

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 5, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

QUESTIONS

Employment Program Credits

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, if that's the appropriate name, and I would like to direct a question concerning the employment program announced in the budget. The question I direct to the minister is this: am I right in assuming that the program which offers tax credits for employers would not be applicable to any employment by, let us say, the city of Regina, the RM of Edenwold, the Roman Catholic Separate School Board?

Hon. Mr. Rousseau: — Mr. Premier . . . I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the question is for the minister responsible for Small Business and Tourism. It'll be his department handling that program and I'll have him answer it.

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr. Speaker, the program that was announced, the details of that program will be coming out and I can . . . the latter part of this week, or at the very latest early next week. But the program, just in the broad sense, for the hon. member's answer, would be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I do know it will deal with small business. It's directed at the private sector, something that has not been the case with job creation programs in the past, directed at the private sector. And what we are basically saying, what we are basically saying is that we want people in Saskatchewan to be employed. We believe that the private sector has a major role to play in that. And what we've said is we will have a program that's directed directly to the private sector and to the small-business community out there, and as I say, we'll have the details late this week, or at the very latest, early next week.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the minister agree that the program, as described by him, provides that if a small business is providing hamburgers to young people they qualify, but if they're providing swimming pool facilities for young people they do not qualify — if the city of Regina provides those?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — As I've said, that the details of the program, Mr. Speaker, will be coming out as I've indicated in the first answer, and I would suggest to the hon. member, wait for those details.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, the program was announced in the budget. There's naturally a good deal of public interest. And accordingly, I am, I am anxious to find out from the minister what the outline of the program is, and accordingly I direct to him the following question. Can the minister tell us approximately how much a small business would have to have — one that qualifies for the small-business tax rate — how much profit it would have to have in order to qualify for the full \$5,000 deduction for having employed one employee?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Well, I'd say to the hon. member, once again, certainly there will be some detail once again. But I would say that I would agree with him. There certainly has been a good deal of interest expressed by the public, by the private sector out there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — We're, we're extremely pleased about that and we feel that it's just another, it's another example of innovative and new direction ideas that are coming from this government. The details will be coming in due course.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a new question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. This has to do with the employment program to which he has been referring, which he has already described as innovative and all the rest. And obviously if he describes it as innovative he knows the details; otherwise he couldn't describe it as such. Now what I'm asking is the details, and I want to know this: how much does a small business have to make, in profit, before it will entitle itself to the full deduction for the employment of a single employee?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — I have . . . Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that the details will be coming out later this week or, at the very latest, early next week. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows, the budget will announce programs in the general terms of the programs, and it's up to the ministries and the departments to come down with the details. Those details are being worked on and have been worked on, as a matter of fact, over this Easter week-end. They'll be ready in due course and you will hear them at that time.

And I would hope, and I will be asking at that time for, for the co-operation of members of the opposition, as well as all members of the House, in going out and promoting this program with the people of Saskatchewan because there has been a good deal of interest, as has been indicated by you, and there will be a great deal more interest expressed by the private sector in this province when the details come down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I'd be happy to attempt to co-operate with the minister, but he's got to give me some facts. And what, what I'm asking now is this . . . What I'm asking now is this: is it true, is it true that a small business in my constituency would have to have a taxable income in excess of \$60,000 in order to qualify for his full deduction for a single employee?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — There's a great flight into speculation there by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have said once before the details will be coming down. As I've indicated to you before, please be patient and wait for those. And I'm not asking for much patience. These, these programs will be announced much quicker than many programs that I've heard in budgets presented by your government in the past.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — One further, one further supplementary with respect to the speculation. Would the minister advise us what is the effective tax rate, corporate tax

rate, for small businesses in this province now so we can all work it out — how much \$5,000, or how much income would have to be earned in order to get a credit of \$5,000?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — You're into . . . Mr. Speaker, with respect, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is into more of this speculation. He's asking, he's asking questions about details which he is very well aware of, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that those details, including the definition of what will be, what will be a small business for the purpose of this program, will come out when the details come out, and that's all I will provide today.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, one supplementary. Is the minister refusing to tell us what his government charges to small businessmen as a tax rate today — or doesn't he know?

Hon. Mr. McLeod: — Mr., Mr. Speaker, I'm saying once again, anything dealing with this particular program will come in the details. They'll be coming to him, and he will be pleased, I'm sure, as all people in Saskatchewan will be, when those details are presented.

Elimination of Public Service Unionized Positions

Mr. Shillington: — I have a question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the, the minister's and the government's supposed commitment to create jobs. My question is: how many permanent public service unionised positions will be eliminated as a result of your budget?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — The . . . With response to the question, in this particular budget, the number of total positions that will be abolished will be 381 vacant positions — vacant position, that's nobody there now; 81 total positions that are now occupied. Of those 81 occupied positions, 45 will be in scope and 36 will be out of scope. By way of comparison to previous years, I would go back to the year 1979-1980, where the number of total positions occupied that were abolished was 90, which is 9 more than we are doing with regards to this budget. Of those, of those, 73 were in scope and 17 out of scope, so far more of them affected unionised employees than happened with the budget of '83-84.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — The difference . . . New question. The difference, of course, was that in previous years there had not been, there had not been a freeze on in the public service.

Mr. Speaker: — Order please. Does the member have a question? This is not time for making statements.

Mr. Shillington: — My question to the Minister of Finance is: have the people whose positions have been eliminated, have they been given notices of the elimination of their positions?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I understand that as of today notices have gone out to those 81 positions, and, as the members are aware and cognizant of, those particular employees do have the right to bump within the civil service. And it would be our understanding and expectation that over half of those 81 people would be able to bump into other

positions. We will also be freeing up some of the vacant positions left. It would be our anticipation that probably fewer than 40 people would lose their jobs under the budget.

Mr. Shillington: — When is the . . . At what date does the deletion of the position become effective if they haven't got their notice, if they still haven't got their notice?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — It is my understanding is how much notice is required to be given to what I understand . . .

Mr. Shillington: — As of what date is, is, is the deletion effective? It is . . . By way of background, Mr. Speaker, it's normally effective the 31st of March. I gather that isn't the effective date this year because you haven't given them notice yet. At what date does the deletion of the position become effective?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — It becomes effective today is my understanding.

Mr. Shillington: — The, would the minister . . . This is my final supplementary. The, the, will . . . Could the minister tell the House how many vacant positions there remains in the public service?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I'm not sure of that fact. I will undertake to get it for you. I think it's some, somewhere in the area of 1,400.

Announcement Regarding Cut in Grain Prices

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In light of today's announcements regarding the cut in grain prices, is the minister prepared to end his love-in with the federal Liberals and announce, and announce some immediate measures to assist farmers in the high costs of farming today? Will he make some of those announcements and prove that he is working on behalf of Saskatchewan people rather than against them?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well firstly, as it relates to a love-in with the federal government, never will you find me in the incestuous relationship that was carried on between the federal government and members opposite while they were sitting on this side of the House.

Number two. Number two: we in Saskatchewan have, in fact, announced several programs that are helping our agricultural community; I will name the farm purchase program just, just for one — just for one.

Number three. I just came back from Bulgaria and I want to tell you that I was not over there on a philosophical refresher course . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — . . . and I was hoping that somebody would ask me that question.

Number four. Number four: I am, I am disappointed, I am disappointed in the federal minister's announcement today as it relates to his initial payments for prairie grains. Traditionally, initial payment has been about 75 per cent of projected world price, and

I'm not sure if that's what we're seeing here today or not, but I would hope that under the circumstances the federal minister would in fact move as close as he could to 100 per cent, because we have serious cash flow problems in, in prairie agriculture, and there's no question about that.

It's a little difficult to pay more than the commodity is worth on the international marketplace, so you can understand the predicament he's in as well. But I would hope that he will give us as much as he possibly can now in exchange for a lesser final payment at the end of the crop year. In that regard I have today instructed my officials to get a telex off to the federal minister to, to encourage him to make initial payments absolutely as high as he possibly can.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lusney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister, and I won't ask him the question of what course he may have taken in Bulgaria, but question to the minister is: in light of that decrease in, in grain prices and the fact that you state that you expect, or you have asked the minister to set them prices as high, as high a level as possible, do you not agree that any cut in prices today is going to hurt the farmers? It's going to hurt them financially to a degree that's liable to put them out of business in 1983, and will you not indicate to the federal government that they should not be making any cuts in the price whatsoever, and indicate to them that you want them to maintain the price as it has been in 1982, and that they should continue that price regardless of the risk that they may be taking?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, I agree that any cut in a commodity price is certainly going to be a hardship on, for agriculture. No question about that. And you don't even have to be a genius to understand that. But I also . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's why you can understand it.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I also . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's why you're so successful.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I also . . . that's why we're over here and you're over there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I also understand something of the marketplace, and it doesn't make a great deal of sense to pay more than the market will bring, because it's those kinds of lunatic type approaches to things that have caused the situation that we have in Ottawa today, mounting deficit after deficit after deficit, and if it wasn't . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

An Hon. Member: — What about here?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Deficits, my friends, are for tough times, not for buoyant times. And, I also want to say, I also want to say if it wasn't for your colleagues in Ottawa we would be dealing with a government in Ottawa — a Tory government in Ottawa — that would deal more effectively with these problems.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would . . .

An Hon. Member: — Ask me about Bulgaria.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes. First of all, welcome back from Bulgaria, in what is becoming known as the 'Bulgaria connection.' But, I would like to ask the question of the minister, if he is aware that the initial price of wheat, which is usually based on the export price, is going down at a time when the export price is higher, right now, than it was last year at this time? And, will you not take that into consideration in making the lobby with the federal government and go there yourself to defend the farmers' position?

An Hon. Member: — He just got back.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — He was in Bulgaria but he hasn't been in Ottawa to the federal minister fighting for the grain farmers of Saskatchewan. What I would like to know is what you are going to do personally to see that the initial prices for grain do not drop as of August 1st.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Oh, God, I'd better resist. I'd better resist, with your colleagues, they're not bad people.

Mr. Speaker, I think the first part of his question was dealing with what was I doing in Bulgaria.

An Hon. Member: — The Pope wants to know.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, I'll tell you what we did in Bulgaria. What we did in Bulgaria . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — In answer to the member for Pelly's question, just a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it fairly clear. In our communication with the federal minister we have asked that the initial price be as close as is reasonably possible to 100 per cent of export price. Now, I don't know. Traditionally, the level has been set at 75 per cent. I say that it should be set at, at much closer to 100 per cent. And, you know, if, if, if the federal minister listens, and I'm not sure that he will because we have to remember the history of that fellow, he came from the same ilk as you guys did . . . And . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And, in any event, yes, I will take it into consideration; that is included in the communication.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr., Mr. Speaker, a supplementary — final, final supplementary. I wonder if the minister will include in that request, that the, the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board cease to play politics with the Canadian Wheat Board and the, and the initial price in lowering it this year, so that the initial payment will be higher in the year of the federal election, as well as the initial price increase at this time next year (which we are all certainly looking forward to), the simple playing of politics be included in your communiqué, that we in Saskatchewan will not accept that, and if you will take that into consideration and make that case in Ottawa for us.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I'll take it into consideration, Mr. Speaker, and I just point out

to the hon. member that while Don Mazankowski was minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, not once did he make a payment announcement. It was always made by wheat board people, and not politicians. And had it not been for you, and your incestuous relationship with the Liberals in Ottawa, they would . . . The Tories and Don Mazankowski would still be there today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Lay-offs in Department of Social Services

Mr. Yew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the social assistance case-load has sky-rocketed 30 per cent in northern Saskatchewan . . . Just to give you some specifics in terms of figures: in February of last year it was 1,404 cases, as compared to February of this year, 1,826 in northern Saskatchewan. And now, with your recent budget, you have given way to eliminating 19 positions in social, social department — social assistance department. What . . . How can you justify that, Mr., Madam Minister?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I shall; I promise. Considering the fact that we . . . DNS was dismantled, northern Saskatchewan has now come into the mainstream of life in Saskatchewan, so I don't have . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — I don't have the breakdown, as you call northern Saskatchewan. I only have the total picture, all of Saskatchewan, which, whether you like it or not, does include those people. They belong to this province.

