

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Neudorf and the amendment thereto moved by Ms. Simard.

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we recessed for a slight break, I was speaking for a moment on the success of our home program. And I wanted to get into some other area of discussion regarding the debate from the throne, Mr. Speaker.

But I have to share something that happened with this Assembly and, for that matter, with any people that may happen to be viewing this discussion tonight. I had the occasion to attend a couple of functions in between 5 o'clock and 7 o'clock tonight. One was very large.

The Leader of the Opposition keeps saying that I don't stay in touch and I don't represent my business community. Well I should inform him that earlier this afternoon, about 5:30, I was in the midst of a couple of 300 business people that had been speaking to me about the matter of diversification and the incentives that were provided by our government, and how in their mind the NDP focus, regardless of that they say about small business, is simply not there. It's disjointed, and again they just reaffirmed all of what I was saying earlier — that they don't understand business, they never have, and they probably never will.

But interestingly enough, I suppose that the earlier question period of the day brought forward the situation and the discussion concerning the ward system in our cities. And of course this created . . . People say, well the minister and the government is looking at the changes to the ward system simply because . . . And there is no basis of foundation and the like. Well I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case — and again, as has been the case ever since I indicated publicly almost a year and a half ago now that we would undertake a review of the ward system and begin discussions with people and all the like.

All of these people in the first . . . I'll speak about the second function later, but this first function, it was not just limited, Mr. Speaker, to the business community, but some of our larger corporations were represented. And I suppose again that members opposite wouldn't have any use for the larger corporations — and I think about the likes of Kramer Tractor, for instance, a big, well-established firm in the city of Regina that's been here, good gosh, as long as I can remember. And several of their employees were there. And I entered into discussion with the employees of this firm and, you know, they were convincing me as to why the abolishment of the ward system made an awful lot of sense to them. And they kept repeating to me, look who's against the ward system; look who objects to the ward system. Just pay

attention to the primary objectors — union leaders, CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) — attacking me and my government because we're trying to save the taxpayers' dollars. Why are these union leaders like that? That's the questions that they posed me.

Now the NDP, when clearly . . . And as we get into the debate of the ward system, in the event our government chooses to make some alterations to it, it will be interesting as we go through the debates in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, of what the Leader of the Opposition, the present-day Leader of the Opposition, had to say in 1973 as that government was implementing the ward system. So it would be interesting if our government chooses that that is the direction to take, that really the ward system becomes an issue of the taxpayers' dollars. And if our government firmly believes that we can save those taxpayers their dollars at municipal level and we should choose to do something with the ward system, the debate in this forum, Mr. Speaker, will be most interesting.

The second function that I attended, Mr. Speaker, I ran into a constituent of mine, a woman admittedly, that said, Jack, I just happened to turn the TV set on and I was busy making pies, but I was listening to your presentation earlier in the afternoon. She said, you know, you're right on. You made so much sense — and there they go laughing again, Mr. Speaker — and she was talking about vicious dogs, the very thing that the NDP benches opposite are laughing about at this very moment. To this lady, Mr. Speaker, the vicious dog scenario was a very, very important issue — and the member from Moose Jaw laughs — because her granddaughter was mauled by a vicious dog and to this day is seriously maimed, and there is nothing funny about it. And the NDP benches can laugh about it, and if she's watching now — pay attention as again they giggle over this serious issue. Mr. Speaker, they all . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order, please. I'd like to ask the hon. members to just refrain from interrupting and allow the member to continue.

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Another comment, a funny speech: the Leader of the Opposition seems to get a lot of humour out of the vicious dog scenario. And I won't even bother quoting you any more and your ludicrous statements about vicious . . . Why don't you grow up? Why don't you pay attention? Why don't you go to the hospital and visit some of the people that are, in fact and indeed, scarred for life as the result of a vicious dog attack, and then see if you still giggle? You've got a responsible position now; why don't you treat it that way?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — I'm kind of fortunate as well, Mr. Speaker, insofar as my family now having basically left home. My wife spends an awful lot of time with me at a lot of these affairs and functions, and certainly she listens and she respects the attitude of the people and the comments of the people, and she shares those comments and attitudes with me.

And I believe that that is an important part of this whole democratic process of sharing information of your criticisms and likes and dislikes, and I think that that speaks well of any of us in this legislature who are fortunate enough to have a partner that assists them carry out their responsibilities and duties of this legislature. Again, speaking on behalf of my constituents of Regina South, I know that the people in Regina South respect my wife for that, as I do, as well.

I was speaking earlier, Mr. Speaker, about the home program. Over 80 per cent of the work is being done by Saskatchewan contractors. That represents almost some \$800 million. And the home program is doing, of course, what it intended to do and that is to create thousands of jobs and generate millions of dollars of economic activity. And we realize . . . We realize that there is some concern about the capacity of the industry to handle the volume of activity that this very successful program has created. And the industry, for that matter, as we talk and listen to them, have expressed concern to us, and we are making every effort to ensure that the benefit of this program is realized over a five-year period, so that our Saskatchewan contractors can spread out this tremendous economic activity and, in fact, reap the benefits of the program right here in Saskatchewan. And the diversification of the home building industry and the home builders themselves is not unlike the challenges that we face here in Saskatchewan today.

You know, Mr. Speaker, government can create incentives, but really it takes business to make it work, and I am proud of the working relationship that this government has with the business community and with the home builders. Through consultation, we are able to direct our support where it is not needed. And working together — working together is the key to success. It is now, and it will be in the future. We heard the Leader of the Opposition about three engines and one engine was out and all this malarkey. Well I can assure you that the engine that drives the economy of this province — the engine of the small-business community — is alive and is well and is functioning.

And buying the homes that these home builders build are the most important investment that any one of us will ever make. And here in Saskatchewan there is a great deal of pride shown in home ownership and in the protection of that investment. And our government has been committed to providing the opportunity for home ownership, Mr. Speaker, to all people. We've taken measures to help people maintain and protect their investment. When sky-rocketing interest rates jeopardized the people's homes, we introduced the mortgage interest rate protection program, and through lower interest rates this program provided mortgage protection. When interest rates finally levelled out, we redirected our support toward the families who wanted to own their own new home, and the build-a-home program gave many people in Saskatchewan the opportunity to do this.

Mr. Speaker, the way I see it, in Saskatchewan today we face three challenges. The first challenge, and I'm sure that you're aware of, is lack of money, lack of revenue.

And that's not only a problem being faced here at home but it's a problem world-wide. We're faced with the international price of wheat, oil, uranium and potash going down and down dramatically. And when these prices go down together — and who in their best judgement or wisest wisdom could have thought that it would have hit an all-time low all at the same time? — but when it does, we run out of money because they are our major source of income. And it's not the farmers' fault that the price goes down, or the miners' fault, and we certainly didn't tell OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) what to do with the price of oil when they did that. But we face severe economic pressures as a result of international economic conditions, economic forces well beyond the bounds of Saskatchewan, forces, Mr. Speaker, that we, here in Saskatchewan, have no control over.

To illustrate our revenue problem, if you took all of the income tax, all of the sales tax, all of the oil royalties in our province today, it wouldn't quite pay for health care alone. It just isn't here. Manitoba has an eight billion . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . there he goes again, the member from Saskatoon South. Boy, he just keeps spouting off, and then he asks me to have pity on him.

Well it isn't just here, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba — their party in Manitoba, you know, I don't know what their deficit is, 8, 8, \$10 billion and still growing. They've got a problem \$12 billion; Alberta, over \$3 billion, and it's growing. So it's not just a Saskatchewan problem. But we have to make sure in this province that our financial security will be in place and indeed stay in place so we can build for our future. We can either resign ourselves to our future or we can redesign our future.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — We can either resign ourselves to the future or redesign the future — simple enough. We have to manage our local economy so that we can control our destiny in the future, in spite of global economic conditions.

The second challenge we face is economic diversification; in other words we have to remove all of our eggs from one basket. Commodities like agriculture and potash have been our economic mainstay. While we will continue to support those industries, Mr. Speaker, we must broaden our base, we must diversify, we must process, we must manufacture. The final challenge is the loss of markets because of protectionism and subsidy, and this, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps our greatest problem because it makes trade between Saskatchewan and the rest of the world harder and harder.

So three problems: money, because of the lack of revenue from international trade; all of our eggs in one basket — we must diversify more than we are; and third, we have an international trade and relationship problem.

So what are we going to do about it? Do we have a plan? You didn't seem to want to listen to the throne speech. Well sure, I can give you some very simple examples, Mr. Speaker, examples that my constituents of Regina South really appreciate. We will be refining soon our own

Saskatchewan heavy crude oil at the new upgrader right here in Regina. For the first time in our history, we'll be refining our own heavy oil — right here, right here in my home town of Regina.

(1915)

Another interesting fact that you may not realize. We all know that the number one industry in Saskatchewan is agriculture. Do we know that the number two export of agriculture is pork products? So we're diversifying by manufacturing bacon, both in Saskatoon and now in North Battleford, and it doesn't stop there.

There's pulp, and soon paper — paper in Prince Albert as well. Members of the opposition said, Mr. Speaker, it would never be built. Well it's built. And soon they will be shipping paper into that big market in the U.S.

It all creates jobs; it all creates new sources of revenue. And while it's true that you might consider these industries as big, this diversification with the added-on values to our growth, our own oil, our own pigs, our own paper, and all of the small businesses that are required to support these megaprojects . . .

And that, Mr. Speaker, again I repeat, is where the NDP philosophy is lost, is mired in some deep, old philosophical rhetoric that they simply don't understand, that the big businesses require a host of small businesses in order for them to survive and prosper. One of the largest industries we have in our province today is tourism, and the growth in tourism reflects what has always been a great strength of Saskatchewan's, particularly when you consider the hospitality and the friendly people here. I could go on at some length on tourism, Mr. Speaker, but I know that some of my colleagues are interested in entering into this debate this evening so I'll save tourism for another time.

A plan — you bet we have a plan. The people here in Saskatchewan are not easily intimidated, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite seem to think they are, but they aren't. The people in Saskatchewan know how to work, they know how to think, and they know to manage. So the three solutions that I've mentioned are reasonable.

The people here in this province want us to make the right decisions and the right choices, to take the action that is necessary — and in some cases overdue, long overdue — and we will do it fairly, we will do it openly, and above all, we will do it with consultation. I know that the members opposite don't like to hear that, but we will do it with consultation.

And sure, while our province faces these economic challenges, we're not going to face them alone. We're going to face them in co-operation with the people of this province, of this country, and, you know, wherever we have to. After all the things we've been through — various problems: drought, grasshoppers, falling commodity prices, severe economic conditions, just about anything else we could run into — we've either had the lowest or second lowest unemployment rate in Canada for the last five years.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has made great strides in encouraging new business and industrial development, resulting in new development opportunities for Saskatchewan people, young and old. Major advances have been made in all sectors of our economy, Mr. Speaker, and all regions of the province, and the thanks goes to the business community. They've identified new opportunities and development in manufacturing, food processing, construction, tourism, resource development, resulting in billions of dollars in economic activity and thousands and thousands of new jobs. I can hardly believe the members opposite as they deny the people of our province all of these good things that go hand in hand.

If we work together and co-operate, the private sector with government, we can create a powerful economic force. It's a common vision and a common purpose, and you find it in every single, solitary community in Saskatchewan. All of Saskatchewan wants to build. Our plan in Saskatchewan is to build on our strengths and realize our great potential for those natural resources, for our agricultural base, in diversifying our industries and in small business, and to take the strength of the rural, agricultural, oil, timber, mining, and combine it with the energy and activities of the people in towns and villages and put them together so that they all meld and build and process and manufacture to make this province of ours so much better.

