we have not only asked for, Mr. Speaker, but that we have received.

And I will just repeat to the member opposite. We have never seen such money in the history of the country come to a single province on any sector, let alone agriculture, as we have in the last two years between the province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada in the sector of agriculture.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Final supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Premier, you can posture all you want, but the fact is that there's a record number of farmers going broke under your administration. The facts are that you were the weak link at the Manitoba meeting with the western premiers, and that you gave only conditional support for the \$1 billion in deficiency payment for the farmers. And in this very Assembly, as I have indicated earlier, you voted against deficiency payments on May 2nd and, in fact, your caucus voted against it. You weren't even here . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. Order, order. The member rose on a final supplementary and is making a statement. If you have a supplementary, I'll take it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier and it deals . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. Order. The member rose on a final supplementary. If you have the supplementary, I'll take it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I'm now asking for a new question.

Mr. Speaker: — I'll take the next person that wants to ask a question.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question and I want to direct it to the Premier, and it deals with your posture on the deficiency payment and the fact that you have indicated that you are now in favour of a deficiency payment in Manitoba. How do you square that with the fact that on May 2nd your caucus, while you were away in Vancouver at Expo, voted against the deficiency payment? And what kind of a message do you think that is sending to Ottawa when it comes to paying out money to farmers?

On the one hand you've indicated today that you're not even going to bother asking for assistance for farmers on grasshoppers, and now we see that you're voting against deficiency payment and saying that you're in favour. Who's standing up for Saskatchewan? How can we believe what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when the member opposite asks who's standing up for Saskatchewan, I'll take his agriculture record in the last 11 years, or four years against this agriculture record any day of the week. The solutions, Mr. Speaker, that we have put into place in terms of improved crop insurance, western grain stabilization payments, and the various kinds of livestock and interest rate protection are unheard of in the history of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the answer, opposite, would be land banks — sell your land to the government. That's the NDP solution. That, Mr. speaker, and as well, I'll tell you what we could do — if you were NDP, you could charge them a little succession duties and death tax. Land bank and death tax — that's the answer to farmers.

I'll tell you who has the support of agriculture. This side of the House has support of the agriculture every place in this province, and you know it and I know it. And all you can do is put up smoke-screens. If you want to know who led the charge in Winnipeg, it certainly didn't come from Manitoba. It came from this side of Manitoba, and everybody in Manitoba knows it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Answers to Written Questions

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Government House Leader, Mr. Minister . . .

An Hon. Member: — Who would that be?

Mr. Lusney: — Well that could be anyone, I guess, at a given point. But my question is to the Government House Leader. Mr. Minister, this deals with the government's arrogant refusal to account for the expenditures of this government of public moneys.

Now, Mr. Minister, the Government House Leader . . .

I know you don't like the question; I know you don't like this question at all. But we're going to keep asking the question, Mr. Minister. We're going to keep asking it because this deals with the taxpayers' money, and your government still has not answered a number of written questions ordered answered by the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, of nearly two years ago. You haven't answered those questions.

And, Mr. Minister, can you tell the Saskatchewan people when your government will finally answer some of the questions, such as the government employment arrangements of the former PC candidate, Terry Leier; the money paid out to various law firms by government departments and Crown corporations; and the out-of-province travel expenses of cabinet minister, such as the Premier and the former minister of Economic Development and Trade. When, Mr. Minister, will you respond to these questions?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated on a previous occasion in the House, I think it's something like over 300 questions have been asked in the period of our term of office. I think there's something . . . there's certainly under 20 questions which have not been answered, and the member mentions one Mr. Terry Leier, the employment and so on of Mr. Leier; I believe those questions were answered in Crown corporations committee to his own leader, the Leader of the Opposition, as it relates to Mr. Leier's employment and the conditions of that employment.

But in any case, there are, I admit, a few questions on the order paper that answers are required for, and answers will be forthcoming, Mr. Speaker. As I've said, we've answered well over 300 questions, and there are very few that have not been answered.

Mr. Lusney: — A question to the minister. Mr. Minister, you keep saying that the answers are forthcoming. Mr. Minister, this government's arrogant attitude in answering questions, or refusing to answer the questions, I think is some concern to the public of Saskatchewan. I think it continues to amaze the taxpayers of this province how you refuse to answer any of the questions.

You have spent more tax dollars during the past four years than any government has . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member is making statements. If you have a question, get directly to it.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Minister, I can see that we aren't going to have the opportunity to put the point across because you will not answer the questions. But, Mr. Minister, will you finally tell the Saskatchewan taxpayers the full cost of the various international junkets taken by the Premier and the former minister of Economic and Trade?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I will match the record of this administration in answering questions that have been ordered by this House with the record of that former administration any day. And any fair-minded person who examines the two records will give us good marks in that area over that government. That member who just asked the question was a member

of that government. I can remember him in that chair over here, sitting there laughing, waking up and then laughing, when they brought in box after box after box of answers in the last dying minutes of a session. And the members opposite, some of whom are bellowing from their seats . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Proceed.

Legislation Promised in Throne Speech

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the House Leader. Mr. Minister, I want to deal with the shambles which you have created in your legislative process in this Assembly since the calling of this sitting of the legislature. More than two and a half months ago your government promised a number of legislative changes in the throne speech which opened the session. You've even advertised some of those proposals, Mr. Minister. That was in March. Here we are in June. Not one piece of major legislation has been introduced.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, will you give the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan a guarantee that all major pieces of legislation promised in the March throne speech will be introduced for first reading today or tomorrow so that interested groups and individuals will have a chance to review your proposals and comment on them before the legislature is required to debate them?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member will look at the record, there are over 50 Bills before the House. Some of them have been passed, but there have been over 50 Bills introduced. There are other Bills being introduced as we go along. There will be more Bills introduced before this week is over, and I suspect there will be other Bills introduced next week.

I would just say to the hon. member, we will be bringing forward our proposals in legislation as we have been doing. We will continue to do that. The hon. members, all they need do, as an opposition should do, is review those and provide whatever opposition statements that they feel appropriate. I'm sure they'll do that, and we'll get on with the business of the House.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, there are 53 or 54 Bills that have been introduced in this session. He says they're housekeeping Bills. He says housekeeping. He says some are major, some are housekeeping. I'm saying that every Bill that's introduced before this House is part of the legislative program of the government on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Call for General Election

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words under rule 16, a special debate which is going on today. And when I complete my remarks, I intend to move the motion along the following line:

That this Assembly regrets that the Government of Saskatchewan has stayed in office longer than any peace-time government in Saskatchewan since the last Conservative government; regrets that the Government of Saskatchewan is clinging to power beyond the traditional four-year mandate; and further, that this Assembly therefore urges the Premier of Saskatchewan to call a general election forthwith.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will know and other members of the government will know that we are now well into the fifth year of this government's lawful mandate. And I say legal mandate because by the rules and the laws of the country, a government, a provincial government, is allowed to stay five years. But, Mr. Speaker, you and the members opposite will know as well that the long-standing tradition in our province is that you have elections every four years or sooner — that you would have an election in this province every four years or sooner. Now the fact that we have gone beyond the four-year term of this government, the traditional four-year term, indicates clearly that we have a government that is afraid of the people of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, people are asking us, why is Grant Devine and Premier Devine afraid to call an election. They're asking that. Everywhere we go in the province, it doesn't matter whether you're knocking on doors in Shaunavon or Watrous or up in the northern area of the province where my colleagues from Cumberland and Athabasca represent the area, the first question that anyone is asking is, why isn't there an election when this government's mandate has run out? That's what they're asking. The first question when you knock on someone's door or when you go into a coffee shop and sit down for a cup of coffee is, why isn't there an election — why isn't there an election? And they're also adding now, we know why there isn't an election; this government is afraid. They're afraid.

They say that they ran away from the farmers last year in Swift current. The Premier was down there for a little meeting. There was 1,200 or 1,500 farmers who got together to have a little discussion with the Premier because he was meeting in Swift Current. And in that group there were people from the Hutterite brethren — they were there; there were people from the member from Morse's constituency — they were there to meet the Premier; and Shaunavon and Maple Creek and Swift Current and Morse, as I mentioned. And they all came out and they brought their picnic lunch, and they were going to listen to the Premier explain how he was going to bring the farming economy out of the doldrums.

Now do you know what the Premier did, this man who today indicated that he's the one who represents farmers? He hid in the school behind police barricades and this was shown across the country on TV. And I had calls from British Columbia that night, people saying, why wouldn't Premier Devine come out and see the farmers? Well we know he runs from farmers. We knew he ran from the nurses here on the steps of the legislature a few months ago — wouldn't meet with them. He wouldn't even meet with them in Estevan in his own constituency. He said: I

don't have to go there to meet with the nurses. He's referred to working people who come to see him as radicals and NDPers. Well the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that he writes off about half of the population when he talks in insulting ways to that group of people.

He treats working people as if they are dirt. And I say to you that a Premier in this province who runs away from farmers and runs away from nurses and won't meet with working people — and now even the doctors are saying that the Minister of Health and the Premier won't meet with them — is getting a reputation. Do you know what they're calling Grant Devine out in the cafe . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member is using the Premier's personal name. If you want to refer to the Premier, that's fine, but I would ask the member to obey that rule of this Assembly.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I accept your ruling and will refer to him as Premier Devine. But he's getting a reputation about running from people. He's ran from the farmers in Swift Current. He's ran from the nurses here on the steps of the legislature and his own constituency. He won't meet with the doctors. Do you know what people are calling him out in the country, Mr. Speaker? They're saying this is the gingerbread man Premier; he runs and runs and he won't meet with anyone, and they're saying he is now running from the people of the province. That's what they're saying, that he is running from the people of the province in not calling an election.

Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this individual, this Premier of ours, Premier Devine, can run but he can't hide. He can run from the farmers, and he can run from the nurses, and he can run from working people, and he can insult them by calling them radicals and crazies, but I'll tell you that he can't hide from them because we still live in a democracy. We still live in a province where we have to have elections. We still live in a province where we have to call an election. And I say to you that maybe Grant Devine has a reason . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. The member is not obeying the rules of the Assembly. I would ask him to stay with the rules of the Assembly otherwise we'll move on to another speaker.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I say again, that Premier Devine may have good reason to be afraid of the people of the province. He may have good reason. Because if we look at the economy of this province and the changes that have occurred in the last four years, I say to you, there is reason why Premier Devine should be afraid and should be worried. But I say that's not a good enough reason. That's not a good enough reason not to call an election.

The tradition in this province is that you have an election every four years. And I say to you that the tradition across Canada is that you have elections every four years or sooner.

Look at the facts. Over the past 26 years in Canada, since 1960, there have been 60 provincial elections in Canada, and the average length is three years and eight months. That's the average; that's the tradition. And in the British

parliamentary system of government, tradition is every bit as strong as the written law because that's what we govern our lives by and that's what our laws are based on. In fact, they have much power in themselves because tradition is what we are all about.

Mr. Speaker, since April of 1982 there have been 10 provincial elections in Canada. In fact, Alberta and Prince Edward Island have had two elections, believe it or not, two elections since we've had one in Saskatchewan. Now that's unusual; that's very unusual to have two elections in our neighbouring province of Alberta and not having any in Saskatchewan.

Believe it or not there are people in Maple Creek and along that west side of the border who are beginning to wonder about the laws of the province. They're saying: do you think there's a chance that Premier Devine is going to stay beyond his five-year mandate? That's what they're saying out there. They are concerned about it.

They're concerned in Maple Creek, in the towns along the border, because they're saying this government is afraid because they broke all their promises. They're saying that he promised to take off the 5 per cent sales tax; even in places like Rosetown people are saying that. And the candidate out there, Mr. George Tweedie, is saying that when he's out on the doorsteps this is what he's hearing — that that promise to take off the 5 per cent sales tax is one of the reasons they're afraid. And they're afraid to call an election, this Conservative government, because you've broken all your promises. You can't possibly put ads in the newspaper in 1982 saying you're going to eliminate the sales tax and then call an election three years later and win.

Well here's an interesting theory that the Conservative Party believes that the people of the province have such a short memory that if you wait five years maybe they'll forget all our broken promises. That's what they're saying out in the streets of Rosetown and Maple Creek and in Moosomin, that this government is afraid of the people because of all the promises that have been broken.

There's another tax increase that they're saying has been pushed across on the people of this province, and that is the removal of the property improvement grant, which amounts to a massive increase in property taxes. Now this wasn't talked about in the election campaign in '82; not one word in the hidden agenda of the Conservative Party in that campaign about taking off the property improvement grant. Was that ad in any of the papers? I didn't see it in one paper that they were going to take out the property improvement grant — not one word.

Now that hidden agenda, that hidden agenda of Conservative parties when they get into power, is another reason that the people of this province are ready to kick the Conservatives out. And I invite all of the Conservative members opposite to think about why you are now in a position where you can't win an election. Why do you think that has happened? Why do you think it has happened that you've gone from 15 points in a lead to now being behind and not able to call an election?

And this came as a shock to many Conservative members.

They were here in a jocular manner for three years, believing that any time they wanted to they could call an election and be back in the same configuration as we are now.

Well in April of this year I couldn't believe the look on their faces when Premier Devine told them that he couldn't call an election because they couldn't win. They looked like whipped dogs when they came into this House after that caucus meeting when they were told that they couldn't have a provincial election. I couldn't believe it.

He had built them up in the hype and the cheer-leading to believe that they couldn't be beaten, for three and a half or four years. Then they had their caucus meeting in April and Premier Devine told them: look, we can't have an election in April because we can't win, but wait till June.

(1445)

I'll tell you, between April and June I'm going to advertise, I'm going to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars, and I'll bring us back up. I'm also going to travel around the province and I'm going to announce Pocklington in North Battleford, and Weyerhaeuser in P.A. And I'm going to announce a fertilizer plant in Regina, and I'm going to attach it to an upgrader that's never been built, but I'm going to be able to con the people of province. And you wait — wait till June. I'm going to spend millions of dollars advertising, and I'll use those executive aircraft to fly around the province and stop at each town. And I'll fix them. I'll get our popularity back up, and I'll use the taxpayers' dollar to do it.

Well he tried. Grant Devine spent all of his time . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. That's about the fifth time today that the member has done the same thing, and I would ask that he either stay on the subject or move off the subject and let someone else speak that's prepared to obey the rules.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I apologize for using the Premier's name. When I get talking I slip into the use of his name, and I wanted to refer to him as Premier Devine.

But I want to say that, in using the taxpayers' money . . . I want to finish this scenario that has happened between April and June of 1986. premier Devine did spend millions of taxpayers' money. Every newspaper was plugged full of advertising. The TV — you couldn't turn it on without seeing a government ad or a beer ad — and they're closely connected. And we did hear all the announcements.

And they did their polling in June. And then he came back to caucus and told them again, we can't have a June election because it's still not good enough; in fact, it's worse; in fact, it's much worse and slipping. And boys, I'll tell you, what we have to do is just sit back and enjoy it for five years and collect your salary because I don't think I can turn it around. That's what he told them. That's what he told them: get your cheques, spend your money, but I don't think I can turn it around. I've pulled my biggest punch, and that's spending all the taxpayers' money on

ads and announcements, and it hasn't helped; in fact, it's got worse. In fact, what they're telling me out there is, they don't even believe me any more, and my popularity's slipping. Premier Devine said that to them: my popularity is slipping so fast that I don't know . . . He said, in fact it looks like we're in some trouble, and I think we'll have to wait at least until October or maybe even next April. So we'll see.

But I'll tell you that the people of the province are not happy with being tricked and manoeuvred by Premier Devine. And I'll tell you, the day he chooses to call the election — and he will have to, and he may not choose but it will be forced on him — that that will be a day of reckoning for this government that has broken its promises of decreasing taxes, and in fact hasn't decreased, but has increased sales tax, put it on used automobiles; increased it by increasing property taxes by elimination of the property improvement grants, and increased income tax by putting a 1 per cent flat tax across the board.

I'll say not only have they increased taxes on cigarettes and other examples up over 100 per cent, tax on cigarettes . . . increased every area of taxes. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the reasons that we're in a great deal of difficulty and have \$2 billion in deficits.

Even though the taxes have been increased in every area, we owe \$2 billion. Now people are saying, how is that possible; how can I be paying more taxes, getting less service, and still owe 2 billion in deficit? is that possible? Even at a time when we're producing more oil than ever before, and the oil prices are higher than they've ever been in the history of the province, how can anyone mismanage a province that bad? Well it's not hard when the Premier when he was elected said this province is so wealthy that you can mismanage it and still make money.

An Hon. Member: — You can't even say it.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well it's hard to say because it's so stupid. It's hard to say it because when Premier Devine said it I couldn't hardly believe it, that there's so much money . . .

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

Order, please. Order. I've called for order several times, and I'm not going to call again.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to second the motion of my colleague, the member for Shaunavon. The thrust of this motion is that the government opposite is clinging to power, is staying in office long after the normal time when people would be given an opportunity to pass judgement on a government. And there's no question that that's right.

I looked up some figures and I note that in the history of this province since 1905 there have been 20 elections and 20 legislatures. Sixteen of those legislatures have lasted four years or less. Four have lasted more than four years. Two have been brought about by the disasters and crises of two world wars, World War I and World War II;

and two have been brought about by the disasters and crises of two Conservative governments — the government of Dr. Anderson, and the government of the doctor, Premier, who we now have.

And that's what we've had. Every single peacetime government in this province that wasn't a Conservative government went to the people in four years or less, but not this government. Not Dr. Anderson's government, because it was scared and had every reason to be scared, because when it went to the electorate, it not only lost the election, it lost every single seat.

And now we have the second Conservative government, the only other one in the peacetime history of this province who has clung to office beyond the traditional four years. And certainly there's no question that this government is clinging to office. And it's clear that it's clinging to office because they know they want to have an election, they come up to an election day, and they suddenly get cold feet and they back off.

They have come up and back — they walked out to the end of that diving-board and looked down and turned around and walked back, and then they had another upwelling of courage and they walked out to the end of the diving-board again, and they have looked down and then they have turned around and come back. Every time that board looks awfully high and that water looks awfully cold, and they are still marching back and forth on the diving-board, still trying to get their courage as to when they're going to take the plunge.

And certainly they tried it in the fall of 1985. Everybody knows that in the fall of 1985 they were planning an election.

An Hon. Member: — Who was? Who was?

An Hon. Member: — You were.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Mr. Speaker, someone says we were planning an election. We were certainly planning for an election. I was up at the sod turning of the upgrader project in October . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, indeed, I was.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — And I wish that project well, but I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will be able to attend the turning of the second sod before next fall because we certainly haven't seen the second sod turned since last fall. No indeed, we haven't.

We've got in September 21, 1985, an article in the *Prince Albert (Daily) Herald*:

. . . provincial campaign has already begun. Saskatchewan voters are being swept into a provincial election campaign despite no formal announcement by Premier Grant Devine.

And then on April 30th, the Canadian press story quoting a Conservative government appointee — who asked not to be named — quote: "We were told to be ready for a fall

campaign and not to plan any holidays."

Well indeed, indeed, they were certainly planning for one. But they got out to the end of that diving-board and their feet got very cold and back they walk, and instead they had a Regina North East by-election. And I suspect they'd like to have that one back again. I think they'd like to have that one back again.

