

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure this morning to make an introduction in this Assembly to all hon. members of a gentleman who is a previous member of this Assembly, representing the Estevan district. He is seated behind the rail, and I would invite all hon. members to welcome Mr. Ian MacDougall.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Proposed Sale of SGI

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, can you confirm that the SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) board of directors and their senior management staff met all day in Estevan and that you met them there?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the board members of SGI met in Estevan, and I joined them for dinner last evening.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Let the history books show that the Premier has answered his first question in, I think, six years in sitting in the legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — And you answered it well. Now let's hope this spirit of co-operation continues with the next question.

The supplementary is, Mr. Premier: can you confirm that the SGI board of directors reached a decision at the Estevan meeting on the proposed sale of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance, and can you inform us of what decision you've made with respect to the public insurance company?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I cannot confirm that the board of directors made any specific decisions with respect to public participation or privatization of SGI. I will point out, as I did on the radio this morning, that I understand philosophically the problems with Sask Power bonds that the NDP had and with Saskoil bonds and shares and with Weyerhaeuser and other items.

You know, the philosophical difference is quite clear. When we allow Saskatchewan people to participate, obviously it's popular; it works. So I won't deny, and have never denied, that we don't look at public participation

and privatization in government where we can make a company stronger and make a national company, as a matter of fact, with its head office here allowing us to compete not only nationally but internationally. This is the global village we're in, and if we have a strong insurance company, I think we should at least be able to look at it on a broad issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Premier, your minister, who has now joined us in the Assembly, has told the public and the press that a decision will be made by the cabinet before the end of the year. Given the constipated process which is at work in your cabinet, Mr. Premier, that means that a recommendation must have gone forward from the directors to cabinet or must be coming forth very soon. Which is it? Do you have a recommendation, or do you expect one soon?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, if I recall, the same sort of questions were asked with respect to allowing the people to invest in Sask Power and we said, yes, when we come to the conclusion that we will allow Sask Power bonds or Saskoil shares, we'll obviously make that decision public. We are reviewing all those possibilities, and the public knows that. When we do come to a conclusion, we'll certainly let the hon. members know, and we can debate the legislation is there's legislation here in the House; we can review it all as we did with Sask Power. I believe it's fair to say the last Sask Power bond issue, or was it fourth or fifth, runned over \$100 million. It was over-sold. Well people obviously like to think that they can invest in corporations here in Saskatchewan.

And secondly, if I would, Mr. Speaker, let me point out, rather than have corporations go into the United States or the Japanese market to borrow money, they can borrow from Saskatchewan people. And the interest goes back to Saskatchewan people so, in fact, we make more money when we allow the bonds and shares to develop our province, as opposed to just having it in the government. That's why it's so popular.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Premier, yesterday in Crown corporations your Minister of Finance all but admitted that he intended to make no announcement with respect to the sale of all or part of SaskTel until after the session was over, and any opportunity for public scrutiny would be lost. Will you admit, Mr. Minister, that that's all you're waiting for with SGI, is for this session to terminate so you can then make the decision when you can't be subject to public scrutiny?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member knows my philosophical bent better than that, and I am proud of the kinds of things that we have done in terms of power bonds and shares. And I would be more than happy to debate any of those upcoming issues that

might come to pass in the province. And I would say categorically that we would be prepared to announce them in the House or outside the House, and at any time, because obviously we are prepared to debate them. And the success of the power bonds and the Saskoil shares and others, Mr. Speaker, are things that we are quite ready to talk about here and in full disclosure.

So I would hope that he doesn't say that we're waiting for the House to close. I mean, it will happen if it's appropriate time, in the House, all the time, because it will come back to the legislature at any point.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — New question. Mr. Premier, a scant 11 months ago you got elected in an election in which you vigorously denied the intention to sell any Crown corporations. Mr. Premier, since that election your support in the polls has plummeted because of right-wing policies such as this.

I say by way of background, Mr. Premier, that you have no mandate to be selling SGI or any other Crown corporation, given the events of the last year. Will you, Mr. Premier, assure this House that there will be no steps taken with respect to the sale of SGI without public hearings so that you can at least have some semblance of a mandate to do it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to point out that the NDP, they're against the Rafferty project; they're against a trade deal with United States; they were against Weyerhaeuser; they're against the upgrade development; they're against packing plant development; they're against welfare reform, Mr. Speaker. They're against educational reform; they're against Sask Power bonds; they're against Saskoil bonds; they're against Meech Lake. Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on. We could have hearings on every single, solitary thing that the opposition is against. Well, they're almost against any economic development that you would find in the province of Saskatchewan or any reform. They're quite in favour of the past, Mr. Speaker. They live way back in the 1940s and 1950s where they were in control. That's all they're in favour of. We could have hearings on the past.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I think before we go any further I'd like to ask the hon. members to be careful in their questions, that the preambles are not provocative. And I would ask ministers . . . Order. Order, please. And I would ask ministers to please try to stay on the topic, or we're going to have a question period that will rapidly deteriorate.

Coopers & Lybrand Study

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health, and it has to do with the Coopers Lybrand study on the Health department, which is part of the government's restraint program. I wonder if the minister is aware of that portion of the study prepared

in June which called for a 25-year future plan for the Health department, a plan to be called "tomorrow's health system," and bearing a recurring annual cost of \$1 million. Is the minister aware of that plan; what is the status of that plan today; and what will Saskatchewan people get in return for a price-tag of \$1 million a year for the plan alone?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the Coopers Lybrand study, as everybody is. It's been widely discussed in the House in terms of the existence of the study and the fact that Coopers Lybrand has been looking at various departments of government, including the Department of Health. Beyond that I have little to say at this point. And has been said by several of my colleagues, Coopers Lybrand recommendations, those which are adopted by the government, all recommendations of Coopers Lybrand will not necessarily be adopted, but certainly some of them will have merit, and many of them may well be adopted. But that's all I can say at this point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Goodale: — Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. In relation to some of the aspects of the Coopers Lybrand work that in the minister's opinion may bear merit, I wonder if he could indicate whether he thinks the following proposals have merit? Number one, regaining control . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. That's sounds to me like it's going to become a very long preamble if you have several proposals, so please put your question. I think you have had a sufficient preamble in this one.

Mr. Goodale: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for the minister's specific reaction to the proposal made by Coopers & Lybrand that the government regain control over the doctors' fee schedule; that they control utilization of our health care system; that they restrict general practitioners in Regina and Saskatoon; and that they freeze all new facilities' construction. Does the minister regard those proposals as having merit?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. I think I'd like . . . I would like to interrupt at this point. It's a good example of a question that could draw about . . . I don't know how long a reply. It actually has five parts to it, and the hon. member has asked for an answer to each part, and so I ask the minister not to reply that way because I'm afraid I won't be able to allow him to.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the answer is as my answer was in the first portion of the question.

Cuts to Saskatchewan Student Bursaries

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Last year, Mr. Minister, more than 7,000 students in this province received Saskatchewan student bursaries. This year, after the election, you cancelled the Saskatchewan student bursary plan, and you cut or eliminated the bursaries of thousands of students in the course of doing that.

My question to you, sir is very simple. Do you deny that, as a result of your changes, the average student in a

33-week program at the University of Saskatchewan, or the University of Regina, borrowing up to \$5,900 will not receive one penny of bursary or one penny of forgivable loan, and five years ago under the NDP they would have received \$1,800? And further, Mr. Minister, do you deny that a student at Kelsey ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. I think the hon. member knows that he has been allowed quite a sufficient preamble without starting a new topic in his preamble, so please put your question.

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Minister, I've put the question. Will you answer the question? Do you deny that fact, and do you deny that that kind of a cut is highly unfair to students in this province?

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Mr. Speaker, in some instances, and I'm not sure of his exact numbers, in some instances what he says relative to his numbers is mathematically correct; however, one ought not to stop there.

The hon. member talks about going back to the NDP days. And I don't know as many young people want to go back to the NDP days because the NDP days, Mr. Speaker, are characterized by relatively few students getting assistance. He might argue that it was better assistance; I would argue such was not the case.

If we could go back to NDP days, Mr. Speaker, and special high need students weren't addressed, which is what we are trying to do with or forgivable loans, Mr. Speaker. We wanted to give more assistance to more people, and particularly extra assistance to people like in these categories: natives, disabled, and single parents. And we will stick to that agenda, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — A supplementary, question, Mr. Speaker. The minister says that he's now giving special support to native students. Well I want to ask him: do you deny, Mr. Minister, that in 1981 a native student in the SUNTEP (Saskatchewan urban native teacher education program) program could graduate after four years with bursaries and not one penny of debt, and yet today in 1987 under your program, they are going to get no bursary assistance in their third year, no bursary assistance in their fourth year, and they are going to graduate from SUNTEP in debt 15 to \$20,000. Do you deny that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking if I deny that changes have been made. No, I do not deny that. But I will argue, and I will argue vehemently, Mr. Speaker, the changes that have made have been very positive ones by every measure. Mr. Speaker, whether you talk specifically about SUNTEP programs, native students, students generally, Mr. Speaker, there is more assistance available to more students, point number one.

And point number two and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, is: our young people have a post-secondary education system that is more accessible to them than it's

ever been in this province, Mr. Speaker.

And point number three, they are going to, in the future, have a post-secondary educational system that is even going to be more accessible because of the creation of a new institute and ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — A new question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I want to give you a sample of the average student in my riding. Summer contributions, \$1,000 this year and \$1,000 last year from earnings; total allowable expenses in both years, \$6,000; total allowable needs in both years, \$5,000.

My question to you is this, sir: that student last year got a bursary of \$1,400; this year they don't get a penny in the form of a bursary from your government. Will you admit that that's unfair, and will you now reinstate the Saskatchewan student bursary program?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — No.

Status of Manage of Saskatchewan Transportation Company

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Transportation Company. Can the minister confirm that Saskatchewan Transportation Company's transportation manager, a Mr. Rick Millar, was fired by the corporation on Wednesday of this week, and can he confirm that Mr. Millar was fired with cause?

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm whether or not Mr. Millar is still in the employ of the Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

I will advise the hon. member, and I would suspect the hon. member already knows, that this particular individual has been somewhat ill; he has been hospitalized; he is undergoing some fairly severe personal problems. So at this time I don't think it would be fair, I don't think it would be reasonable, that we would bring this gentleman's name up in the legislature when he's undergoing what I would call a personal crisis at this time.

Mr. Trew: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform this Assembly whether some of Mr. Millar's problems involve the misuse of Saskatchewan Transportation Company's funds? And if so, can he tell the taxpayers how much of their money is involved?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I think I have made it quite clear that I don't feel that it is right. I don't believe that it is appropriate when an individual is undergoing a person crisis, when an individual has just been released from the hospital with a very, very serious illness, that a

member opposite of the NDP party who stand in this legislature day after day being so sanctimonious and so compassionate, and my friend, I don't believe that you are in order in discussing this subject today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, you have totally ignored the question. The question I put to you is simply whether Mr. Millar's problems involved the misuse of Saskatchewan Transportation Company's funds, and if so, how much of the public funds were misused? They have a right to know.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree that the public of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan and the general public, have every right to know if public funds have been misused. And I will give the hon. member by absolute assurance that if that question is asked again, after a reasonable period of time where I can have some time to investigate this matter, after we give some time for this gentleman to perhaps get over his illness — and I'm not going to go into the details of that — at a later point in time I'd be happy to give you all of the details.

Mr. Millar has been fired, or has been terminated for whatever reason. I'll certainly be happy to provide that information to you. But I am not about, here today in the legislature, to get down in the gutter and start and discuss some of the individual's personal problems.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, is Rick Millar under investigation at this point in time? We have a right to know; the public has a right to know. Is there an investigation ongoing?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to add to this.