There are many recent example of programs which demonstrate our record in Saskatchewan and our commitment to build a stronger and more diversified and stable economy, Mr. Speaker. Some of the examples of products never manufactured before in Saskatchewan, which are now readily available from Saskatchewan manufacturers: plastic gas pipe, insulated high-voltage cable, laminated wood cross arms for power poles, street light standards, fibreglass transformer foundations, fibreglass truck bodies, coveralls.

I was in Moose Jaw the other day, for example, Mr. Speaker. Phillips Cable, they're manufacturing for SaskPower, and it's the first time that they've decided to manufacture in western Canada. Not only for Saskatchewan, not only for our neighbouring provinces, but they are going to supply cable to southern, northern, eastern, western United States because of the economics of scale and because the best technology they could find in the world is right here in Saskatchewan — diversification.

And, Mr. Speaker, you know what? Nobody disagrees with it. Everybody agrees. You can travel right across this province. Whether you're in Lloydminster or in Estevan or in Swift Current or Nipawin, they're all saying it — right on, it makes sense, build it here. Cut those ties of dependency on Ontario and Quebec and manufacture in Saskatchewan. Give the jobs here to our young people. We can manufacture in Humboldt; we can make it in Saskatoon; we can do it in Moose Jaw — everybody agrees.

That wasn't going on before, and they agree to that as well. It simply wasn't happening. The government and the private sector co-operating, allowing us to do it here.

And they're saying, that's building; that's the common purpose. And it's showing up right here across the province.

I'd like to talk, Mr. Speaker, on free trade. And I just looked up in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I see my partner up there — my little wife — the one I was talking about that does go out and listen, that does complement the work that we're trying to do.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Free trade, Mr. Speaker. It's important to Saskatchewan. You know, Ontario alone, Ontario alone, Mr. Speaker, does more trade with the United States of America than Japan does. That puts it into a little bit of a perspective because the people — my constituents, your constituents — they see all these products coming in from Japan. And just imagine, Ontario alone trading more than Japan does with our American neighbours.

Doesn't it make an awful lot of sense that if Saskatchewan could get a little piece of this action, just a little bit — and I don't care what industry you're in, whether you're making bacon or whether you're making cross arms or whether you're making chopsticks — if you could get that much business in Los Angeles or in New York instead of all of the business in Davidson, Saskatchewan, wouldn't it make economic sense?

Mr. Speaker, again, I can speak on free trade at length, but I won't. But at my second function this evening, I met Mr. Thomas Roesch, the Consul and Trade Commissioner from the United States who is stationed in Calgary, and we had quite an interesting discussion. And I'll just close after very briefly describing for you some of our conversation. While lots and lots of Americans object to the deal because . . . I don't know why they're afraid of Canada, why they're afraid of Saskatchewan. I guess it's because when we do something we do it well and we do it right.

But when you listen to this commissioner and encouraging the free trade the way he does — he is waiting for this free trade opportunity so that we can have this agreement and trade freely between our two countries to make his job easier, to make our job easier. And why are the Americans afraid? Why are they . . . Why do they fear us? You know, and I'd like to again quote the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, and when he referred earlier in his remarks to me, are we going to outlick the Americans? Outlick the Americans — it's got nothing to do with outlicking anybody. It's a matter of negotiations; it's a matter of help; it's a matter of very survival; and it's a matter of opportunity for our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I'll close my remarks this evening simply by indicating that this government, our Premier, does represent a vision for the future. We are not burying our heads in the sand and closing our eyes to reality and ducking any issues. I've spoken freely about the issues this afternoon that confront my particular portfolio, but our Premier, with his vision for the future of this province in health, in agriculture, in rural life in quality of life for

our urban people, in reduction of taxes in building, and yes, even protecting the kids and seniors against vicious dogs. Mr. Speaker, I support the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to be able to take part in the throne speech debate this afternoon.

My first comments, Mr. Speaker, must be on the speaker who just took his seat. I was interested that he started his remarks about talking about the industrial and expansion and diversification in Saskatchewan, and he was talking about Mr. Peter Pocklington, and he was talking about the upgrader. Mr. Peter Pocklington, of course, being the private enterpriser who is making it work in Saskatchewan; and the upgrader, of course, which doesn't have a cent of private capital in it. And the member for Regina South holds this up as an example of private enterprise doing the job in Saskatchewan. And here on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, we have Mr. Pocklington, who is the disciple of private enterprise, and he's held up as the shining example — this millionaire from Alberta — he's held up as a shining example of how to make free enterprise work.

And it's interesting to not . . . And I think the people of Saskatchewan and other provinces are becoming more and more aware of how Mr. Pocklington works. He has obtained from the Premier of Saskatchewan, who says free enterprise will do it — and Mr. Pocklington is a disciple of free enterprise; they say free enterprise will do it . . . Why did the \$20 million change hands between the Premier of Saskatchewan and Mr. Pocklington, if free enterprise will do it, if free enterprise will do it?

He mentions in the same breath the Weyerhaeuser corporation as being a free enterprise corporation. I agree it's a big corporation, and it's doing something in northern Saskatchewan. But the question is, at our cost, at what cost? And it's our cost.

He said, and he reiterated it after supper — he drove me out of the chamber before supper, but I came back because I decided I wanted to hear some more of what the member for Regina South said — he said he spent supper talking to some business people. And I was interested in, wondering . . . I was thinking to myself, what was he telling those business people.

He told us some of the questions they raised with him about dogs and wards. But I wonder, when he was discussing things with them, if he related to them some of the things he's done for business in Saskatchewan. I just happen to have a list of some of the things he's done for business in Saskatchewan. And we have here business corporations' fees. A certificate of incorporation, which previously cost \$100, now costs \$250, which is a 100 per cent increase, 150 per cent increase. I wonder if he told those business men when he had them assembled there that he'd put a 150 per cent increase on that particular fee, restoring the name of a corporation to the register. It used to cost \$100, now it costs \$250 — 150 per cent increase. Did he tell those small-business people when he was talking to them that he'd done that for them?

(1930)

A certificate of revival. I'm not sure what kind of revival that is, but at least the certificate cost \$100 before, cost 250 now — 150 per cent increase in this business fee. A certificate to amalgamate two or more companies. This occurs quite commonly in the business world. The fee used to be \$100, it's now \$250 — that's a 150 per cent increase, and this is taken from a list of fees. Just on this page along, Mr. Speaker, there are 17 increases in fees ranging . . . The smallest one and the only one below 100 per cent is 25 per cent increase and the largest one is 1,000 per cent increase. And that's what this government has been doing for business, and many of them small businesses in this province.

I think the members of the Assembly will agree that most of the auctioneers in Saskatchewan would be classed as small business. Now what's he done for the auctioneers, the small-business auctioneers? The licence fee for an auctioneer previously was \$100. It's now \$125. That's a 25 per cent increase. The licence for an auction sales company used to be \$100, is now \$300 — a 300 per cent increase.

Mr. Speaker, I'm goad that he brought this up about what his government was doing for small business in Saskatchewan. They've done a lot of things to small business in Saskatchewan. And I've listened to some small-business men that have come to talk to me who were in preparation, had prepared the documents to obtain a loan from the government and it was approved. And then the government notified them that the loan program was gone; they were pulling it. And I'll tell you that that person will not be voting Conservative in the next election. He was very upset by what happened. They just . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Your cousin.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, no relation whatsoever. I'm glad to see the member from Maple Creek is here. She hasn't been here much since the Pioneer Trust . . .

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

Hon. members are not to refer to the absence of presence of members.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with part of your ruling, and that is the part that we cannot refer to the absence of a member from the House, and I have not done that. I said, I'm goad to see the member from Maple Creek here. I'm glad to see the member from Melville here too, and Kelsey-Tisdale and Arm River. I'm glad to have enough of them here so that I can talk to them about this throne speech. But the distortion . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I'm glad to see the member for Rosthern here as well. I know he feels left out.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. Order, please. Beauchesne's citation 316(c) indicates clearly members are not to "refer to the presence of absence of specific Members." You may continue your speech.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I will accept your ruling. I will accept your ruling and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order, please. If the hon. member from Saskatoon south has a problem he may rise and be recognized. Otherwise I would advise him not to make comments from the chair, from his desk.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — What is your point of order?

**Mr. Rolfes:** — Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when the Minister of Urban Affairs referred to me as the member from Saskatoon South speaking from his chair, I didn't hear a ruling at that time. Now the member from Westmount refers to a member on the opposite side in her chair, and there's a ruling. Why the difference in the ruling?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The difference in the ruling is that the member from Saskatoon Westmount referred to the member in such a way that she had been absent and that he's happy to see her back. That is the ruling.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get bogged down in the relevancies of rulings in the House; I want to get on with the speech that I came here to make this evening. And the comments I'm making this evening are about the throne speech, and I have a copy of the throne speech here, and all members will be familiar with this particular document. In this document it mentions diversify, or diversification, at least five times, and there is a section of the speech designated as diversification. Now this seems to illustrate one point about this government, that the perception is more important to them than the reality of the situation that is occurring today in Saskatchewan. They must . . . I think there is a mandatory rule that members on that side of the House, when they make their speeches on the throne speech, must, at some time, or several times through their speech, mention the word diversification or diversify. And I wish that the members would get down to the reality of the situation we're faced with here today in Saskatchewan.

The member, in the speech, in its words of wisdom, if they be that, discusses the matter of dangerous dogs in the province of Saskatchewan. And we received quite a serious lecture from the member from Regina South about whether this was a serious situation or not, or what our thoughts were on the situation of dangerous dogs. I don't think anyone in this Assembly believes that that is not a serious situation. I know some people who were mauled by dogs in the city of Saskatoon. The question that is before us in this throne speech is the priorities of this government and how they relate and arrange their priorities. That is what is laughable in this throne speech, and the government's arrangement of priorities in this throne speech leaves much to be desired.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Something else which was not mentioned in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, but which the member from Regina South and some other members

spoke about a number of times, was the ward system. What we have here in Saskatchewan is a government that is now prepared, after they have interfered in the boundaries commission, the independent boundaries commission of the province of Saskatchewan . . . have brought in legislation to make it not an independent, more independent commission, but a political commission. That political commission is now in place and it will do this work. It has on it a direct appointment of the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Chief Electoral Officer — and no one denies that is a direct political appointment.

Now what this government has done is said, we will bring in legislation dealing with the ward system. It's important that we know what is the source of the demand for this legislation. Well, I did a little bit of research, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to know what the source of the demand for this legislation on the ward system would be. And I looked in the SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), 82nd annual convention — Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, 1987, last year. In these resolutions . . . there are 41 resolutions here and these were all adopted by the convention — 41 resolutions.

The member from Weyburn who is . . . I don't know whether he is here or not, Mr. Speaker, but I hear his voice. And I wonder if later we can make a ruling on him.

In these resolutions from SUMA, the urban municipalities association, the largest and most significant urban association in Saskatchewan, there is not one resolution about the ward system — not one resolution, Mr. Speaker. And in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, there is not one resolution about dangerous dogs. And has the member from Regina South attacked SUMA because they didn't have dangerous dogs on their list of resolutions? No, he hasn't said a word about them. What his attack is, is a political attack to try and direct attention away from the folly of this government.

What are the priorities of SUMA, the urban municipalities association? Well, if you look at the resolutions, the first one is municipal infrastructure financing, municipal infrastructure financing, tax arrears, sewer lines maintenance, right of appeal of the decision of the municipal boundary commission, The Local Government Election Act, business taxes — a number of very important issues. And I suspect that SUMA has arranged these in their order of priority, something that this government doesn't recognize. Is there an order of priority? They haven't recognized it.