As to the numbers that we had talked about earlier, I believe last week, on staffing, it was assured that none of those positions would be the front-line social workers. It was also indicated that over all the department we were looking at a reduction of 31 positions, with some of those being presently frozen positions, contrary to what the member from Regina Centre thinks, that took place in 1981.

Mr. Yew: — A supplement, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given the fact that you concur that there is a 30 per cent increase in the social assistance case-load up in northern, northern Saskatchewan, and given the fact that there is 80 per cent, right up to 99.9 per cent unemployment in the majority of those communities in northern Saskatchewan, Mrs., Madam Minister, can you identify or concur that we need special emphasis in that nine-point job creation package that your government has announced just recently?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, overall, the increase in social assistance in the province of Saskatchewan is 25.9 per cent. I do recognize that the unemployment factor in northern Saskatchewan, as you know it, is extremely high, and I suggest the package that the Minister of Finance brought, brought forward was also meant for those people living in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Are you leading us to believe that the 22 people cut in regional operation and the 19 cut in northern administration, that none of them will be in fact social workers?

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — No, Mr. Speaker, I can't say that. The member from Shaunavon knows full well that many administrators also hold a social degree, a social worker's degree. What I have said is those positions will not be the social workers that work directly on the front lines to do with SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan).

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. While the SAP (Saskatchewan Assistance Plan) social workers are important, as are the psych social workers in the Department of Health, what I think the member from Cumberland and myself are more concerned about are those who are involved in the areas of child protection particularly, and what I would like to know is if you will give us your guarantee and assurance that none of these 40 positions which are being eliminated are not going to result in higher child-abuse cases in this province as a result of your budget and staff cuts.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think it's absolutely ludicrous that social workers can be held responsible for an increase in child protection, child abuse. I can't give you the assurance of those particular positions. What I have said is, the positions that will be done away with will not be those social workers that are directly on the front lines.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1983 Junior Canadian Curling Champions

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I ask all members to join with me in congratulating the 1983 junior Canadian curling champions from the community of Kronau. The team was skipped by Jamie Schneider, grade 12 high school student at Greenall High School in Balgonie. The third was Danny Ferner, first year arts student at the University of Regina; the second was Steve Leippi, a grade 11 high school student at Greenall, and the lead was Kelly Vollman, also a grade 11 high school student from Greenall. All of the team members are from the community of Kronau, just south-east of Regina. All of the team members have curled together for some seven years already, at their very young age. And they are coached by Mr. Mike Schneider, the father of the skip.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that the community of Kronau has brought pride to the province of Saskatchewan with its curling accomplishments and I would ask all hon. members to join with me in congratulating the Jamie Schneider rink, the 1983 junior Canadian curling champions.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with colleagues in congratulating the James Schneider rink. These youngsters have the privilege of excelling in a sport which has been a Saskatchewan specialty, and I know that all Saskatchewan people share in the sense of pride which the community of Kronau must feel at this time.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATE

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Andrew that the Assembly resolve itself into the committee of finance.

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm certainly pleased to rise again in this House today to resume debate on this year's budget speech. I would like to start, of course, by congratulating my colleague, the Minister of Finance, for a positive, responsible and compassionate budget which he brought down in this House last Tuesday, March the 29th.

The budget is clear evidence, Mr. Speaker, that this government is doing its full part to maximize the stability of our economy, and to protect our citizens during this time of reconstruction and recovery. We believe that this is the role the people of Saskatchewan want their government to play, a role that complements but does not overshadow the role of the private sector and individual initiative in Saskatchewan.

Today I would like to elaborate on a number of the announcements that the Minister of Finance made relating to the Department of Urban Affairs and Culture and Recreation.

Mr. Speaker, the revenue-sharing program is the largest single grant program for urban municipalities. Our government's commitment to the concept of revenue sharing has been clear ever since we took office last May. We are aware, Mr. Speaker, of the degree to which municipalities rely on the financial assistance provided through revenue sharing. That is why last year we honoured the amounts provided for in the announced but never implemented budget of the former administration. We realized that many municipalities had already budgeted on the assumption that they would receive these amounts.

This year's budget recognizes the fact that . . . (inaudible) . . . revenue sharing is an important additional source of funding for urban municipalities, similar to the funding individuals receive for health, education and many other services provided by the provincial government.

We are committed to retaining the notion of revenue sharing and in fact, Mr. Speaker, we are now hard at work with the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities' Association improving the way revenue sharing will work in the future. During the review begun last year, the SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities' Association) executive felt that it would be preferable to implement changes to the revenue-sharing scheme in 1984 rather than in 1983. We agreed. This will enable us to ensure that the revised formula meets both the immediate and longer term needs of urban municipalities in the province. This government's early, positive, and I might add, popular action in removing the provincial gasoline tax has in itself necessitated a change in the way revenue sharing will be calculated in future years, since that tax was one of the components of the former revenue-sharing escalator.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, as an interim measure, until the new formula is in place for 1984, the revenue-sharing pool for 1983 has been increased by a straight 7 per cent. That amounts to almost \$6 per capita over last year's figure, resulting in a pool of \$62.1 million. Let me emphasize that this 7 per cent increase means that each and every community will receive 7 per cent more than it received in unconditional revenue-sharing grants in 1982-83.

Mr. Speaker, this 7 per cent increase in unconditional revenue sharing demonstrates three important things. First of all, that our government recognizes the crucial role that this program plays in all municipal budgets; secondly, that we recognize municipalities will face cost increases in 1983.

And third, that we practise what we preach when it comes to our program of economic recovery. That is, where increases are necessary, they should be in the range of inflation minus one.

It'd like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to review the increases in the revenue-sharing program recently announced in the NDP budget in Manitoba. There, the NDP government has increased its revenue-sharing scheme by only 4.2 per cent over the previous year's amount. When compared to this government's responsible increase of 7 per cent, it becomes clear, Mr. Speaker, that a free enterprise government has a better understanding of municipal needs than does an NDP one.

At the same time that we are working with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities' Association) to revise the revenue-sharing formula, we are also examining a broader range of provincial, municipal, fiscal matters. We want to be sure that adjustments to revenue sharing fit in with other possible modifications to our financial relationship that SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities' Association) has raised with the province.

Over and above the 7 per cent increase for unconditional revenue sharing, this budget provides expanded support for ambulance services in this province. The ambulance program and related funding have been transferred from the Departments of Rural and Urban Affairs to the Department of Health, in line with the recommendation of the ambulance committee, which of course was chaired by Mr. Birkbeck, the member from Moosomin — a move that is probably long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday the minister . . . excuse me, last Thursday, the Minister of Health spoke at some great lengths on this important matter. I just want to underscore the seriousness with which this government takes the need for improved ambulance services.

As well, I want to point out that municipalities will suffer no net reduction in funding to them by the removal of the ambulance program from revenue sharing. In the past, grants for ambulance service were paid to municipalities who turned them over to the ambulance boards. Now the grants will be paid directly to the ambulance boards. The net effect on the municipal funding will be unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, water is an issue of concern to many Saskatchewan residents and to their municipal governments. Our government knows how vital a water, a resource water is to the economic and social development of Saskatchewan. We also know that our citizens, our local governments and other organizations have a lot of common-sense ideas about how to best manage this essential renewable resource. True to our tradition we have listened to the people. We listened by establishing a cabinet committee on water concerns that travelled the province and received hundreds of briefs on a wide range of water-related matters. Our intent is to bring order to the confusion we inherited regarding provincial responsibility for water-related matters.

As outlined in the throne speech and the budget speech, we'll place these matters and

the legislation involved in funding related to these into a more consolidated form. A new provincial crown utility will be established in 1983 to meet the expanding water needs of Saskatchewan community, communities and individuals. The specific shape and form of the utility will be reviewed with local government before it is finalized. However, until that is done we have no intention of shrinking our responsibility to assist with the water supply and waste water concerns of our hundreds of towns, villages and hamlets. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, for 1983-84 the budget for the municipal water assistance board will be increased by almost 7 per cent over last year's budgeted level to a total of \$4.8 million — more proof, Mr. Speaker, that where there are real and basic needs our government will move forward with responsible increases.

The budget also provides an almost 7 per cent increase for the water pollution control assistance program, which assists cities with the capital costs of sewage treatment work, and just over \$3 million is provided to fund the province's share of completing the Lloydminster pipeline project in 1983. These, Mr. Speaker, are programs which we inherited from the previous administration, programs which we are in the process of revising and augmenting in order to better respond to municipal needs. In the meantime, however, we are increasing the budget levels by a responsible amount so that assistance for water and sewer projects will continue uninterrupted.

Before leaving water, let me say a few words about the Regina-Moose Jaw pipeline project. As this House is aware, the Government of Saskatchewan has made a concrete financial offer of assistance to the two cities, consisting of an up-front grant of \$10 million, and a subsidized interest rate on municipal borrowing. The cities have not yet prepared, responded to this offer, and the position of the Government of Canada is not yet known. Accordingly, the funding situation for 1983-84 is unclear. When the local and federal positions are clear, Mr. Speaker, we will allocate the provincial share of costs as they are required. The Minister of Finance's \$30 million special project fund is a possible, and, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize the word possible, source of the province's commitment to the pipeline.

We are committed, Mr. Speaker, to continuing the financial assistance to urban municipalities for the operation of municipal transit service. In 1983-84 the levels of per capita and incentive operating grants will be stabilized at their current levels. A close look at priorities has necessitated some reduction in funding allocations for capital assistance to lower priority transit projects. Funding for transit for the disabled was also provided through Urban Affairs, and I am very pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that the funding for this necessary and worthwhile program in 1983-84 has been set at almost \$1.3 million — a 7 per cent increase over the amount provided last year. Once again, Mr. Speaker, clear evidence of the compassionate and responsible tenor of this budget.

Mr. Speaker, in 1983-84 a total of \$12 million will be provided to the community capital fund program. This money will greatly assist our urban centres to construct much needed capital facilities, and thereby to create employment throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, possibly I could pause here for a moment and mention a couple of things about the name of the program. As you are aware, the initials spell out the CCF program. When we took office, there was some pressure to change the name to something like the provincial community capital program, the PCCP program. I resisted that attempt, Mr. Speaker. Probably my background in history led me to do that. CCF obviously applies to the, or refers to the party that preceded the present opposition

party. The former leader of the CCF Party and NDP federal member, Mr. Douglas, was very fond of saying there's nothing quite as strong as an idea whose time has come. I left the CCF name in place, Mr. Speaker, as a, as a tribute, if you will, to an idea whose time has long since passed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — I would like to remind the members that the community capital fund is a program which provides urban municipalities with \$100 per capita over five years for capital purposes. Municipalities must also contribute a portion of their own money for projects funded under this program. This marks the fourth year of the program, and our government is committed to the full five-year term. The peak cash-flow period of this program has now passed, with last year and the year before being the times of heaviest demand. I provide this background, Mr. Speaker, to quell any concerns that members opposite might have regarding the reduction in the community capital program for '83-84, as compared to the peak years of '81 and 82.