And so that by January 2nd, the press were saying, and this is Mr. Paul Martin, in the P.A. Herald:

So far Premier Devine and his government are finding that the last days of 1985 were difficult ones as they come to grips with the reality of the polls that showed them trailing and in danger of having the largest majority in the history of Saskatchewan lost.

Yes, indeed. They were troubled by that, but they got their courage up again in the spring, and they planned a campaign for some time between April 28th and May 5th. And there's no question of that. Nobody could have existed in this province in March without knowing that the government was planning an election campaign. There was no question of that. Signs of spring election abound.

This was when the member for Lakeview was moving his trailer on the parking lot at the Golden Mile mall and putting up his vast sign which says, Tim Embury. I know he just put that up because he wanted the trailer to be there. We all know that it isn't there now, but he just wanted to show the folks, I suppose, that he had a trailer. I think not. I think he was planning for an election. I think he was planning for an election.

I think a lot of other people were planning for an election. Here's the *Globe and Mail* saying, "All signs point to a May election in Saskatchewan." and you bet they did. All signs pointed to a May election. but once again out on the end of that diving-board, once again the feet getting cold, once again deciding to turn around and come back.

There were many, many comments during that period. The Premier's election tease was one of them. But when it came right down to it, there was a bad case of cold feet and a withdrawal, a walk back from the diving board. And the member for Lakeview has had to dismantle his committee rooms, and many, many others have had to do the same thing. I'm sure they knew there was going to be an election, and they were wrong, because even they didn't count on the bad case of cold feet that the government opposite most assuredly had.

And then came the possibility of a June election. And again the Premier dithered and couldn't make up his mind. He consulted the polls and he found them once again not to his liking. Once again he walked out to the end of that diving-board, and once again that water looked awfully cold, and so were Decima telling him the water was cold, and so were the other pollsters telling him the water is cold, and he has once again turned back.

But now, Mr. Speaker, the situation is changing. Up until June, if he'd had an election in June, it still would have

been the longest legislature in the peace-time history of Saskatchewan except the Anderson one. But people may well have suggested that a month or so doesn't much matter. But now it is very clear that this government proposes to cling to office many, many months longer than any other non-Tory government in the peace-time history of this province — clinging to office because you're afraid to face the voters.

So for the third time in about eight or nine months, the Premier has decided to cling to office rather than face the electorate. And I say that this at this point is wrong. Issues are hanging fire. Many people, not only the government, want to know who's going to be the government of this province over the next four years. They don't know who's going to win the election. I don't know who's going to win the election. You people don't know who's going to win the election. The voters as a group know who's going to win the election, and they ought to have the opportunity to say who's going to win the election.

As the press are very, very clear in saying — and there are a number of editorials, and others could be quoted — as they say: even if the PCs aren't ready for an election, the province is, and it's time we had that election.

It's possible, indeed, to run away from an election for a few more months, but not without making it very clear . . .

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

(1500)

Mr. Birkbeck: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to enter this debate. It got awfully entertaining and I thought I'd get into it. Just after listening to the Leader of the Opposition, Opposition Leader Blakeney, he describes it as if, you know, we're not asking for an election here. I was beginning to wonder, Mr. Speaker, was he asking for us to call an election; or was he asking for us to take a dive; or was he asking us to, you know, turn a sod; or what was it he was wanting?

Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, he describes it as us going out on this diving-board and seeing the deep, murky, cold waters down below, and having to check it out, and then trotting back and not making the big dive. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I recall when he went tiptoeing out in his lily-whites, clad only in a polka-dot bikini, you see, just for the little fellow. And he got out to the end of the diving board and he didn't check a darned thing; he just jumped right in. And he found out that the water was cold and it was deep. And they've been wallowing in that cold, murky water ever since 1982, and they haven't got over it yet. they're looking muddier every day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at what the Leader of the Opposition is doing here. He is wanting us to call an election. Well, he should be recalling, Mr. Speaker, that we've had, for instance, three by-elections since 1982. They need to be reminded, Mr. Speaker, we won two of those by-elections. They win one and they think they've won all three of them. We won two out of the three by-elections.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was in government for 11 years and they got used to that position. And they have found it very, very difficult to be in the opposition benches. Oh yes, they want an election. They want to have the opportunity to get back into government. The Leader of the Opposition, Opposition Leader Blakeney, can't stand to be out of the limelight — not at all, Mr. Speaker. But be they reminded, we won two out of three by-elections.

Now the member for Shaunavon, Mr. Speaker, says that the Premier is afraid to call an election; he won't meet with people. Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Shaunavon, whom I wish was right close to me so he could hear very well what I have to say, should well be reminded that the Premier would be more than happy to debate the issues with the member for Shaunavon, or any other member of the NDP, or anyone in this province, any time, anywhere in the province of Saskatchewan. And he's certainly not afraid of the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's be sure that we understand what they're saying. To call the Premier of this province afraid and to say that he won't meet with the people is just not a fair statement. He has met with more people, Mr. Speaker, than the Leader of the Opposition ever did when he was premier in 11 years. He met more with Trudeau down in Ottawa, when Trudeau was the prime minister. He and "Rocky" Roy Romanow were down there putting a new constitution together. Bringing home the constitution — that's what they were busy doing. Bringing home the constitution and fiddling away with it and amending it and the like, while the people of this province were wallowing in despair — walling in despair with no help for agriculture, no help for mortgages when interest rates were 22 per cent.

No, they couldn't deal with the issues that the people of this province were concerned about, Mr. Speaker. No, they couldn't deal with that. The Leader of the Opposition wanted to be again in the limelight down in Ottawa, in bed with the Liberals, and they still are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer back to the member for Shaunavon again. He says elections should be held every four years. Well we had one in 1982 and we'll likely have one in 1986. Now '82 to '86, by my calculations, is four years. So I don't see where we're off the mark anywhere. I really don't see that.

Furthermore, he said that we went into the campaign in '82 and we never said anything about the property improvement grant being taken away. Well I recall, Mr. Speaker, in the election of 1975, when they had their campaign on the roll, and I didn't hear in the campaign — not one little whisper from one unturned rock did I hear it — no, I didn't hear that they were going to nationalize the potash industry. I didn't hear they were going to spend \$600 million in the uranium industry. No, I didn't hear that — not in their campaign.

So I think it's unfair for the members in the NDP party — the member for Shaunavon in particular — to be trying to tell us that we did something that wasn't in the campaign. My goodness, we were elected to govern, and that's what

we're going to do.

Further, with regards to the member for Shaunavon, if there was any member in that caucus that epitomizes arrogance, that member epitomizes the arrogance of the NDP party. He wants to have an election because he believes that they can form government. He says the people of this province are fed up with us and they're going to vote for the NDP. Well I think it's unfair to prejudge what the people of this province may do in an election. They'll do what they want to do, not what some NDP member of this legislature is telling them they should do. We'll give them that option to vote as they choose to.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, as well tell this Assembly, and tell the NDP members in particular, that elections are expensive. Elections cost millions of dollars. And when I was elected in 1975, I thought I was here for five years because that's the legal mandate for an election term, is five years. We didn't get five years. We were into an election in 1978 — that's three years — just a little over three years they called an election. Then in 1978 we got elected again. I got elected again and I thought: well, great, I'm here for five years this time. No, not at all. We had another election. They had elections every three and a half years, more or less. Every time that they felt it was opportune for them to get back into power, they would call an election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we hold a differing view from the NDP members in opposition. We believe that we were elected to govern. If we'd have called an election, Mr. Speaker, in three years, they would have said: aha! you're just using your big mandate and you're getting back into power when you think it's opportune. We could have went after the federal Tories were elected; we didn't do that. It would have been opportune, maybe. We said no, we were elected to build and build we have.

The NDP would have complained, as I've said, if we went early. I say that we will go when we are ready to go. It's always been the Premier's prerogative when to have an election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right, we will have an election when we are ready to go. We'll be ready when our Premier says we're ready to have an election. It's always been the Premier's prerogative to call an election, not the NDP members in opposition.

So quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it would be fair to say we're wasting our time discussing it in this House right now because, in fact, it's not our decision to make. It's always been the Premier's decision, and it still is the Premier's decision. And he'll call that election when he wants to have that election, and the people will get their choice at that time.

The NDP want to throw this province into reverse. That's what they think. If they get a chance to be government, they hope they can get a chance to be government again, and I tell you they'll throw it into reverse. They'll bring back the land bank. They'll put the gas tax back on. They'll introduce the succession tax; the inheritance tax — the death tax if you want to call it that. They're a government, Mr. Speaker, that will get back to ravages of income tax increases — 37 to 51 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

They're an anti-family government; they were an anti-family government; they are an anti-family party. We're pro-family; we're pro-growth; we're pro-reform. They're against welfare reform; they're against everything in this province.

They're against major projects. They're against the Prince Albert pulp-mill. They're against the bacon plant in North Battleford. They're against the fertilizer plant here in Regina. They're against the co-op upgrader. They're against the co-ops; against the co-op upgrader here in Regina. They're against the upgrader in Lloydminster. They're against the two power projects in the South, the Alameda-Rafferty dams. They're against projects worth billions and billions of dollars and worth just hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs. They're against all those projects — not to mention, of course, an arena in Saskatoon — they're against all those projects.

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. The Manitoba NDP waited to four and one-half years and I didn't hear a word from you people, not one peep out of these same NDP that have moved this motion; not one peep did I hear out of them. And your NDP friends in Manitoba waited four and one-half years. Where was your silly motion then? Four and one-half years the NDP waited; waited and waited so it was an opportune time for them to have an election.