Possible Sale of Hudson Bay Plywood Plant

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation and I would like to know from the minister if he can confirm that SFPC has sold the Hudson Bay plywood plant, and if so, can he give us the sale price, the names of the new owners, and the date on which the sale takes effect?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, I can't confirm today that the plywood plant in Hudson Bay has been sold, but I can confirm that there have been various proposals being looked at by the corporation in terms of the possible sale of the plywood plant, but I don't confirm today that it has been sold.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can

the minister tell the taxpayers whether you've had an outside independent appraisal done on that Hudson Bay plywood plant before you decided to start negotiating and put it up for sale; and if an appraisal has been done, will you table that appraisal here in the legislature?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Once again, I just confirm, Mr. Speaker, that we have been looking at various proposals as it relates to the plywood plant at Hudson Bay and, in fact, whatever installation Sask Forest Products has, we will look at proposals.

Just to give me a chance for a little commercial here, Mr. Speaker, we will look at proposals for the various installations which are held by Sask Forest Products at the present time.

Mr. Lautermilch: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister and, Mr. Minister, we're asking about this sale because it's just another example of your government's mismanagement, your incompetence, and your readiness to give away to your buddies.

And my question is: I want to know, do you deny that the plywood prices today and over the last 12 to 18 months are at an all-time high? And do you also deny that the private industry have told you that the plant is worth around \$10 million in today's market? And I want to know, as well, if you deny that you're selling this \$10 million plant for less than \$4 million without even having sought an alternative bid from anybody involved in the forest industry.

Now, Mr. Minister, I ask you if that's good business practice and if that's what you've been about?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, I will confirm that plywood prices operate in a very cyclical nature. They have their ups and they have their downs. They are up at the present time, I agree with that. But, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing to be gained from a further discussion of what the member's raised today because I have just said there is no confirmation of any sale having taken place. There is a confirmation that we have been looking at proposals over a period of some time.

Withdrawal of Funding from Port of Churchill Development Board

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, in May your government signed a communiqué from the western premiers' conference in Humboldt stating, and I quote . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. I think we should ask everybody to shut down because I can't hear him myself, so would the hon. members please give the opportunity to have the member from Humboldt ask his question.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the western

premiers' conference in May, Mr. Minister, your government signed a communiqué stating, and I'll quote:

The Port of Churchill once gain received the support of western premiers. They urge continuing efforts to take advantage of opportunities for expanded activity at Churchill.

In light of that, Mr. Minister, why, four months later, has your government withdrawn funding from the Port of Churchill development board which promotes the expanded use of this facility?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing the access to various kinds of markets and institutions as we are, for example, PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute) in Humboldt. And we said that we are going to review that with the Governments of Alberta and Manitoba. We have the same feeling with respect to the Port of Churchill and the cost, and that's exactly what we're doing.

We have priorities for expenditures in agriculture, and whether we want to choose to spend them to a group that will be promoting the Port of Churchill, or whether they want to allocate them to PAMI, or whether we want to allocate them to something else is, I think, a reasonable piece of research and some good questions.

So I would say we support the Port of Churchill, but we won't support it at all costs, or any costs, Mr. Speaker. We want to look at it carefully with respect to the cost per bushel and the number of bushels that can be moved and compared to alternatives.

Mr. Upshall: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, you will know that Churchill can handle in a normal year about 1.5 million metric tonnes. At a saving of \$20 a tonne, that equates to \$30 million. A \$30 million saving to farmers in Saskatchewan, if you pooled it, it is somewhat less — about \$25 million. The investment that you have withdrawn is \$37,000.

Mr. Minister, do you not agree that an investment of \$37,000 in a group that promotes the use of Churchill is a good investment, in light of the approximately \$25 million return it could bring to farmers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. member, you would be the only man in Canada that I know that could stand up and substantiate a \$30 million savings by taking grain to the Port of Churchill. Now I don't know anybody else or any terms of research; I don't know where you get your numbers. But you know that the costs are much higher to take into Churchill — you know that; it's the other way around, because when you take it over that muskeg, and you take it over the kinds of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order. Order, please. The hon. members may disagree with the answer, and that's their prerogative, but the Premier should have the opportunity to give it.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll just say to the hon. member: it is a little, it is a little bit presumptuous to say that there is locked in 25 to \$30 million savings to farmers, net, in Saskatchewan, or in the west for that matter, to automatically go through the Port of Churchill. Now under the right conditions — and they would have to be perfect — under many millions of dollars expenditures upgrading the track, under the right kind of hopper cars and boxcars to go over that track which is on muskeg, at the right time of the year, with all those conditions you might relieve some pressure on other ports. You might relieve some pressure on other ports.

Now the key is to look at the logistic systems through the St. Lawrence and through the west coast, and indeed south, right through to the Mississippi, as well as to the Port of Churchill, but don't just say that there's . . . \$3,700 would get you \$30 million savings. I mean, come on, that's not particularly fair.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. I repeat once more.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Ruling on Points of Order

Mr. Speaker: — Before orders of the day I would like to refer to yesterday's ruling please.

Yesterday a number of points or order were raised before orders of the day concerning question period. Most of them were disposed of at the time. However, on a couple of matters regarding unparliamentary language I undertook to review the record.

On page 2809 of *Hansard*, the member for Saskatoon Nutana said:

Is it fair to say, Mr. Premier, that your Minister of Health deliberately misled this legislature?

And on page 2810 of *Hansard* the Minister of Finance accused the member for Regina North East:

. . . of falsely and deliberately misleading this House.

Whether implied or direct, whether in the question or statement, I think all members know that such words are unparliamentary. I refer members to citation 322 in *Beauchesne's* as follows:

. . . it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible.

All hon. members will also be aware that it is a long-standing tradition of this House that accusations of deliberate misleading or lying are not acceptable in this place.

In view of the other numerous examples of disorderly

behaviour that occurred yesterday, I will not go through the formality of asking those two particular members to withdraw. However, I ask all members to make a greater effort at maintaining an acceptable level of decorum in question period and in debate.

And I would also like to make a comment, if you don't mind at this time, on what I perceive to be a problem here in question period. There seems to be a problem as to one side thinking that preambles are too long, the other side believing answers are too long. I would say that to a degree both sides are correct.

The Speaker could rule very rigidly on this matter. I don't think it would behoove question period if he did that. It would not be good for question period. However I believe members can self-discipline themselves and know what's a reasonable preamble, and I know hon. members who are answering know what's reasonable length of time to answer the question and if they're on the topic or off the topic.

So I ask hon. members, who I know know the rules and have the best interests of this House at heart, to please think of that in the coming weeks.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Economic Development and Trade Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 19

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Mitchell: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Minister, last night we had a series of questions about the so-called IIP, the industrial investment program, and we sort of both seemed to be a bit short of hard numbers, Minister. I wonder if I could leave it on this basis: could your staff prepare and send to me a list or schedule of grants that have been . . . of applications for grants that have been made under that program which have been approved, and which have either paid or will be paid when the project has matured?

And if that's acceptable, could that schedule include the applicant's name and address, the nature of the project, and the amount of the grant that has been paid or is estimated will be paid when the project has matured? And then we could get away from that part of the estimates and move on to something new.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We would take, as follows, the approach to the hon. member. What I will provide to the hon. member is the companies that have been approved and have completed the qualifications for the grant. I would have a little problem giving you the information of those that have applied, that they have been approved but they have not met the criteria necessarily.

And the only reason I say that is if they don't meet the criteria, I'm not sure that information should be made

public, because there's no draw on public funds, and whether or not the company in question would wish that information made public. If the company is drawing money, then clearly that particular grant should be made public and is made public through public accounts. If that would be satisfactory.

Mr. Mitchell: — Yes, that's fair enough. I want to now turn to the subject of private and public investment in the province, and I know from speeches that have been made by ministers of our government that you came to power in 1982 with some pretty definite ideas about this.

And I think it fair to say that your plan was, in a general way, to activate the private sector so that the private sector part of our economy would play a larger role in the business of this province and increase their investments. And a corollary of that, sometimes spoken, sometimes unspoken, was that the government investment in the business of the economy would be reduced over time.

And we on this side of the House have criticized you during this session and in previous sessions and outside this House for being very ideological about the question, for being impractical about it, for following some right-wing plan that you follow blindly and for its own sake, a plan that you follow without regard to the practicalities of a situation but in pursuant of some demigod of how things ought to be done.

We on this side of the House say that in Saskatchewan, as probably everywhere else, a government has to be practical about these things, and a government has to encourage a full range of approaches to this subject, including the private sector, including the public sector, and including other institutions in our society such as co-operatives; and that it's not becoming of a government to try and somehow wrench Saskatchewan out of its traditional ways, accustomed ways of approaching these complex problems that we face, and try and make us over into a Texas or an Alabama or some other foreign jurisdiction in pursuit of an ideological goal.

Now I don't want to be unfair to you, Minister, and you'll have an opportunity to stand up and respond to these things, but that's the clear impression that the people of Saskatchewan have from the rhetoric that ministers in your government have been using for some long period of time, and we've heard it repeated again in this session.

The figures that are available to us indicate that for all of your rhetoric in this area nothing very much has changed in Saskatchewan; that the mix between private investment and public investment remains about the same; that year over year the situation in Saskatchewan has not changed very much; and that your goal of privatizing Saskatchewan has to this point been a failure.

In other words, for things to happen in this province it is necessary for you to take the approach that we advocate, namely, that this requires a mix of instruments in Saskatchewan. It requires the public sector to be doing what it can. It requires the private sector to be doing all that it can. It requires the co-operatives of this province to be doing what it can, and it requires other institutions in this province to play a full part. And it's not becoming of

the government to be trying to wrench this situation away from the time-proven approach to these problems and introduce on our soil a foreign ideology.

Now I have before me statistics, year over year, showing the percentage distribution of private and public investment. It shows the mix in 1982 when you came to power as being more or less what it is in many other provinces in Canada in 1982, and in 1986 being more or less what it is in other provinces.

Now I open up there of course a question of philosophy on which we probably differ, and differ fundamentally, and I understand that. The question that I pose to invite your responses to the things that I've said is: would you agree that the mix in Saskatchewan between private and public investment really hasn't changed very much over the last five years, particularly in relation to what's been happening in other jurisdictions in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I think the hon. member . . . If we talk about the specifics here — if you look at public sector investment, let's say over the last five or six years — recently we completed the Nipawin power project, began under the NDP administration, completed under our administration. That was probably the largest capital investment as far as both the public and private sector were concerned.

Now we are undertaking the development of the Rafferty project, which again is going to be public investment through the power corporation — a very large project. Again over the last five years, from the public sector point of view, the completion of Key Lake, which was a large, large capital investment by, I suppose, a mix of the public and private sector. You had the completion of the Lanigan expansion which — and I'm just going from memory or guess here — we're talking about an \$800 million expenditure by PCS at the Lanigan expansion.

(1045)

Now what we will pursue as a government is clearly a mix in the sense that we are undertaking Rafferty-Alameda. We are undertaking fairly extensive investment in rural gas line, rural gas distribution system by Sask Power to provide natural gas to the rural part of Saskatchewan and not just to the urban part of Saskatchewan. That's a large investment.

We are making a large investment in burying both power cables, the power lines throughout the province, again to the benefit of rural Saskatchewan. We are looking at, in SaskTel, doing individual line services, and that becomes a fairly significant capital investment. That's being done, and that's public investment, and we will continue to do that. There is public investment in the area of irrigation which we see as important.

Now if you look at that part of it, and I suppose what I could say is this, is that we would tend to see the investment by the private sector to grow and investment by the public sector to be restricted, if you like, to more of the utility-type of concept — Sask Power, SaskTel, Sask Water — those types of public investments that we will continue to pursue.