To be perfectly fair to this government in their concern about dogs and the ward system, I thought, well, what about this year's SUMA convention. So I obtained the resolutions from SUMA convention, 1988, February 1 to 3. In this one there are more resolutions — 81 resolutions, Mr. Speaker. Not one mentions the ward system, not one mentions dangerous dogs — not one. And did the member from Regina South, the Minister of Urban Affairs who should have some sense of priority on behalf of the urban municipalities of this province, did he attack them because they didn't have the ward system and dangerous dogs on their list of priorities? Well I hear that member

from Weyburn again. I don't know whether he's here or not, Mr. Speaker, but I hear his voice. Perhaps he's here in spirit.

Now the issues that SUMA does address in its resolutions are ones such as these: federal and Saskatchewan government taxation. Well that's a burning issue with SUMA. Well let's take a look at what SUMA has to say about these particular items, Mr. Speaker. This is the third resolution in the book, Mr. Speaker. It says:

Whereas the federal and Saskatchewan governments have imposed increased and certain taxes on various goods (in brackets, including motive funds) purchased by municipalities (and it goes on and on with several other whereas's), therefore be it resolved (Mr. Speaker) that the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association expresses its concern about the financial impact on local governments arising from the further elimination of their tax exempt status as a result of greater reliance by the federal and Saskatchewan governments on commodity based taxes as a resource of revenue.

And it goes on with another "be it resolved" section.

But, Mr. Speaker, they have their priorities arranged, and this is something the government has failed to do in the throne speech. I thought to myself, maybe, maybe when SUMA distilled these resolutions down and made a presentation to the cabinet, they would put something in about dangerous dogs or about ward systems because the government gives this very high priority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have the submission to the provincial cabinet, February '87. This is . . . There might have been one submission since then, but this is the one in '87 following the '87 resolutions of SUMA. And, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, not one mention about dangerous dogs, not one request for changes to the ward system. But they do say something about municipal financing. SUMA members are very concerned about the problem in municipal financing. And I can understand that because the government has dealt them a blow in the eye every year since they've been in government by removing certain features in grants, by removing certain grants that they pay to them. They have their priorities in order. This government has failed to put their priorities in order.

I thought, well why not go a little further back to the grass roots. And I started checking and I have here the resolutions for the 1987 convention of the PC Party. It's called "On Track," it's called "On Track." Now I wonder if they're on track. I wonder if they're on track. I read who the convention chairman was. W. Roy Wellman, Liberal/Tory, at the PC convention.

And you know what? The prime mover behind the dogs and the ward system is the member for Regina South. And I thought he must have checked this with his leader, the Premier, the member from Estevan — and I hesitate to say where he is, Mr. Speaker.

(1945)

However, on going through these resolutions, I checked every resolution from Estevan constituency, the Premier's constituency. Not one resolution mentioned dangerous dogs, not one resolution mentioned the ward system. Then I thought I'd check the resolutions from Regina South, the constituency of the Minister of Urban Affairs. There was not one resolution about anything; not one resolution about anything from Regina south. So he didn't get the idea for the ward system changes or the dangerous dogs from the constituency of Estevan or his own constituency of Regina South.

So I thought to myself, Mr. Speaker, there's one step farther we can go. We can go to the bedrock, the bedrock of the Tory party, and that's Tory policy. This is "the" policy of the Tory party. Now this is the blueprint, this is the blueprint for the Tory party. And I had a look at this book, Mr. Speaker, and it's very interesting. And I want to read some of this because it's got titles here that would just blow your mind. It says . . . There's one of the headings is, "Government wasteful spending, finance, and operations." And one of these sections in there saying, "A Progressive Conservative government will (this is the second point) provide sufficient resources to the Provincial Auditor so that he can properly carry out his function as protector of the public purse."

Well we know what this government has done to the Provincial Auditor. His staff is down, his budget is down, and we need spend no more time on that. We know what this government has done about shutting up, attempting to shut up the auditor, the Provincial Auditor in Saskatchewan.

Let's take . . . Oh, and I let my fingers do the walking in this book, and I went to taxation. Now this is an interesting section. This is a bedrock of Tory policy. this is on which they fashioned their victory in '82. Under taxation it says, "Eliminate the provincial sales tax and pressure Ottawa to remove federal sales tax." Well there's a lot of silence over there now. I don't even hear the member for Weyburn, and I don't know whether he's here or not, Mr. Speaker, but I don't hear him. And they haven't removed the provincial sales tax, and I don't think they've pressured Ottawa to remove the federal sales tax.

Well it says, the next point, "Reduce income tax to encourage individual initiative and economic expansion." Well if they were talking about me, they sure didn't reduce my income tax. They jacked it up with a flat . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm quite prepared. The member for Melville has indicated that he is here by speaking out from his seat, and I'm quite prepared to pay my portion of the taxes to the running of this province, and I hope the member from Melville is as well. Now have they reduced income taxes in the province of Saskatchewan? Clearly they have not.

What else does this book have to say? Under agriculture . . . Now this is interesting. Under agriculture they say, "Right to maintain the Crow's Nest freight rate structure and its expansion to improve the whole transportation system." Well the crows are coming back; it's spring in Saskatchewan, but one of them that isn't coming back is the Crow's Nest freight rate. The Conservative Party, federally and provincially, has taken care of that crow.

Under agriculture, "A two-price system for wheat with domestic price that recognizes and reflects the producers cost." This is a bedrock of Tory policy. And our agricultural critic will have something to say about that, Mr. Speaker.

We get over into the energy section of this book, and its . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I'm coming to that. I'm coming to the section on dogs and the ward system.

Under energy they say, "Enforce the province's constitutional right to set its own policies governing resource development without federal interference." Well, of course, this was written before the free trade, Mulroney-Reagan deal. So this one has gone out the window, definitely.

**An Hon. Member:** — It's gone to the dogs.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, this one's gone to the dogs, definitely.

Now by this time, Mr. Speaker, when I was reading this, I was in tears, because I've arrived at the health and social services section. And if the member for Melville is here, I want him to listen to this. "A Progressive Conservative government is committed to the preservation of the free medicare system and opposed to any deterrent fee in any shape or form."

**An Hon. Member:** — Who wrote that?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well that's part of the bedrock policy of the party, and not only that, the issue — the guarantee which says the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan is committed to continue the medicare system in our province. "The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan rejects any form of deterrent fees or health insurance premiums."

Budget time coming up. Note that, Mr. Speaker.

"The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan will abolish the unfair deterrent fees for prescription drugs." Well that one has certainly gone with the crows and will never return. Well this is a timeless document; it has no date on it; it's good for ever.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who signed it?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well I'm not sure who signed this, but it's got a blue cover.

**An Hon. Member:** — The member for Estevan, maybe.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — It could be the member for Estevan.

"A Progressive Conservative government will institute measures to ensure that rural citizens have reasonable access to health and social service programs." I suppose that means do away with the dental programs for children, in modern-day translation. and this says, "A Progressive Conservative government will."

And just in case the member for Weyburn missed it, Mr.

Speaker — maybe he wasn't listening closely — this is the bedrock document of the Conservative Party, the policy manual. We could get no more authoritative piece of literature than this. And it says, "Make changes in the Saskatchewan drug plan." Well they certainly have done that, but I don't know if they conform with what's in the policy book. The policy book says, "to abolish the unfair deterrent fee for high-volume prescription drug users." Well, the high volume prescription drug users in Saskatchewan now pay a fee that is commensurate with the amount of drugs they use and this sick tax makes sure they do — this Tory sick tax.

And here's another one. The pharmacists will get a great ... If I can be heard over the member from Weyburn, Mr. Speaker, the pharmacists will get a little bit of laughter out of this one. "To alleviate ... " This is what the government promises to do. "To alleviate the necessity for onerous bookkeeping by the pharmacists." I'm sure the pharmacist is filling out just as many or more forms than he did before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I went through this document with care. Not once, not once does it mention dangerous dogs or doing away with the ward system. Not once does it do that, Mr. Speaker. Are these the real issues, then? No, these are not the real issues. This is a case of the tail wagging the dog; the tail from Regina South wagging the dog.

He says we've got to have changes in the legislation with regard to dangerous dogs, and it's a high priority. And he says we've got to change the ward system. Well I could recommend one thing to the Premier. Since there is no evidence in SUMA, in the party's resolutions, or in the party's policy document, to support the legislation on the ward system being changed which the minister promises will be brought in, I can recommend to ... I can recommend to the Premier, since there's no evidence, that he put the member from Regina south on a shorter leash and put a muzzle on him.

These are not the real issues. And we have a word from the hog dog from Weyburn there. He's not even in his own seat, and he's chirping up.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Order, order. I'm sure the hon. member will not wish to speak to another member in terms which perhaps are somewhat unparliamentary.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I'll take that back, Mr. Speaker. I was looking at his seat and there was no one there, and I heard his voice. I'll take it back. I see he is there. He's occupying the seat of the member for Regina South, if I may observe that.

Now what are the real issues? What are the real issues in this budget to the people of Saskatoon Westmount? That's what I'm concerned about. We want to deal with the real issues.

The ward system is an issue if this government tampers with it, Mr. Speaker. It is an issue then, and I'll make it an issue. I have in my hand two maps, Mr. Speaker. The first one was the ward boundaries for the city of Saskatoon,

established by their municipal wards commission of the city of Saskatoon — at great expense to the city of Saskatoon — for the 1982 municipal elections. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, those were very successful elections. I had a part to take in them, and I enjoyed it very much. I also want to say that the other map that I have in my hand has come about because the municipal wards commission of the city of Saskatoon has just completed the redrawing of the ward boundaries for the city of Saskatoon. And it says on here pursuant to the relative section of the municipal Act:

... the municipal wards commission, on February 15, '88, filed its report with the Saskatoon city council and with the Minister of Urban Affairs.

The map outlines the new boundaries for the ten wards of the city of Saskatoon, and this takes place on a scheduled basis to accommodate changes in population, the shifts of population and growth.

Now do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, and I know the councillors in Saskatoon; I know the aldermen in Saskatoon. Do you suppose for one moment that they would go through an expensive process of running full-page ads in the paper informing the citizenry that there's going to be a change in boundaries — we want to receive your opinions, if any — having this commission sit on it, sit on it and deliberate and come forward with a map which they then advertised in the paper as being "the" map for the elections this fall, if they wanted a change in the ward boundaries?

No, the city of Saskatoon councillors, I give them much more credit for more intelligence than that. They would have made representations to this government for changes in the municipal boundaries of the wards. I don't believe the people of Saskatoon are prepared to have that tampered with. I know that when I was on council — the issues was raised once in three years on council — it received a very brief discussion, and that was the last we heard of it. And for the member for Regina South to stand in his place and suggest there's a demand for this, there's no demand for this. It's a deflection, it's a deflection by the member for Regina south, the Minister of Urban Affairs, to get attention off of the folly of this government's actions over the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I'd see the day — I've lived in Saskatoon many years — I never thought I'd see the day when the Star-Phoenix would run a whole section on hunger — a whole section in the Star-Phoenix on hunger. It's entitled, our Hungry Kids," and it was this year, January 30, '88 — "Our Hungry Kids," and here's the heading, the heading section:"

One young Saskatoon mother is considering placing her children in a foster home so they can get three square meals a day. Another lives on a diet of bread so her daughters will have enough to eat.

Exactly how many city children are going to bed hungry every night is unknown, but a team of Star-Phoenix reporters, who spent the past three weeks examining hunger in Saskatoon, found that



the problem is definitely real.

(2000)

Now this government has had some successes in this area, Mr. Speaker. They've started four food banks in the province, just on their own. That shows a kind of initiative, not that I admire it at all. It shows the folly of this government's actions over the last five, six years in Saskatchewan. And even the food banks are faltering, Mr. Speaker, even the food banks are faltering under this government. What a folly this government has perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan. There are all kinds of stories in this three . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh there's the . . . The door blew open in Weyburn again, Mr. Speaker, and somebody, somebody's voice is being heard in here other than mine. And I thought I had the floor.