Well I say that's unfair, Mr. Speaker. We were given a mandate to build. And as I said, build we have with projects, trade and job-related policies . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Meagher: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to make a few comments on this motion because I feel that it clearly demonstrates a couple of points that I think the people of Saskatchewan should know in this election year. One is that either the NDP opposition have no understanding of the parliamentary system, or worse yet, they have nothing but contempt for the parliamentary system.

The Leader of the Opposition expounded at great length about walking the plank and looking at the water, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people that were walking the plank were, in fact, the NDP and the media. They were the ones that called the election dates in the past several months. He quoted the *P.A. Herald* at length setting dates for a general election, and when the general election didn't come to pass, they get made because their predictions didn't come true. They call an election but they forget to tell the person who's supposed to call it, and that's the Premier.

I'm not surprised that they're disappointed and a little disillusioned with their own ability to prophesy, but it certainly isn't a subject that should be debated in this House. If the media and the NDP opposition feel that an election should be called at a particular date, that's their problem. They make reference to a tradition of four years, and that's simply untrue. It's not true in Saskatchewan; it's

not true anywhere in the British Commonwealth. I can think of election dates that were called here in this province in the past decade or so that were for purely political reasons, political expediency. And again that demonstrates the kind of contempt that they have for the parliamentary system; they don't recognize that legislators are elected for a period of time to do a job. They're not elected to get into office and then start looking at the polls or looking at the political winds to see whether or not they can be re-elected and then jump onto an election when they feel they can be re-elected.

I can assure you that a lot of people in northern Saskatchewan aren't asking the question: when is the election? They're concerned instead that the same kind of thing may happen as happened in 1971 when the Thatcher government did call an election in three years, a snap election, and it resulted in an NDP government that cancelled the Dore Lake pulp-mill that was already under construction and just entered into — a mill that would have provided hundreds of jobs to people in that part of Saskatchewan. That's a concern, and that's a far bigger concern in Prince Albert than the date of the election, despite all the comments of the *P.A. Herald* and the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe that we were elected to do a job and there's things to be done, important things, and that's one of them. I would like to see the Weyerhaeuser deal completed; I would like to see the paper-mill under construction; in fact, I'd like to see it further advanced than any . . . and heaven forbid any possible new government cancelling that project.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Shaunavon as well in his motion makes great efforts to connect this Progressive Conservative Party and government to the far off 1930s Anderson Conservative government. And I would like to remind them and the people of Saskatchewan, and they are as aware as any, that there's absolutely no connection at all with those two parties. This is a new party of new people and new ideas, obviously.

But on the other hand the party opposite would love very much to tie themselves into the old CCF party, a party that was a populist party with rural roots that did reflect some of the values of the Saskatchewan people, instead of the party that they are with no connection — none at all — with the old CCF.

(1515)

This new, New Democratic Party, based and controlled almost entirely by militant, revolutionary, labour people — a long, long way from the CCF party of Tommy Douglas. But while they are trying to make a connection with the CCF party, they're trying to establish one that doesn't exist between a Conservative government of the early '30s, which made some serious mistakes and certainly wasn't a government that reflects the views of people — for instance, Catholics in this province. It's interesting that many, many Catholics are sitting on this side of the House, and they certainly wouldn't be supporting a party that advocated some of the measures that the old Anderson government implemented. But I

don't blame them for trying to make a connection when it doesn't exist and trying to make another connection that doesn't exist as well.

Those of us in Prince Albert and northern Saskatchewan who believe that the kinds of policies that this government have begun to implement, the kinds of projects that are now established by this government, are essential, absolutely essential for our well-being in the future. We're not prepared to let either the media or the NDP opposition determine when a date for a general election will be held.

This is an election year, and my suggestion to the members opposite is to get yourselves prepared for a general election, as opposed to speculating every second day on when it will be; come forward with some constructive suggestions for how to make this province a better place to live; do the things you were elected to do; be members of the Legislative Assembly for the duration of your term; make intelligent, constructive contributions to the workings of this House. Bringing stockings to emphasize the cold feet that you think that the Premier has, and clucking like a chicken, certainly isn't making the kind of contribution that the people that elected you expect you to do.

It is again, I believe, not only a demonstration of your misunderstanding of the parliamentary system but, indeed, your contempt for the parliamentary system. You show it often. You believe in political expediency. You think that we should be like you. We stand for nothing but re-election.

Well I don't support that proposition. I'm proud that we are prepared to stay here and do some work and accomplish some things, the very things that we were elected to do. When the times comes for the general election, I'm sure that the people of Saskatchewan will recognize that as well, and all of your speculating and, to the great chagrin of the media and yourself, the election may not come on the date that you call it, but will come indeed, and it will return a Progressive Conservative government for the very reason that I outlined. And for that reason, I opposite this motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to enter into the debate here, I think an important debate from the standpoint of the people of this province. I've listened to two members from the government side attempt to justify their continuing carrying on in government rather than calling the election.

And you know, the last speaker got up and said: there are things that we were elected to do. Now I'll tell you, we'll agree. And not to pursue an immediate election, if in fact they will carry out two of the essential promises which they laid before the people of Saskatchewan — I say deceived the people of Saskatchewan during the last campaign and haven't carried out. And I'll tell you, if they guarantee to this legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan that they will reduce and eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax, which is in the tune of \$386 million, then I say to you, they have a job to do, and we will not

request them calling an election.

But I'll tell you they have absolutely no intention of carrying out the essential plank that they promised the people of this province. You know, they said that they were going to reduce the income tax by 10 per cent on average. Well, what a laugh. What mockery. What a breach of faith!

And they promised the people of this province that they would in fact eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax. And did they eliminate it? Well I'll tell you, they certainly haven't eliminated the sales tax. And they say, well we have things to do. What have they got to do? the only thing they have left to do is try to reverse the polls. That's what those birds have to do, Mr. Deputy Chairman. That's why they're waiting, hoping that there will be a change.

But I can tell you . . . You know what? The Premier goes around and he thinks that if he makes enough promises to the people of Saskatchewan that he can, in fact, buy their support. And so this spring he went around and announced and announced project after project, but surprisingly no change in the polls.

You know, people are saying that they have had so many official openings that there are more holes in Saskatchewan than there are pot-holes in the highways. These people are going around with official openings all over Saskatchewan. Nothing has been built.

You know what I say: here is a party elected 56 members, had 55 per cent of the vote, and do you realize that in four and a half years, going on to five years, that that outfit across the way has no respect for the people; and the people of Saskatchewan, I'll tell you, have no respect for them. They cannot, in fact, call an election because they'll be thrust out of office. Do you know what? Justice has been mentioned. This is nothing more than a caretaker government now. There is no substantial legislation. All they are doing is attempting to use taxpayers' money to reverse their position with the people of Saskatchewan.

As has been pointed out, there are important topics to be dealt with, such as The Matrimonial Property Act, and the Attorney General says: we've got to study that. Well I'll tell you, they aren't dealing with key issues that should be addressed. There are certainly other issues that should be dealt with which they are delaying — delaying — because if you take the legislation in respect to all-terrain vehicles, the Minister of Highways, he studied it for two years, but it's close to an election now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so what he's done — let's put that under the table.

So let's be basically very, very frank on this issue. The party opposite, the government, have absolutely no intention of carrying out their basic promises they made during the last election. They are not going to reduce income tax as they promised, income tax by 10 per cent; and they are not going to remove the 5 per cent E & H tax. Now if they are not going to, in fact, carry out the basic promises they made during the last election, then one asks, what are they holding back for?

Well if you look and read from the Swift Current Sun: "Left the door open."

It's open house for the opposition these days to criticize Premier Grant Devine's mischance to call a provincial election. He's left the door open for MLAs and others to express opinion and gain critical advantage on the Conservatives. The NDP surely accepts his gift with thanks.

Over and over, paper article after article indicates that this government should in fact go to the people because the people of this province have the right to pass judgement on this government.

This has been a bad government for the people of Saskatchewan, bad in many ways. And when you take a look at what they have done to this province in four short years, when you take a look and look at the magnitude of the deficit facing the people of Saskatchewan — \$2 billion of debt in four years, \$200 million of interest we're paying — more than enough to pay and finance medicare in interest alone. This is the legacy of Premier Grant Devine's government.

And then when we take a look, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at other aspects of how our province has been downgraded. We take a look at the sale of the assets. We have a Crown corporation, Saskoil, which was in fact making money for the people of Saskatchewan, and what they did was sold off the one Crown corporation that was in fact making money for the people of Saskatchewan. And what they've done is also sold off a coal-mine down in Coronach; received over \$100 million; have blown that.

If you take a look at the fiscal management of this province, I will tell you it's fast becoming the worst-managed area in North America. And contrary to that, when Allan Blakeney was premier of this province, New York investors said that Saskatchewan was the best-managed area in all of North America.

I'll tell you this: this province is rapidly becoming another Tory province from the standpoint of mismanagement. Today we are finding that the per capita debt is increasing. We find that our credit rating is going down. We find the power corporation, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation — do you realize that every dollar that is raised in the power corporation in charges for services, that 36 cents has to be paid in interest? And that is the record of your government.

And I'll tell you, the people are sick and tired of your mismanagement and they are demanding an election. Go around the city of Regina. You don't have to strike up a conversation with the business community. All you have to do is to walk into their premises and the business people of Saskatchewan are saying, how soon with there be an election? They are saying to us, is there any way that we can force them to call the election? — we want to get rid of them.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that what we have here is a government . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You know, this debate simply is not an issue. And I can't believe that you're bringing this into this Assembly and wasting our time in here when we've got so much important unfinished business to do and you won't allow us to do it. I don't know why you're talking about an election. It's like you're rushing to your own funeral.

Now while we indeed acknowledge, Mr. Deputy, that we have stayed in office approximately one month longer than the traditional four years, it's not well into the fifth year the way that the NDP would have us believe. You kind of tend to discolour everything all the time, and half-truths . . . and other remarks that I would like to make about your half-truths that I'm limited to doing in this discussion.