It would be our hope that, let's say, in the gold mining development, now SMDC is part of that. I think we make it fairly clear that it would be our hope that we would be able to in the future find a vehicle by which SMDC could issue shares and allow the people of Saskatchewan to participate in the ownership of SMDC.

SMDC and a variety of partners, we hope, will develop Cigar Lake, given any kind of stability in the uranium markets, now and into the future. So that would be a . . . We would see that being maybe more private investment and less public investment in that type of thing.

In the oil industry we would see more investment being done, or virtually all the investment now being done by the private sector, in the sense that Saskoil is now owned less than 50 per cent by the government and therefore whatever . . . and then they've made a lot of capital investment in this particular province.

If you look at projects like the Co-op — and while you might criticize the Co-op in the sense that government, two levels of government, have had to back-stop the Co-op, if you like — but I would hope that you would appreciate that a business like the Co-op to take on a project of 7 or \$800 million is a risk that they were not able to justify, low as the risk might have been, because of the size of Federated Co-op in Saskatchewan. So they had to do that, and we had to back them up on that particular thing.

But I would class that as a private investment, or at least it's a movement more towards a private investment than, let's say, Saskoil under your proposal, where Saskoil would build an upgrader. In other words, the government would build the upgrader.

So I think there's where your change will be. The change will be . . . let me put it this way. Public sector is going to continue to invest in Saskatchewan, primarily through utilities. Non-utility investment, we would hope to see a larger and larger part of that being done by the private sector. And I think, in fairness, if we're to look at any kind of economies of scale in larger projects, we're going to have to seek investment from outside of Saskatchewan because there's just not the type of capital here, or the risk capital here, to do some of those larger projects. So we are moving towards more and more of the private sector in the commercial area and away from the public sector involvement in the commercial area.

Now philosophically you say that you want to have more . . . the mix should be far more weighted towards the public sector. That's the philosophical difference that we have. We would want to see the mix weighted much more to the private sector; you want to see the mix much more to the public sector in both commercial and non-commercial investment.

Mr. Mitchell: — Now I just simply didn't say that, Minister, and I didn't say anything that could fairly be interpreted that way. All I said was, you're being ideological about it. You've been ideological about it in your rhetoric from your ministers for the last five years. You've been dumping all over the public sector, as

though government ought not to be doing any of the things that government had done in this province for many, many years.

We're not trying to weight things in favour of the public sector. What we're trying to do is be practical and pragmatic about it, and not ideological. You're the one following an ideology. You're marching to the drum of a foreign ideology that has no business in Saskatchewan, and that won't sprout if you plant it. It won't come to seed. It won't grow, and it won't harvest.

An Hon. Member: — It won't take root.

Mr. Mitchell: — It won't take root, the Deputy Premier says.

Now as regards to the upgrader project, Minister, that is a good project; there's no question about it. We're still looking forward to seeing some of the paper on it, but we like the idea, and I don't think anybody on this side of the House has ever indicated that we don't. And no one on this side of the House has suggested that we would have done that project by ourself as a government, that we would have had a Crown corporation do it.

I think what you've done with the Co-op here is a good idea. It's completely consistent with the idea that we've been putting forward, that it requires a fair and pragmatic mix and an open and flexible approach. I have no hesitation in saying that the arrangements with NewGrade certainly meet with my approval. That's how we should be prepared to do things in the province of Saskatchewan. And when I see you do something like that, it's encouraging, because it seems to me that perhaps in some respects you are listening to the ideas that we've been putting forward for a long time on this question of public and private investment.

That project ought to go, and it's going, and it's going because your government decided to get in there and back-stop it with the federal government, as you say, behind the co-operative movement in this province. What I object to is all of the rhetoric and all of the nonsense about privatization and the introduction into Saskatchewan of this right-wing, foreign-based concept that has no business in this province.

Now another point that I wanted to pick up on and not just leave it unchallenged is the notion that by selling shares in SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) you would convert that into a company that was owned by the people of Saskatchewan. I don't have to tell you, of all people on that side of the House, that the Crown corporations of Saskatchewan are owned lock, stock, and barrel by the people of this province. They're not owned by anybody else. They're not owned by the government. The government has no existence independent of the people. The government in the final analysis is the people. It is the people. I am an owner of SMDC. I do not become any larger owner or any different kind of an owner if I have a share certificate in my hand, and you know that to be true.

Now I want to take you back, Mr. Minister, to the industrial incentive program and the new program. I think I'm

correct in describing it as a new program — the industrial development grants referred to in your estimates under vote 66. And I would like you to tell us how these grants will operate. My information is that the program guide-lines for these grants are not out.

Now I'm looking at the heading "industrial development grants," and you told me last night that some 85 per cent of those would be IIP type grants. And it may well be that the criteria for these grants will be the same as the criteria for the IIP grants, and if that's the case, then that will be a simple answer. But if it's not the case, will it work along the same lines, or will there be different criteria, and who will these grants be targeted towards?

And are there further details in addition to the IIP guide-lines, and if so, when can we expect to get them? We've heard and read criticism from the private sector about this program, and so far as I'm aware, those criticism have not been responded to by you, criticisms that included the fact that there had been no guide-lines published; and other criticisms was that the grants were . . . in one case somebody said they were not properly targeted, and in another that they were not cost effective.

But perhaps you can . . . I've asked a number of questions there, Minister, but if you could start at the top of the list and work you way down, I'd be obliged.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Let me deal with your first priority with regards to the ownership of various commercial corporations. And I won't dwell on this because I think it is pretty crystal clear that we would see the government owning a variety of industries and a variety of businesses as being owned by the government. And I believe that it's right and proper that government could and should, where possible, divest that ownership in government into the people of Saskatchewan who look for an investment in that.

What we're looking at . . . if you really go back to the philosophy, even of Crown corporations by your government, and if you're to listen philosophically to the argument advanced by the leader of your party, was to the effect . . . Let's take a good example being SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation). The argument, as I understand it and as it goes, is as follows: that without the government taking a part of the action, through SMDC or whatever, that we would not have seen the uranium mines built in northern Saskatchewan, certainly not Key Lake. And that was because there was some maybe hesitant on the part of outside of investors to go into a project like that. They found a comfortable level of investment with the Crown corporation. As a result, Key Lake was built.

Now, be that valid or not valid — and we don't necessarily have to argue the economics or the reality of that — having once built the plant and built the mine, is it therefore necessary that the government continue to own it? And perhaps that's not a good example because much of what SMDC does, it does through joint ventures, whether it's the gold mine that was built, future gold mines to be build, and that type of thing.

I think what the hon. member . . . and the point that I

would like to leave with the hon. member, is the following. No matter where you are in the world, most of the world is looking for investment in their particular jurisdiction. Whether it's Ontario or Alberta or Manitoba, everybody is looking for somebody to come in and investment in their particular territory.

And we're no different than they are; in fact, to build large projects you need a large amount of capital. And I think realistically we come to the view that there is not a large amount of capital here in Saskatchewan, certainly not a large amount of risk capital. If the people do not have the risk capital that live in the province, the question then becomes: should government go into that and do the risk capital, put up the risk capital? Or should we, on the other hand, bring somebody else in, prepared to invest, whether it's from Japan or from the United States or from Ontario or whatever?

I would argue that given the tighter fiscal reality that the whole western world is facing today, that the government's priority should be more into the area of social programs and less into the area of making capital investment in commercial ventures, with the view of somehow you're going to get a return always on that investment. I'm not sure the government's job is to do that, given the fiscal realities of the western world. And I don't think that's peculiar in Saskatchewan. I think you're seeing that in Alberta; you're seeing that in other jurisdictions, pursuing exactly the same thing. I don't think it's dogmatic; I think, quite frankly, it's very pragmatic, in the sense of how do you marshal scarce resources? But we can continue on that debate all day, I suspect, and all night and for a couple of weeks.

(1100)

Dealing with the second question, when we announced this year as we were going through the budget adjustments that we had to go through from a fiscal point of view, we also made a cut in our department that basically said we have to hold back as well; and we did that. The largest expenditure of this department was the IIP program, and that was cancelled. Now the program runs as such that it takes a year before it's phased out. At that point in time I indicated that I thought that the business departments of government should make as concerted effort as other departments of government to pull back.

What I also announced at that time is that we had to re-look as to what type of a program that we would replace it with. And the reason we had to replace it, quite simply, was the fact that if we did not, and we just left it to the whims of the private sector and the free market, you have to compete against Alberta who subsidize a great deal into business, against Manitoba who subsidize a fair amount into the business world, certainly in B.C. and Ontario, and virtually every province in the country has some type of — for lack of a better word — a subsidy program to encourage or attract business into their territory. And we need that as well.

Now what we looked at with the IIP program, as well the IIP program quite frankly was a fairly successful program in the sense that it was not tied totally to jobs but also to

investment. Nevertheless it was universal, and therefore the question became: when you had to rationalize your dollars, should you have a universal program, or should you have something less than a universal program? And that's what we're looking at today.

We would . . . I think when I announced the cut in the program or the dropping of the program last spring, I indicated at that time to the public that we were going to look at bringing back a program used to attract industry in the province. Now I can say to the hon. member, we have looked at a series of these types of options, but we have not yet brought that matter before cabinet as to what those options would be. We would hope to do that later this fall and certainly in the process for next budget year.

It will likely be something relative to IIP in the sense of being performance based. It will not be universal in the sense that, I think, we have to look at how do we target and what do we target. And that will tend to be what economic strategy the cabinet decides to pursue on this particular thing. I think it would probably be also fair to say that the targeting will have to be a little more precise, and I would guess at what you will see is something in the field of agriculture processing, of further refinement in the resource sector of science and technology and of manufacture.

There will be other areas as it relates to tourism and small business generally, and a new focus there, but certainly the process will be very much oriented that way. One could look at the model which is the . . . what we will call for the purposes of this discussion, the Manitoba model. The Manitoba model has a pool of dollars, I think it's something like 20 or \$30 million in a fund that is drawn out of that fund on the approval of Executive Council. So in other words, if Manitoba say, we want to attract a plant that builds buses or expand the plant that builds buses, we're prepared to go directly into that fund and allocate money to it.

Alberta have far richer plans, pardon me, but that has, I think, still living or emanating out of the '70s when Alberta was overflowing with cash, so they have a . . . it's very difficult for us to compete against Alberta.

The third dimension that we're looking at is the western development fund that the federal government has announced. And because we're dealing again with finite dollars, we would hope to try to dovetail as much as possible into the regulations that will be forthcoming on the federal program so that we're not trying to lift what we're standing on; so that the dollars are, in fact, directed in an appropriate way; that we're not competing one against the other, or a person looking for assistance is not playing one off against the other. So we would hope to be able to co-ordinate it there. We still have not yet taken the decision.

I can advise the hon. member that I would tend to lean towards the fund-type operation that exists in Manitoba, maybe 20, \$30 million that we could then allocate out to a project, because I think you're seeing in the modern day, needing economies of scale. We need the small companies and businesses, but we also need economies of scale with the capacity to market into the world their

product that they produce. So I hope that can explain the thinking at this point in time; no decision has yet been taken.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you, Minister. I'm going to stop talking about the earlier subject of the appropriate mix of public and private investment and that sort of thing, just disengage it, but promise you that we're going to come back to that at some future occasion because I think you're wrong. I think you're headed in a wrong direction. I think you're using the wrong language, and sending out all the wrong signals, and I don't think you really believe what you're saying yourself. And I think the upgrader project is a prime example of that. It's not a question of the government wanting to own everything or anything, it's a question of what the government has to do in Saskatchewan in order to make things happen.