Yes, there is a reduction this year, but it does not in any way reduce the commitment to the full five-year term of the program. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, we are working with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities' Association) on the whole issue of provincial-municipal fiscal relations, and the need for replacement to this program on its expiry is one major item.

Mr. Speaker, municipalities have chosen to allocate almost 20 per cent of their community capital moneys to recreation and cultural facilities. We know this is an important capital need in our urban and rural communities.

Accordingly, I am pleased to announce today that beginning in 1983-84 the Department of Culture and Recreation will begin a new five-year provincial cultural and recreation facilities program to provide even more capital assistance for projects of this type and to provide additional jobs to aid in recovery. In this fiscal year, \$5 million will be provided, and I will give more details on this exciting new program when I get into the culture and recreation portion of the speech.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to convince this House how important it is for the province and its municipalities to be prepared for emergencies. When we took office we were surprised and disappointed at the poor state of emergency preparedness in the province. Mr. Speaker, we are taking steps to beef up the long inactivated provincial emergency measures organization.

Our first step was to hire a full-time executive director. We are now moving to make maximum possible use of the funding and expertise available from Emergency Planning Canada, in particular, through the joint emergency planning program, as it is known.

We currently have a proposal before the federal government to survey and catalogue existing municipal resources for coping with peacetime emergencies. This is an essential step in rebuilding the long-neglected area of emergency preparedness. We have to know what tools municipalities already have before we or they can plan for new or additional ones.

The JEPP (joint emergency planning program) proposal will provide 42 jobs for

students this summer, Mr. Speaker — jobs throughout this province. The project would provide municipalities with a valuable manual for emergency use. I hope to be able to report back to the House soon on the success of this application which will begin to get emergency planning back on its feet in Saskatchewan and provide much-needed student employment.

Mr. Speaker, the setting, the setting of priorities is an activity that we all engage in, from the individual, to government, to the private business person. In times of economic rebuilding and recovery, priority setting takes on added importance. The budget, brought down by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, shows the pragmatic yet compassionate manner in which this government has established its priorities at this time. Increases — reasonable increases — in basic areas such as health, education, social service, unconditional revenue sharing in municipalities and water and sewer assistance, are examples of this type of funding.

Yes, there have been reductions, too, and we're not afraid to stand up and take responsibility for them. For example, we will be introducing legislation to reduce by 20 per cent the statutory contributions made by participating parties to the three urban park authorities in Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw — Wascana, Meewasin, and Wakamow, respectively.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that these authorities are playing a valuable role enhancing the quality of life in our three largest cities. We applaud their effort and initiative. The province remains firmly committed to the long-term recreation-conservations goals on which these urban parks are based. This reduction in statutory funding does not mean that these organizations will cease to exist. They will continue, but, like the rest of us, will have to carefully consider their priorities and husband their resources.

We are confident that in these times of economic recovery, the citizens of Saskatchewan, in general, and of these three cities, in particular, will support our redistribution of provincial priorities to place greater emphasis on the basic needs of all Saskatchewan citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne mention was made of a new urban municipality act and a new planning and development act. While these initiatives are not directed, directly reflected in the budget, I want to mention them briefly, since they round out the package of assistance to be provided to our municipal partners in the upcoming year.

The Urban Municipality Act is the most important single legislative tool for urban municipalities. The act has been under review for a number of years by the previous administration, although no new legislation has ever been brought forward. We have, however, have gotten the procedure in gear and have been consulting closely with SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) and urban administrators on the principles of a new act, an act which will be ready for introduction in the fall 1983 session. We are redrafting the urban act with two main goals in mind: to streamline and update municipal practices and procedures and two, to increase the degree of local autonomy by reducing the number of situations where municipalities are required to obtain provincial approval.

Mr. Speaker, The Planning and Development Act was last reviewed in 1973. Since that time there have been significant changes in Saskatchewan which make a rewriting of

the planning act necessary.

We want to be sure that municipalities, both urban and rural, have the appropriate tools that will enable them to encourage and accommodate the growth that will result from Saskatchewan's new Open for Business stance. The new act will be introduced in the spring session and is being guided by two major goals. The first, Mr. Speaker, is to preserve and strengthen the principles of local autonomy. This will be done by providing a framework within which municipalities can make their own land use decisions in providing a greater range of land use management techniques for municipalities.

The second goal, Mr. Speaker, is to streamline the planning and development review process with a view to limiting provincial involvement and approval to those situations where there is a clear and demonstrable interest that extends beyond the community. The streamlining in the development review process is taking place within the context of the province's comprehensive program of regulatory reform.

Mr. Speaker, we firmly believe that it is crucial to reduce the number of hoops that a developer must go through, not to mention the time and expense before development proposal can be constructive. After all, it is only once the building is up, that the developer can, can achieve a return on his investment, and only once the development is up that the municipality can begin to reap the benefits of increased property taxes and employment from once, from what was once only a paper proposal.

Mr. Speaker, we are confident that our responsible package of financial assistance to urban municipalities, when combined with these two major pieces of urban legislation, will provide our cities, towns and villages with the tools they need to complete the recovery and reconstruction job that is already well under way.

Let me turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the assistance provided directly to individuals by urban affairs through the property tax rebate programs. For the 1983-84 fiscal year, a total of \$83.35 million is budgeted for the three programs: the property improvement grant, the senior citizens' school tax rebate, and the renters' property tax rebate. The members will recall that last year we increased the maximums for both the seniors' program and the renters' program by \$10 over and above what the former government had promised. In order to assist individuals with the cost of living we have stabilized the rebate maximums at last year's level. Mr. Speaker, this will come as a surprise to some of those who predicted in typical gloom and doom fashion that our government was going to axe these programs.

In 1983, home-owners will qualify for a maximum rebate of \$230. Senior citizens will receive a rebate equivalent to all education taxes, to a maximum of \$510, and renters will be eligible for a rebate of 5 per cent of the rent paid, up to a total of \$150.

Mr. Speaker, when combined with the \$22.5 million that has been budgeted under the mortgage interest reduction program, our government will be providing, not the \$85.78 million the former administration promised to provide to home-owners, renters and seniors, but a total of almost \$106 million. It's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that this government has done more than any other to put money back into the pocket of the hard-pressed home-owner and renter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly outline the steps my department has taken to increase its own operating efficiency. The total non-program budget for 1983-84 is \$5.2 million, slightly below the \$5.3 million budgeted in '82-83. Total staff complement has been reduced from 155 1 person-years to 134.8, a 13 per cent reduction. I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, this streamlining has been accomplished without laying off any full-time employees and without affecting the level of service to municipalities, or to the general public. That, Mr. Speaker, is a perfect example of what this government means when it says it can do more with less.

Let me conclude this portion, Mr. Speaker, by summing up our package of assistance to, of assistance to urban municipalities and their residents for 1983-84: over \$96 million in capital and operating assistance to urban municipalities, including the new culture and recreation facilities grant program; along with the mortgage interest reduction program, nearly \$106 million of direct assistance to home-owners, senior and renters, two pieces of major urban legislation that will assist municipalities, and the private sector alike, to face the challenges and opportunities of the '80s — legislation, I might add, Mr. Speaker, that is long overdue.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible budget, a budget that has provided responsible increases and basic financial support to urban government, increases in line with the provincial government's own expenditure guide-lines, and a budget that lays the groundwork for meeting the challenges we face in the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, I'd now like to move from Urban Affairs and make some specific comments about the Department of Culture and Recreation. To begin with, I'm going to talk about the department's initiatives that are not directly related to the budget. These are the kinds of initiatives I mentioned earlier — ones that increase the quality of government programs and services, without increasing costs. These kinds of initiatives, I'd like to add, were more or less invented by the Conservative government. The NDP kept giving the people of Saskatchewan the same old government programs, only at escalating prices.

The Department of Culture and Recreation, Mr. Speaker, is entering the '83-84 fiscal year, not only with a new name, but also with a new structure. I'm confident that the department's reorganization will lead to greater efficiency and a broader range of services to meet the specific needs of its client groups in the areas of culture, sport, and recreation. In addition to changes in its organizational structure, the department has also responded to its clients' demands by drafting sport and cultural policies, and a recreation position paper.

These three documents, which have just received approval from my colleagues, underline our emphasis on the quality of life in Saskatchewan, our commitment to the further development of sports, culture and recreation in this province, and our belief that all residents must have an equal opportunity to participate in these activities at their own level and in their own communities.

In the next few months I'll be outlining specific details of the two policies and the position taken. But for now, I'd like to speak briefly about one program that arises from the goals and objectives of these papers. Presently, the department is formulating a new community recreation development program. The intent of this program is to strengthen community recreation authorities through their participation in workshops in such areas as: recruiting and training recreation board members; identifying

community needs; and facility planning and operation. By designing and co-ordinating these workshops, the department is increasing its consultative role and aiding in the professional development of community recreation services. The program is not finalized yet, but it will be phased in on an experimental basis over the next year.

The department, of course, has already been involved in community recreation development. We believe strongly, Mr. Speaker, that one of the major roles of our department is to facilitate grass roots involvement in culture, sport and recreation. This participation at the local level not only brings mental, social and physical benefits to the individuals involved, but it also leads to the further advancement of those who possess special talents: professional performers, writers, visual artists, and elite athletes.

Since this government has taken office, Mr. Speaker, people of Saskatchewan have begun to recognize something about themselves: that we're world-class competitors, that our lifestyles can't be rivalled anywhere else in the country; and that we can do anything we set our minds to.

The talent hunt in the performing arts is one recent example of first-class musicians, singers and dancers who rose from local community shows to excel in the provincial final.

Many of us witnessed another recent example of a first-rate performance, an example I mentioned earlier in the throne speech debate. The Saskatchewan team at the Canada Games in Chicoutimi brought home the Centennial Cup, which is awarded to the province that showed the most improvement over its previous standing. Mr. Speaker, that's something I'm sure we're all proud of. I'd like to point out that if provinces were given trophies for the most improved government from one year to the next, Saskatchewan would have won that cup as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Schoenhals: — Our team brought home nine gold, eight silver, and 15 bronze metals from the Canada Games. But perhaps more important than the 32 medals, and the winning of the Centennial Cup, is the geographic breakdown of the athletes' home towns. One-third were from Regina, one-third from Saskatoon, and one-third from the other centres in the province. The athletes came from 41 different communities: from Creighton and La Ronge in the North, to Carnduff and Fox Valley in the South; Lloydminster and Marsden in the West, to Kamsack and Hudson Bay in the East. In a large part, their successes were due to my department's emphasis on quality recreational services at the community level, services that enhance the talent and energy of Saskatchewan people.

I think it's also significant that during this government's tenure two national training centres have been established in Regina: the wrestling training centre, and the national women's volleyball training centre. The presence of these top athletes in our province will not only increase the opportunities to view first-rate competition but will also benefit our younger athletes who aspire for future positions on such teams.

Mr. Speaker, I've summarized some of Culture and Recreation's new directions that do not involve budget increases. Now I'd like to speak about two fairly major financial items which will have a significant impact on Saskatchewan citizens. The first is a \$7 million government-directed grant to the Western Development Museum for capital works over the next three and a half years. I consider this grant to be a response to an

emergency situation created solely by the neglect of the previous government. If we had not moved and moved quickly, most of our Saskatchewan heritage would have been lost because of the abysmal storage conditions at the museums. Artefacts your grandparents and mine proudly donated as legacies to this province were left out in the sun and the rain to deteriorate because of the short-sightedness of the NDP government. A capital grant will be used to solve the museum's storage, workshops and head office facility problems. As well, approximately one-third has been earmarked for capital improvements to the individual branches.