But I'd like to point out a few things, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In fact, the legal mandate is five years, and the NDP is the only one in a hurry to call it. Now if a government with a huge majority like this one were to call an election, we would be branded as wasteful. It costs about \$5 million to call an election. So why do you have to rush into something like that if you call one early when you have a huge majority?

(1530)

And they cry that we're clinging to power, and yet when your NDP neighbours in Manitoba did, in fact, go some four and a half years, did you have an outcry then? No, the NDP, when they went four and a half years in Manitoba, there was nothing said about that; that was accepted.

Well they talk too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about their great victory in Regina North East, that by-election. But do they say one word in fact about the two by-elections that were lost by the NDP — overwhelming by-election victories to the PCs — Prince Albert-Duck Lake, and Thunder Creek? No, you don't very often mention that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our Premier still has much to do before he calls an election, and he can't complete these important functions during an election campaign. And the member from Quill Lakes . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I'd like to ask the members to my left who are hollering at the speaker to give him a chance to speak so he can be heard by the members. Order. Order, please.

Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the members of the opposition would care to just relax and enjoy for a moment, I could save myself a lot of my little vocal chord functions.

But anyhow, I was saying that our Premier can't complete his important functions during an election campaign. Free trade, for example, very important to the province of Saskatchewan, and the jobs that this translates to, jobs for the people of our province. Now the NDP obviously don't care about free trade; the NDP obviously don't care about jobs for Saskatchewan people, and they would far rather be out there electioneering.

Well I guess it's understandable that they don't concern themselves with jobs for Saskatchewan. One of their colleagues, Bob White, the union leader down East who they're promoting to be the leader of the national NDP Party, he's got this quiet little pact going, in fact a free trade pact for his union, so why would he want to protect jobs in Saskatchewan? Doesn't want to.

The NDP want to tie in with Bob White and the big union bosses. You don't believe in jobs for Saskatchewan. The member from Athabasca, we like jobs in northern Saskatchewan, and we can't get them up there with the way that they keep opposing the free trade and the free trade discussions, and thank God that our Premier is working so hard on that because it's so important.

Now an election campaign would also take the Premier away from the important agricultural situations that exist now. The member from Regina Centre, walking into the Assembly late, started yelling at me and making me raise my voice again to be heard; if he would have been here from the outset there'd be no problem.

But agriculture, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the number one industry in our province. Our Premier, fortunately, has the happy capacity of sitting down with the Prime Minister of Canada to discuss seriously the problems facing our agricultural sector and the possible solutions.

So although we have accomplished much, we have a few more things to finish prior to the Premier's wish to call an election. This call will come in time, and it is not — and I repeat — a mandatory situation for another year. The Premier will call it when he's satisfied that the timetable is such that new projects permit the proper timing for this election call. And the people know, the people know that we're not afraid of an election call — on the contrary.

As I've travelled in the business community, not only in Regina but throughout the province, they tell us the same thing. We can't be expected to change a socialistic attitude of 40 years in four short years, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And the business community very clearly want this government to maintain power. They know that Saskatchewan presently enjoys an excellent business climate. They know, too, that the NDP don't understand their problems, don't understand their situation. And their slate of candidates in the next upcoming election proves that.

I keep telling my business community friends that. It is really unfortunate, but four candidates with business experience, four out of 64, is the best that the NDP could muster in candidates to represent their point of view to the business community. And I'm very doubtful, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any one of those four candidates will ever have a seat in this legislature to carry forward their anti-business problems and situations.

Tourism didn't exist under the prior administration. And the Leader of the Opposition, now, yelling from his seat to call an election. You were gone, Mr. Member, when I indicated why bother rushing to your funeral; it will come in time.

Tourism, Mr. Speaker, that didn't exist under the prior

administration. And Heaven help tourism if it should ever come back, and the tourism operators in this province are fully aware of that. We've just begun with the tourism industry to place that vital industry where it properly belongs in this province, and it can very definitely become the number two industry in this province with proper guidance from a private sector oriented government that knows how to expand and work with these people to insure that tourism does what it should do, and that is to create jobs, to create employment.

Over 30,000 people are presently employed in the tourism industry in this province. Can you imagine how many jobs our government, with the private sector, could help create if tourism were placed where it rightfully belongs, and not on the back burner where the NDP had it before, tucked away in some little department as an offshoot of something, never recognizing what tourism potential could be when it relates to the economy of our province.

I find it humorous that they ant us to call an election, too. Speaking about tourism . . . they keep talking about our advertising budget and the waste of money because of the pride that we have in our province selling this province of Saskatchewan outside of our boundaries. And yet, if our internal advertising campaign was designed to be a political platform then, as you say, why wouldn't the Premier call the election? So obviously that tourism advertising is designed to do what it should do, and that is to encourage tourism in our province to create those meaningful jobs for our people, and certainly not any kind of an election gimmick.

The oil industry, and the small service companies related to it — you people don't understand the oil industry. You don't understand business; you don't understand the oil industry. And I'll just give you, Mr. Speaker, one short example of it, when the NDP leader said that their position was: we have no objection to a royalty tax holiday; every government has to realize that this is no longer the '70s. However, that's not what the rank and file of the NDP party have said, Mr. Speaker. The NDP MLA for Shaunavon, in direct opposition . . .

An Hon. Member: — Contradiction.

Mr. Klein: — Contradiction. Thank you, Mr. Member. Contradicting his leader, the NDP MLA for Shaunavon said that under an NDP government drilling incentives and royalty-free periods would come to a quick end.

The NDP MLA for Regina North East contradicts his leader, as well, by saying: we believe we can raise more money out of resources. We object to the tax holiday.

So why do they want to rush into an election call. They don't have, obviously, their stuff together between their leader and their candidates. The NDP claims that our oil royalty policies are for big oil companies. but they fail to understand the enormous economic activity that's generated by the small-business sector and by the service sector of that particular industry.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that our government is respected, not only by the private sector, not only by the

people that are employed by the private sector, but by all the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to take part in this debate also today. And in order for me to take part in this debate and to debate this motion here, I think I have to go back in history and talk about the Conservative Party that was in this province between 1929 and 1934. Because Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a comparison, there's only one comparison that we can use, and we have to go back to the last Conservative government that was in this province.

And I think that the old saying is that "a Conservative is a Conservative" holds true. And I think that all the Conservative members . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. A New Democrat is a New Democrat is a New Democrat. And we're very proud to say that we were a part of the CCF government that brought the progress to this province.

But I want to go back in history. And we all know, Mr. Speaker, that history repeats itself. I think we have to take a serious look at what happened in big River when they sold off the Big River saw-mill to a group in the United States. And we should say to ourselves: is history going to repeat itself? Is Carrot River next? They've sold the Big River saw-mill, Mr. Speaker; are they going to now sell the Carrot River mill? We don't know. But I tell you, this is something that we want to know.

But I want to . . . and I find it kind of interesting, Mr. Speaker. We've went through this whole debate today and this Conservative government has not even come up with an amendment. They've sat here and all of them have got up and spoke, and not one of them have got up and proposed an amendment to this motion.

But I want to go back in history because I want to go back to the last Conservative government that we had in this province. And I want to go back to an ethnic group that's very important to me, and that's the French people in this province. My mother's French. She was born and raised in the Debden-Big River area. And I want to go back and show you how we compare the Conservative government of the Anderson government of 1929 to '34 and the government today that wouldn't call an election for five years, Mr. Speaker. And I want to say that my mother, who is French, had to live through the type of legislation that was brought forward by the Anderson government in 1930.

I want to give you a little bit of history, and the Conservative government members sitting there like to talk about history. And I say that we have to be very careful in this province, Mr. Speaker, because history is starting to repeat itself. Here we are with a Conservative government that's now well into the fifth year. And let me tell you, even if they issued the writ today, we would be almost into four and a half years. They're well into their fifth year, so history is starting to repeat itself.

We see a government — the Conservative government of Premier Grant Devine. It is no different than the last Conservative government that we had of Premier Anderson. History is starting to repeat itself. Premier Anderson decided that he wasn't going to go to the polls until the fifth year. He went to the fifth year. He also brought in the type of legislation that I want to put on the books here today.

In 1930 — and I want to quote, **Mr. Speaker:** —

When the strategies of the Anderson government made it quite evident that an all-out attack would be launched against the Catholic schools . . .

And that's the type of legislation that came in.

At the first session of the Anderson government, The School Act was amended in such a way that it prohibited the presence of the crucifix in public schools.

And that is a fact. That is legislation that is on the books, Mr. Speaker, by the Conservative government. It also prohibited the wearing of religious costumes in class-rooms. Religious orders were numerous.

A further amendment to The School Act referred to the trustees, and this is another Act that the Conservative government brought in.

A trustee had to give satisfactory proof to the inspector that he could read and write English because henceforth all school meetings were to be carried on in the English language only.

That is legislation brought forward by the Conservative government of Premier Anderson. He brought this into Saskatchewan. This was in 1930. This was legislation brought in by the last Conservative government.

I tell you that history is repeating itself because once again we are into the fifth year of this Conservative government. They're following in the footsteps of the Anderson government, and you just watch, it's exactly what they're doing, and it ended up in 1934, the provincial election, the Anderson government was completely wiped out. They were completely wiped out.