Well here's an article. I want to read a bit of this to the House and to the people that are listening:

Going without food, sometimes the only option. There is child neglect in Saskatoon. It doesn't mean all hungry children are neglected, say a supervisor of child protection of the Department of Social Services. I don't think we're talking epidemic, but I know there are children going to sleep hungry in our city. There are also children poorly nourished because they're living on a starch diet.

And it gives the minimum welfare rates here, Mr. Speaker, and they're not very princely sums. This is January 30 this year, Mr. Speaker. And I never thought in my lifetime I would have to read this in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, a three-page section completely devoted to the business of hungry children in the city of Saskatoon, children coming to school hungry. And the headline here, and there's a name of a minister, and it's the Minister of Social Services, "rejects school-run lunch plan." The minister rejects it.

"Welfare diet, barely nutritional." Mr. Speaker, it goes on here to say, and this is a person who says that, yes — a chief Saskatoon nutritionist, Janet Mitchell — it can be done, that people can eat on welfare rates, but the person buying and preparing the food needs almost a degree in nutrition to do it. And this relates the story of how difficult it is to figure out, calculate the nutrition in food. It goes on with many more heart-rending stories about hunger in Saskatoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the issues in Saskatoon. It's apparently not an issue with this government because it wasn't dealt with in the throne speech. They had other things like the ward system, which nobody appears to have asked for but the member for Regina south and the Premier and those that they have encouraged to sponsor the idea that it is important that we change the ward system.

What is some other issue in Saskatoon? Well I wanted to refer to the prescription drug plan. This is an issue in Saskatoon. The cuts to the prescription drug plan. This is an issue in Saskatoon. The cuts to the prescription drug plan have caused severe financial stress to thousands of families and individuals and have forced many to make the choice

between necessary medication or groceries. And I know that to be a fact because I have a constituency office in the centre of one of the poorer parts of Saskatoon, very low-income or fixed-income wage-earners. And I know that to be a fact, Mr. Speaker.

What are the cuts to the prescription drug plan? Well these people, these people across the way who give out guarantees that they will not allow medicare to be damaged, will not allow penalties or fees on prescription drug plan, have allowed one here. They have now put in place a deductible of \$125 a person which has to be paid every year for those that use prescription drugs. And there is a further deterrent of 20 per cent of the prescription cost — 20 per cent of the prescription cost — where people before had to pay \$3.95.

Mr. Speaker, that is a burden on many of the people in the constituency I represent, that I have the honour to represent, Saskatoon Westmount. And it's not mentioned in the throne speech, not mentioned in the throne speech, but changing the ward system is high on the priorities; and dangerous dogs, although it's serious, is very high on the government's list of priorities.

What about hospital waiting lists, Mr. Speaker? I just want to deal with that for a brief moment because hospital waiting lists in Saskatoon ballooned up to 11,000 — 11,000 people in the city of Saskatoon. And the government made noises like it was going to attack that problem, get that rate down. Well, Mr. Speaker, at the end of February '88, the list is still around 10,000 people waiting for hospital beds in the city of Saskatoon: City Hospital, over 3,200; University Hospital, over 2,100; St. Paul's Hospital, over 4,500. And these people say they're going to preserve and protect medicare. Nothing about it of preserving and protecting medicare in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. Just more abuse — abuse by this government of medicare.

What about nursing home waiting lists? That's an interesting topic, nursing home waiting lists. Well in July 1987, there were 1,251 people on nursing home waiting lists; in March of this year, there are 1,316. So it had gone from 1,251 to 1,316, Mr. Speaker, people on nursing home waiting lists. That's a problem in Saskatoon and Saskatoon Westmount, Mr. Speaker.

What about home care in Saskatoon, a program that the government of Saskatchewan has been tightening down the thumb screws on in its economy drive? Instead of tightening down the thumb screws on government advertising, which is running in the multi millions of dollars, they're tightening down the thumb screws on home care. And an article in the Star-Phoenix just on February 6, '88, says:

Saskatoon home care official waiting list has about 282 names, but another 200 people have dropped their names from it in the last two years because they simply couldn't wait any longer.

So here's the waiting home . . . or the home care waiting list, Mr. Speaker, a very significant factor in Saskatoon, and of importance to the people in Saskatoon Westmount.

What about the unemployment figures? Now, that's important to the people in Westmount because there's a lot of them looking for jobs. Every once in a while some of them drop into the office and they say they're looking for jobs. Well, what's the situation?

We go back to December '86, there's a headline which seems to prophesy that things are going to get better, "The job picture may improve in '87." This appeared in the Star-Phoenix. But the first report in '87 shows that the city's jobless rates rises to 9.5 per cent. This was on January 9, 1987; that's for the December jobless rate. And then in February '87, one month later, it climbed from 9.5 per cent to 11.4 per cent in the city of Saskatoon.

What is it this year, Mr. Speaker? Well in January it was 11.4 per cent in '87; it's now 12.5 per cent in January of '88, and it's gone up to 12.6 per cent. And those figures in '88 were higher than the same period in '87, Mr. Speaker.

Unemployment is a problem in Saskatoon Westmount, but this government would rather tinker with the electoral system in Saskatoon Westmount or in Saskatoon city where no one's requested it. But people are talking every day to this government trying to get them to listen, trying to get them to listen, say there's a problem here in welfare, there's a problem in the jobless rate. But this government's not listening, it's not on their list of priorities. And that's distressing.

What about the cost of living? Well the cost of living is going up, going up, Mr. Speaker. Here's a clipping on December 10, '87, "Basic telephone rates rise 5 per cent." Here's another one, December 3, '87, "Gas, electricity to cost more." Here's one, December 31, '87, "Power rates to rise January 1, '88." Another clipping, December 19, '87, "Saskatoon' inflation tops in Canada." And it states:

Saskatoon's inflation rate was the highest among major Canadian cities at 5.9 per cent in November, up from 5.3 per cent in October.

So that's a problem in Saskatoon. The government could alleviate the situation if there were jobs. People would be able to pay the bills. They'd be able to pay for things that they require. However, there are not the jobs there. It's the highest unemployment of major urban centres.

And the most recent item about Saskatoon city's cost of living, it shows a 6.3 per cent Saskatoon inflation rate in February — so it's up again, Mr. Speaker, and continued to be the highest of the major Canadian cities. And this is according to Stats Canada figures which were released for this report which is dated March 19, '88. These are the problems in the urban areas.

I referred to a list earlier, Mr. Speaker, of fees an increases. Now that list is not completed. I referred to some of the business taxes that had gone up, or some of the fees that had been charged for licences, and business amalgamations, and so forth. That list is not yet complete. There are already 234 taxes or fees that have gone up since this government took power in '82. And they haven't even touched the area of health care, haven't even touched the area of health care.

I had the opportunity to . . . or I required a birth certificate for someone last summer. And I phoned the vital statistics to get the birth certificate, and I found not only did birth certificates go up, marriage certificates went up, and so did death certificates. So this government has got the people of Saskatchewan coming here and gong with increased fees — birth, marriage, and death. They got them at every turn, at every turn.

And the member for Weyburn is proud of that. He's proud of his government's record of taxing and taxing again the people of this province. The people of this province are getting sick and tired of the member of Weyburn and his attitude, his arrogant attitude about the people of Saskatchewan and how he can go ahead and tax them all he wants.

Is the burden of taxation falling fairly on the people, Mr. Speaker? We must examine that. Well there's some very enlightening information in this area, Mr. Speaker. It's fine for some people. I noticed just recently that the Premier, when he was telling everybody else to suck in their stomach and tighten up their belt, he was appointing 10 legislative secretaries — 10 legislative secretaries. And what some people will not know is that a Legislative Secretary gets \$7,000 a year approximately over the MLA's stipend, over and above that, plus expenses, plus expenses.

Now the Premier says, I'm going to take care of the families, I'm for the family. Well I'll tell you something, he's certainly taken care of the family for the member from Biggar because he's a Legislative Secretary. The Premier says, everybody else suck in your stomach, tighten up your belt because tough times are ahead, but he's just appointed the member for Biggar as a Legislative Secretary to the Provincial Secretary.

(2015)

Now the provincial . . . everybody in government who has anything to do with it knows that the Provincial Secretary position is the lightest possible position you can get except for head of the crop insurance corporation. The only one that is lighter weight than that, and that's the head of the crop insurance.

So the Provincial Secretary has a Legislative Secretary. I ask why, when the people of my constituency are bearing an undue tax burden, when they're being hit in the welfare, they're being hit in the health care, unemployment is at unreasonable proportions, why are we appointing more legislative secretaries?

Well the family of the member for Saltcoats is certainly taken care of by the Premier's appointment of legislative secretaries, because he just appointed the member from Saltcoats as a Legislative Secretary at 7,000 plus expenses a year on top of what he gets as an MLA.

What about the member for Canora? He's a nice enough fellow. I like him fine. The Premier has just appointed him as a Legislative Secretary at \$7,000 a year plus expenses. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, well now we've heard from, I think it was the member from Yorkton . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Wilkie.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . Wilkie. He's been . . . The member from Wilkie has been a legislative secretary already. He's had his whirl at the trough. He's had his whirl at the trough when the people of Saskatchewan were being overtaxed. He says, he asks a question from his seat, Mr. Speaker, a question which he doesn't have the gumption to get up on his feet and ask: did you have legislative secretaries?

Allan Blakeney, the maximum legislative secretaries he ever had was four. This government had 14; 14 legislative secretaries — 14 of them.

Now I agree with the position of legislative secretaries, providing it's for the purpose of putting somebody in a position to see how they perform if you're going to put them in the cabinet. You want to have a look at him under speaking engagements and so forth, so you put him in the cabinet.

But that's not the way it's used here. Mr. Speaker, there are only six people on that side of the House — from the government side — that do not have extra remuneration over and above their MLA. Out of 37 people, there are only six that don't have extra remuneration.

Well I'm ashamed of that, Mr. Speaker. I'll admit I was more ashamed when they had 14 of them because there was no justification for that, but I'm ashamed of the fact. And there's many more of them: Arm River, Morse, Kelvington-Wadena, Bengough-Milestone, Nipawin, thunder Creek, Regina Wascana; and, Mr. Speaker, they've since then, since they appointed those 10, they've sneaked in the appointment of another one. They sneak in the appointment of the member from Kinistino. So I've got to revise my figures on how many are on the payroll here.

And that becomes obscene, Mr. Speaker, when the people of Westmount constituency and Saskatoon are suffering under some of the burden of this government. And not only do they have to suffer under the burden of the legislative secretaries that are appointed here but they've got to shoulder the burden of the Schoenhals, the Sandbergs, the Katzmans of the world, who are also another layer of appointment by this government, of former cabinet ministers. My constituents are making their sacrifices. This government is not making the sacrifices, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly cannot vote for this document. It shows the chaos of the government. It shows misconstrued priorities. And I think if the Lieutenant Governor, when he is reading that speech, had left some of it out, he would have been excused — he would have been excused.

I notice the Lieutenant Governor in British Columbia, he left out reading a half a page of the throne speech in British Columbia. And if this government is bringing in any more throne speeches, I would recommend to the Lieutenant Governor that he leave out a lot of sections. He could have left out a lot of sections here and the speech would have been just as heavyweight as it is now.

I'm disappointed in this speech, and I'm certainly going to vote against it, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Atkinson:** — At the onset I want to congratulate the move and seconder of the throne speech, the members from Moosomin and Rosthern. And in the spirit of good fun, I want to remind the member of Rosthern that the last mover of the throne speech was Mr. Ray Martineau, who six months after he moved the throne speech resigned his seat, and we're now awaiting a by-election in Eastview. Perhaps if history repeats itself, which it often does, next year we'll be awaiting a by-election in Rosthern. But in all good seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the mover and seconders.