There is a wide variety of reasons; that's not the only one; there may be other reasons. You raise the example of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), and there were policy reasons for that decision as there were policy reasons for the decision to go into the potash industry, and you know that as well as I do. And it's a complex question. But you can't let your ideology get in the way of that, and that's what will be the subject of further debates between you and I and other members of this House in the future.

I think it clear from your answer, Minister, that there . . . We're six months into the fiscal year now — are we? — something like six months into the fiscal year, almost half of the budget year gone, and with the exception of paying out the IIP grants, this sum of money that's to be voted for the industrial development grants hasn't been spent yet, and it's not, I suggest, not likely to be spent in this fiscal year.

Now you may want to consult with your officials and give us an estimate of how much the \$7 million is realistically likely to be spent during this fiscal year, or is it simply a number? It may be, if we want to decrease the deficit, that we could decrease that item right now to a realistic level and do a great favour to the Minister of Finance in so doing, because there's no point having a number on the books and approving an estimate for an expenditure which has little or not chance of being made this year.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well to date about 50 per cent, I'm advised, has been paid out. And we . . . This is a legal requirement for us to pay this, because the IIP program is cast in legislation. And it would be our expectation, our best guess is that the — virtually it all, if not all of it, would be paid out by the end of this fiscal year, and so we would anticipate the number in next year's estimates to be very, very close to that number.

Mr. Mitchell: — Now, Minister, I'd like to turn to the western diversification initiative and say a few words about it first, and then get your comments on it.

We've been talking in this province about building on our natural strengths for many, many years. We used to talk about it; the late Mr. Thatcher used to talk about it; Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd talked about it; and we all to some extent did it. You've been talking

about it, and if we're to believe your rhetoric, some day you plan to do something about it; but it's not clear to us what you've done yet to build on our natural strengths.

And the federal government has been saying the same thing through their economic development programs and their regional development programs for many years. That's what the regional development or the general development agreements and the subsidiary agreements were all about under DRIE (Department of Regional Industrial Expansion), where we were all going to build upon our natural strengths.

Five years ago the Liberal government appointed federal economic co-ordinators in the provincial capitals, and I believe that Mr. Wakabayashi and your staff came to Saskatchewan on such an assignment, and they were to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Does the Deputy Premier want the floor here now, or is he going to hear me out on this subject?

They were going to provide advice on an ongoing basis that was more regionally sensitive. And in 1980, finance minister MacEachen's budget announced a \$4 billion western development fund. Again, special development initiatives were to be selected in consultation with the governments of the western provinces. "They will be designed," and I'm quoting here:

They will be designed to address the major economic opportunities and constraints which will challenge the west during this decade.

Now seven years before that, the then Liberal government, federal government, had organized a major western economic opportunities' conference which was part of a new approach to national development wherein, I'm quote here:

. . . wherein our goal must be to seek balanced and diversified regional economies across the country.

So everybody's been addressing the same problem for that time, at least, and before that, in fact.

But none of these programs have achieved their objectives. They've fallen far short of their objectives, and as well now we learn the \$1.2 billion western diversification program will be allocated mainly on projects with the same kind of criteria as in the past, and we in Saskatchewan have, I think, a degree of skepticism about these grandiose plans that emanate from Ottawa about how much they're going to do for us out here in the regions or in the boondocks.

In Saskatchewan we have had a commitment for many years to put small business at the leading edge of our provincial economy, and the western diversification program does address the subject of small and medium-sized businesses. And we're glad to see that.

The March 1984 budget introduced a number of measures that were aimed at creating the environment in which small business would provide the diversification thrust through venture capital and your IIP program and your targeted tax cuts.

As I tried to point out last night, the indigenous Saskatchewan small businesses have not reaped their share of the benefits of this approach. They do not feel — let me put it that way, Minister — they do not feel that this program has benefited them. They feel the program has benefited others, the big boys, many of them from outside the province. But at the end of the day they're left asking: what's it done for me? And the answer, I fear, is that it's done very little for them. I have some sympathy for them when they express that point of view. And that viewpoint has been put forward by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business who has stated . . . Garth Whyte said, we've tried to bring in the big projects, and they haven't worked out that well.

Now I questioned whether this approach to business diversification, and specifically to small business diversification, is genuine, or whether what we're going to see under the new federal initiative and your own assistance project in Saskatchewan, that we were just talking about, won't be another approach that is oriented towards the big deals, the megaprojects, the propping-up of businesses that are already large and can already afford to take care of their own investment financing requirements. And your friend Pocklington is a perfect example of a guy who was able to do it himself; no question about that.

(1115)

Now I guess what I come down to is that if you look at the way back to the western economic opportunities conference and trace it all the way through, we in Saskatchewan have had a long series of words and words and words — ideas. And it hasn't been good enough, because on the ground it just hasn't delivered what Saskatchewan business people are entitled to have delivered to them.

The \$1.2 billion allotted to the western diversification fund won't go very far, Mr. Minister — I think you recognize that — because it's going to be spread across four provinces over the course of five years. And even if that were divided equally, and I think there is some real question about whether it will be divided equally, it would only be some 60 million a year per province.

And at the same time that that's going on, our province will be feeling the impact of federal policies such as deregulation in the transportation industry, such as the cut-backs and restraint measures in relation to efforts to combat the federal deficit and elements of the tax reform ideas, and the whole mess in trade that Saskatchewan is going to have to grapple with in the years to come, with blessed little assistance from the western economic development fund.

There's also a distinct lack of specifics surrounding that federal program. Its structures and its operation have been left relatively open-ended. And there's no fixed limit on the grants, and there's no application forms, and there's precious little information. And Saskatchewan businesses just simply don't know what's happening.

Applications have been formulated and they're being

delivered to the office in Saskatoon, but nobody knows what's going on. Now the intention of the federal government is that this type of approach will insure flexibility. I think it's fair to say that the very flexibility that's involved also opens it to other influences, even including heaven forbid, political influences.

And finally, Mr. Minister, there is a perception, shared by many and shared by me, that the impetus for this kind of a development policy, for this kind of a regional or western development policy, is primarily an act of political symbolism rather than an act of economic reality. And we feel a certain degree of skepticism, and we're reassured in that by the reaction that we get from the business community in Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Minister, I would ask you to comment on those rather general remarks that I've made — most of which I admit were rather critical — and give us as much information about this area as you're able to.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The hon. member has asked several questions, and I'll try to respond to the basic questions he's asked.

First question was, we are not dealing with small business but with big business. Now I suppose, in order for us to debate, what we have to do on that is define what we both mean by big business or small business. We address that in two ways. One, there is a Department of Tourism and Small Business, and they have a budget almost twice as large as our budget. Their job is exclusively to deal with small business. And of course that blends into what is large business.

Now if you look at two or three of the projects — is Hunter's in North Battleford, would you class that as a big business or a small business? Flexi-Coil in Saskatoon, is that a big business or a small business? And I suppose by Saskatchewan standards that would be a bigger business; by Canadian standards it would be seen as small business, quite frankly, by comparing to the large corporations that exist in other regions of this country. So we have to look at that.

I think that however we proceed, however anyone proceeds, one should not take the view that small business is the answer to all our woes, and the only way that we can diversify or, on the other hand, that it's only going to be big business that can diversify. I think you have to have a proper mix of those. Business is a business.

Now the hon. member, I think, would say that he and their party does not support any kind of big business. I'd like to know how he defines that, but if it's big business, it's not welcome. So I'll leave that at that.

With regard to the western development fund and the history of that. Let me give you an example of the most recent one which was the western development fund put out by the Liberals in the 1980s, late 1970s, to help diversify western Canada.

I think, if you looked at that project, and people looked at that project honestly, what you would find was the following. It was driven by Lloyd Axworthy, who was the

only real member of the Liberal caucus and the cabinet from western Canada. And quite frankly, the lion's share of that fund was spent in the city of Winnipeg, and for the most part in Lloyd Axworthy's seat, to the detriment of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia.

And I think anybody would admit that, including Liberals — and I've talked to many Liberals who have the same view of that particular fund. We were left with Hazen Argue to flirt around the province very once in a while announcing that he was going to build a swimming pool here or something else there. And that's what we got out of it. We got short-changed dramatically by that, and I would hope the people of this province and this part of the country would not soon forget the way that was delivered. Quite frankly, I think it was a disgraceful administration of that particular fund.

Now that fund carried on, and what happened is that it was driven at the national level and looking always at national questions and not at regional questions. Let me give you a good example. Ipsco yesterday opened their new caster — \$65 million investment that has now have their work-force up to, I understand, around 800 people, where it was down as low as 250 people at the total down of the oil industry because they were pretty much reliant upon the oil industry for what they produced.

That project was done with the assistance of the Government of Saskatchewan, with absolutely no assistance whatsoever from the federal government. And the reason given by the federal government — and it doesn't matter whether it's NDP, Conservative, or Liberal: you get the same type of answer from them, and that is: that looking at the national interest, we have over-supply in the steel industry and, therefore, to give you assistance at Ipsco would further exacerbate our problem in the steel industry. And of course that steel industry is concentrated lock, stock, and barrel in the province of Ontario.

As a result the national government says, we cannot do something in the West because it would impact upon the already existing industries in central Canada. Now if the new program announced recently is to continue to follow that criteria in every way, shape, or form, then I would agree with the hon. member; it's going to be an absolute failure. Because what it's going to do is say, we don't want to see any manufacturing really developed in the West because to do so would put stress and strain upon the existing manufacturing sector of this country, which for the most part, as we all know, is centred again in Ontario and central Canada, but primarily Ontario.

So it would be our hope that that would not happen with regard to these projects.

Now I would say we have two things going for us that are different. I think they have recognized the error of their way in looking at some of that stuff, and therefore have to look at dealing with a more reasoned approach to it. That's number one. Number two, to say that there will not be political involvement when politicians and government is involved, we both know that that is not in fact true, and it has not been true since the beginning of time, regardless of which political party. Now some use it

more than others; some use it less than others. But we all use it. You know that, and I know that.

Now I would say that if we have a Bill McKnight from Saskatchewan in charge of that program as opposed to Lloyd Axworthy from Manitoba in charge of that program, I would hope that we would get a better shake out of the program than we got out of the previous program. I would just . . . two and two would say that.

So I would hope that we would be able to play that lever and play that card to our advantage. And I'm sure others will look at different ways by which they could play it equally as well.

So having said that . . . But let's get down to the nub. I think, of your question, and that is: how do we diversify the western economy? And we have all, as governments, attempted to deal with that particular question over the last 50 years. We go back, and I think we both agree the West has been always cast in the role of hewers of wood and drawers of water, and that's something we've always tried to be able to move away from.

Now if we're going to realistically say how do we build (a) on our strengths, and build something that can last. Then I think we have to look and say, okay, where is the economy of (a) this province and this country going, and what is happening in the world.

For us to build anything only to serve Saskatchewan, with but a million people, we're not going to see anything of very large scale built in this province other than for our resources and the development of our resources and the sale of our resources. So it seems to me that what we have to do is try to arrange trading patterns, however we might arrive at those, whether it's bilaterally with United States, or multilaterally through GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), or bilaterally with Japan. However it's going to be, I think we must be far more cognizant now of the world out there than perhaps we were before. And I think that's a matter of the country growing up, quite frankly.

So that is one area, I think, we have to be keenly interested in. I think, number two, we have to go back to saying, I think, two basic things. You cannot move away from agriculture and the agriculture sector. I think there should be concentration on the agriculture processing sector, and that is something you just have to stay with and stay with.

Further refinement of our resources, whether it's a heavy oil upgrader, whether it's a Weyerhaeuser type project where you can use the lumber to make fine paper as opposed to fence posts, that type of thing, then you can pursue some manufacturing sector. But the manufacturing sector, which we have made some strides forward in, that is one that you have to develop with a fair degree of care, a fair degree of care in the sense that it must be financed in a way, and with enough investment, in a way that it can weather the ups and downs. And it also must have a marketing arm capable of dealing with the world market out there and the ups and downs and the changes in the world market.