(1545)

And this is the type of government . . . History does repeat itself, Mr. Speaker. And when we take a look at this government who sat here today, did not bring forth an amendment . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Mr. Thompson: — We take a look at the member for Prince Albert who stood up in his seat, Mr. Speaker, and indicated his support for the Athabasca pulp-mill, and that's how Ross Thatcher lost the election in 1971 — because he was going to build that pulp-mill, which would have destroyed northern Saskatchewan and would have destroyed the last freshwater watershed that we have in this province, and that's the Churchill water

system. But the Conservative government now say they approve of that.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that what's going to take place if this government was given another term in office, not only would they sell the Big River sawmill, they'll sell the Carrot River sawmill also. And right now we know that there is talk between the two, the Simpson Timber and this government, to sign a new agreement.

And I just wonder what's in that agreement. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if what's in that agreement is that Simpson Timber want the Saskatchewan government to get out of Carrot River also, and turn that mill over to them.

But here we have a Conservative government following in the footsteps of the last Conservative government in this province. And let me tell you, they are right in step, Mr. Speaker. They are right in step. They're into their fifth year of their mandate. That is exactly what the last Conservative government did. It went into five years.

And the polls are telling us across this province — not only our polls, but the Conservative polls — are telling them that they are following in the Anderson footsteps and, if they don't call that election by October, there's a good chance that this Conservative government will end up like the Anderson government, with not one seat in this province.

I have talked to Conservatives, and I talked to a Conservative yesterday in Saskatoon who told me, Mr. Speaker, he has never voted anything but Conservative in his life, and he said he would never do it again. But he said, when they poll me, I tell them I'm voting Conservative, because I want them to get that election under way so we can get them out. And this is an individual who has never voted anything but Conservative in his life.

And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that is the mood in Saskatchewan today. That is the mood out in voter land. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, we have not had an election last fall, and that's why we haven't had an election this spring, and that's why we're not going to have an election this summer.

This group is repeating history over and over again. And if you just follow the pattern, you will see the Anderson government all over. And I tell you, here we are, a government in its fifth year of the mandate, a government that was left with \$140 million in the bank and has now turned that into a \$2 billion debt. They should call the election.

A government that was left with 4 to 4.5 per cent unemployment; it has now turned that into 9.5 to 10 per cent, and in regions of this province it's up into the 90 per cent. I say they should call an election. But they're not going to call an election. They're not going to call the election because they want to repeat history. And that's what they're doing. They're repeating history.

When a government can take, in four short years — they're into their fifth year — and turn a \$140 million surplus into a \$2 billion deficit . . . That's the operating

budget. When they can take the accumulated debt that they had when they started, of 3.3 billion, and now turn that into a \$9 billion debt . . .

And they also have another debt that they're facing, and that's about \$3.3 billion. And I'm quoting here: " . . . where the debt is nearing a dangerous level . . . "

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to get into the debate on this rule 16 which is a debating forum that is being done by this Assembly. I find it somewhat strange, Mr. Speaker, that in the House, that we are elected to deal with the spending as to how government spends money; that we are set in an institution that sets to deal with the laws of the land; that we find a priority as politicians, quite frankly, to sit and want to talk about when is the election.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that you look at the institution. You look at the institution, Mr. Speaker, and what the NDP have done in this entire session . . . and this debate is rather fitting for the NDP because in this entire session, Mr. Speaker, they have raised not one point, not one substantive issue. Not about agriculture; they're not prepared to talk about that. Not about economic development and how you might create jobs; they've never talked about that, Mr. Speaker. They sit and are afraid, Mr. Speaker, to talk about some fundamental questions, some fundamental substantive questions in the field of health care. Are they prepared to talk about that? No.

They simply walk around and say, well why haven't you got a deal with the nurses? Well we got to deal with the nurses, 93 per cent acceptance. Why haven't you got a deal with the doctors? Sitting gloating, Mr. Speaker, not about substance, not about principle, Mr. Speaker, but how are we going to gain a political advantage to this. And that's what this institution has become for the NDP. What this has become, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than a political forum being driven by the members of the media and being driven by the members of the opposition.

Don't talk about substance any more. Don't talk about substance. don't deal with the question of agriculture, Mr. Speaker; don't deal with how you might develop the economy of this province . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. It's my duty to inform the member that the time allotted for motion under rule 16 has elapsed.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the Assembly to move down the order paper to government orders.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, last day I had talked to the House Leader that day about moving some of our motions for return that stand on the order paper, which would take only a short amount of time — get them moved and then move down the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: — Would the House Leader give direction

as to where they're prepared to move?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Have you got the numbers of the ones which we'd like to move? Because, by agreement, Mr. Speaker, we can move to some of the orders for return if . . . agreement with the other House Leader. Page 7 in the blues.

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS (Debatable)

Return No. 1

Mr. Yew moved, seconded by Mr. Shillington, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 1 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985, to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Environment of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Yew: — Mr. Speaker, I move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 1 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, just allow me a moment here to just look at the last couple of lines. Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development and Trade:

That return no. 1 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 2

Mr. Lusney moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 2 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985, to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Highways and Transportation of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, I move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 2 showing.

Mr. Speaker, I think this motion is one that we would like to see answered in this Assembly. We are aware of some of the expenditures of the Minister of Highways. He has decided to resign his seat because of some of those

expenditures, and I think that the public should be allowed the opportunity to see just where he spent that money; why he spent it. And it's unfortunate that the former minister doesn't even attend the House any more.

But I wish that the government would, and the Leader of the Opposition would see fit to let this motion pass as it stands without amending it, as they do in their general fashion by removing some of the last lines and not allowing the public to get the information that we are asking for.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, we have no problem . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Would the member please sign the return and give us the seconder for the return and send it here immediately after moving it.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — As I was about to say, we have no problem with providing the answers to these various questions, and I notice that most of them are the same, and the amendments will be the same in every case, Mr. Speaker. The amendments will provide the following answers, and I'll just read out the answer just so you'll see what will be provided, Mr. Speaker.

The motion by the member from Pelly that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 2 showing:

For the period of December 3 (and so on) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Highways and Transportation of Saskatchewan. (2) In each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense, and in each case the total cost of the trip.

What more could anyone ask for, Mr. Speaker. There is all of the information on behalf of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. We're quite willing to provide it, and in doing that, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the motion be amended in the following way:

That return no. 2 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection 3.

I so move, seconded by my seat mate, the minister from Kindersley.

(1600)

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a few comments in respect to this particular motion, but I think it's applicable to most of the motions which are seeking similar information.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, and I put to the members here in the Assembly: if you in fact were running a business and you had an employee that was taking trips, travelling on behalf of your business, I wonder, as the business man or the owner of the company, what specific details would you want. Would you ask simply that they give you a ballpark figure, or would you in fact ask for the details to be set out in detailing the expenses?

And what we had been asking for, Mr. Speaker, is a breakdown of the total cost of the trip, separated according to costs incurred for the following: air fares, hotels, meals, taxis, gifts, gratuities, entertainment, expenses, miscellaneous. I think it makes eminently good sense to request the specifics of the details of the breakdown of the expenses. If indeed they say the global number includes all of these, I ask you: why is the government afraid to provide the specifics? That's the question.

And the other thing, as has been indicated by my colleague from Pelly, he has indicated that in moving this particular motion, the very fact of the information that we're seeking is . . . There's a case, a proven case in the Assembly where the former minister of Highways . . . We haven't been able to get the specific details, but we did find, or at least he resigned, having misused the assignment of the plane.

And what we need here is, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, all of the details. And I would say to you that if you're running a business, you would want the specifics, not just the global, because it's important to know whether or not people are living very lavishly in respect to hotels — there are different levels of rooms that can be purchased — meals, taxis, to gifts, gratuities, and indeed entertainment. I think that the taxpayers do have a right to know the specific details.

And I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason that they are denying this is that they're ashamed of providing the details because it would be an embarrassment. This is the most travelled government in the history of this province; there's no doubt about it.

And so what they are doing is preventing the people knowing how they are spending the taxpayers' money. And certainly I want to say the amendment reducing the amount of information that we're going to receive is totally unsatisfactory to the opposition.

Mr. Shillington: — I want to echo the comments of the member from Quill Lakes. This is the minister who spent \$60,000 in travel expenses for the last year for which public accounts are available — a far, far higher figure than any minister has ever spent in the history of this province. And that suggests some explanation. It is not obvious to me, or a number of other people, how anyone could run up travel expenses of such a magnitude.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to travel expenses of such magnitude, we have a right to something more than a global figure. We have the global figure for 1984 - 85 and that's not terribly useful. With respect to a minister who resigns because of improper use of aircraft, we expect and deserve some additional detail. We expect, and I think have the right, to know what was spent under the various items.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is utterly inadequate. This government is hiding again from the truth. They're not prepared to be candid with respect to travel expenses and I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, we can all simply assume the worst . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the member from Kindersley can wind his hand or whatever

he's doing, but I intend to make these comments because I think they should be made.

Whether you know it or not, this government has suffered some damage through the travel expenses of your ministers. Your ministers have travelled in a fashion which is lavish beyond anything in the history of the province and beyond what's acceptable — beyond what is reasonable and beyond what is acceptable. And, Mr. Speaker, the attempts of members opposite — they may ultimately succeed in hiding it — but the attempts of members opposite to hide the facts, I think, is going to convince the Saskatchewan public that they have the right to assume the worst, and I think they do.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I, too, want to add my comments to this because I think it is a matter that cannot be ignored or passed over lightly. We have asked certain questions here dealing with an issue that is not new. It's dealing with an issue of a minister — a former minister — who himself has admitted to some misuse of certain privileges and, as a result, chose it upon himself to make a decision to resign from his office.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, we have here a government that refuses to provide answers to legitimate questions which are being asked by the opposition and which, I might add, are being asked by the opposition because the questions are being asked by the citizens of Saskatchewan who pay the taxes that pay these kinds of costs that we are asking about.