Last week as I listened to the throne speech, I thought about the people back home, the people who are my friends and my neighbours, the people who sent me here to speak on their behalf, and when I heard all of the familiar buzz-words of the Conservative Party I wondered what those words meant to the people that I represent.

I heard words like "diversify," "efficiency" and "effectiveness," "consult," "fair," "protection," "opportunities," "fair trade," "competitive edge," "a fair market value," "public participation," "first-rate health care," "major renovation" and "to build Saskatchewan." I thought of the people back home in Saskatoon Nutana and what those words meant to them. And I think we would all acknowledge that those words are regularly used with enthusiasm by the members opposite, but for the people who I represent, those words have very little reality in their lives.

But, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech referred to the word "build." Well, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people have had enough of Tory building. They've seen what these people opposite can build. They build provincial debt; they build taxes; they build high unemployment rates; they build huge hospital waiting lists in Saskatoon; they've certainly built Tory patronage for Tory friends; they've built the welfare rolls; and they are building farm and business bankruptcy. How is that building Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? How is that building?

You people aren't builders; you people are destroying this province. And there are people who believe across this province, and believe strongly, that when your work is done, when your day is done, there will be nothing left.

I think the Conservative members are aware that the political decisions you make as a governing body of Saskatchewan affect the lives of all of us. And tonight I want to talk about the tremendous toll that has been paid by Saskatchewan people as a result of your actions. You say on a regular basis that you aren't responsible for the state of our economy, and to some extent that's true. But since you came to power six years ago, a number of decisions have been made by your government that would suggest that you are indeed responsible and that you are quite prepared to reward your friends.

Let's look at the oil companies. In 1982 we, the people of

this province, collected \$700 million \$1.292 billion worth of oil production. In 1985 production rose to \$2.4 billion, and the revenue declined to \$670 million.

Since 1982 you have changed the tax system in favour of the oil companies, giving up \$1.7 billion in revenue. Had you collected the taxes from those oil companies, the prescription drug plan could have existed for another 35 years. Had the oil companies paid their fair share — their fair share — the school-based children's dental plan could have been funded for the next 300 years. Had you not rewarded the oil companies, senior citizens in this province wouldn't have to wait for over a year for hip and cataract operations, and cancer patients wouldn't have to wait four to five weeks to get into hospital.

Had you done the honourable thing, had you done the honourable thing, jobs would not have been lost at our post-secondary institutions when you eliminated over 1,000 student positions. And young, young people in this province would have hope that they might be able to enter into a post-secondary institution of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of other examples of ways that \$1.7 billion of lost revenue could have been used to support public programs that could have benefited battered women, the could have benefited children and native people, that could have benefited children and native people, the could have benefited disabled people, persons who have emotional illnesses, the unemployed, senior citizens, and the list goes on. But you made your choice and the choice was the oil companies, and those who are not as rich and not as powerful lost out.

But this is consistent, this is consistent with your philosophy of rewarding your friends and punishing those that don't have much, those that aren't so rich. We've seen you reward Peter Pocklington, Paul Schoenhals, Gavin Koyl, Weyerhaeuser, Ralph Katzman, Jack Sandberg, Mercury Graphics, and the list goes on. Peter Pocklington, but not senior citizens who choose between prescriptions and groceries; Weyerhaeuser, but not battered women and their children who are turned away on a regular basis from transition homes because of no space and cuts in funding; Gavin Koyl, but not senior citizens and disabled people who sit on waiting lists to get into home care services because of cutbacks; Mercury Graphics, but not the 10,500 patients on the hospital waiting lists in Saskatoon. Jack Sandberg and Ralph Katzman, but not rural families who have to drive many, many miles while the school-based children's dental plan was eliminated and over 400 workers fired.

All of these people know who's in power in this province. We know who's in power. It's not us, but it's the friends of the Tory Party. It's the rich in this province, that's who's in power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech did not even mention the problems of young people. He didn't even mention the future. Mr. Speaker, young people are faced with the increasing problem of not being able to enter our technical schools and universities because of restrictions on enrolments. And the restrictions have arisen as a result of a lack of Conservative government funding. Increasingly, young people can't find full-time jobs and

are relying on part-time work, and some young people have no work at all. Increasingly, young people are postponing marriage and families because they can't get full-time jobs, because they feel insecure about the future.

How demoralizing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, seeing the years go by and finding themselves without technical training or mental preparation for useful work. There is a problem and this government didn't even bother to address it — didn't even bother to address it.

And, Mr. Speaker, I also want to direct my attention to the men and women between the ages of 50 and 65, the people who have helped produce and build the wealth of Saskatchewan. Hundreds of those people are having difficulty facing the future with any degree of optimism. The member from Weyburn talks about those people contributing to the pension plan, and that is total nonsense. Many of those people don't have work. Many businesses aren't hiring them. They have been cast aside. And what do you propose to do with these people? They helped produce the wealth of this province and I . . .

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

**An Hon. Member:** — Mr. Speaker, with leave, I'd like to introduce some guests.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — It's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, some guests that I just noticed in your gallery. I have not had a chance to visit with them yet, but they are constituents of mine, good friends of mine as a matter of fact. They are here in Regina on some important business, and I would like to introduce to you Roger and Carol Pedersen from the town of Star City to the east, and we have bill and Ann Robb from just south of Melfort. And we're just happy to have you here. I would assume that you've conducted your business and now you're up to just a little bit of fun for the rest of the night. So welcome to Regina.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## SPECIAL ORDER

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

## ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Neudorf and the amendment thereto moved by Ms. Simard.

(2030)

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we must have programs and opportunities for those men and women, those men and women who are between the ages of 50 and 65 who are not working, these men and women who have served their day and generation faithfully and who now look to society to do their part in

ensuring them a measure of economic security. But they, too, weren't mentioned in the throne speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn my attention to the whole area that the government did address, and that's the area of privatization. One of the most damaging economic policies of the PC government is its privatization scheme.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Atkinson:** — This government is resorting to double speak, but it tries to call its sell-out strategy "public participation" — because the public already owns those assets, already owns those assets that those members over there are giving away. And no matter what Saskatchewan people may feel about public ownership, they expect that no Crown corporation or government department will be sold unless it will benefit them — no sale unless it benefits them.

But that's the problem, that's the problem. This government's privatization actions just aren't working. There is no public benefit in privatizing the school-based children's dental program while saving the province very, very little money that has thrown over 400 workers out of work in this province. And it has, in many respects, helped empty our rural communities because those women, those women who were workers in the dental plan, many of them lived in rural Saskatchewan. And as we all know, many farm families need that off-farm income because of the economic crisis in agriculture.

And there we have it, there we have it — privatization of the school-based children's dental plan, and more people out of work, and another loss of a rural service to rural Saskatchewan. This policy, this policy of privatization is hurting families, it's hurting health care workers, and it's hurting small communities. And Saskatchewan people are saying, count them out of that kind of privatization.

And then we have the other privatization that took place in this province. Jobs were lost when your government, Mr. Speaker, decided to fire the highway maintenance people, when they decided to turn over this work to the private sector. And since that time, I think everybody in this province, including the members opposite, will realize that the condition of our highways has deteriorated and declined in this province. The travelling public is saying, if this is privatization, count me out.

A classic example of how privatization hurts our province is seen in the sell-off of Saskoil. Within a year after this Crown corporation was privatized, a quarter of the employees had lost their jobs in Saskatchewan, and more than 75 per cent of those shares were held by people outside of Saskatchewan. Out-of-province ownership of our resources means a loss of control of our resource policy, because when it comes to the crunch, non-Saskatchewan shareholders will act in the interests of Bay Street or Wall Street but not in the interests of Main Street, Saskatchewan. Saskoil already sees its future outside our border. It has bought an Alberta oil company and saved Alberta jobs. Saskatchewan working people say, if that's privatization, count me out.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Selling off public assets that are profitable and future-oriented is the worst folly of this government's privatization schemes. This is the case with the recent merger of the computer utility, SaskCOMP, with Mercury Graphics, the company that prints all of the Tory political propaganda. Part of SaskTel and another company were also involved. A share issued to see the new company, WESTBRIDGE Corporation is planned by this summer.

There is several bad decisions in this, not the least of which is the government's obvious ploy in creating a sweetheart deal with its political friends. SaskCOMP was a successful, high-technology company. It kept the costs of high technology down, to the public sector and other education institutions. Every school child in this province knows that high tech is the future, but this government just sold that future off. And for what? No money will come into the provincial treasury until shares are offered, and the government won't say what percentage of this company it plans to sell. Meanwhile, SaskCOMP's debt-free record gets blemished by the debt load of the private company going into WESTBRIDGE.

In the last privatization boondoggle, one wonders how selling Saskatchewan minerals to a private firm is public participation. This is a sale that makes absolutely no sense. Sask Minerals is a profitable, stable company. It has made money every year but one since 1946. As well, its main product, sodium sulphate, is a counter-cyclical commodity. Its sales improve during recessionary times. Why sell a dependable, unique asset which has paid dividends of more than \$40 million to the province and helps our commodity-dependent economy weather tough times? Why indeed? That's what ordinary Saskatchewan taxpayers are asking this government every time it announces another sell-off and another asset built up by their labour. And that is the crux of the privatization issue. This government can't give good reasons because it has none. It has put the province up for sale for the sake of a dogmatic belief that somehow public enterprise is never good and public assets must be sold at any cost.

Ordinary Saskatchewan people are worried about such blind ideology and about what this government plans to privatize next. The PC government says it won't sell any part of SGI except its general insurance section. But that's the thin edge of the wedge. How much further behind would the sale of the Auto-Pak be? And what will that mean if the Auto-Pak part of SGI goes? Will it mean higher insurance rates like they have in Ontario and Alberta? Is that what we're looking at?

This government denies that it's going to privatize utilities, but has now sold off two pieces of SaskTel. And it says no privatization will follow SaskPower's bond issue, but you have to wonder. Under this government SaskPower's debt has tripled. Labour problems and the expensive television advertising program were unpopular. Is SaskPower being set up for a sell-off that the public won't object to?

If they get any say in it, ordinary Saskatchewan people

won't stand for privatization of these utility companies. But that's if they get any say at all. And there we have a Minister of Public Participation, or privatization, as I call it, or privatization, as my colleague calls it, from Moose Jaw North — who says that before he privatizes any companies or any Crown corporations or any services in this province that he is going to consult the public. What nonsense!

Consult means, to the members opposite, to go out and tell you what we're going to do. We're not going to listen to what you might say; we're not going to take feedback from the community and consult with the community; we're just going to come out and tell you — and that's called "consultation." And we have seen example after example of the way this government consults. They just go out and they tell you what they're going to do. They talk, we listen — that's consultation. What hog-wash!

The throne speech also promises new legislation which will give the government sweeping powers to privatize whatever it wants by cabinet order alone, and we all know what that means. We all know about Bill 5, where this government without ever having to come before this legislature and justify the decisions it was making. And if that's what this government has planned, if they have some sort of omnibus Bill planned where they will simply be able to privatize without ever coming before this legislature, once again we will see the democracy that the Premier talked about the night of the throne speech at the diner, and the Lieutenant Governor talked about, and the freedom that this province has had for all of these years since 1905; we will know full well what democracy means to the members opposite — and democracy does not mean bringing its decisions before this legislature.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the members opposite that it isn't enough to achieve high office and all the power associated with it. Power does not necessarily bring a sense of personal satisfaction. I would ask the Conservative government to be mindful that the real measure, the real measure of a province is its quality of life; what it does for the least fortunate; how it treats its minorities; and the opportunity it gives its people, particularly its young people, to live useful and meaningful lives.

The people of our province are looking to this Legislative Assembly to do something about the economic crisis and the promises that you people have made in the 1982 election and the 1986 election. I suggest the time has come for action. The people of Saskatchewan look to us. The people of Saskatchewan are counting on us, and I think that we shouldn't fail them, or we shouldn't be here.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this throne speech because it does not address the fundamental issues facing this province. It does not address high unemployment rates; it does not address the rapidly increasing insecurity and despair that Saskatchewan citizens are feeling.