The second Culture and Recreation budget item I'd like to spend some time on today, Mr. Speaker, is the provincial cultural-recreational facilities program. I've already spoken about the importance of culture, sport and recreation at the community level. In his budget speech, Mr. Andrew stated one of the main purposes of this government: that we have been listening to our constituents and that the 1983-84 budget is a result of that listening. All my colleagues, in travelling about the province, have been hearing a common concern: communities, whether they consist of 100 people or 100,000, want to be vital centres where people choose to live because they like the quality of life available in their neighbourhood, in their district, in their town or in their province. Communities want places where their youth can engage in meaningful recreational activities, where their senior citizens can spend an enjoyable afternoon with one another, where local performers can stage a play, where townspeople can meet to discuss issues of local concern. Mr. Speaker, they want cultural and recreational facilities that will meet the needs of their citizens.

I have a letter from the R.M. of Leask supporting the facilities program. It was only one of about 420 letters that we've received stressing the need for such a program. But I'd like to quote from it because of the eloquence of the request:

If such a program is implemented, it, along with the present job creation program, would provide direct visible results to communities, in addition to stimulating the economy and providing employment.

We, as a government, agree with the people of Leask, the people of Estevan, Saskatoon, La Ronge, Swift Current, Weyburn, the Standing Buffalo Reserve, Rosthern, Shellbrook. A facilities program will benefit the entire province.

Mr. Andrew announced the provincial cultural-recreational facilities program as part of our government's nine-point job creation strategy. It is now my pleasure to outline the details of this important contribution to both job creation and community life.

The provincial cultural-recreational facilities program was effective on April 1st, 1983. It will continue through March 31st, 1988. We will provide \$32 million to communities to assist with the renovation, construction or acquisition of recreational facilities. Projects started between January 1st, 1982 and April 1983 inclusive are also eligible.

Under the terms of the new program, Mr. Speaker, each municipality and Indian band is eligible for a base grant of \$5,000, plus \$25 per capita. Municipalities are also eligible for an extra \$5 per capita, per capita, where a minimum of two urban municipalities undertake the construction, operation and maintenance of a joint project. Total grants provided will be a maximum, will be to a maximum of 50 per cent of the cost of each project. Eligible projects under this program include: land or building acquisition required for the project; payments to construction workers; purchase of labour, building materials; purchase of essential equipment; renting or leasing of construc-

tion equipment; volunteer labour costs, which may not exceed 25 per cent of the total cost of the project; engineering, architectural and related consultants' fees; interest on total cost; and costs incurred in producing a formal agreement for joint municipal construction, maintenance and operation, to an amount not exceeding 2 per cent of the total cost.

The program is designed to encourage maximum local autonomy and flexibility. Unlike facility programs designed by the previous government, we do not want to interfere with local decisions. Communities will be able to decide what kinds of facilities or renovation projects best respond to the needs of their residents. At the same time, the program guarantees accountability. Every application for a project with a total value over \$100,000 must be accompanied by a feasibility study.

We are very pleased by this new program, Mr. Speaker. Not only will it allow every community in this province to improve and upgrade its facilities, but it will also create a boom in our construction industry and generate new employment opportunities across Saskatchewan. We predict that the program will generate over \$100 million worth of construction and create countless jobs — jobs in related areas, including engineering, architecture, furniture and equipment supplies, the facility's operation and maintenance. It will also expand opportunities for cultural and recreational professions.

This program, Mr. Speaker, along with the other programs announced by my colleagues this week, demonstrates our faith in the energy, creativity and innovative spirit of Saskatchewan, something the previous government lost sight of when they lost touch with the people.

Mr. Speaker, because of the direct programs that I've announced relative to the Department of Urban Affairs and Culture and Recreation, it will give me a great deal of pleasure and pride to support this budget. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to briefly address the legislature on three points this afternoon, with respect to the budget.

First, I want to take the opportunity to refute many of the misleading statements by the opposition. Second, I want to show how this budget and the policies and programs outlined by this administration build on our long-run strengths in the province of Saskatchewan, and indeed, build on our industrial strategy of working with government, industry, labour and education.

And, finally, I want to briefly examine the record, the 11-year record, of the former administration, to put this administration's programs into context.

If I could turn to the opposition's comments about this administration. Their first observation on budget night was that the government didn't keep its promises: we didn't keep the promise of removing all the sales tax; we didn't keep the promise of cutting income tax by 10 per cent. We hadn't got that done, therefore we were a failure, Mr. Speaker, to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, because we hadn't removed the sales tax completely and hadn't reduced the sales . . . the income tax 10

per cent. We didn't keep our promises.

Well, we made several promises in the campaign, Mr. Speaker, several promises that I'm sure the members opposite will remember that they even voted for in this legislation. The first big promise . . . I remind you, Mr. Speaker, they said we didn't keep our promises; they said that we didn't live up to the expectations. I believe, I believe it's true, Mr. Speaker, that we promised, we promised, we promised the NDP opposition, we promised the people of Saskatchewan, that we'd remove the tax on gasoline. We promised that. It was the biggest single tax cut in the history of the province. We promised it. We promised it, and, Mr. Speaker, we kept that promise. Number one, promise number one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And, Mr. Speaker, I don't . . . I suspect, I suspect 20 years from now we'll be going through these same promises, reminding, reminding the few members opposite, that we do keep our promises.

Promise number two, promise number two, Mr. Speaker. We promised that we would protect home-owners and make sure that their interest rates wouldn't go over 13.25 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the most imaginative, most exciting home protection packages in Canada. And, Mr. Speaker, we kept our promise. Promise number two.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Clearly, Mr. Speaker, while I'm, why I'm doing this is that they said we didn't keep our promises. That was their major argument on budget night: 'They didn't keep their promise to remove the sales tax and cut the income tax by 10 per cent.'

Promise number three we made during the campaign, Mr. Speaker, we said we would introduce a farm purchase program to provide 8 per cent money, and 12 per cent money to farmers, and not buy land for the government any more. Well, Mr. Speaker, we initiated, we initiated our third promise, brought in the most successful, the most successful . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I don't think they're interested in hearing about our promises, Mr. Speaker. We kept the promise. The third promise, Mr. Speaker, we brought in last fall a fall purchase program that is second to none in North America. We're proud of that third promise.

The fourth promise, Mr. Speaker. We said that we would get the oil pumping in the province of Saskatchewan, and we would get more revenue in the province of Saskatchewan and get more oil pumping than the previous administration. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've gone from 40 per cent slack capacity to 100 per cent capacity, and the revenues are up, and I'll comment more on the revenues when I get that. But, Mr. Speaker, we got, we got more money from the provincial revenues on the same ground pumping more oil than the previous administration because we kept our fourth promise. Mr. Speaker — putting people back to work in the oil patch.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I can think of a fifth promise. I can think of a fifth promise. We promised, we promised the people of Saskatchewan that we would provide a natural gas distribution program to the entire province of Saskatchewan. We have, Mr.

Speaker, as a result of that, initiated (because we keep our promises) initiated the largest natural gas distribution program in the history of Canada — perhaps one of the largest in the world, because, Mr. Speaker, we keep our promises. The fifth promise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Promise number six. Promise number six, Mr. Speaker. We said to the people of Saskatchewan that the people opposite, the NDP, had 11 years to deal with water problems in the province of Saskatchewan. We promised we would provide water solutions, water development, and a water development program for the province that is Saskatchewan, one of the first programs ever to be developed by a provincial government. And, Mr. Speaker, we are proud to say that we kept our promises, announced a new water public utility and a new department to look after water, a pipeline proposal, something the previous administration hadn't done in 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 years. That's our sixth promise, Mr. Speaker, and we're proud of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — That's in 11 months. Six promises off the top of my head, six promises that just come to mind because they said, Mr. Speaker, we don't keep our promises. Now there were several others. We promised schools and we promised hospitals. We promised improvements to the ambulance system. We promise, promised improvements to social services and health and they are outlined, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the entire, the entire set of promises that we put together in the first 11 months are part of our long-run development strategy. They fit extremely well into the long-run plan for success to the province of Saskatchewan, and we are extremely happy with that — that we can go back and say, the first six major promises, the most significant promises ever made to the electorate in the province of Saskatchewan, were kept the first six months.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the second point, the second point the Leader of the Opposition made, and I would want to point out to the . . . I would like to point out to the public of Saskatchewan that the Leader of the Opposition isn't in here to hear this debate. But the second point, on budget night, that the Leader of the Opposition made was that, well, actually it's because we kept our promises that caused the deficit. So his first, his first line of argument was that we didn't keep our promises, and I just pointed out that we did keep them. Then the second line of argument (because the first one didn't work), 'Well,' he says, 'You've got this deficit because you kept your promises.'

An Hon. Member: — How do you spell inconsistency?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, I don't know. But it seems to me, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that they can't, they can't have it both ways. When I say that they can't have it both ways, I'd like to point out that the major concern . . . And I think it's important to point out to the public of Saskatchewan that the Leader of the Opposition was intentionally, was intentionally misleading the public in the province of Saskatchewan by saying our programs and our policies in oil and in the energy business had caused a major deficit. Well, I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, and I want the media to make sure that they do remind the members of the opposition, I want them to remind . . . I

notice the member from Shaunavon, who has a few oil wells in his constituency, just left when I get into talking about the truth about the oil industry. The Leader of the Opposition isn't here to hear the truth about the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that statements by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition, are irresponsible and misleading. Oil revenues are the single most important item in the budget and it does not deserve the public's understanding to create fairy-tales during a debate about the tax and royalty structure in the province of Saskatchewan. Oil revenues for the first three fiscal years — '81-82, '82-83, '83-84, actual and estimated, are as follow, following: total oil revenues — '81-82, 532.7 million; 82-83, 710.7 million; '83-84, 538.8 million.

I believe the opposition will grant the provincial government has no control whatsoever, no control, Mr. Speaker, over international oil prices. It is therefore reasonable to deduct that the export tax revenues, from the total, are a major component. The new figures are as follows: export tax revenue for '81-82 is 164 million; '82-83, 213; and '83-84, 23.7. Total oil revenues less the export tax share are 368 in '81-82; 497 in '82-83; and 515 in '83-84.

When we assumed office we found that millions were being spent on ineffective oil industry incentive programs, programs that were a waste of taxpayers' money. And our government scrapped those programs and introduced a system of royalty holidays. Our program is already reflected in the numbers, but the NDP incentives are not. It is reasonable that these costs be deducted from the revenue because it is the net that is available to the finance, to finance other government expenditures. And I want to net them out so the NDP opposition understands the truth about the provincial oil royalty program.

The NDP incentive program, 1981-82, was 60 million; in '82-83, it was 45 million; in '83-84, was 30 million. The net oil revenues, after deducting the export tax and the NDP incentive program, were as follows: 308 in '81-82; 452 in '82-83 and 485 million in '83-84. Nowhere are there the give-aways the opposition are claiming. The truth is . . . And the true oil revenues, the revenues that we as government are accountable to the people for, increased \$176.6 million in two years in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — \$176 million. If the Leader of the Opposition were here, I could clearly say to him, as I looked him in the eye, that oil revenues in the province of Saskatchewan, where we have control over the oil revenues, are up 57 per cent — 57 per cent over '81-82.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — It would have been well up over 200 million — \$200 million higher — except for the liability for ineffective incentive programs that we inherited under the NDP administration.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to add, just to clear it up for the record so the public of Saskatchewan can understand what we've been doing, that our program was introduced last July, that we resulted in a 200 per cent increase in drilling — a 200 per cent increase. We increased employment. We increased production, and hence

increased royalty and tax revenues in the province of Saskatchewan. The estimates show that provincial revenue from royalty and taxes levied against the industry will be up again in '83-84 by at least \$6 million compared to '82-83, and I already mentioned they'd be up over '81-82.