I don't understand why any government, who in a throne speech would announce a freedom of information Act, would want to undermine any little bit of credibility it might have on that issue by turning around and doing exactly and completely the opposite. Mr. Minister, this is not any different than the fact that the government on other orders for return which this legislature has passed, has now for over two years refused to provide the answer, and that deals with the travel of the Premier some two years ago. This Legislative Assembly ordered a return, and yet this government has not provided the answer.

Here now, Mr. Speaker, they've adopted a new tactic. Instead of providing the answer — or sitting on the answer because they know it's politically now unpalatable — they make amendments so that the legislature will not order an answer to be provided by the government. I personally object to that, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan object to that. This opposition objects to that. It is wrong. It is secretive. It's time this government stopped playing games with the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and provided the information that they have a right to know.

Even the former minister from Regina South is not embarrassed about his \$71,900 salary. That's been an OC that's been passed. That's public. Why can't this kind of information be public also, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak at length on this. I am here in a rather unusual role, and that is to say something of merit about the Mulroney government. That government has not been over scrupulous in a good number of things, but it allows

people to know what the travelling expenses of its ministers are. The circumstances surrounding Madam Blais-Grenier are well-known.

Mr. Speaker, I'll try to shout. I'm sorry that the Premier will not take any steps to get his members under control, and I'm sorry about that, but I am going to make this point. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House and to the public of Saskatchewan, that at Ottawa, however difficult it was for the Mulroney government so to do, they told the public about what the expenses of Madam Blais-Grenier were, and they tried to defend them, and when they found that they were not defensible, steps were taken.

Here in this House the government opposite takes the view that the public of Saskatchewan are not entitled to know about taxis, expenses, and entertainment expenses, such as was the warp and woof of the Blais-Grenier issue. And those facts were made known in Ottawa. The Mulroney government did not withhold them, even though they were likely to be embarrassing, and in fact turned out to be embarrassing.

And here in this House, particularly when we're dealing with the activities of the member for Wilkie, this government refuses to give facts which the public are entitled to know, because surely suspicions have been raised by the previous conduct of the member for Wilkie and the size of his travel expenses as shown by previous public accounts.

Now it seems to me very clear that the practice across Canada is clear. I remember an occasion when people asked the Premier of Alberta about what his expenses were in a particular trip to Asia. And within, I believe, it was three or four weeks, detailed copies of the expenses accounts were available.

The Premier — the Conservative Premier of Alberta. I am saying what the practice is in Albert; I am saying what the practice is in Ottawa; and I'm deploring — I'm deploring the practice of this government; I'm deploring the practice of this government who refuses to give us some pretty reasonable information about the costs of hotels.

And we have the experience of some other members who . . . The member for Souris-Cannington, the Deputy Premier, has acknowledged that he has, at least on occasion, rather expensive taste in hotels. And that seems to me to be a reasonable thing for the public to know, and similarly with respect to gratuities and entertainment and the like.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my point is clear. The practice in Ottawa, we now know what it is, and it's been established; the practice in other jurisdictions has been to give this information; and when the government opposite decides that it will not give that information, then I think it is clear that they have something to hide. There is no other rational explanation for denying this information. The public will conclude that they have something to hide, and the public will conclude, rightly, that they have something to hide.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a

couple of words to the debate that is going on, on whether or not this motion should be amended. And I want to say quite clearly that I am of the opinion, and my colleagues are, that this answer should be given in the form that the question was put by the members of the opposition. Because if the government is allowed to change the questions to suit their mood or their whim, then what are we doing talking about bringing in freedom of information?

Here we have a government that, in their throne speech and in the budget speech, talks about freedom of information, to expand what is already available. And I'll tell you that this is reality. On the other hand we hear what they talk about doing, and here is the reality of what they actually do. And that's why the public of the province are saying: can you believe what they say when you see what they do? Obviously they're not in favour of freedom of information.

This question that we're dealing with clearly indicates — what the cost of taking a trip that the minister took, and it says, how many people went with you and who were they?

Now take this scenario to Ottawa and the filming of the life of Brian which has come up in the last week. That never would have happened if it had been in Saskatchewan. Let's say the Premier takes a video equipment team with him when he goes on his trips — and he may, he may. He wouldn't tell us because he doesn't have to. They simply amend the question so we can't get the information. How do you get the answer to that question?

In the period that we're talking about for the Premier — and that question hasn't been asked for a long time; I use that as an example — what if there was a video team going with him to film it? How would you get the answer to that question?

Well I'll tell you that the issue of Brian Mulroney, or the Prime Minister, and his use of a Hercules aircraft to transport seven individuals and all the video equipment that cost \$44,000, I believe — and I could be corrected on that — to come to Regina and other points, I believe part of that for political reasons — never could have been found out in Regina under this government. No one could find out. You can't find out.

(1615)

This question simply asks for the Minister of Highways and Transportation — the individual who had to resign over the inappropriate use of an aircraft — it asks in each case his destination, purpose of the trip, name of persons who went with him at government expense. That seems to be a reasonable question for the people of the province who want to know. When you're talking about increasing my income tax with a flat tax, how are you using the money? And when you go on a trip, who went with you and who's getting paid? What is irrational about that? And it says, how much went for air fares, hotels?

And my colleague from Elphinstone talks about the former minister of Economic Development giving out his

list of places that he went, and the Beverly Wilshire hotel that he stayed at in Los Angeles. And when he was asked about it in the House, he said, I don't care if it cost 200 or 400 or how much it cost, because when I go, I go.

Now this kind of an arrogant attitude of a government that's been in power for almost five years, well into its fifth year, I say that it's important to know.

The yappy member from Saskatoon talks about trips that our members took. And the simple proof of the matter is that he knows what it was because it was a public document. We let you know. We let you know it. Of course we did. Of course we did. And I say to you that that proves the point, that the Mulroney government, the instances that we have talked about . . .

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could you get some control in here? You're allowing a lot of yelling to go on.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the Assembly ready for the question?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I wonder, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, do you think you could get any semblance of order in here? There seems to be a lot of yelling from the government side, continuously, for the five minutes I was talking. Do you think that it would be possible for you to get some control in here?

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order is not well taken. There has been yelling from both sides of the House all the way through the afternoon, and I think that the hon. member that is asking for order was probably one of the worst offenders.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The members opposite will know that I haven't been in the House during this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. If the member has something further to say on the debate, I'll hear that.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — That's what I'm going to do. Having just returned to the House, and having been out for most of the debate, some of the comments made in here are very difficult to understand about this debate. I don't know what some people are talking about when they say that the noise was coming from this side of the House.

But I want to tell you that, in dealing with this problem of not getting answers from this government, that the proof is here — that the proof is here — that if there are crews of video cameras going with the Premier for political reasons around the province and around the country, there's no way that the taxpayers can find out because the opposition can't raise and get the answers. We can't do it; it's impossible.

And I say, for a government that talks about freedom of information and then carries on like this in this Assembly, is a phoney government and one that doesn't deserve the support of the people of the province, and I say is the main reason we're not having an election, because they're afraid of the people. And I'll tell you, at the first chance, this is one reason why the people of the province will kick

you birds out.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. When the member is referring to members on the other side of the House, they are not birds. He is to refer to them as hon. member or members of certain . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order. When I'm on my feet, I'll ask the members to be quiet.

If the member wants to refer to any member in this House, you refer to him either as the hon. member or refer to him as the position he holds or the constituency he comes from. But the comments that you're using are out of order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for calling the members birds. But because they fly so much, they have this reputation out in the country. But I will try to refer to them as hon. members, as difficult as that is at times.

But I want to say, in closing my remarks on this issue, Mr. Speaker, that this closed government, this closed government, the closed government of the Devine government, in not giving out information, secretive, I say, breaking promises at every turn, whether it's in Shaunavon or Maple Creek or Rosetown, that kind of breaking of promises, that kind of blatant spending of the public's money, and that kind of lack of credibility and explanation on your spendings will get its just deserts when you call the elections.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the comments of the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The member did speak on this resolution.

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — I listened with a great deal of interest, Mr. Speaker, to the comments of the members opposite who somehow are maligning members on this side of the House for travel.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that some weeks ago I spoke from my place in the House about some of the vagaries and the travel that took place under former members of that administration sitting over there. And I hear that they're saying, yes, but we gave you the information; it was all public documents, public information. Balderdash! Any information we dug up, Mr. Speaker, on the travels of their ministers in the former administration was done by diligent research.

And I'll point out, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of information that they're requesting now, they refused to provide in its entirety. For instance, for instance, Mr. Speaker, I attempted to find out who accompanied Reggie Gross, the former NDP member, the former minister of natural resources. I wanted to find out . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wondered who went with Reggie Gross on all these skiing trips — Reggie the skier. Reggie the skier, where did he go? Well January 19 to 22, 1982, he went down to Denver . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Does the member have

anything to say dealing with the amendment or the question before the House?

Hon. Mr. Maxwell: — Certainly, Mr. Speaker. As it relates to the question before the House, we are somehow being maligned as if we are creating a precedent. My point, Mr. Speaker, is we are in no way creating any precedent in answering the questions in the manner suggested by the Deputy House Leader. We are merely following the type of precedent that was set by the members of the opposition when they were in government.

And what I was pointing out was the type of travel one of their ministers did — extensive travel he did all over the world; twice in Europe in the same summer, Mr. Speaker. And we couldn't find the information as to who went with him, gratuities, taxis, and such like information. All we got was a global figure, including the one of course where there was a bill that came in from the Playboy Club in New York city, and we had some trouble exactly pinning down where that one came from and how that came about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I really feel I am speaking to the question and addressing the amendment. So I'd like to continue and point out that some of these trips that that former member took, which took an enormous amount of research to put together, didn't give us the conclusive, definitive type of information which they are now seeking, saying that we should be taking about taxis and so on.