This government can use all of the flowery language in the world. It can use all of the cheer-leading words that it wants, and all the buzz phrases, but the people of this

province fundamentally, believe that these members opposite are destroying this province, and when they're done, there'll be nothing left. And until such time as this government comes forward with positive economic and social policies. I will not be supporting any throne speech. Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sauder:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to rise tonight to speak on this debate on the throne speech, to speak on behalf of my constituency, the people from Nipawin area.

I must lead off by congratulating my colleague from Rosthern and colleague from Moosomin, the movers and seconder of this throne speech; they did an excellent job. I appreciate that and congratulate them for that.

Mr. Speaker, as the Legislative Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, I listened with some interest to the Leader of the Opposition and his response to this throne speech. I must say that with some regret I'm disappointed in what his response was. A department that has so much impact on every person in Saskatchewan — whether it's to do with their air, whether it's to do with water and water quality, whether it's to do with other types of contamination — that member did not even respond or mention the Department of Environment, give it not even passing mention.

Mr. Speaker, I find that disappointing for the Leader of the Opposition to not recognize the importance of that, particularly at a time when even some of his members are calling for various changes to that department, for various things to be reviewed, for projects to get closer scrutiny and more scrutiny, but they don't even have the integrity to respond to it and to put forward his position on that and what it means to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it's particularly disappointing, at a time when Saskatchewan people thought they could expect to hear new ideas out of the opposition leader, the new leader, that he did not even mention it — no new ideas. Frequently those ideas from that party many times seem to come from the fringe — some type of mental acrobatics — ideas like the ones from the member for Saskatoon University suggesting that chocolate bars should be banned, outlawing farm chemicals.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps they were mental wanderings, but at least they were ideas. They were more than we've seen come forward from the Leader of the Opposition to date. Now we have a man who aspires to be premier, a man suffering from the worst kind and case of power-hunger tremors, and he's not even one word to say about our environment.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it hearkens back to his days when he was a member of the former administration, a member of the cabinet of this province, when he participated in one of the most scandalous cover-ups of an environmental accident in the history of this province. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he does not want the people reminded that it was his government and their own uranium mine which spilled uranium tailings, and his

Department of the Environment that hid that fact from the people of Saskatchewan. There are many who are not even so sure that he was not involved in breaking the law in that instance, Mr. Speaker. And I'll tell you that under this PC government it is required by law to report such accidents. The concern for the environment, for the member of Riversdale, seems to extend only to concern for the political environment in which he feeds his power hunger, and that, Mr. Speaker, it totally unacceptable to the people of Saskatchewan, and definitely to the people of Nipawin.

Mr. Speaker, when the throne speech talks of a commitment to the land that we love, it is speaking with force to the commitment of this government to the environment, to the protection of our land, our water systems and our air.

(2045)

I would remind members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan that it was this Progressive Conservative government that passed The Clean Air Act, an Act to deal with the quality of the air that we breathe, that is fundamental to all of us.

However, as I said, it was the previous government, an NDP government, that kept a nuclear accident from the sight of the people — an attitude that does not seem to be acceptable to me. Their attitude seems to be that because they owned the mines and they run the Department of the Environment, let's get a little collusion going here and hide the facts. That was the attitude then, and it appears that it's still the attitude of the member from Riversdale — not acceptable to the people of Saskatchewan.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale who wants to say what about Rafferty-Alameda, a project that has been on many peoples' minds in Saskatchewan, a project which my colleague, the member from Souris-Cannington, elaborated on this afternoon in some detail. There are some facts available to the members opposite, facts that I believe they should carefully consider in their discussion of this major project.

As they look at this project as they seem to have with the blinders on, Mr. Speaker, they should remember that this project and Shand do not only have to go through our approval process, our Department of the Environment, and meet the conditions laid out there — a process which is better than anything they had when they were members of government, stronger — it also has to go through the studies mandated by the minister; it has to go through the studies in the environmental process of our partners in the project, the U.S. assessment. It also has to go through an assessment of Environment Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, unless that member, the Leader of the Opposition, wants to continue to impugn every environmental expert on the continent, he should be honest with the people of Saskatchewan and confess that that project and the Shand projects will have to meet the toughest, most stringent environmental standards of any project ever undertaken in this province.

But he does not seem to care about the damages to the

character and the reputations of those good, hard working professional people, and he and his party will go merrily along implying somehow that professionals that are studying the project will distort the truth the way the former government did when it came to uranium spills. Everyone, I'm proud to say, is not as conspiratorial as the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, along with my concern with the environment goes another concern, and that's regarding the department that I worked for before I became involved with Environment, and that's the Department of Health and the health care system in our province.

I'd like to address a few of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition again, and his discussion of that and his response to the throne speech. And I'd like to place it in to some perspective as regarding some of his ideas that he's put forward in the past as to what he believes is good for our health care system. I would just quote from his speech, page 30 of Hansard. It says:

Saskatchewan at this time in its history . . . has no game plan, has no blueprint, no vision for the people of the province of Saskatchewan — none whatsoever, none whatsoever . . . (It's) rudderless, leaderless and visionless.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to him, he was not speaking of himself and the NDP, but he may well have been; perhaps should have been. As I said, where was his vision for the environment? Where is his ideas for the ways to improve the quality of life for the people of Saskatchewan? There was not one word in his major speech to this Assembly. Where is his blueprint for agriculture? Not a policy, not a suggestion, not an idea since he's changed seats. Where's his leadership for economic development? Not a new idea — not one, Mr. Speaker. Where is his leadership on public participation? He says perhaps it is good. But no leadership, no ideas, no suggestions; no leadership on health care; no leadership on education. The member for Riversdale, I'm afraid, is a leader of an opposition of open mouths and closed minds, a party suffering from age and obsolescence.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sauder:** — The man from the past, when we're looking to the 1990s and the next century, the 2000s — a leader of a party with no game plan, no blueprint, and no vision.

Let us take a look at the health care, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier. He's finally taken credit for a task force report and the conclusions that he came to. In his rambling address to this Assembly on March 23 he said, and I quote:

I think the report was a very, very good study . . . You may accept or reject the recommendations, but we did a job.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can at least agree to part of that, that we can accept or reject it and, I believe, reject it we will.

Let's look at some of his recommendations and decide

whether we should accept or reject them. I have this story from the Canadian Hospital Association, and will be quoting the member from Riversdale on the *Hospital Products and Technology Journal*, the August-September issue of 1985, reporting the Leader of the Opposition's recommendations from his participation on this task force, recommendations that he's asking us to accept. The headline, Mr. Speaker, says, and I'm making a direct quote of the member from Riversdale, "Building more institutions for the aged is a road to disaster," Mr. Speaker, according to the member from Riversdale, that is their leader's approach and solution to the problems of the senior citizens of this province, Mr. Speaker, not accepting the responsibility to care for those who are no longer able to care for themselves. Recommendation number one, before anything else, he wants to refuse, as his government did, refuse to build special care home beds and other health care facilities for our seniors. Mr. Speaker, a man from the past would go back to the ideas of the past and tell them that they don't need it. Look after yourself — we're not interested in you. That's his philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, he said we could accept or reject his recommendations, and that one we certainly reject. He said in his recommendations, and I quote further: "Rationing of high-cost technology is desperately needed." That's his response to the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Nipawin's constituency suffering from serious illness and disease. That's his response to the young person who was recently involved in an accident who lost a hand, but because of new technology was able to have that hand sewn back on, the nerves replaced, and has full use of the arm which had been severed — direct advantage of the new technology. That's his response to the young mother of this young family of four children who recently had a brain tumour removed because of the breakthroughs in new technology and is home caring for her children. Mr. Speaker, I don't find that acceptable to the people who desperately need that type of health care, and I don't believe that the people of Saskatchewan buy that.

He recommends that government politicians, Mr. Speaker, should be rationing medical technology. This party and this government does not believe that we should be doing that, and we certainly reject that recommendation of that member.

Mr. Speaker, another quote, and that is: "There is little evidence to show that increased funding does lead to better health." Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't agree with that, and we certainly have increased funding to health care and have increased it dramatically — more than a 63 per cent increase since we took over government in 1982 and even larger increases in specific areas, like the 157 per cent in ambulance funding and 90 per cent increase in alcohol and drug abuse programming, Mr. Speaker; programming to help the youth of our province primarily deal with addiction and to chemicals and drugs and to return to a normal life-style without the dependence on those things; a commitment to education for them to keep them from falling into those traps that are there in our society. Mr. Speaker, once again, we cannot accept his recommendation dealing with that aspect of our health care.

Mr. Speaker, it's not only a matter, as he seems to think, of increasing funding or not and then taking his recommendation not to increase it. It's a matter of deciding whether the funding is directed and improving the areas of our health care system that need improvement, and not just cutting off everything or everyone.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition said, and I quote again.

Obviously our health care system is undergoing some stress. There are some creaks and cracks, but it really does what it is supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I can't agree with him on that statement, and that is exactly the reason why, in the recent throne speech, there was an announcement of a task force to deal with our health care system, to review it, to study it, and to find out where the deficiencies may be; identify the problems, but also, and more importantly than just identifying the problems, but also to bring forth recommendations for solutions, and proposals to deal with it; to build on the base that we have in our health care system and to make it better as we go into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the people of Saskatchewan, I'd also ask the people of Nipawin, what would have happened if we had accepted the recommendations of the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, there would have been no new hospital in Nipawin, the hospital that's providing needed service to that area, a hospital which cost almost \$10 million and was funded largely by the provincial government. It would not have happened under the leadership of that member, and it would not have happened under their government.

It reminds me of the day that we had the sod turning for that facility. And if you'd permit me to just tell a little story, it comes from the then chairman of the hospital board, who is not of the same political belief or faith that I am but has tended to support some others. His comment, when we had that sod turning, as he spoke to the crowd in his address to them, was that the Liberals had talked about that project, the NDP had talked about that project, but it was the Conservatives who were building it.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sauder:** — Mr. Speaker, building more hospitals and other health care facilities, the costs are going to be high, but we are going to do it. He said his alternative is that the costs will be prohibitive and the results will be disastrous. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have worked hard. They've contributed to it. They expect a good health care system and they're receiving it under this government. Building that hospital I do not believe was disastrous, and nor do the people of Nipawin, and I would invite you to come and talk to them and ask them.

What else would have happened under the leadership of that government? Well we would not have had the 16 senior citizens' apartments which were recently built and opened in that community, Mr. Speaker, providing housing for those pioneers who opened that area up,



who've developed it, and who have worked hard, and who have come to a point where they need some assistance. And we have given them assistance in their housing needs in that community, Mr. Speaker, something that would not have been available under the leadership of that member or under the government that he would like to lead.

Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan we would not have had almost 2,000 new nursing home beds which this government has built across our province. We would not have had the new hospitals in Saskatoon, Regina, and other places. We would not have had the new technology that has been taken advantage of. We would not have had the new cancer clinic. Mr. Speaker, he is right when he says that those things cost money, and they do cost a great deal, but they're only responsible in the delivery of our health care system to the people of Saskatchewan, people who deserve the best health care system that we can provide.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sauder:** — Mr. Speaker, I accept that there is limits to the amount of money that's available in our treasury, but we have to continue to provide a health care system that's for our people's needs. I realize that we cannot have a university hospital in every town, nor do we want that. I'm well aware that there are serious cost considerations that have to be addressed but the tax force is going to look at the various components of our system and deal with them and bring in proposals, as I said, recommendations for change and improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I've been out in my constituency and have not had an opportunity to listen to all of the speeches here, but I was reading through Hansard today, and I understand and read that many of my colleagues have addressed most of the other things in the throne speech debate and dealt with the other important issues that affect particular the people of Nipawin, but all of Saskatchewan, the agriculture, our education, resources, diversification, trade, and other things.