So I would hope to see the federal initiative now being directed towards, one, agriculture and agricultural processing; two, further refinement of natural resources; three, some help to the science community, particularly in Saskatoon, that has shown some fair growth over the last five years and over the last 15 years; and some specific manufacturing that we can do that can have and hit into niche markets whether in Canada, in United States, or other parts of the world, but I think primarily into Canada and United States because it's difficult to manufacture and export into Japan, or manufacture and export into very competitive, the EEC (European Economic Community) in Europe.

So I think that would tend to be the direction I would like to see us take.

(1130)

Mr. Mitchell: — I want to respond. I want to respond to one point that you made, Minister. I think that what Lloyd Axworthy did when he was minister responsible for western Canada was wrong, was just bloody wrong. It was wrong for him to take all that money that ought to have been available to businesses right across western Canada and put it into his seat in Winnipeg — wrong, immoral, and he ought to have been fired from his job for it; he ought to have been removed entirely.

And if Bill McKnight administers this western economic development fund in anything like the way that Axworthy did his job, then he should be kicked out of the cabinet. He should lose his job also because he would be wrong.

And, Minister, it just can't be that you believe that the administration of those grant programs have a political content. If you think that, you're wrong, and you shouldn't be in the job that you're in. You should be fired from your job if that's what you believe.

Surely these grants ought to be administered against a set of criteria and administered fairly and objectively. And the people who qualify for them should get them; and people who don't qualify for them shouldn't get them, regardless of what kind of a contribution they've made, regardless of what kind of a party card they're carrying. And even if they're on your executive, Minister, they're not any more qualified for an industrial incentive program grant than I am, who have never been on your executive.

Now I think that you agree with what I've said, but if you don't, then you shouldn't be sitting in that chair trying to administer that department.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I want to turn to another subject area, and I have a number of questions in them, and I think I'll ask these one at a time. It concerns your trade program.

Trade is a subject that I know that you're very interested in from speeches that you've made in this House and conversations that you and I have had. And we recognize fully, and I recognize fully, that trade is essential to the

economy of Saskatchewan. You have made a great deal of your endeavours to build better economic ties internationally and to aid Saskatchewan companies to find new markets. And I'm not about to launch into any kind of a criticism of that, but I do want to say that I am unable to understand what you're now doing in light of that history.

The entire trade programs branch of your department has been decimated, and I think that unless there's some explanation for it, it must be a totally contradictory move, a totally contradictory development. On the one hand you are strong trade proponents, and I give you that as a fair description of your philosophy — you, Mr. Minister — and yet at the same time you're stripping away from Saskatchewan business any help as they try to develop their international trade connections.

And what we've seen in this budget is that the three programs are eliminated, three programs that were the backbone of your trade development policy — first, the Aid to Trade program; second, the market development fund; and third, the trade opportunities program. Now I want to deal with those in order.

First of all, let's look at the Aid to Trade program. In 1985-86, 1,095 projects were approved under that program, providing about \$570,000; and last year, '86-87, there were 590 projects approved, providing slightly less than \$400,000. Now obviously it was a popular program, and I'm given to understand that in many respects it was an effective program. And my question, Minister, is that you are not concerned that Saskatchewan business, in particular smaller manufacturers, will be adversely affected by the decision to eliminate that program? And do you not agree that these smaller companies could have utilized this money to assist them in venturing out into the export market, and in that way increasing our trade? And really are they not doing what we need the most to enhance Saskatchewan trade?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Let me address the two questions you raised. With regard to the political cards, I don't think that is anywhere close to what I was saying. What I was saying is this, and I think the Leader of the Opposition when the new government came in in 1984 was very critical of the formation of the cabinet because all the cabinet ministers with key economic portfolios resided in central Canada, or not in western Canada. I think the history of this country has tended to be that much of the largess of government in assisting business has gone to Ontario and Quebec, with very little of it going to the West, and what we got was chicken-feed relative to what central Canada got.

So at least with the \$1.2 billion fund, and everybody would like to see it higher, at least now that is specific to western Canada. I think the government has indicated that it's not going to be apportioned on a one-quarter, one-quarter basis to each province. And I don't think that it would be fair to say that, and certainly talking to the federal government there's not an intention of saying, are you a card-carrying member as to qualify for a job or qualify for this grant. I don't think that is going to happen, and I would want to see . . . all I indicated with McKnight

is that I think with McKnight we're going to get a fair shake, where we certainly did not get a fair shake with Lloyd Axworthy. And I would rather deal with a Saskatchewan member than I would deal with a Lloyd Axworthy. And that's all I'm simply trying to make on that particular point.

The second point with regard to our approach towards international trade, there's two things that I think you have to look at with regard to international trade. One is, if you look realistically at the numbers for trade by our province and by our country, Saskatchewan lives on exports, and therefore we have to pursue the export dimension of our economy and what we produce.

We export roughly half of what we export into the U.S. market, and half to the rest of the world. Now that's about 50-50. And one would argue that if that was the national average, that would be very good, because the national average is not that. The national average is 78 per cent is exported into the United States, and the remaining 12 per cent into the rest of the world. Ontario which is the largest of all exporters, exports 90 per cent of what they export into the United States, and but 10 per cent into the rest of the world.

Then you look and say, how do you approach the rest of the world? And the rest of the world is very, very large for a province like Saskatchewan. How do we get into (a) the Pacific Rim, which is very large? How do we get into Europe which is very large? And how do we maintain our markets in the United States within the small businesses?

Now we still have in our trade vote, what? — about \$180,000 less money than we had last year. And that's simply saying that we have to rationalize like everybody else has to rationalize. I can say that the government is reviewing its entire Aid to Trade program. And I think maybe if you went through some of the people that were qualifying, some of the stuff that was paying out again maybe got too loose in the sense if you had to prioritize; should we be giving \$15,000 to this company to go to a trade show in some part of United States; was it better to spend that 15,000 there or tighten it up so we're perhaps a little more targeted, not unlike what we're talking about in any grants we might have to incentives?

I can assure the hon. member that we see this as a high priority in government, and we will pursue the international dimension in a continued way that we are now. And that means that we have to put offices out into the various parts of the world. We'd like to have more, but clearly we have to put offices out into the rest of the world. And hopefully we could co-operate in the future with the other four western provinces in our trade offices around the world, that would allow us to better utilize the sparse dollars that we have, to maximize our chances in the international markets. And that's a long process and it's a difficult process, but it's clearly one that we are committed to.

Mr. Mitchell: — To some extent I think your answer applied to the other two areas that I mentioned in addition to the Aid to Trade program, namely the market development fund, which was to help exporters of agricultural and food products, and the trade

opportunities program. Both of those programs were well used, I think, in '86-87 and in '85-86.

And as you have said today and on many other occasions, your government puts a great deal of emphasis on diversification of agriculture and the further processing and marketing of agricultural products. And it seems to us that the elimination, the specific elimination, of the market development fund flies in the fact of that priority.

The trade opportunities program was created to help exporters expand their markets while providing career opportunities for Saskatchewan graduates. And you paid, under that program, part of their salary and their travel costs, and that program also was used in '86-87 and '85-86.

As I said when I began this remark, Minister, to some extent you touched on those programs, but could I ask you more specifically whether the areas covered by those programs are now dead or whether they're to be subsumed in a new program.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Let me address a couple of those. One, the market development fund was primarily involved with agriculture, and what we are proposing to do is have that strengthened in the Department of Agriculture where it's far closer to the farm community and to the spin-offs coming out of the farm community. So you're going to see that much more focussed in the Department of Agriculture.

With regard to the trade opportunities program, that program was introduced by myself, so I take a fair degree of interest in that program. I believe it is something that deserves more effort, for this reason: that it takes a long time perhaps to reap the crop from that type of dollar. But what we are doing is trying to get a situation where we can have students graduating from university that are able to obtain experience in the international markets of the world, hopefully that they would come back and become involved in the companies employing them, and therefore advancing our knowledge of trade and understanding of the world market. So that will not be eliminated; in fact, it will be significantly developed, I would hope in the near future.

Mr. Mitchell: — Minister, could I refer you to your estimates under the heading "Business Development Grants." The amount estimated for that grant in the last fiscal year was slightly over 17 million. This year it's 9,500,000, which is a cut of almost \$8 million. What's the story with respect to that cut?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That falls under the Department of Tourism and . . . the hon. members, that falls under the Department of Tourism and Small Business. I would ask that . . . I hope that you would pursue it in that area.

(1145)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have some questions as well for the minister.

Mr. Minister, in looking through the estimates under subvote 3, under trade development, I've noted a . . .

under the 1987-88 year you've indicated an expenditure of \$1.8 million, and under the '86-87 year you've indicate 1.9.1 note as well a decrease in person-years of 4 person-years. I'm wondering if you could give us a breakdown of the employees, who they are, and their salary range. As well, Mr. Minister, under subvote 4 I'll be asking some questions in terms of person-years, and who has left, and if you could perhaps get your officials to get that information for us.

An Hon. Member: — Can you be specific as to what you want there?

Mr. Lautermilch: — I would like to know who has left, in terms of the employees for last year to this year, what their salaries are, and what their positions were?

An Hon. Member: — Subvote three and vote four?

Mr. Lautermilch: — Subvote three and subvote four.

An Hon. Member: — All right. I'll undertake to get that.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. I'm wondering as well if you could give us a breakdown under both subvote three and subvote four of the other expenses. I note in '86-87, 1.1 million; '87-88, estimated 1.043 million — if you could give us a breakdown of those expenses under subvote 3. And as well if you could — I note under subvote 4: '86-87, 1.6 million; '87-88, 866,000. And I'm wondering if you could give us the specific breakdowns of the expenditures under those subvotes.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'll undertake to get that information. It's not here, and so they're going to have to go back to the office. So I wonder if the hon. member would put the list down, if he wants to complete the list, so that we don't have to keep running, and get the entire information. Do you understand what I'm saying? You've asked a series of questions; I'll undertake to get that information for you. But are there other areas of information that you wanted as well, so I can get that without them having to then run back and try to redo the same job?

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Minister, we would like as well for last year the total breakdown . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's fine; we're willing to wait. And you'll be bringing those back for last year, as well as for this fiscal year?

An Hon. Member: — You bet.

Mr. Lautermilch: — If I could, I've got some questions regarding the trade offices. Your government has directed an awful lot of expenditure to trade promotion and established trade offices throughout the various areas of the world. And I'd like to know if you could, for the year of 1986-87, give us the total amount of money directed towards these offices for commercial operations, residential accommodations, salaries of your representatives, anything that you may have expended in terms of personal service contracts, employment contracts, in the trade offices in London, Vienna, Hong Kong, and Minot, as well.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — London is not under our department. It's under, I believe — it's not under us — in Executive Council. Vienna is under Agdevco. That question should be properly posed in Crown corporations. Minot office has been closed in this budget year, and so I'll undertake to get you the information with regard to Hong Kong.

Mr. Lautermilch: — I would ask . . . Mr. Minister, you indicate to me that the trade office in Vienna is not under your jurisdiction?

Mr. Minister, in terms of promotion and the amount that your department spend for advertising, I note in '83-84 you're spending a total of approximately 19 per cent of your budget; in '84-85 it increased to 20 per cent of your budget; in '85-86 to 23.4 per cent of your budget. And I'm wondering, Mr. Minister, if you're feeling that your department has garnered the kinds of benefits from these amounts of advertising that you would have expected when you forecasted these amounts and when you spent these amounts.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — You have to . . . I mean that's always a debate at budget finalization time. The advertising, of course, is for outside of Saskatchewan — promotions for outside of Saskatchewan to (a) assist in the selling of Saskatchewan manufactured or produced product, or seeking to encourage investment back into our province. And so I suppose it becomes somewhat difficult to perhaps say that the money has always been spent in the right way.