For instance, that former member took a bus load of people down to Cypress Hills, took over the lodge to have a party, and threw all the skiers out. And I can't find out who all accompanied him on that bus on that trip. And I'd like to find out who all was involved in that, when he took over the ski hill that day and closed it down . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please.

An Hon. Member: — You let him go this far; let him go.

Mr. Speaker: — When I'm on my feet, I'll ask the member for Shaunavon to be quiet.

The member is not dealing with the matter that is before the House, and that is the return moved, requesting information with regard to the Minister of Highways, and the amendment that has been proposed. If the member has something to say on that amendment, I'd like to hear it; otherwise, we'll move on.

Amendment agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas

Tusa	Maxwell
McLeod	Hodgins
Hardy	Morin
Folk	Muirhead
Smith (Swift Current)	Johnson
Myers	Young
Hepworth	Weiman
Dutchak	Rybchuk

Dirks	Domotor
Embury	Meagher
Sandberg	Muller
Klein	Gerich
Currie	Petersen
Martens	

— 27

Nays

Blakeney	Koskie
Tchorzewski	Lusney
Thompson	Shillington
Lingenfelter	Yew

— 8

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 3

Mr. Lusney moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 3 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Telephones of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Lusney: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no 3. showing. And I would think that the minister wouldn't be amending this one because there's hardly anything to hide in the travels of the Minister of Finance, at least I would believe there isn't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Did I say Highways? Telephones.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we will be amending this one as with all of these motions which are in the same order, and in fact we will be providing the total costs of all of the trips taken by ministers in all of the cases as has been the practice of the House. And the amendment is as follows, Mr. Speaker:

That return no 3 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

I so move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member of the government that proposed the amendment would be prepared to take a question in respect to his amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the member prepared for a question? No.

(1630)

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, then I want to again just make

a brief comment to reaffirm again our position of the nature of the cover-up of the government opposite. All that . . . as I have said before and the arguments have been put before the House, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that when the members opposite were in opposition rather than in government, they were asking for more and more information. Now that they have assumed the office of government they have taken the opposite position. And this is not the sole evidence of them decreasing the amount of information that I think the taxpayers are entitled to. We have other instances of this cover-up. A very recent one is in respect to Crown corporations where they are no longer going to disclose the global . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order. The questions that we're dealing with here are the returns and the trips of members, and I don't think that it has anything to do with the public accounts and Crowns. I would ask the member to stay on the subject.

Mr. Koskie: — I certainly will do that. I wanted to point out the direction that the government is taking. There's one action here which demonstrates clearly the position of the government to disclose information which I think the public is entitled to. I am indicating to you and to the House that this is not the sole instance in which information has been withheld.

Certainly I think the arguments have been put forward. It's evident that the minister won't take a question because he can't come up with a legitimate reason why he is amending it. And that's . . . I think the people of Saskatchewan will realize that he will not give the reason why he insists on this amendment.

All he has done is move the amendment. He has not justified why he has moved the amendment. And I think that's it's clear enough to the public that there's a cover-up. When the election is called this will be a part of what the people of Saskatchewan will look at — the total waste, the lack of any respect for the taxpayers' money, a double standard for the cabinet ministers.

And I think why it's so important that we get this information here in respect — and the details of it — is because of the tremendous amount of travel by this government. This is what we have been trying to do, is to track down and to disclose the extravagance of this government.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 4

Mr. Lusney moved, seconded by Mr. Koskie, than an order of the Assembly do issue for return No. 4 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Rural Development of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated

according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 4 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment:

That return no. 4 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

I so move, seconded by my colleague, the member from P.A.-duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 7

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 7 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Premier of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 7 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 7 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Seconded by member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 8

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no 8. showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Finance of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air

fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 8 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 8 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3)

Seconded by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 9

Hon. Mr. Blakeney moved, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 9 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Revenue and Financial Services of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 9 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 9 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Seconded by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 10

Mr. Thompson moved, seconded by Mr. Tchorzewski, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 10 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g)

entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 10 showing, and I would ask the House Leader if he would consider not amending this.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, the member from Turtleford who we're asking the questions about and the Minister of Parks and Renewable Resources would want to give all the information out to the taxpayers of this province, Mr. Speaker, who are paying the bills. And I'm sure that the taxpayers who are paying the bills, I say it's only fair to the House Leader that the taxpayers are entitled to know — not just a lump sum on the trip, but what it cost for the air fares, and the hotels, and the meals, and the gifts, and if there was any tips, or whatever it was. And I'm sure that the hon. member would want that information to be released. And I ask you, Mr. Minister to reconsider amending this motion.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 10 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. When I'm on my feet and the House is doing business, I'm going to ask for order on both sides of the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 11

Mr. Tchorzewski moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 11 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Social Services of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 11 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 11 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Seconded by my colleague, the member from P.A.-Duck Lake.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. I'm going to ask the members to follow the rules of the Assembly. It's very difficult to carry on the word of the Assembly with this much calling back

and forth across the House.

Mr. Shillington: — I really do not intend to take long on this. I do hope we hear from the Minister of Social Services with respect to this matter. This is the sanctimonious minister, Mr. Speaker, who tells us how, when we are doling out a pittance to someone on welfare, there's normally not enough to buy food and clothing, we need exhaustive information with respect to the individual. We need all kinds of information which would offend, and I'm sure does offend them, except that they need it to stay alive. I really would like to hear from the Minister of Social Services as to why . . . He's leaving. Well isn't he a man of conviction.

I really wish the minister had had the courage to tell us why he thinks those who can barely exist on their welfare and who are patently living below the subsistence level should give the public exhaustive information to make sure that there's nothing wasted; to make sure that there's not a morsel too much on the table. And yet when we are dealing with the minister himself and the lavish travel of this government, the public is not entitled to any information.

I really wonder if the minister is going to be able to be that hypocritical, because that's what he's being if he doesn't stand up in this Assembly and justify, Mr. Speaker, why there should be one very rigorous standard for those who live below the subsistence level on welfare. Yet those ministers who live high on the hog, the same taxpayer paying the bill, the taxpayer is not entitled to any money.

So I wonder if the minister is going to be sanctimonious and hypocritical enough to stand up to give us his information or not. I really look upon this with interest. If it isn't, we'll know what the so-called welfare reform is; it's an attempt to make a scapegoat out of those at the bottom of the ladder.

So I wait, Mr. Speaker, for the minister to tell us why we need no information on him and a lot of information, Mr. Minister, on those who can barely keep body and soul together.

(1645)

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 12

Mr. Tchorzewski moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 12 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Urban Affairs of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d)

taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 12 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 12 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Seconded by the member for Weyburn. Where is the member from Weyburn? P.A.-Duck Lake — sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 13

Mr. Tchorzewski moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 13 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 13 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member from P.A.-Duck Lake:

That return no. 13 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 14

Mr. Tchorzewski moved, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 14 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Education of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h)

expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 14 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake:

That return no. 14 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 15

Mr. Lingenfelter moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 15 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Energy and Mines of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 15 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake:

That return no. 15 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 16

Mr. Lingenfelter moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 16 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Supply and Services of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 16 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 16 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

I move, seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 17

Mr. Lingenfelter moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Blakeney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 17 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Health of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 17 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no 17 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Moved, seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 18

Mr. Shillington moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 18 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the member from Cumberland, that a return do issue for return no. 18 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 18 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

I so move, seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 19

Mr. Shillington moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 19 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Culture and Recreation of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Shillington: — I move a motion for return no. 19 showing, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 19 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Moved, seconded by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 20

Mr. Shillington moved, seconded by Mr. Yew, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 20 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Labour of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Shillington: — I move a motion for return no. 20 showing, seconded by the member from Cumberland.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 20 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

So moved, seconded by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I'm going to ask the member for Shaunavon to apologize to the Assembly for refusing to obey the orders of this Chair.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I guess I was . . . after the defeat of that amendment, I was calling for an election. I guess I shouldn't have been doing that at the time.

Mr. Speaker: — I ask the member to apologize for his behaviour.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I do apologize for calling for an election from my seat.

Mr. Speaker: — What I'm asking the member to apologize for is shouting right through the time when I'm trying to put a motion, and I would ask him for an unequivocal apology.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I unequivocally apologize.

Motion negatived.

Return No. 73

Mr. Koskie moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 73 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Justice of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my colleague, the member from Pelly, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 73 showing:

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 73 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

So moved, seconded by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 74

Mr. Koskie moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 74 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Science and Technology of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from Pelly, that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 74 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 74 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Moved, seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 75

Mr. Koskie moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 75 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 75 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 75 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

So moved, seconded by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 76

Mr. Koskie moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 76 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Minister of Economic Development and Trade of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 76 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 76 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

So moved, seconded by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Return No. 77

Mr. Koskie moved, seconded by Mr. Lusney, that an order of the Assembly do issue for return no. 77 showing:

For the period December 3, 1985 to March 18, 1986: (1) the number of out-of-province trips made by the Provincial Secretary of Saskatchewan; (2) in each case his destination, the purpose of the trip, the name of each person who accompanied him at government expense; and (3) in each case the total cost of the trip separated according to costs incurred for each of the following: (a) air fares, (b) hotels, (c) meals, (d) taxis, (e) gifts, (f) gratuities, (g) entertainment, (h) expenses, (i) miscellaneous.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Speaker, I move that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return no. 77 showing.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I move:

That return no. 77 be amended by deleting all the words after the word "trip" in subsection (3).

Seconded by the hon. member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Motion as amended agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask for leave of the Assembly to move to government orders when we reconvene at 7 o'clock.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I would just ask the House Leader: I believe that we're moving back to Labour where we left

off yesterday.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Our intention would be to go to committee of finance, but I believe there are two Bills. There's one in adjourned debates, as there was scheduled for earlier this afternoon.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.