I do not want to be repetitive and deal with the same things, but it is with pride that I can say that I support what's in that throne speech. I'm proud of the past record of this government, as I said, on environment, on health care. I'm proud of it in the other areas of our province.

(2100)

Mr. Speaker, it's going to be with pride that I support the motion of my colleague from Rosthern and do not support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to start by congratulating the member from Rosthern who moved the Speech from the Throne and the member from Moosomin who was the seconder to the Speech from the Throne. I understand that it's a great honour for a back-bench member of the legislature to have the opportunity or to be asked to move and second the Speech from the Throne.

I would like to also congratulate the government, but I don't feel that I can actually do that because, although there is some laudable things in the Speech from the Throne, there are some things that are sadly lacking therein. I feel that those things that are lacking are the very serious things that need to be addressed by this government to assist the people of the province of Saskatchewan through some very difficult times. The difficult times are blamed in the throne speech on conditions beyond the control of the government, and I don't think that's necessarily so in every situation.

But I would want to look first at what the government actually says they're going to do in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker. And when you look at the Speech from the Throne, I suppose the indication of what the government is going to do over this second session of this legislature are the things where they say they will introduce legislation, either new legislation or legislation to amend current Acts of this legislature.

They say that they're going to improve the Saskatchewan pension plan. Well that's an admirable position to take, and I would have no disagreement with improving pension plans to people. I would hope that the government would at some point look at greater portability of pension so that people, when they move in the very transient work-force that we're getting in our society today, that they would have some opportunity to transfer their pensions along with them so that the pensions attached to the job and not necessarily attached to the ... or the pension is attached to the person and not necessarily attached to the job.

The second item that I see in the Speech from the Throne is that they're going to improve labour standards. The Labour Standards Act will be brought before the legislature, and as long as it is improvements, I'm sure that this side of the House would have no objection to improvements in The Labour Standards Act for working people in the province of Saskatchewan.

They are promising amendments to The Occupational Health and Safety Act to provide information on toxic chemicals used in the work place. Again, a very noble effort and something that we would support and hopefully add some constructive criticism to over the course of this session, Mr. Speaker.

They are going to replace The Family Services Act with legislation to improve the role of the family in foster-parent situations and to simplify abortion procedures. We very much want to see what that legislation actually says. We would have some concerns about that and again hope that we can be constructive in the legislation that comes before the House.

The government is also going to provide a framework and standards for day care in both urban and rural areas of the province of Saskatchewan. For many, many years, not only in this legislature but in the federal House of commons, New Democrats have fought for access to day care so that those that have children, especially in single parent situations, are not hampered from the work-force because they don't have adequate child care. And we're

very anxious again to see this legislation come before the legislature.

There is talk in the throne speech about The Homesteads Act and to recognize the modern day arrangements concerning ownership of marital property. They go on to talk about amendments to The Small Claims Enforcement Act so the courts become more easily accessible to people. I would have to say that concerns me a little bit in that people are finding a greater need to go before the courts than they are to come to elected members of the courts than they are to come to elected members of the legislature, or members of parliament, or whatever the elected officials, to help find remedies to the problems. Our court systems are certainly overtaxed at the present time. And I think that in the past, people who have put more emphasis onto the court system and away from the system that we have traditionally known within the country should be chastised to some extent.

There is going to be improvements to the judicial system in the jury selection process. They're supposed to provide greater financial and personal security for mentally disabled adults, and they're going:

to control and regulate all-terrain vehicles as a result of growing concern over accidents resulting from the increased use of such vehicles.

Now all of that — we're anxious to go into debate on those items, but as I say, there's much that's missing from the throne speech, Mr. Speaker.

There's one final thing that entertains me to some extent. The previous speaker before the member from Nipawin, from that side of the House, the member from Regina South, gave great credence to this section of the throne speech, and he said there's going to be an amendment to The Urban Municipality Act to deal with such questions as store hours and dangerous dogs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's good. I would not want anyone to be bitten by a dangerous dog, as the member from Regina South pointed out. In fact, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we believe that all dangerous dogs should be either caged or restricted from contact with the public. Now I don't know if the legislation will accomplish its intent, Mr. Speaker. We'll have to see the Bill when it's introduced, in particular, the definition of dangerous dogs will be very important because Saskatchewan citizens have already been bitten and many may not even survive. They've been bitten with the flat tax, the sales tax, income tax, gas tax, property tax and about 250 hidden taxes ranging from everything from hunting licence increases over to surcharges — some 250 increases.

So those people when they're bitten, Mr. Speaker, we want them protected. And if this government isn't going to protect them, we're going to do our best in opposition to expose this government for what they really are, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, the things that are lacking in the throne speech — and the government doesn't wish,

obviously, to move on because they've been the ones who've been biting the people in the province of Saskatchewan — are things like health care. What remedy is there to solve the waiting list problem — 10 to 11,000 people in the city of Saskatoon?

I was talking to a physician this past weekend in The Battlefords constituency, and he informs me that there are people coming from Saskatoon to receive some surgical procedures at the Union Hospital in North Battleford — great hardship on people having to travel that distance, but since the government can find no remedy to the problem, people are taking it upon themselves to find their own remedies, and that means moving out to the regional hospitals within the province to assist with any ailments that they may in fact have.

The government has chosen to turn a blind eye, even though the Progressive Conservative convention last November stated very clearly to the Progressive Conservative members of the legislature that the changes to the dental program, the children's school-based dental program, were absolutely wrong. And the premier at that time responded to his own delegates by saying that we're going to have a look; we know we made a mistake; we know we've hurt rural Saskatchewan people by the changes to the dental program.

Well what's the report on that? Last November . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Nothing.

**Mr. Anguish:** — the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake says, nothing. Well that's absolutely correct. They've done nothing. They even tell their own delegates at the convention — not just people in the province of Saskatchewan — their own people, that they should be able to take into their confidence. They say they'll do something; but nothing. What is there for rural dental services, Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech? There's nothing there. It's non-existent. We want to know what this government's going to do in dealing with those very serious health problems.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that bothers people the most about the dental plan is that they have known a great standard of health care in the province of Saskatchewan ever since 1962 — and it started a bit before that — and that the dental plan was an extension of health care services to people in the province.

The health care plan was supposed to be the sacred trust. Tories would never touch the sacred trust, Mr. Speaker. Well the dental plan was an extension of that, and now the dental plan has been privatized, it's been decimated. Utilization rates are far, far down from what was being utilized by children in the dental plan when it was a school-based program that had accessibility, easy accessibility to all children throughout the province of Saskatchewan. A change to our basic structure of medicare; betraying the sacred trust.

The other thing in health care, Mr. Speaker, has to do with prescription drugs. I'm sure that there's not a member of the legislature in this room tonight that hasn't been contacted by someone who is a senior citizen or someone

who has to rely on prescription drugs that are prescribed by doctors, that have been contacted, and that person will say to them, I can't afford the prescription drug that's sitting on the druggist's counter. I went there today, and that drug is going to cost them 80, 90, 100, in some cases, more than that, and people quite often don't have that money to put up front. And the government has not found a remedy to that situation. They say that they are going to "fast-track" payments back to them; they have the option of 20 per cent down in some cases. But this is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, to many people in the province of Saskatchewan.

What does the government say in the Speech from the Throne? The government says they're going to have a task force. Well they had a task force or a study last year looking at the regionalization of hospitals in the province. That's good, but we've heard nothing on it yet. Now they're going to have another task force, and that may be good, but in the meantime, what do the people in the province of Saskatchewan do who are suffering under the erosion of our medicare program in the province of Saskatchewan?

The government does not listen. They don't hear what people are saying. If there is a consultation process going on, that consultation process seems to be directed one way only. The government and the members go out and they tell the people what is best for them. They don't hear what people are saying back to them, Mr. Speaker. It's a one direction communication. There's no communication that comes back. At least if it comes back, it's not sinking in.

Mr. Speaker, that task force, as far as we're concerned on this side of the House, is a delay tactic because the government refuses, or else doesn't know how to address those very serious problems in health care in the province of Saskatchewan, so that they can delay and delay and delay, saying that they're studying the situation. And although the study is necessary, we should study health care in the province of Saskatchewan because it's a very basic problem that people have come to appreciate. It has future problems that we will have to address and deal with. We on this side of the House will deal with those problems, Mr. Speaker, by making sure people in Saskatchewan have adequate health care services and not blame it on a task force study that we have to wait and see what happens.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that is lacking in the throne speech, the member from Nipawin was saying about the environment, that we're not saying anything about the environment. The government doesn't even address the environment in the Speech from the Throne. There's nothing in there, Mr. Speaker, from the Throne. There's nothing in there Mr. Speaker, about the environment. So the hypocrisy of the member from Nipawin to stand up and criticize this side of the House when he is speaking in favour of the Speech from the Throne, and nothing in that Speech from the Throne on the environment. What hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the next thing I would want

to say is lacking, but is addressed in the Speech from the Throne, is the whole thing about the legislation coming in for the Department of Public Participation. The Department of Public Participation, under the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, I believe his constituency is, is not public participation; it's a misnomer. The name is certainly not correct if the actions to date are any indication as to what's going to happen under that government department. I would take, for example, the sale just within the past few days of Saskatchewan Minerals. Saskatchewan Minerals was sold for \$15.9 million to two companies. One portion of it, the sodium sulphate division of Saskatchewan Minerals in Chaplin and Fox Valley, has been sold to Kam-Kotia Mines Ltd. for \$12.5 million, and the Crown corporation's peat moss division at Carrot River has been sold to Premier Saskatchewan Inc. for \$3.4 million.

(2115)

No, Mr. Speaker, although one of these companies, at least, has an office in Saskatchewan, neither one of them are Saskatchewan-based companies. One company is based in the province of Quebec, the other company is based, I believe, in the city of Toronto.

And now how do you tell people in the province of Saskatchewan that's public participation? Public participation from Quebec and Toronto? Well that's not the kind of public participation that people in the province of Saskatchewan have come to appreciate and know. They've participated in Sask Minerals as a Crown corporation since 1947, Mr. Speaker. And since 1947 Saskatchewan Minerals has — according to the figures that I have done up fairly roughly and what the media are quoting — is that Saskatchewan Minerals has paid more than \$61 million in wages, \$2 million in grant in lieu of taxes, \$12 million in royalties, and \$40 million in dividends to our province over the years since 1947 when there was real public participation in Saskatchewan Minerals in the province of Saskatchewan.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was just out in the Morse constituency recently, and the people there pointed out to me that in 1981 — or it was possibly 1982 — Sask Minerals had a profit of \$6.1 million, Mr. Speaker — \$6.1 million in one year. And what does this government sell it for? This government sells that division of it for \$12.5 million.

At the same time they say we're short of money; we have to increase taxation because we can't support all these programs that you've known to appreciate and to utilize and to love in the province of Saskatchewan. We can't afford it. We have to sell these off to get more money. Well Saskatchewan Minerals, as we pointed out, has raised millions and millions of dollars between 1947 and the current day — and only one year, only one year since 1947 did Saskatchewan Minerals suffer a loss, and it was a minor loss at that time.

But I don't think anybody can justify public participation when you sell something that has been already owned by the public of the province of Saskatchewan to interests outside the province. It just doesn't make any sense, and they should call it for what it

really is — it's privatization. These people over there want to turn the wheel so far to the right that there'll never be able to be real public participation again in the province of Saskatchewan, so that when the people in Saskatchewan kick them out after the next provincial election, that they'll all have cosy jobs to go to. They not only put their sons and daughters and relatives and friends in high positions, they'll also have some positions to go to themselves when their term is done, by pillaging and looting the province of Saskatchewan — the privatization, as it's called by the member from Moose Jaw North. Yes — ha, ha, mateys, what are we going to privatize today?