The thing I can say to the hon. member is the amount that we spend, let's say, relative to what Alberta would spend, or B.C., or Manitoba even would spend, and certainly Ontario and Quebec, is minuscule as to what they spend on those type of promotions. So that while it is still a fairly significant amount, part of the function of this department is to try to encourage sales outside of the province, trying to attract investment into the province. And you can do it by promoting, and you can do it by sending people out.

If you simply sit back and do nothing, the world is not going to run to us, and the world is not going to come zooming into Saskatchewan. You have to go out and try to promote yourself, and that costs money, but I think it's something that we have to undertake to do.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Well, Mr. Minister, I just want to say, we all understand that Saskatchewan needs to be exposed to the rest of the world in order to have our economy grow. But I also want to say on behalf of the small-business people in this province that we don't believe it's worked. And I also want to tell you that the money that your department has expended in this province has certainly not been aimed to Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan entrepreneurs. And I think if you will be honest with yourself and look at all of the economic growth indicators that are published across this country, that you will have to agree that the small-business people in this province have a reason to be upset with your government.

You have been standing up here and debating philosophy with the members on this side. You talk about your desire

to see free enterprise involved in the economy in this province, and that's all fine. And we on this side of the House expect that as well. But I tell you what we don't expect. We don't expect your kind of open for business philosophy, the Peter Pocklington and the give-away to Weyerhaeuser, to continue, nor do we appreciate that kind of conduct from your department and your government.

You, I'm sure, would understand what small business in this province could do were they given the \$20 million that you gave to Peter Pocklington. We've talked about private and public and corporate ventures, joint ventures, but in the case of the Pocklington situation what you've done is, you've taken public funds, given it to private enterprise. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the money you've expended there could have created an awful lot more jobs had you directed that to the small-business community, which you didn't see fit to do.

We believe, and the record of this government has been, in joint funding. But I can't for the life of me understand why you would give a millionaire, a Peter Pocklington millionaire, money that belongs to the people of this province in order to create the few number of jobs that you've created.

We're pleased to see those jobs. We are. But I tell you, if you divide the amount of public funds that you've given by the number of employees, the amount of money that the city of North Battleford had to inject in order to get that particular operation to come to their city, the investment per job ratio is a woeful and a sad, sad specimen. And it's not the kind of development that the people of this province can afford. And that's one of the reasons that you're sitting with almost a three and one-half billion dollar deficit that you've built since 1982.

And I would also want . . . You've mentioned Weyerhaeuser, you've mentioned the development. Well, Mr. Minister, please to understand that the people of Prince Albert have seen through you. And they saw through you prior to the election of '86, and not very comfortable with the fact that you gave away one-quarter of a billion dollars to an American firm.

You've talked about markets and you talked about the \$91,000 a day that the PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) assets were supposedly losing. But you haven't stood up in this House and indicated to the people that the pulp and paper industry in North America was on a downturn. And you haven't stood up and indicated that you knew — or if you didn't know you should've known — that there was going to be an upturn in that industry. And you should've known that the PAPCO assets, whether privately owned or publicly owned, were going to generate profits. But that's the kind of rhetoric . . . you spent hundreds of thousands of dollars telling the people that the PAPCO assets were a waste, losing money; you did open for business and the like, on and on and on.

But what you've done is you've forgotten your friends, or who should be your friends, the small-business community in Saskatchewan. And I'm afraid, Mr. Minister, outside of the board of directors of the chamber

of commerce who represent a number of business people in this province, you've forgotten the downtown Saskatchewan, the downtown Moose Jaw, the downtown Swift Current, and Yorkton, and Estevan, and Elbow. You've forgotten about those people. And what you've done because of your incompetence, you've gone to them and you've asked them to pay higher taxes. You've heaped the gas tax on them. There's been an increase in their business tax because of revenue sharing, an increase in their property tax because of revenue sharing.

And I just say, Mr. Minister, that your performance has been dismal. And I would ask you how you expect the business community who for the most part I would suggest didn't support you in 1986 and won't again in 1990, or whenever you have the courage to do it — won't be supporting you the next round.

And I want to ask you, what do you say to them in light of the expenditures to your big-business friends? How do you condone that and how do you explain that? I would like to know what you're saying when you're out campaigning, and if you ever do get out there and talk to those folks. I'd like to know how you condone that and how you condone your actions.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, one would . . . we just went through what I thought was a fairly informed debate with the member from Saskatoon Fairview, and then we come back to the rhetoric of the so-called token business man within the NDP. Let me say a couple of things. One, is that you hobble around on your horse saying that there's \$250 million given to Weyerhaeuser. I mean the member from Regina Centre, while we were 17 points behind in the polls, swung the wrong way on this one which allowed us to move up in the polls to the point where we won the last election, quite frankly. So we can argue whether Weyerhaeuser was good or bad in the last election. My question is that it was good.

The success of the Weyerhaeuser project . . . and I can't really believe a member from Prince Albert standing up and being totally opposed to a \$250 million investment in his city to manufacture paper to create a lot more jobs, and that investment being made by a company and not by the people of Saskatchewan.

You come back to the view that what was right is when there was a pulp mill in Prince Albert, that you had to as government go in and buy the entire amount. It was brought in by Ross Thatcher. It was built by the Liberals, not by you. It was a joint venture.

(1200)

But when the opportunity presented itself, what did you do? You stepped in and bought it 100 per cent, so that the government could own it — at a very inflated price. It was a very poor investment by anybody's standards. You absolutely built nothing. You simply bought what was existing, what was there. There was nothing new added, nothing new added. And now a new project comes on that doubles the size. And what the government will do is get back the \$250 million we sold that project for with a very good return of interest on it during period of

pay-back, plus a new project.

Now if that doesn't make economic sense, if that's not called building and development, then I don't know what is. Now that's what the member looks at. The member sits and says, you shouldn't give \$20 million to Peter Pocklington. We never gave no \$20 million to Peter Pocklington. I defy you to look through the books and see whether or not Peter Pocklington got no \$20 million.

There was more money given to Intercontinental Packers to expand the red meat industry than there was given to, or assistance to Peter Pocklington. So what you've got is more jobs, more expansion in Intercontinental. So now we really come back to the key question. Is it okay to help Gainers build a plant, or not okay to help Gainers build a plant but okay to help Freddie Mitchell build a plant? I mean, really, what is the difference if both of them are going to build, if both of them are going to create new jobs, if both of them are going to process the red meat that we need to process in this province? Why is it that you're against Gainers and in favour of Freddie Mitchell?

I suspect that if you probably compared net worths of Freddie Mitchell and Peter Pocklington, they'd probably both be fairly close to the same, I would guess. So what are you interested in — in the personality, because you don't like Peter Pocklington? I mean, if you get down to that, that is a strange, strange way to try to develop something. That is a strange way to develop something.

The member opposite has simply picked up the NDP brochure as to how to argue on this particular issue and he's given it word and verse. We've heard it a thousand times before. And I would have thought the token business man — I don't know what kind of business you're in — but the token business man of the NDP could have done better than that. You saw the member from Saskatoon Fairview, at least he's a lawyer so you give him credit for that, he asked legitimate and decent questions and real questions in everybody's view — better than simply getting into rhetoric like the member from Riversdale. I would have thought the NDP would have been able to come up with a little bit more than simply the old rhetoric.

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Chairman, I most certainly would like to respond to some of the comments by the minister and I want to tell him as well that he's probably insulted about 20,000 small-business men in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, what you have done is shown clearly where the PC party is in terms of small business. You would rather talk to an entrepreneur from New York than a little business man from Yellow Grass.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — I'll tell you, I've operated retail in this province since 1970, and a lot of my small-business colleagues have been around and have watched the administration that you guys have thrust upon them. And

they can compare the difference and their bottom line from when the NDP were government and when you big business tycoons came in and decided to load money on Pocklington.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And do you want to know the difference between Freddie Mitchell of Intercon and Pocklington? I'll tell you the difference. Pocklington came from Alberta, took Saskatchewan tax dollars, a Tory hack, ran for the leadership under the free enterprise banner, no government subsidy, came in and took \$20 million of Saskatchewan people's money. Freddie Mitchell and his family have operated a legitimate business in Saskatchewan for many, many years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And I want to tell you, when you take Freddie Mitchell's tax dollars and give them to one of your Tory friends from Alberta to compete against him, I say you're going in the wrong direction. And I would suggest to you that Freddie Mitchell would say you went in the wrong direction as well. And I'll bet you did a lot of back-stepping when you went to Saskatoon and talked with Freddie Mitchell.

I think clearly the minister stands up and he talks about a token business man. Well let me tell you, Mr. Minister, if you compared the gross of my business to about 50 other businesses in Prince Albert and in Moose Jaw, and if you're telling those people that because they don't have a gross of billions and millions of dollars that they're able to net a decent wage in order to feed their family and to clothe their kids, and if you're telling all of those small-business people that they're token, I tell you, Mr. Minister, you better go out and you better start explaining what a legitimate business is to them.

Because I'm telling you what you are — you're a token minister of a token government who purports to represent the small-business community but you don't represent anything but multinationals and millionaires and the kind of Tory hacks that are associated with your political party. You don't need to stand in this legislature and insult legitimate business people in this province. And I tell you, your remarks of today are going to go to a lot of small-business people in this province, and I'm going to see to it through my communications budget that it gets out there so that they know what you really think about them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Minister, I am telling you, I am saying to you today that the small business community are understanding that the New Democratic Party is a party that believes strongly in the aspirations and the things that they want to see.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — They believe strongly that they have the right to make a living for their families in this province. And they believe strongly that they don't have to compete

with a multimillionaire, a Peter Pocklington, and see your government give their tax dollars to bring him in to compete with a company that is employing hundreds of peoples, the Intercon Packers — that's what they don't believe. And they believe that the New Democratic Party would do it fairly and honestly and openly, and without the kind of politics that you guys have been thrusting upon the people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — My colleague from Saskatoon suggested a little earlier that if you don't carry a PC membership you don't do well under this administration, and I tell you I believe him. And if you don't think the small-business community believes him, why don't you call a by-election in Saskatoon that has got the highest income level of most ridings in this province? Call an election in there — a by-election. Tell the Premier to get up and call a by-election and see what the business community, and what the middle- and upper-income people, are starting to think of your government.

I tell you why you won't do it — because you haven't got the guts, you haven't got the courage. And I would suggest to you, you'll probably wait until the Deputy Premier takes off to his job in the CN so that you've got a chance of winning one and losing one. But I don't even believe they're going to win that one because I tell you, you look at the poll results in Saskatchewan and they've had enough of you, and it's because of the deals like the Weyerhaeuser and the Pocklington deal.

You people aren't business people. You couldn't entice business. You got Paul Schoenhals running the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, and he's amassed almost what — \$700 million debt? That's your kind of business. You guys are a dismal display. You aren't a business orientated political party; you're a patronage orientated party, that's where you guys are at.

And I tell you, you're going to find out over the course of the next three years who your friends are, and you're going to find that there aren't as many, and every day and every day you'll find less and you'll find less. You're going to find out that the business community aren't going to accept remarks like the minister opposite when he talks about a small business man being a token business man.

Have you any idea how many people you insulted? Do you care? Do you care? I tell you, Mr. Minister, that's the problem with your government: you haven't got enough vision to understand that there are many small-business people like me in this province who don't desire to be millionaires but desire to feed their families and have enough to retire on. And what you're doing since 1982, is you're taking away their retirement through increased taxes, lower grosses in their stores, which means lower bottom lines. That's what you're about.