The recovery program has also sparked interest in the exploration and development side of the industry, with land sales, for example, up \$12 million in this year compared to 1982 and '83. In a time of declining world oil prices, these facts are significant, and they're significant because they're true and because they're significant . . . They're significant, also, because it is a recovery program, despite the fact that the world oil prices are to blame.

The main reason oil revenues are down in '83-84 is because of lower export tax revenues. As the estimates show, the difference in export tax between '82 and '83, and '83 and '84 — it amounts to \$190 million — completely, completely outside the control of the provincial government.

The export tax set by the federal government is dependent upon the price of oil in the United States market, and that price has fallen dramatically. Such a reduction in revenue is beyond the control of any provincial government, and the NDP opposition knows that well, but still, Mr. Speaker, they continue to mislead the, the people of Saskatchewan by saying it's a responsibility here.

Mr. Speaker, another point of misrepresentation. The Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition says that farmers are paying more for fuel now than they did when they were in power. Well, I would ask the, the Leader of the Opposition: whose signature is on the agreement between Saskatchewan and the federal government? Whose signature is on that agreement? Who signed that agreement that said that they would continue to pass federal tax increases on to the farmers of Saskatchewan? Who signed that? Well, it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that the individual who signed that was the former premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Allan Blakeney, who signed an agreement that allows the federal government to add increased taxes on to the backs of the Saskatchewan farmer, and he knows full well there's no provincial tax at all in this province.

It is a little misleading to the public of Saskatchewan to blame the provincial government, to blame the provincial government for increased taxes on farmers when it was the member opposite whose signature is on that agreement with Mr. Trudeau to pass those tax increases, federal increases, on the backs of Saskatchewan farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — They also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't created jobs. Well, I'll just briefly touch on it again, as I did when I responded to the Speech from the Throne.

The difference in the months from January to February in 1983 set all records for the province of Saskatchewan in job creation since we've been collecting records. There's an increase in the number of people employed, new jobs created, by 6,000 people from January to February, an increase of 3,000 over the year before in the same month.

Mr. Speaker, there are now more and more people, more and more people coming into

the province of Saskatchewan, and only, only in the province of Saskatchewan is there a net increases in the number of people being employed. In no other province across Canada is that taking place but right here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I notice that the member from Regina Centre, again the, the member from Regina Elphinstone have pointed out that there's a great big cut in staff, and therefore, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, services to the public is going to decline.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think it might be fair to look at the question of increased productivity, increased productivity in the public sector under the new administration. The former administration's, the former administration's idea of good government was big government. If you just made it bigger it would be better; a bigger bureaucracy, more and more people. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just throw out a few points with respect to efficiency in the new administration.

This year there have been several productivity gains in several departments already. In continuing education they will process 9,000 student aid applications, a 30 per cent increase over last year with no increase in staff at all. I would add, the dollar value of the requested processed increased by 38.5 per cent of the previous year, and no increase in staff — that's productivity, Mr. Speaker.

Between January 1982 and January of this year, the social assistance plan cases increased by 28.6 per cent per month, and again this increased work-load has been accommodated with existing staff resources.

In regards to education, our government, through new systems and competitive bidding, has reduced the costs of producing a major educational publication from \$2,300 to \$3,000 a copy, to \$1,200 per copy — a measure which has cut costs more than half, Mr. Speaker. That's productivity. Not more and more government, but increased productivity.

The Department of Education has also absorbed a 50 per cent increase in enrolment in the correspondence school, with only a 35 per cent increase in teaching staff and no increase in administrative staff. This was done by the prudent use of computer technology and through the redesign of many programs.

The Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs has done the same. And I can go on and on and on, and I won't reiterate it. I just make the point, Mr. Speaker, that the former administration said that bigger government was better government. Just because you had more people in the public service, you were going to get better service. Our point is that we can have a more productive civil service: their productivity can increase and so can the service to the public of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, let me just briefly turn to some of the major points in the budget and how they reflect and fit into an overall industrial strategy for the province of Saskatchewan.

We've been mentioning for some time, across this country and indeed across United

States and Europe, that Saskatchewan is well known and will become better known for food, energy, mining, high technology and tourism. Based on our strengths, we want to build an industrial strategy that recognizes four key corner-stones: government, industry, labour and education. I believe, if you will look at the budget, Mr. Speaker, you'll find the industrial strategy of our administration is right through that budget. I'll briefly look, briefly look at the whole labour component.

The minister outlined nine points and nine strategic elements in a job creation program specifically designed for labour in the province of Saskatchewan. The nine points are worthy of reconsideration. One, extend the Build-A-Home program, \$3,000 grant, to August 1st, 1983 and jobs created with that. Second, a five-year, \$32 million cultural-recreational facility construction program. More jobs, Mr. Speaker. The introduction of Opportunities '83 program for student employment, \$2.7 million for labour, for jobs and job creation. Again, the province with the lowest unemployment, the province with the most students going back to school, and also the province — the only province in the country — to introduce a nine-point job creation program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Tax reduction for small businesses targeted at job creation — the only one in Canada; continuation of the Saskatchewan JOBS program, another \$8 million; an economic development program for treaty Indians, \$2 million; new special projects fund to finance production investments, \$30 million; ongoing government and crown corporations capital expenditures, another \$1,500 million — \$1.5 billion; an establishment of a crown utility for water distribution, Mr. Speaker — for the first time in Saskatchewan's history — job creation related to water and water projects all across the province. Total job creation — these nine points, Mr. Speaker — input creates 6,000 jobs in 1982-83, and will exceed that for '83-84. A nine-point job creation program for labour, part of the industrial strategy — government, industry, labour and education.

I'll tell the young people of the province of Saskatchewan and the young people across Canada: if you're looking for a job, the best place to look in the entire country is the province of Saskatchewan, as a result of the Minister of Finance's budget. That's the best place to look.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I can also tell the young people of this province about the skill-training expansion program, with millions of dollars going into it; a new Department of Advanced Education and Manpower; a four-year, \$120 million program to finance a 60 per cent increase in training spaces; a new Saskatchewan skills extension program. Other stimulative measures, including: increased funding for trade development; expansion to aid and for trade; \$2 million to encourage new investment; and creation of a new Department of Small Business and Tourism — all designed to create jobs to focus on labour as the key industrial strategy in the province of Saskatchewan.

When we look at investment, when we look at the private sector, we realize that 65 to 70 per cent of all the jobs in this province come from the private sector. The benefits and the confidence that the Minister of Finance provided to the businesses — small and large businesses — in the province of Saskatchewan is to be recommended all across the country.

With respect to agriculture, with respect to research and development, the heritage fund will now be something that is useful and targeted to areas of strength, Mr. Speaker — in our agriculture, in our research and development, in the high technology — building on our strengths of food and energy, high tech, mining, and tourism.

Mr. Speaker, as we go through these, department after department — Advanced Education and Manpower, Agriculture, Economic Development and Trade, Education, Environment, Health, ambulance services — on and on and on in this budget, Mr. Speaker, we see the results of a long-run industrial strategy that means a blueprint for success for the province of Saskatchewan. We can provide, in the long run, the guiding light, the engines that pull us out, this country out of a situation that they haven't seen for 30 or 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, the kinds of things that were outlined in the budget by the minister have resulted in thousands and thousands of increased jobs, more optimism in this province than we've seen in decades, and, Mr. Speaker, opportunities for people — opportunities for young people, opportunities for people who have moved out of Saskatchewan. I believe it's true we've lost about a million people since 1935-36 — a million of our number one resource, the children of Saskatchewan. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, they are indeed ambassadors of this province all across the world. A million Saskatchewan residents — former residents — now know that they're welcome to come home to Saskatchewan, that the potash-wall psychology no longer exists, that they can come into this province, they can get into this province and build and work and develop and lives with their families.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of the budget, the strength of the budget is built on the industrial strategy that the members of this administration have put together, and we're extremely proud of that strength.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the third point that's worthy of some comment: the record, the record of the NDP for the last 11 years, of the 11 years from 1971 to '82. The truth . . . Mr. Speaker, the truth hurts, and that's why the front, the front row of the opposition is empty. Mr. Speaker, I wish the people of Saskatchewan could see this. The front row is empty, and the back row is there, but it's rather empty as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP had 11 years, the NDP had 11 years in the province of Saskatchewan to prove that they knew what they were doing. They had 11 years to show to the people of Saskatchewan that they really knew what they were doing, how they could build on our economic strengths. They had 11 years of windfall prices, Mr. Speaker, 11 years of windfall gains in prices all across the world in terms of their commodities, windfall profits. They had all this money to try their schemes and 11 years to build on it.

Well, let's look at the record. The record, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself. It was a failure. It was a dismal failure. Better we have . . . Well, I suppose their claims to fame could be, could be summarized as follows: they thought that big government was good government. In 11 years of windfall profits and lower prices — remember, Mr. Speaker,

oil went from \$2 a barrel to \$30 a barrel while they were in power. Let's see what they did with it. Let's take a look at it. Well they said that big government is going to be good government so in 11 years from 1971 to 1982 (just looked it up), and the consumer price index increased 154 per cent, consumer price index 154 per cent.

But the provincial government expenditures in terms of their bureaucracy increased 470 per cent or three times the cost of living for the province of Saskatchewan and the population virtually remained the same over the 11 years. Eleven years of super profits — oil prices going from \$2 a barrel to \$30 a barrel and they increased the size of the government 470 per cent in terms of expenditures, and the actual numbers, Mr. Speaker, went up, went from 17,000 people to 29,000 people in 11 years and the population of Saskatchewan stayed stagnant. That's the record of the former administration, Mr. Speaker. That's a record of failure.

They had 11 years — they complain about this budget, Mr. Speaker — they had 11 years to build on the Saskatchewan economy. They had 11 years to build a heritage fund. They had 11 years to build up a kitty for a rainy day. They had 11 years . . . They had 11 years to reduce the tax burden, 11 years to reduce the tax burden for the people of . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair to remind the public that two more members left the opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair to remind the public of Saskatchewan that there is one member now sitting in the opposition. One member sitting there to listen to the 11 years of the NDP record — the record of failure.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they complained. They complained because they said: oh my gosh, we kept our promises. Then they said we didn't keep our promises, and now there's a deficit. Well, Mr. Speaker, what did we find when we opened up the books after taking over government? We found the cupboard was bare, Mr. Speaker. There was no heritage fund with a billion dollars in it. There was no strong structural foundation for the people of Saskatchewan. There was a bureaucracy twice as big as it was 10 years ago. The size of it had increased 470 per cent in terms of expenditures, which is three times what the consumer price index had increased, and there was nothing in the heritage fund. There was no money saved.