Mr. Speaker, in the past in the province of Saskatchewan, people have always felt a need for a mixed economy. And what is a mixed economy? You've heard that before in this House, but it needs to be said again because obviously the members opposite don't understand it very well. A mixed economy means that you have the private sector that is important to our economy, and we recognize that. Many members on this side of the House are involved in private enterprise. Many members have businesses, farming operations, they participate in the private sector just as many members opposite do.

But we also need other things. That's not the main engine of our economy, not just the private sector alone. We've always relied on co-operatives and the co-operative spirit of people in the province of Saskatchewan such as Federated Co-operatives, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, to name two of the biggest that have been functioning very well for a long period of time. And those co-operatives came into place to make the mixed economy because the private sector in the early days alone was an engine in the economy, but only for a very few. People in Saskatchewan were left without, for the most part, because the very few were getting the very most out of the resources and the rewards of the province. So the co-operatives came into place.

The other engine of the economy that we've had in this mixed economy in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has been that of public ownership. Public ownership has been very important in the past. I've just pointed out the importance of Saskatchewan Minerals to our economy, employing hundreds of people and paying millions of dollars into our economy in the province of Saskatchewan to provide these programs such as health care, such as education, such as job creation, so that people can live with some standard of decency in this fine province of ours.

The other thing that was really lacking, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne was the plight of agriculture that we have today in the province. I want to address that for a few moments here this evening.

The Conservative government, Mr. Speaker, both provincially and nationally have said about all the money they've poured into the farming operations and agricultural economy in western Canada. And granted they have poured large sums of money into the agricultural economy and into the hand of farmers in Saskatchewan. But it hasn't helped the situation, Mr. Speaker; all it's done is forestall the inevitable. All of a

sudden the government says we'll give you \$25 an acre on farm production loan and you can pay it back in three years — but the agricultural situation gets worse.

And now that the agricultural situation is worse, when farmers got the \$25 an acres for farm production loan, the government says, well, we'll extend it over 10 years, but we'll take all the security you have so that you're in jeopardy getting an operating loan with your bank or credit union when you want to put in your crop in the spring, and we'll also increase the interest rate on it. They don't do that to their corporate friends, but they certainly do that to the very basic salt of the earth from the province of Saskatchewan — from our roots, from our farmers in this very fine province, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Huge deficiency payment shave come out in terms of dollar amount. But what happens, Mr. Speaker, is a very small portion get the lion's share, and all those who actually need more get less than those that get the lion's share — very inequitable distribution of the money that comes out of the financing schemes that the government has, Mr. Speaker.

They talk about equity financing, the private capital land bank. I can't imagine the government opposite wanting to give farmers' land away to private interests outside of the farmers' control — asking for international capital, capital outside of Saskatchewan, capital outside of Canada, to buy up farmer's land. Why would they bank land into those private sector land banks, Mr. Speaker? I can't understand why they'd want to do that.

What the farmers have to have today instead of a private capital land bank, Mr. Speaker, is some kind of a family farm transfer program so that the retiring farmer can transfer that land to a son or a daughter or a nephew or a niece or a cousin or someone who is in the family of that farmer. Today they can't do that, and the answer is equity financing, the private capital land bank that this government wants to sell out the farmer's land in the province of Saskatchewan. We think that's disgraceful, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — What about those farmers, Mr. Speaker, who the government gives the majority of the money to, that small 10 per cent or so of farmers that are over \$250,000 in debt? Very small number of farmers, but huge, huge debts. And the farmers that are operating efficiently and struggling through these difficult times, that haven't over-expanded and have been prudent and have had good farming practices, they're saying, look, the Conservatives are increasing the debt of these people. Some of those small portion of farmers are being irresponsible and just gathering all this debt in all the time.

And what is this government going to do about it? They've got no plan for that. They're just going to increase that debt until they can get the land away from those farmers that have increased their debt so high that they can't service it.

But then there's a portion that we're particularly concerned about on this side of the House, that's those farmers that have under \$250,000 in debt. A good portion of them have no real debt, about 25 per cent or so, because of their farming practices — maybe they didn't have to go into debt to get farming, maybe the parents helped them out, or for whatever reason. We want to make sure that those people succeed. We want to make sure that those people that have a smaller debt that they've had to borrow to get into farming and they've farmed good for a number of years, that they can remain on the farm as well.

But what does this government do? They want to drive them deeper in debt, and then give them harsher conditions to pay back when the farmers can't pay it back. What's this government going to do about pricing of the products that farmers grow and raise on their farms? Nothing. They don't call on the federal government to help in that situation. They call on the federal government to drive farmers deeper into debt.

Farmers say . . . for the most part, those good farmers say that there isn't really a debt problem as much as there is an income problem, and the income problem is because this government stood idly by and done nothing to make sure that farmers get a fair return on the crops they grow and the livestock that they raise in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — Mr. Speaker, before I close off this evening, I'd like to say that the small farm in Saskatchewan is disappearing under the policies of the government opposite and the Mulroney Conservatives in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Small towns as well.

**Mr. Anguish:** — And with that, as one of the members points out so accurately, the small towns as well. Because Saskatchewan has relied on agriculture and on farmers, and we still recognize that it's number one in our economy.

But the government allows farmers to be going out of business. The farmers get fewer and fewer, and the farms get larger and larger. And as a result, the small towns in Saskatchewan are dying.

And I hope that some day, and some day very soon, that this government under the member from Estevan is told very harshly in an election that we don't want the face of Saskatchewan to change. What's happening? More and more part-time farmers are coming about, Mr. Speaker. They can't make a go of it on the land; they move into other jobs to support their farming operation. Even though the love of their life is their family and their farm, they find it necessary to go and work off the farm.

The final thing I want to say this evening, Mr. Speaker, is the empty arguments that are given by the government in terms of free trade. Free trade, Mr. Speaker, is not the great

thing that would be pointed out to be by the Conservative government.

I think though, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the conclusion, I'd like to say a bit more about free trade than time would allow me here this evening. And I would beg leave to adjourn the debate for the . . . (inaudible) . . . Well I understand, Mr. Speaker, from our legislative expert that I can't adjourn the debate and take my place back when the debate resumes tomorrow.

Since there's a vote at 9:30 on our amendment, I would like to indicate that I will be supporting that amendment, as all colleagues on this side of the House will be.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Anguish:** — It's a very good and a very sound amendment.

And when it comes to the final vote on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, we will not be supporting the Speech from the Throne, not because there aren't some good things in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, but we will not be supporting the Speech from the Throne because of the things it does not address that I pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker, such as the problems with health care, and the problems with funding of education and agriculture, and the many serious problems that the government has just really failed to address.

And, Mr. Speaker, our motion that we'll be voting on here very shortly, put forward by the member from Regina Lakeview reads as follows . . .

(2130)

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I must inform the Assembly that under Rule 13(3), that it is my duty at this time to interrupt debate and put the question on the amendment. It has been moved in the amendment to the main motion by the member for Regina Lakeview and seconded by the member for Humboldt:

That the following be added after the word "session" in the last line:

but regrets that the provincial government has betrayed Saskatchewan families by its attacks on medicare, its failure to support Saskatchewan farmers in financial crisis, its unfair tax policies, and its failure to provide jobs and opportunities for Saskatchewan young people.

(2139)

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

# Yeas — 21

Romanow	Kowalksy
Prebble	Koenker
Rolfes	Atkinson
Brockelbank	Anguish
Shillington	Goulet

Tchorzewski	Hagel
Koskie	Lautermilch
Thompson	Trew
Solomon	Smart
Mitchell	Van Mulligen
Upshall	

#### Nays — 32

Devine	Pickering
Muller	Martin
Duncan	Toth
Andrew	Sauder
Berntson	Johnson
Lane	McLaren
Taylor	Hopfner
Swan	Petersen
Muirhead	Swenson
Maxwell	Baker
Schmidt	Gleim
Hodgins	Neudorf
Gerich	Gardner
Hepworth	Kopelchuk
Hardy	Saxinger
Klein	Britton

#### SPECIAL ORDER

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Neudorf.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder for their fine speeches and their astute perception of how a good government is run.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — And all the members opposite have maligned back-benchers now for the past four or five days. I remember being a back-bencher; I remember being maligned by the members opposite. So I could say I'm quite used to it, but I could also say they're not a very good judge of character or candidate or politics or anything of that nature. They lost some of their best people, including a few people on this side. And I wouldn't say that anybody on this side ever crossed over. They had the decency to quit and run as a proper Conservative rather than stay with the NDP and compromise their principles.

But, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the throne speech here, we are looking at a document that is detailed, but not lengthy, and gives an indication of the economic state of the world and Saskatchewan and shows that it takes skill to govern in volatile economic times. And it shows that you have to have principles to govern in difficult economic times. In contrast, the members opposite, in

the easiest economic times in the history of Saskatchewan, only proved that any fool could spend money, and that they did. They spent if faster than drunken sailors. I don't know what they used for an example, but they certainly learned how to do it.

I recall being a member of the party of the Leader of the Opposition, and the biggest problem at conventions was: how are we going to spend all of this money? Well, they found many, many ways: hire more and more bureaucrats — and they would say that we hire our friends. Well when I was there I never saw them ever hire any of their enemies. So I don't think politicians . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — I don't think politicians have changed over the last 2,000 years. It's not logical to think that your enemies will deliver good government for you, so you have to be practical about these things and hire people who can get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly refer to my constituency, the constituency of Melville, where we have shown leadership in governing under volatile economic times. Without going into a two or three hour speech on agriculture, I want to remind the members opposite the difficulty that agriculture has faced in North America, and especially in Saskatchewan as a result of the grain wars between the United States and the European economic community. And I want to tell you that the farmers of my constituency greatly appreciate the support that has been given to them by this government and their government in Ottawa in keeping them afloat and keeping agriculture strong under difficult economic times.

(2145)

Mr. Speaker, I also want to refer to you about instances in my constituency. For example, this government has gone a long way to help the economy of Melville, Saskatchewan, and part of that commitment was in the moving of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance office to Melville, Saskatchewan. The members opposite suggested that it couldn't be done, that a head office of an agricultural based corporation could not function in rural Saskatchewan. And I invite them to come and have a look. They are afraid to come to Melville. Two of them did. They didn't stay long, and they didn't have much to say, but I invite them to come to Melville and watch how a corporation designed to serve farmers can serve farmers from rural Saskatchewan. This has done a lot to improve the economy of Melville. And many, many of the workers there are the spouse of farmers supplementing their income so that they also can become two-income families.

But all has not been easy in my city. And at the same time that the provincial government moved 60 workers into Melville, CNR chose to move 57 workers out of Melville and reducing our employees at the car shops in Melville. Now this has not been an easy thing for the employees or for the city of Melville, but I say to the citizens of Melville that we will not give up in trying to keep the local economy going. I say to the workers in the car shops in my city that we must compete with other car shops in Canada

and that we must be the most efficient and best managed and best operated car shop in Canada, and then we will have more and more jobs in the city of Melville. So the challenge goes out to us in Melville, not only to have the government provide jobs but for us to do the best we can in our own city, shown by the leadership of this government and myself as the MLA in competing in the world, in Canada, and competing for business and jobs — and the jobs that I am talking about include jobs in the car shop in Melville.

A little discussion about procedure here, Mr. Speaker. I'm advised that one of my colleagues would want to seek to leave to introduce guests, and I am prepared to defer to him.

Leave granted.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Petersen:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct your attention to your gallery where we have members of the Farm Land Security Board with us this evening, their chairman, David Angell. I would ask all members to give them a warm welcome here.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### SPECIAL ORDER

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Neudorf.

**Hon. Mr. Schmidt:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that there has been a long evening, and I would ask for leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:48 p.m.