And, Mr. Minister, I'm going to close by saying that I'm not going to forgive you. And you want to know that there are hundreds and thousands of people in this province who aren't going to forgive those kind of callous and uncaring remarks. The Minister of Human Resources and you have very much in common — your mouth flaps

before you think, and it's going to cost you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the member opposite to take his speech and take the speech of the member from The Battlefords and send it to every small-business man in the province of Saskatchewan using his communications dollar. I would encourage you to do that. I knew you were foolish, but I did not think you were that foolish, Mr. Speaker.

Now let's get back to . . . The NDP say, we are in favour of small business- the NDP. They had a chance for 11 years in government, and what did they do for small business, and what do they propose to do now. Well let's see. We had 22 per cent interest rates that was hitting the consumer, the home owner; it was hitting the farmer; it was hitting the small-business men. And what did the NDP say? Don't . . . That's not our fault. We haven't got the money to help you there because we've got our agenda building potash mines and buying PAPCO and buying farm lands. So that's what you did there.

Now the second thing that the members of the NDP say: here is what we will do for small business. We will increase the minimum wage to \$6 an hour. And I'll tell you there's going to be a lot of business men out there cheering and cheering — yes, we've got a \$6 or a \$7 minimum wage — NDP policy. And if you think that small business likes to see \$6, \$7 minimum wage, then I think you're out of touch with the small business community. Clearly the people in Kindersley that I talk to, when they hear that they want a \$6 or \$7 minimum wage, they say, hold it, hold it, that's not what we wanted in small business. That's not what we wanted in small business.

Mr. Speaker, the members in the business community in Kindersley then hear the NDP say: we are going to reduce the work week to 32 hours. Does the small business want to see the work week reduced to 32 hours? Not very likely. Thirty-two hour work week and a \$7 minimum wage? And they say the small-business community is going to support the NDP. You people have not had the support of small business since 1944, and you're not going to get the support of small business now.

Now the member opposite said we only give money to big, multinational corporations and nothing to the small business. This department doesn't deal with small business, the Tourism and Small Business does.

Now let's go through the list of ones that the industry, the department that deals with big business, who they assisted through the IIP program. Now we'll go through this list and see how big they are: 60 Minute Photo PA Ltd. Now you should know that one — 60 Minute Photo PA. Is that a multinational corporation? Is that a legitimate small business in the town of Prince Albert? I would think it is.

How about Accu Agricultural Implements of Senlac, Saskatchewan? Is that a multinational corporation? Is that something that is . . . somebody from way afar, and not a small business? They were helped.

Ace Fibreglass (& Urethanes) Ltd. of Saskatoon. The member for Riversdale probably knows those guys. Is that a multinational corporation? Is that somebody that is a multinational corporation and the head of some corporation?

How about Ad-Ventures Ltd. of Saskatoon? Is that a multinational corporation? How about . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. We may not agree with what the minister is saying, but let's give him some courtesy in being able to be heard in this House, please.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — How about Apex (design) Graphics Ltd., Broadway Avenue, Saskatoon? Is that a multinational corporation? Is that some giant firm?

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. If the member for Moose Jaw North wants to ask his question, I'll be glad to recognize him if he would stand after the minister has sat down.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — How about Appel Printing of North Battleford; is that a multinational corporation? They got assistance under the IIP program. Armor Elevator Limited of Saskatoon; is that a multinational corporation? Artemia Canada of Chaplin, Saskatchewan? How about Atlas Concrete Ltd. of Yorkton; is that a multinational corporations? Is that a small business in the province of Saskatchewan?

(1215)

I'm going to give this . . . I've got 45 pages of this I'm going to read into the record just to show you that these are not all multinational corporations.

How about Auto-Tronic Controls Limited of Estevan; is that a multinational corporation? They got assistance from the government in this particular program. How about Autotran Swather Limited of Loreburn, Saskatchewan; is that a multinational corporation? It's a farmer who is expanding his agriculture concept into building swathers — a Saskatchewan guy, on the farm, building swathers. And that's what they refer to as a multinational corporation.

How about Bailey Bros. Seed of Mildens, Saskatchewan — Bailey Bros. Seeds of Mildens, Saskatchewan? There's a giant in the league with Cargill, I bet you. Battleford's Machine Shop Services of North Battleford; is that a multinational corporation? How about Bay Trail Plastics Limited of Humboldt, Saskatchewan — the member from Humboldt — is that a multinational corporation? Big Sky Steel Fabricators, just south of Saskatoon; is that a multinational corporation? Is that something that we should or should not be doing in the province of Saskatchewan?

How about Blackline Sports of Saskatoon; is that like Nike or Adidas? Is that a multinational corporation or is that a local small business in the province of Saskatchewan? How about Blackline Sports of Saskatoon; is that a multinational corporation? Or how about Brake and Drive Systems of Regina; is that a

multinational corporation?

Brandt Industries of Regina; Brandt Industries, for anybody in the agriculture community know that Brandt Industries have been manufacturing farm equipment for some period of time. Are they a multinational corporation, are they headquartered in Saskatchewan, and are they a Saskatchewan family operation? Clearly they are. Those are the people that were helped.

How about Bridge City Transmission in Saskatoon? Is Bridge City Transmission in Saskatoon a multinational corporation? Not very likely.

Now here's a big one. Broadview Meat Markets of Broadview, Saskatchewan. Broadview Meat Market. Did the IIP program help those? Is that a big multinational corporation? Broadview Meat Markets where they're processing beef in Broadview, Saskatchewan, Canada? Hardly.

Brown Industries of Drinkwater, Saskatchewan. Drinkwater, Saskatchewan; is that the home of a branch plant company out of New York, in Drinkwater, Saskatchewan? How about Butte Manufacturing of Ogema, Saskatchewan? Is that a multinational corporation in the words of the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake?

Now here's one from Prince Albert. Campbell Printing Ltd., Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. Now is that in the league with the largest printing companies that you have seen in the world? Or C & C Custom Sleds (Ltd.) of Radisson, Saskatchewan. Radisson, Saskatchewan. If we have this many branch plant facilities in this province of Saskatchewan, well then I think that most of the world be rushing to us.

An Hon. Member: — Name one that's not a Tory?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Name one that's not a Tory. There's not very many people in the business world that are not Tories or Liberals. There's very, very few who are NDP.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Here is the *Carlyle Observer*, limited. Now the Deputy Premier should know the *Carlyle Observer*. Now is that like the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*, or a large printing concern that we might see around the world? Not very likely.

How about Caroline Mills of Saskatoon? Is that a massive grain company or processing company? Here's another one, Christopher's Photo Lab of Foam Lake, Saskatchewan. Another head office or another branch plant of a great multinational corporation.

Here's one for Click Photos of Dalmeny. Now is Click Photos of Dalmeny a small business, or would you class that as a big business too?

Now here's Commercial Industry Manufacturing Ltd. of Humboldt, Saskatchewan, Canada. Now I ask the member from the Quill Lakes, how many multinational corporations are there in Humboldt, Saskatchewan,

Canada? Craig Inkster's men's wear, Watrous, for the member from . . . Creative Touch Millworks Inc. of Saskatoon; Custom Printers of Yorkton.

Here's another big, big one — David S. Jessiman of Lucky Lake. He's not even incorporated. Now does that make him a multinational corporation or not? Dean Smith Acres Ltd. of Swift Current, Saskatchewan.

I'll go through the list and continue through this list. I'll read them all. Here's a big one for you — Develcon Electronics of Saskatoon; now that's a larger operation. They expanded; they have built a large number of jobs in Saskatoon. They are, in fact, a multinational corporation. They are a multinational corporation, the first one in this list that I've read. But they are also headquartered in Saskatoon. Their head office is in Saskatoon; their research facilities are in Saskatoon. And we are to say somehow we should not give money to Develcon because it's a big bad dirty multinational corporation. That's what we would understand if we were to listen to the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

How about Dor-Lite Manufacturing of Moose Jaw, Canada. Now is that a multinational corporation, I ask the member from Moose Jaw? It might be, he says. The member from Moose Jaw says it might be.

How about Dowie Quick Print Ltd. of Yorkton, Canada. Tory, says the member from Quill Lakes.

How about Dyna-Fab Industries Ltd. of Watson, Saskatchewan? Now is that a multinational corporation? Dyna-Fab Industries of Watson. Now is that a . . . the member from Quill Lakes says, yes, we helped get that established. Well they qualified under the IIP to expand. The members opposite are against that, because listen to the member from P.A.-Duck Lake. He has said every dollar that we put into small business or to business in this province went to multinational corporations.

Oh, here's a big one — Elite Eavestroughing Ltd. of Regina — Elite Eavestroughing. Is that a bad company by your standards as well? Is that another one of these big, bad, dirty corporations in the province of Saskatchewan? Pro-media Enterprise Ltd. of Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan — Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan. Now is that a big boy as well? Now I can go through this list, but I won't because the time will continue on and continue on.

But let me go back to the question of the member from P.A.-Duck Lake. What he said was this, and I think this is fairly fundamental, is that there is a big difference between Freddie Mitchell and Gainers, and that we should not support Gainers because Gainers doesn't pay tax in the province of Saskatchewan. That is absolute hog-wash, and you know it. That's what you said. That's the first thing.

The second thing that the member said is that if you're from Alberta you're not welcome in Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — You're not a Canadian.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — You're not a Canadian. Is it okay for the Japanese to come in and invest? Is it okay for the

Americans to invest in central Canada, in Ed Broadbent's riding, in the billions of dollars? Is it okay to do that, but we don't want anybody from Alberta investing in Saskatchewan. And then you call yourself a Canadian. No, we don't want American investment. Japanese investment is okay, but none from Alberta, thank you very much. What kind of a Canadian, what kind of an attitude is that? What kind of an attitude is it for an NDP to say: nobody from Alberta who is prepared to invest in this province, no, they are not welcome, thank you very much.

You take that attitude out to the business community, and I will tell you exactly what the business community will say to you. They will say the same thing they've said to you and your party for the last 40 years in this province: no, thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Minister, the list that you used and referred to and were speaking from for four or five minutes, I'm going to be asking you some questions about those later, but I want to make some comments in terms of your remarks about interest rate and banks. And as well, I'd like to take a couple of minutes about minimum wage.

You, Mr. Minister, are as aware as everybody else in this country that the banking institutions are those that are supporting your particular party, both provincially and federally, with thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars. And there's a reason why; there's a good reason why. Because you're the guys that support the high interest rates. You, the old line parties, have supported the banking institutions for years and years and years, and you know it. But I want to say, Mr. Minister, that's all fine and dandy. We'll leave that alone.

Let's talk about minimum wage for one minute. I want to talk about minimum wage and the middle-income wage-earners who used to be able to shop in small businesses in this province, who used to have some disposable income. And you know the record as well as I do. I want to talk about those people who have been relegated to the role of unemployment and finally to social assistance, and now who have no money to go in any spend in those small businesses and make those small businesses flourish. That's what you've done, and that's your record.

You don't need to go back to the '70s or the '30s. What you want to do is look at what you've done to small business. And I say, Mr. Minister, if you had treated small business in the same fashion that you treated Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington, you would have been on the right track.

You didn't list 250 people on that particular list. And I say to you, if you had given each one of those people, those business people, the \$1 million that you gave to Weyerhaeuser of Tacoma, Washington — and you probably could have because you gave them \$250 million worth of assets — it may have created a different picture, and those little businesses would have invested in this province and created employment, and lots of

employment, a lot more than what we'll get out of the new paper mill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — We welcome that new mill, I want you to know, and we appreciate those jobs. But I want to tell you as well, if you would have turned the profits that that corporation is making now back into the building of a paper mill, you wouldn't have had to give away one-quarter of a million dollars of assets, and those jobs could still be there.