I mean, at least you could point to a neighbour, Mr. Speaker, in Alberta. They at least accumulated \$11 billion for a rainy day, so if they've got some problems they can draw out of the heritage fund. Not in the province of Saskatchewan. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, oil prices went from \$2 a barrel when those members were in government and they didn't save a nickel. Not one cent for a rainy day. The first downturn in the economy, the first time that the American farmer run short of cash, he can't buy potash, and we can't sell and they know it has nothing to do with provincial programs, we don't control the export tax, the first time we run into that. We don't have the opportunities Alberta does to draw out of a heritage fund because there wasn't a single solitary centre there for savings. It was all spent in the bureaucracy, and that's why it is a failure, Mr. Speaker, and everybody across Saskatchewan will recognize that they failed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Now, Mr. Speaker, they can say, they can say that we should

balance the budget, balance the budget when revenues fall. I think I heard the Leader of the Opposition say that we should be balancing the budget despite lower revenues. Well, I can say to him, the Leader of the Opposition, the first priority to the NDP administration was to tax the people to protect the crowns, to tax the people of Saskatchewan, the families of Saskatchewan, to protect the crown corporations and to protect the bureaucracy. In other words, the policy of the NDP administration was to rob the real families of the province of Saskatchewan to protect the NDP castle of crowns.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP philosophy was, and still is, a warped, a warped Robin Hood philosophy: rob the poor to protect the NDP family of thirsty crowns. Well, Mr. Speaker, that whole strategy of taking from the people, and taking from the people, and taking from the people to build a Saskatchewan family of crown corporations has finally come to an end, and I think the people of Saskatchewan are delighted today, delighted today, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP, that the NDP king of the crowns is in exile.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — The NDP king of the crowns is in exile, in fact, he is not even in the room. The sheriff of Riversdale has been banished and the rural Hood Robin ways of the NDP are finished in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — When we look at the record of the NDP, look at the record of the NDP, we could spend, we could spend hours talking about the failure of the land bank, Mr. Speaker. Everybody in the province of Saskatchewan, and now everybody across Canada and the United States, knows of the failure of the land bank. Mom and Dad sold their land to the NDP for \$60 or \$70 an acre and then they tried to sell it back to the children at \$1,000 an acre. It was the biggest single land rip-off in the history of North America, and they started it, and they failed.

You can look, you can look at the losses in SGI, Mr. Speaker. It was subsidized, and subsidized, and subsidized from the taxpayer — 50-60 million dollar losses, Mr. Speaker, and they designed it. You're looking at thousands and hundreds of thousands of children that have left this province as a result of the NDP programs. Lonely, lonely senior citizens all across this province because we have one of the highest ages, average ages in Canada as a result of young people leaving.

And, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine? They went through a situation . . . I've got to remind them again, because they brought it up. Oil prices went from \$2 in their administration to \$30 a barrel. The opportunity to build upgraders, to refine oil, to discover it, to go, to build — by the time we took over it was stopped. There was no upgraders, there was no processing, no refining, no marketing. More and more and more tax, and tax the little guy to save the Saskatchewan family of crown corporations. Where were the upgraders? They weren't here, Mr. Speaker. Where were the economic foundations to build on this province, to build the strength of this province on food, and agriculture, and energy, and water, and high technology, tourism and mining? The first downturn in the economy, and we're in a deficit because they didn't build anything except a bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in today's paper, it points out that the minister . . . the member, pardon me, from Regina Centre was in Estevan over the week-end, and he admits in the

paper today that maybe it's appropriate that they're in opposition because they might have lost touch. It's only in the *Leader-Post* . . . Maybe it's a good idea that they ended up in opposition because they lost touch, and I would just remind the people of Saskatchewan that when the members opposite admit, particularly in the Premier's riding, that they have lost touch with the people, that that message should become very, very clear and he should pass it on to his leader.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, if you want to look at the real philosophy of the members opposite with respect to a budget, Mr. Speaker, I think you just need to turn to our neighbours to the East, the NDP in Manitoba. They've taken a situation where there was the lowest debt per capita any place in Canada, prior to them winning. The lowest debt per capita any place in this nation, and in about a year and three-quarters it is now the highest debt per capita of any province in the country. And they are doing the very same thing, Mr. Speaker, that the former administration did here — build a bureaucracy and build a bureaucracy and tax the people to protect the crown corporations.

And, I might add that they now have not only the biggest debt per capita, but in the paper today it points out that cabinet ministers, cabinet ministers in the province of Manitoba were out on the steps of the legislature, including the Deputy Premier of the NDP administration, were out on the steps of their own legislature picketing their own legislature, and burning the American flag.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that . . . Mr. Speaker, this is a pathetic reflection of the dismal policies that have their roots in the NDP policies, the radical, radical, radical policies of the NDP are no longer acceptable, not only in the province of Saskatchewan, but indeed any place in the country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — What's in, what's in the *Leader-Post* and what was seen on television in Winnipeg is a disgrace to the Canadian flag, a disgrace to the Canadian nation, a disgrace to this country, and indeed democracy.

Mr. Speaker, they deserve, they deserve to be in exile; they deserve to be banished for their betrayals, for their betrayals to this province, to the community, to the country, for the kinds of things that they're, they're trying to promote all across this nation. They've betrayed the West in terms of the former incestuous relationship with the federal Liberals. They've betrayed this province in terms of squandering revenues for years and years and years — fortunes, billions and billions of dollars. We should have had a \$5 billion to \$10 billion heritage fund in this province today, if they had known what they were doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in closing that the budget proposed and brought down by the Minister of Finance for the province of Saskatchewan is an excellent document. And I could quote on and on from the *Star-Phoenix* that says it's right on the mark; that the budget delivers. And it does. It takes some difficult economic, international economic times. And it says, Saskatchewan can cope with hem better than anybody else, if we've got somebody in charge that knows a little bit about economics, a little about families, a little bit about agriculture, and a little bit about this province, in terms of energy and oil and mining and so forth.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that this budget does deliver. It delivers one of the best pieces of economic analysis that this province has seen probably in 40 years. I want to say that I'm extremely happy and extremely proud to support the motion and to vote against the amendment. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Currie: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to congratulate, first of all, the Minister of Finance, for the forward-looking budget which he has presented to this House. I am also pleased to have the opportunity today to rise in this House, and to provide members and the people of Saskatchewan with the details regarding the initiatives in elementary, secondary, adult and post-secondary education that has been taken by, which are being taken by our government.

I shall begin my remarks by referring to matters pertaining to the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, since the time of the early settlers, education has been a corner-stone of life in Saskatchewan; they took great pride in providing educational opportunities for their children. Since those early days, Saskatchewan people have continued to give education the priority it deserves. For 1983-84, we cannot promise that teachers and boards of education will get as much provincial money as they would like, but we can assure the people of Saskatchewan that even though things are tight financially, we shall see that education gets its fair share. We shall maintain the high standards of programs to which people of this province have been accustomed.

Education was developed by a partnership arrangement between the two levels of government: provincial through the Department of Education, and the boards of education. Sharing in that partnership is the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation which, this year, is celebrating its 50th anniversary. Mr. Speaker, both teachers and parents should be very proud of the federation which has demonstrated its professionalism by the leadership it has given in assisting the department to provide suitable learning experiences to our students.

I doubt whether any other province even approaches Saskatchewan in the degree of co-operation that exists among teachers, trustees, government, directors and superintendents. Consultation among the partners is virtually automatic on any major issue. This partnership is strengthened by the contributions made by parents, interest groups and educational organizations.

We have continued with the curriculum and instruction review. This project has provided consultation with thousands of students, parents, teachers and administrators, through questionnaires, through briefs and public meetings. Their input is now being analysed and the report will be ready for consideration later this year. The results will serve to assess whether our schools are accommodating the needs of the students as viewed by the general public. This kind of education is an extension of the continuous evaluation carried on by the department and in each school and classroom.

Mr. Speaker, it was over a year ago that the social studies task force submitted its report. The report was compiled after a major consultation with many publics of our province. To pursue the recommendations, a reference committee has been established to translate them into specific directions. The end result will be a coherent framework for all social studies courses from grade 1 to grade 12, a clear structure for all social science courses at the high school level, guide-lines for developing suitable curriculum guides and resource materials.

Mr. Speaker, we are particularly pleased to have commenced the production of a multi-media grade 4 social studies kit. This will result in a collection of materials pertaining to our province. The kit will be provided to each school that has a grade 4 class.

Mr. Speaker, the services that had previously been provided by SaskMedia will again be served by the Department of Education. Lending service of 16 millimetre films and a tape dubbing service will be produced. Production of audio-visual material will continue by contracting with Saskatchewan production houses.

In order that all students can perceive the computer as an integral part of society, the plan is to provide a curriculum scope that will include informal introduction of computers at the division 1 and 2 levels, more formal instruction in division 3 and in division 3 and optional computer science courses in division 4.

Other programs that are receiving special attention in the department are: health education; French programs, because of the apparent increased interest; heritage languages, particularly German and Ukrainian.

The Saskatchewan Government Correspondence School, which will celebrate its 60th anniversary in 1985, continues to serve thousands of students each year. In recent years the enrolment has increased dramatically, Mr. Speaker. Currently there are 3,431 school-aged students and 2,198 adults who are enrolled in 8,378 subjects. With declining enrolments in rural schools, correspondence courses are increasingly used as course options or as supports to the multi-grade teachers. Adults are able to fit the correspondence studies into their work schedules and family responsibilities. The Correspondence School uses modern computer and word processing equipment for the preparation and updating of courses and for efficient administration.

Mr. Speaker, the department continues to focus on the students with special needs. The R.D.J. Williams School for the Deaf continues to improve its programs, facilities and services.

The Department of Education, in co-operation with national agencies, is conducting a study of educational programs designed to provide an appropriate transition for handicapped people between the school and life after formal schooling is completed. The department is also initiating in-service programs for new thrusts in the area of special education. Incentives are provided to ensure the availability of teachers of students with special needs.

The operating grant budget of the Department of Education will be increased to \$339.9 million in 1983-84. This represents an average increase of 7 per cent in the funds available to the school divisions in this budget year. This year's negotiated wage settlement with the province's teachers fell within the provincial wage guide-lines. Since instructional costs represent about 65 per cent of the school division's expenditures, this settlement will have a major impact on what school divisions have to spend in 1983. With the general reduction in the inflation rate in our province, the increases in the cost of services and materials that school divisions need to purchase will also be down. Transportation costs have been reduced as a result of eliminating the provincial gasoline tax. Of most significance, though, is the fact that individual school divisions are emphasizing prudent budgeting to ensure that education programs are delivered as effectively and as efficiently as possible.

To assist school divisions to achieve that objective, the recognized per pupil basic rates used in the foundation grant formula have been increased to reflect the anticipated increase in instructional costs. Although the total enrolment of the province is virtually the same in 1983 as it was in 1982, enrolments in rural school divisions have continued to decline. Because of this, many rural school divisions continue to be faced with the need to operate schools with low enrolments. In recognition of the problems associated with operating small schools, the small schools factor in the grant calculation will be extended in 1983 to include division 1 and 2. This will be accomplished by increasing the funds allocated to small school support, by 47 per cent, to \$8.1 million. Capital grants, in the 1983-84 budget, will allow for the approval of approximately 22 major construction projects and 22 major roof repair projects, with a total estimated cost of \$61.8 million.

These estimates include two major projects in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we have welcomed the staff of the northern academic education branch into the Department of Education, and look forward to working with them and with local school divisions in northern Saskatchewan. We recognize that the needs of education in northern Saskatchewan will often be different from the needs in the South. We do not intend to assimilate northern education into the department, that its identity and its uniqueness are lost.

The curriculum needs in the North are unique. There are special needs as far as the teacher training is concerned. The financing of education in the North cannot be based on precisely the same factors as the financing of education in the South. I am pleased that there have been, that there have already been extensive consultations between the Regina-based staff and the northern staff of the Department of Education. We are exploring ways in which we can maximize the contribution of our northern staff, by providing additional support from our central office.

Mr. Speaker, we are particularly looking forward to strengthening programs in native languages. We hope that developments in the North will have significant spin-offs for schools in the rest of the province. Two school building projects have been approved for 1983-84, and two others have been given approval in principle. A 4.4 million project at La Loche will replace facilities destroyed by fire. Additions to the Green Lake school will cost 3.2 million, and will provide additional classrooms, industrial arts and home economic facilities and a resource centre.

In addition, negotiations are under way with the federal government for new facilities at Pelican Narrows and Wollaston Lake. The province will contribute about 16 per cent to these projects that are jointly funded with the federal government.

The Department of Education is representing the interests of northern school boards in the current dispute with the federal government about its failure to honour its contractual obligations as far as payment of fees is concerned. We have taken the position, Mr. Speaker, that we will take whatever interim steps are needed until this dispute is settled to ensure that the children of the North do not become pawns in a federal-provincial dispute.

We intend to continue our support of NORTEP (northern teachers' education program). The northern teacher education program is functioning very well, and we believe its long-term contribution to the quality and relevance of education in the North will be significant. As an indication of our commitment to this program, I can tell you that the

Department of Education has recently made a special payment of over \$80,000 to cover an indebtedness of NORTEP (northern teachers' education program) to the Northern Lights School Division that had been overlooked for several years.

Education in the North faces many challenges, especially as far as relationships with the federal government are concerned. I would like to assure Northerners that their interest will be well served by the Department of Education, and that they will retain their identity within the provincial education system.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. As was evident from, as was evidence from the Minister of Finance's budget speech last week, we view adult and post-secondary education as a major priority. I would therefore like to spend some time today describing for members and the public the initiatives we are taking.

Mr. Speaker, as the Premier announced recently, our initiatives in post-secondary education will be overseen by a new Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. This new department, with its dual focus on educational and manpower planning, will enable us to do two things better than was possible in the past. First, it will help us to provide people with the education they want and need in order to benefit personally from the social and economic prospects our province holds, and second, it will allow us to ensure our educational system is a real contributor to social and economic progress for Saskatchewan through the 1980s and beyond.

The new department will provide us with better methods of keeping in touch with those groups which we must involve more in the design and the operation of our post-secondary education system, groups such as business, industry, labour and the general public. I am confident that the new department, with its education, apprenticeship, training, and manpower planning functions will help us to meet our need for skilled manpower. As such, it will make our educational system a real engine for growth and a key part of our economic recovery.

Mr. Speaker, most particularly, I am pleased to elaborate on what my colleague, the Minister of Finance, said so well one week ago: that our government believes there is no better investment than to provide sound technical training for our young people who want to stay and work in this province. Yet we are faced today with a situation where each year we experience a critical shortfall between the number of skilled workers needed by Saskatchewan industry and the number that we are able to train through the current capacities of our technical institutes.

Approximately 9,000 additional skilled workers will be required annually to meet the manpower needs of the province. But we are currently able to produce only 4,500. At the same time, people desperately want this type of training, as evidenced by the fact that we receive twice as many applications for institute spots as we can accommodate. We are determined to increase training capacity to meet the needs of our people and to meet the needs of business and industry in our province.

At this time, I wish to announce that we are embarking immediately upon a \$120 million program over the next four years which will increase our technical training capacity by roughly 60 per cent, to more than 8,600 training places per year, up 3,100 from the current level of 5,500. This year alone, Mr. Speaker, we will spend approximately \$7 million to add about 1,200 new training places. This increase in training capacity will be made up of approximately 800 new training positions in our

three technical institutes and 400 new training places through a Saskatchewan skills extension program, about which I will have more to say in a minute.

I would like to elaborate on this major expansion of our post-secondary education system by providing some specifics regarding the many parts of our overall program. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we are significantly increasing funding at our three existing institutes to add programs and student capacity which will meet the needs of our people in Saskatchewan. This year, we will be providing \$40.94 million to our three technical institutes — a 23.7 per cent increase overall to the institutes above last year's funding level of 33.1 million.

At Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Science in Regina, we are providing \$12 million this year, a more than 35 per cent increase over last year's funding. While Regina is the province's largest population centre, it currently has a relatively limited technical training capacity. It is therefore our plan to inject some much-needed funding to allow for the following: an increased training capacity of 194 students this year, with the increased capacity over the next four years to total 886 training places; addition, over the four-year plan, of 18 new programs in the areas of industrial, technical, service occupations, business and agriculture; offering some programs on an extended-day basis, to make use of costly facilities, and to accommodate more students.

At Kelsey Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences in Saskatoon, we are providing \$16.7 million this year, a more than 22 per cent increase over last year's funding. Kelsey is currently our largest institute, Mr. Speaker, and the expansion this funding will provide for will allow this facility to support the exciting developments in the high-technology field through addition of new programs and expansion of existing ones. In particular, I can cite an increased training capacity of 342 students this year, with further increases in three years, bringing the total capacity increase to about 400; addition to two new training programs; first, computer-assisted design and computer-assisted manufacturing, and second, micro-computer management; expansion of 13 existing Kelsey technical training programs; and offering some programs on an extended-day basis.

At STI, the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw, we are providing \$12.1 million this year, a 16 per cent increase over last year. Our plans call for the following extension of programs at STI: an increase to the training capacity of 236 student places this year, with a total increased capacity by the end of four years from now of 440 student-training places.

Four new programs to be introduced at STI: a computer-engineering technology course, an occupational health and safety course, a two-year office-education program, and a two-year public administration program, and a total of 13 new program initiatives at the institutes, which will help us achieve our enrolment increases over the next three years at STI.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to dramatic increases to the capacity and availability of technical-vocational training at our three institutes, we have recently announced a greatly expanded plan for a new fourth technical-vocational institute for Saskatchewan, the \$25 million Prince Albert technical institute, to be ready for students by the fall of 1985. Of course, this project will now allow training immediately, but I believe that a quick review of our actions and our intentions with respect to this project will give a good indication, Mr. Speaker, of the way in which the new Prince

Albert technical institute will be an integral part of our overall plan to bring meaningful technical training to people all across Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, last August, our government announced we would continue development of a technical institute in Prince Albert. However, in view of the manpower requirements to accommodate the economic strategy, it became obvious that the original plans of the Prince Albert institute would have to be enlarged to serve higher enrolments and an increased number of programs.

This January we announced an increase of the project to 25 million, up from the 15.4 million originally planned. We increased the projected student capacity by more than 60 per cent to 656 students, up from 418. And, Mr. Speaker, we added some important new training programs, such as mining and forestry, cosmetology, commercial cooking, along with commercial art, commercial photography, interior design, and craft certificate. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this new institute will also have the added features of providing an excellent opportunity for native people to gain access to skill training, and it will also be a convenient base for delivery of training to our northern communities through affiliation with the three northern community colleges.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks today, I mentioned that a major part of our increase to our technical training capacity will come by way of the Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program. Of the 1,200 training spaces we will add for technical training this year, no fewer than 400 of them will be through this new program which will take this vital type of training to people in smaller communities around our province.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that there are many people, from Yorkton to Melfort to Swift Current to La Ronge who for family or job reasons cannot move to the cities to which our technical institutes are located to take the training they want or need. This year we are going to spend \$8.72 million on the Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program to make technical training programs available, originating from the technical institutes that offer it, to more than 20 centres outside of Regina, Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, by our community colleges. Mr. Speaker, this new program will allow us to deliver a valuable education to people through the use of available space in local comprehensive high schools or through arrangements with the private sector, to make good use of under-utilized capacity which may exist there. Our plans call for an increase in student places of 400 — up to 636 from the level of 236 last year. And, Mr. Speaker, I might note our spending on this type of programming, at \$8.72 million, is more than three times as much as the appropriation of 1982-83.

I am confident that this new Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program will add greatly to the wealth of technically skilled people that our province needs as it moves forward. And I believe that the proof of our commitment to this goal is evident by the fact that we are targeting training through this program for communities such as Lloydminster and Melfort and Melville and North Battleford, Nipawin, Estevan, Swift Current, Weyburn, Yorkton, Prince Albert, La Ronge, Buffalo Narrows, and other northern points.

Mr. Speaker, as I discuss extension of our training opportunities to centres throughout Saskatchewan I would like to mention our community colleges system. As I mentioned, the colleges will be important links in the delivery of technical education. They will also continue to serve the absolutely necessary function of providing upgrading types of education for our people, such as through the adult basic education program, the general educational development testing program, the English as a second language program, the literacy programs and others. The colleges will see an increase in their

programming, and indirectly in their funding through the Saskatchewan Skills Extension Program that I described earlier, and through an increase in the purchases of training which the federal government plans to make at our colleges this year. They're increasing, increasing involvement in the delivery of education to people around the province.

Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to making an extra effort to ensure that special groups of people who would otherwise face difficulty in receiving quality educational programs will gain access to our facilities and to our programs. Older adults, people without high school completion, disadvantaged adults, the disabled and native people should, and can, expect that the post-secondary education system will serve their needs.

In terms of programs for native people, we are endeavouring to ensure access for native people throughout our planned increases in technical training around the province. This, combined with our intention to push for more utilization of federally sponsored programs for Saskatchewan native people, our maintenance of funding levels for the non-status Indian and Metis program and the impact of the new Prince Albert technical institute, together mean improved educational possibilities for native people.

Mr. Speaker, though we are necessarily placing emphasis on technical training at this point in our history, this in no way takes away from our commitment to maintain the quality of education at Saskatchewan's two universities.

I am pleased to announce that our universities will receive \$126.2 million to operate this year. In light of the agreement earlier by the two universities to observe our provincial guide-lines for economic recovery, this operating grant represents a 7 per cent increase over funding last year.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of major issues I would like to address myself to respecting universities. First, though we are applying a 7 per cent increase to our universities, we are very aware of the space and facilities pressures being experienced at both the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina due to high enrolments. We are sympathetic to those pressures and to the problems that such a situation, if it were to continue for a period of time, could mean for these institutions.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we undertake as a government which recognizes the importance of our centres of higher learning to monitor the pressure that enrolments place upon operating funds throughout the fiscal year. And second, Mr. Speaker, we have provided this year for a direct working relationship between the universities and the government by disbanding the universities commission. This government believes in a direct relationship so the universities will relate with the universities unit in our new Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the \$126.2 million in operating moneys we will provide to the universities, I wish to announce today that we will also be granting more than \$4.3 million for their capital construction needs, including needed repairs and rehabilitation of facilities, as well as new construction. I am very pleased to follow up on the Minister of Finance's statement last week by announcing that we will be devoting \$1.2 million this year towards a new geological sciences building at the University of Saskatchewan — a project which, after due consideration, our government has decided to proceed with during 1983-84. It is our firm belief that Saskatchewan needs

not only increased technical and vocational training capacity, but it must also support its universities' programs of arts, humanities, sciences, high technology and research, if it is to offer its people all forms of quality education.

People are seeking adult and post-secondary education in record numbers today. Though this places a burden upon our programs of financial assistance for students, we remain committed to providing aid for those who desire a further education, but who have a real need for assistance. To this end I am pleased to announce that during 1983-84 we are contributing \$10.3 million to the Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund to make money available for those in need. We expect that the increasing demand upon our student aid moneys will continue, and we have every intention of doing our utmost to meet this need. The federal government intends to increase the amount of an individual loan which a student can receive, and we favour this move; and we in Saskatchewan will increase the amount we will put towards bursaries for students. At the same time, however, we intend to adjust our bursary criteria to ensure that students with high financial need receive maximum benefit of the non-repayable bursary funding.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure last Thursday of announcing details in this House and at a news conference regarding Opportunities '83, our government's new summer student employment program. I will not take the time of the House today to go over that ground again. However, since it is a program to be funded through the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, I do wish to add here today that it is one more way at a cost of \$2.76 million that we are attempting to help students to continue their education. There may be as many as 3,000 jobs created through this program, and that, in addition to the student assistance funding I mentioned earlier, will go a long way towards ensuring that students will be not only gaining work experience, but will be in a position this September to enrol in a further kind of education or training of their choice.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are many other initiatives in the fields of education which we are taking this year. I have just been able here, today, to supply some highlights and add some details to the presentation the Minister of Finance made last week. We are determined to gear our education system to be a strong supporting corner-stone in the development of our province, mainly by expanding our vital technical training capacity, by providing financial and employment assistance to students, and by maintaining an excellent university sector.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a government, are excited about what is planned for our educational system this year. I take particular pleasure in being the minister responsible for an area which is so crucial to our social and economic development in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure and pride in supporting this budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to begin by bringing greetings on behalf of the Regina Centre constituency, the constituency I have represented since 1975. It's an interesting constituency, composed of a mix of the young and the old; relatively affluent and the relatively impoverished; people who own their houses and people who rent; and perhaps more different races and creeds than any other riding in Regina, and perhaps in Saskatchewan.