Mr. Minister, I ask you today to file the document that you were reading from. I'd like to have a list of those businesses. I'd like to have a list of the amounts that each of those businesses were given. And I tell you, I'd almost as well want to know how many of those have got memberships in your political party. But I'm not going to ask that.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, you've been unfair to small business in this province. You've got a double standard. There's a standard for Pocklington and Weyerhaeuser, and there's another standard for local Saskatchewan businesses. And I say at the expense of local businesses in this province, you've been treating your buddies very, very well. And I think it's unfair. The business community thinks it is unfair. And I simply say to you in closing that you're going to pay for it at the polls whenever the next election comes up.

I'm asking you again to table that document that you were referring to with the amounts that each one of those businesses received under that grant program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — That question was asked by the member from Saskatoon Fairview in a meaningful way, and I undertook to provide the entire list to the member from Saskatoon Fairview, and if the member from P.A.-Duck Lake had been listening he would have known that.

Now the member talks about banks. He starts out by talking about banks. Well let's talk about banks for a while then. You say that banks are mean, nasty, dirty villains, is what I hear you saying. And it is only the banks that like the Liberals and the Conservatives. Is that what you're saying as well — that the NDP are firm and strong; that you should not have truck nor trade with the banks of this province? Is that what the member is saying? Because that's exactly what I heard the member saying. This government has brought in . . .

(1230)

An Hon. Member: — Come up out of the trees. He said no such thing.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Now, we will pursue that. You dropped it. We will pursue that.

The member from Indian Head-Wolseley, the minister responsible for Tourism and Small Business, when you

get into his estimates, he will tell you exactly what we've done for small business. When interest rates were 22 per cent you turned your back on small business. What did this government do?

This government assists small business to write down that debt to 8 per cent. Now you ask any business man in this province whether he would prefer and whether he can function with 8 per cent or with 22 per cent. If one party gives him 8 per cent and the other one lets it go to 22 per cent, he will support 22 per cent. You are kidding yourself. You are kidding yourself.

Minimum wage. The member said he was going to speak about minimum wage, but then he sort of said nothing about minimum wage because you know full well your party supports 6 or \$7 minimum wage. That's exactly what you want, and I will tell you that the small businesses of this province can ill afford 6 or \$7 minimum wage. We take that position that if something divides this party from that party, this side of the House from that side of the House, it has been that. And it has been thus for the last five, six, seven, eight, or nine years, and will continue to be that way for some time. Anybody that stands up and says we should have, we should have a minimum wage in this province of 6 or 7 per cent are wrong, wrong, wrong.

Now you talk about taxing business. Go over to Manitoba, the only province, the only province in this country, and what kind of a tax did they put on? They put on a payroll tax, or a business payroll tax. And how does that business payroll tax work? Well it says to business, if you have more employees, then you're going to pay more tax — not based on whether you make any money or not, not based on whether it's viable or not; we will tax you according to how many employees you got because anybody that's got more than five employees is big business by NDP standards, by NDP standards.

So you want to have minimum wage, you want to let interest rates float, you want to have minimum wage at seven bucks, you want to tax them on a payroll tax, you want to have . . . you want to throw the banks out of the province altogether. You don't want to deal with banks, that's what you're saying. That's what the member opposite is saying — the banks are mean, ugly, and dirty, and they do nothing for our economy. That's what the hon. member is saying.

How many business men deal with banks and require banks for their assistance? For the member opposite to sit down and blast the rhetoric that they've been blasting for 40 years in that party, you're no different than you were in the '60s, and no different than you were in the '50s. And I tell the hon. member, keep going, keep talking that same line, and we will continue to have the support of small business and big business in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Shillington: — You won't continue to have it very long, Mr. Minister, if your only policy is to misrepresent what the opposite side says. Mr. Minister, I think it's indicative of the bankruptcy of this government that your only response to some questions from the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake is to misrepresent the NDP

policy. If you had any programs, if you had a single success story, I think you'd talk about it. You don't. You insist. . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — You insist, Mr. Minister, in not talking about your own record but about the record which you . . . but about the programs which you attribute to us.

Mr. Minister, I would like to get to one of your flagships in the last term of office — real success story of yours. I would like if you would tell us what the status of the Husky Oil upgrader is.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I can say to the hon. member that the lead agency dealing with the Husky upgrader is the Minister of Energy and Mines, and that's the way estimates has traditionally worked. And when you went through estimates with the Minister of Energy and Mines, those questions were posed.

So what I would suggest to the member from Regina Centre, to go back and read *Hansard*, if that's too much for him to do. And that question was asked and that answer was given to that particular thing.

Now the hon. member says we're not proud to talk about the record of building in the province of Saskatchewan. I'll tell you that we are proud to look at the record that we've been building in the province of Saskatchewan. Let's start with them and we will go through them for the hon. member.

We are very proud that we, along with the Co-op and the federal government, were able to build a heavy oil upgrader in the city of Regina. The member opposite is against that. When the member opposite was in government, did they even consult, did they even ask the Co-op, what about the Co-op doing it? No, you weren't interested in that. You were interested in doing it with Saskoil so we own it, so we could own it.

And the member from P.A. says, we're against everything Weyerhaeuser does. We aren't. We're quite proud of what Weyerhaeuser is doing — \$250 million investment in the province of Saskatchewan. We're interested in Phillips Cable that now manufactures cable for Sask Power right here in the province of Saskatchewan, rather than importing it. We're very proud of Marubeni-Hitachi that are building turbines for the new Rafferty project down in the south-east part of the province. We are very proud that that is being built in the province of Saskatchewan and not imported in from Japan some place.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — We are very proud of what has happened in the city of North Battleford. We are very happy as to what's happening in the city of North Battleford where Hunter's is now building and manufacturing recreation vehicles that otherwise were imported from British Columbia or United States into Saskatchewan and the rest of Canada to be sold. They're now being built right here in the province of

Saskatchewan.

And we're very happy with the processing of red meat. We are very happy that there is five times more investment in the manufacturing sector. We are very proud that there's twice as many people working in the science and technology field. And the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our record of building and diversifying our economy and we will continue to diversify this economy and build this economy into the 1990s and beyond the 1990s, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, once again we have you talking about anything but the question put to you. You talk about our record; you talk about our platform, but you didn't answer the question.

Mr. Minister, with respect to the Husky Oil upgrader — it matters not who the lead agency is — the fact is, if it's built, there would be significant sums coming to your department, and you will be involved, Mr. Minister, and you have been involved.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, do you know anything about the Husky Oil upgrader, and if so would you share it with us?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicated to the member opposite, and the member opposite full well knows, full well knows that in estimates you ask the department that's involved in a particular project to respond. The next thing you're going to know is you're going to want to ask me questions on Education or on Social Services or whatever, and that's not the job of the Department of Economic Development and Trade. We take on projects; we have brought forth many projects.

Here's another one though, while I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman. And we're going to read some of the NDP resolutions, and how business will like them.

Be is resolved that a New Democratic Party advocates union membership as a condition of employment on government-funded construction projects, including anybody that receives contracts to provide services to those contracts.

Now what you're saying, as a party, and small business out there is: small business, if you are going to provide anything to government or any government project, you must unionize your shop if you only have two or three people working for you. That's what you're saying.

Now you can say, the members opposite, that they're attracting small business. They're going to let the interest rates go higher; raise the minimum wage to \$9; force them into unions; 32-hour work week; payroll tax; and you keep the list going. And I can read some more from your policy statement here, read some more. And you say that somehow that is going to attract business for the province, let alone attract people to your party. And nobody can invest in the province if they don't come from

Saskatchewan, and nobody should be allowed to invest if they have a Tory membership or a Liberal membership.

That is shameful. You have an incredible lack of understanding of business, the member from Regina South. I always knew that. I hoped the member from P.A.-Duck Lake would bring some sunshine to your party. He obviously has not. You are still the same. You're back in yesterday. You understand Crown corporations. You understand nothing about business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I want to say, Mr. Chairman, the day is not totally lost. There is a point of agreement between the member and I — we agree that the member from Regina South — all of those comments are true about the member from Regina South. It's heartening to see that you have just enough integrity not to make such comments about the member from Regina Centre, about which they'd be patently false.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — On a serious note, Mr. Minister, it's in a way sad to see a minister such as yourself, who once had so much promise, behaving in such a fashion in this legislature. Mr. Minister, you display incompetence, and you display a tiredness which I'm afraid has become a trade mark of this government, Mr. Minister. You don't want to talk about the issue; you want to talk about some platform which you attribute to us.

That, Mr. Minister, is a trade mark of a government that's bankrupt of any new ideas, bankrupt of any energy, desperately clinging onto office until the next election comes. And that's all it's going to be.

Mr. Minister, with respect to Husky, all we got from the Minister of Energy was a comment that there might be a meeting sometime in the near future. You would almost certainly, Mr. Minister, be involved in any such meeting. Have you been involved in any such meeting, Mr. Minister? Has anything at all happened with this great marvellous project? Has anything at all happened, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I am sorry about the referring to the member by his wrong seat. The member from Regina Centre, that classic champion of business, small or otherwise. How I could make such a mistake from the member from Regina Centre.

With regards to the question, with regard to Husky upgrader, I can advise the hon. member of two things. One, to somehow indicate just like you did before that you sit there already poised to be . . . there's something wrong if Husky is built. I'm sure that's the way it sits, just like you were in Weyerhaeuser, just like you were in everything else.

Husky is being pursued by the Minister of Energy and Mines. The Minister of Energy and Mines is doing a very good job in that field, and I have all the confidence in the world with the member from Swift Current.

The member from Regina Centre stands up — he makes the same speech for the last five years. And I remember going through these estimates last year. I remember last year going through these estimates and the member from Regina Centre saying, you people are bankrupt of ideas, and just wait until this impending election in 1986, and you'll be over there, and we will be back running the government, and most of you will not be back. That's the rhetoric you used in 1981, before the '82 election; that's the rhetoric you used in 1986 before the next election. You're still using the same rhetoric today and today and today.

The member opposite talks about . . . why does the member not get down and deal with reality? As we saw the member from Saskatoon Fairview asking logic and reason questions, we got into a legitimate debate. How can you get into a legitimate debate — how can you get into a legitimate debate with the member from Regina Centre or the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake who have nothing, nothing but rhetoric to stand up and blab out their rhetoric and blab out what they're against? They never had a new idea in their life.

And what really concerns me — what really concerns me about you folks over there is I expected that from you. I mean, I've . . . nine years, I've learned that. I would have thought something better from the token business guy within their party, but that's what he is. I was impressed by the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

But let's go now to the leader, your new leader. And what did he bring up? Here is the guy who is the critic in Economic Development and Trade. And we've been doing these estimates for two days, and what has he contributed? He stood up for half an hour, for half an hour and read a speech. The Leader of the Opposition had to get up and ask the questions, and the member from Saskatoon Fairview had to get up and ask the questions. Talk about someone who has no ideas. He's got good rhetoric. We all concede that to him, we all concede that to him, but not any questions.

And you guys are sitting there copying him. Don't ask legitimate questions; don't get into what makes the economy go; just stand up and give rhetoric and give . . .

(1245)

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: — Order, please. I know that it's Friday afternoon and we are all anxiously waiting for the 1 o'clock, and we're getting a little bit over exuberant. I think we should try to do a little bit more in terms of decorum in this Assembly, and I'm talking to both sides.

Hon. Mr. Bertson: — I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Lieutenant Governor is here to deal with some private Bills. I move we rise, report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The committee reported progress.

ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

At 12:49 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the throne, and gave Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill No. 01 — An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities

Bill No. 02 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Briercrest Bible College

Bill No. 03 — An Act respecting Our Lady of the Prairie Foundation

His Honour retired from the Chamber at 12:51 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:52 p.m.