The single most striking feature of the Premier's speech, I may say, was its repetition. He stated in closing that the public wanted someone with a little knowledge and economics, they elected them. If they wanted someone with a thorough knowledge of economics, they missed the mark by quite a bit. I don't know how you respond to that sort of a speech. I don't know how you respond to someone who suggests that there might have been five, eight, ten billion dollars in the heritage fund, someone who is so utterly oblivious of the facts.

The Premier made one comment about there only being one member in the House. I'd suggest to the Premier that that's some testimony to the speech's interest, and not to our interest. The single most striking feature of the speech, Mr. Speaker, was the deficit, the ocean of red ink which flows into all parts of public affairs in this province. Indeed, the Minister of Finance is fast appearing like a compact version of Marc Lalonde, because he is chasing his deficits. Last November, we were told that the deficit would be around 220 million. Every time the Minister of Finance mentioned that deficit it went up. And in the space of some five short months, he added a hundred million dollars to the budget . . . to the deficit.

I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that that deficit is out of control. I think it is clear that members opposite have no control over the size of that deficit. That . . . Indicative of that is the fact that every time the Minister of Finance spoke of it, it was up. He clearly had no idea where it was going. And, I suggest to the Minister of Finance, that the final deficit, the final figures which we will see next year, will be considerably higher than \$317 million. We have just got part of the bad news. Part of the proof, Mr. Speaker, that this deficit is out of control is the fact that this government has abandoned any pretence of balancing the budget within any foreseeable time frame.

Last November the Minister of Finance, last November the Minister of Finance indicated that he was going to balance the budget within the four-year term of this government. They have now abandoned any pretence that they are going to be able to balance the budget within any time frame that means anything at all. They are simply saying to the public of Saskatchewan: 'Well, we may balance the budget if we have an awful lot of luck with the price of natural resources,' and so on and so forth. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that to tell the public you're going to balance the budget when all your luck comes in, and when every ship you have comes in, is simply not an adequate way to manage the public affairs of this province.

To have no time frame within which you've got to balance a budget is the road that the federal government has taken the Government of Canada on, and you are starting down the same path, and I suggest that if you people aren't removed from office in a very brief period of time, this province's affairs are going to be as badly skewered as the national government's.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, I, I honestly, I, I owe members opposite an apology. When they sat on this side of the House and spoke of the mountains of cash that was yet to be spent, and which they would do such an efficient job in spending, I thought they were being dishonest. I thought they knew better. But I, I know now, when I see them in office and see the public affairs of this province being run the way they are, that it wasn't dishonestly; it was stupidity. They, they did not realize that there was, that, that, that the heritage fund was not a bank account. That, notwithstanding that annual reports had

been published each year, which told them precisely where the money had gone, but, of course, they had no time to read.

The heritage fund was one of the success stories of the former administration, although perhaps less so in a political sense. The heritage fund was used to build up the economic infrastructure of this province and I ask, and I tell members opposite, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

The former administration took office at a, in the midst of a recession, which was a good deal worse than the one that you took office in. In 1971 this province was going through a recession which was a good deal worse than what you had to contend to. And the, the government of the day lifted this province up by its bootstraps. The heritage fund was used to build an economic infrastructure. We used it to develop resources. We used it to, to develop resources, using Saskatchewan people at all echelons, and this province experienced a degree of prosperity which was unprecedented. And as soon as that administration left office, and as soon as the Tory wrecking crew set in to dismantle all of what the former administration had accomplished, a dark, dank recession settled back upon the province.

And I suggest that until this administration either mends its ways or is removed from office, this province is not going to achieve its economic potential. And again I say the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

The most striking fact of the Open for Business conference and the open for business philosophy is the lack of a single major success — a lack of a single major success. When I prayed to the Premier not to have another such conference, that was only half in jest. The last thing this province needs is any extension of that philosophy.

These people opposite wish to fritter away this province's patrimony, and that is a proper, a proper designation of what the heritage fund is. One should remind members opposite that it isn't something that is renewable. This province was given one cache of natural resources, and when they are gone, whether it be . . . whether we have talked about gravel or oil or uranium, when that cache is gone, our resources are gone. And the heritage fund recognized that and set aside something for future generations.

These people opposite wish to fritter that away and are in the process of doing it with the repeal of the heritage act. And they will spend every nickel they can, every nickel they can, and leave nothing for succeeding generations.

What happened, though, was rather than irresponsibly frittering away the heritage fund, since it was not in the form which they could fritter away, what they have done instead is to irresponsibly run up a deficit which is unprecedented. This government is borrowing in excess of 10 per cent of what it is spending. The federal government is chastised, and rightly so, for borrowing over 20 per cent of what they spend. But one should recognize that that deficit took place over, and it was built up over, a period of a couple of decades. You people have gone half as far in 11 months, and it certainly isn't going to take you . . . Unless you mend your ways it certainly is not going to take this government two decades to start, to get to the point where you are borrowing 25 per cent of what you spend.

In 11 short months you have gone from a position where there was no deficit to a position where the deficit and the interest thereon is a significant expenditure. We heard a good deal of ballyhoo from members opposite, both in this Chamber and

outside, about rural development. Mr. Minister, you are now spending more on the interest payments than you are spending on that Department of Rural Development. Your interest payments exceed the total budget of the Department of Rural Development, and it is going to grow. And it is . . . Unless you mend your ways and start to be a bit more responsible, you are soon going to be in the position that the federal government is in, wherein the largest single expenditure is interest. And you're not far away from that unless you mend your irresponsible ways.

Let us look, though, at who the victims of this irresponsibility are — and let us start with women. Let us start with the women's division. I want to recap some facts for members opposite because they seem to be so easily forgotten. Wages are a, wages of women are a fraction of what they are for men.

Mr. Speaker, I'm soon going to have to call a point of order. My throat . . . I am trying to yell above members opposite, and particularly the member from Regina North West. I don't think my throat is going to last at this decibel level. If you must yell, if the member opposite must yell, would you please do so in a softer tone.

Wages of women are a fraction of what men's are. The unemployment rate is considerably higher. They occupy the lowest echelons of the economy inevitably, and they comprise the overwhelming majority of people on minimum wage. And the, the philosophy of the women's division was that there was a need . . . I see the member from Saskatoon Nutana smiling. We have had an ongoing argument about this. And I'm going to, I'm going to deal with that argument in a moment, but first of all I want to recap for members opposite what the women's division was all about.

If we are to tackle those problems of discrimination we need someone who has a special responsibility for that. And this government was a pioneer in setting up the women's division. Eventually it was copied by all provinces in Canada, yet the women's division of the province of Saskatchewan remained the pre-eminent such division in Canada and received national acclaim for their work. And, I want you to, I want members opposite to remember that because it's become a familiar refrain: pioneers to achieve national acclaim were abolished.

And I, I, I have to ask myself why I can only assume that members opposite are not oblivious to the facts. I can only assume that members opposite, I can only assume that members opposite are reacting to the red-neck backlash against the feminist movement. I'm interested . . . I, I find the song, I find the song interesting. I find the song interesting the country and western song interesting — 'She Got the Gold Mine and I Got the Shaft' — because that is popularly believed.

And I can say to members opposite, it is simply not true. It is simply not true. That song deals with, with, with marital property settlements, and women have not yet achieved equality. Although, thanks to the legislation which we've passed, they have gone a long ways toward it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I, the, I can see I've hit a tender spot with members opposite. They've all come awake. They've all come awake.

The, this women's division received national acclaim. I admit that the problem was not solved. The role of women in society goes to the very basis of our culture. Few changes are as difficult to make, but it was . . . The process was ongoing. The process was ongoing. And we were making some success. And what happens? Members opposite abolish it. Members opposite abolish it. I can only assume that members opposite don't care; I can only assume they don't care about the high rate of unemployment, the low

wages, and the low status of women in the economy.

I want to say to members opposite, though, that what happened in the last few days does reaffirm my faith in the democratic process. Because, just as I saw Harry Van Mulligen brought back from banishment because of the outrage — public outrage so I see the women's division, or perhaps some facsimile thereof, being, being retained. What I saw, what I saw the Premier . . .

This gets back to the argument that I have had with the member from Saskatoon Nutana, because I think I'm in the process of winning this struggle between you and I about whether or not the women's division ought to be retained. I conceded victory the other day, and I conceded victory a little too early, because I underestimated the force of public opinion. Women in the province were outraged — and that is not too strong a word. They were outraged at the abolition of the women's division.

What happened was, the Premier can't stand the heat. When the Premier announced, as he did, that he was considering setting up a minister who was responsible for the status of women, he was admitting that he had made a mistake, and that there is a need for someone who has special responsibility, for someone who has special responsibility, to deal with the status of women.

Now, we will shortly know whether or not this is, whether or not this is, whether or not this is window-dressing or whether or not it's actual. If he merely appoints a minister who is responsible for the status of women and does nothing more, that's window-dressing. We always had that. We've always had that. If he gives the minister — and I'm addressing myself to the Minister of Education — if he gives the Minister of Education some staff, then what in fact he has done is to re-create the women's division in a different name and a different form. So I say that my faith in the democratic process was reaffirmed this weekend as I saw public opinion overcome the deep and abiding obstinacy of members opposite on this issue.

But it wasn't just, unfortunately, it wasn't just women who are paying the price of the irresponsibility of members opposite. And I refer to occupational health and safety. And I remind members opposite, some of whom were born with silver spoons in their mouth, some of whom we may not have been, that there are few occupations as dangerous as the man who works on the industrial site.

I can give you statistics to show that a carpenter, a carpenter is more likely to sustain serious injury than a, than a policeman. A, a carpenter is more likely to sustain serious injuries than a policeman. The, the, the people who work, people who work in industrial sites, have a, have dangerous occupations, and it has been ever thus.

And society has been very slow in dealing with those problems. There have been, there have been a few, a very few significant advances in making the industrial workplace more safe. One of them was the abolition of child employment, of child labour, some hundred years ago. Some of them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, no, no, I certainly am not, and it was not a Conservative government in England which, which did it either, I may say. We may not take credit for it, but there's no danger of Conservatives ever taking credit for such a thing.

Another significant step was the mining laws, also passed in England, and another significant step was the occupational health and safety program which this

government pioneered in North America, and which was making some very significant progress in making the industrial site safer for working people. We pioneered this program in North America. I said that the women's division received national acclaim. The occupational health and safety division did not just achieve national acclaim, they achieved international acclaim.

And what happens? What happens when a group of public servants develop a program which meets a deep need of working people, and when they achieve national, national acclaim? The women's division can tell you. You get abolished. And the occupational health and safety has not been abolished, Mr. Minister, I admit, but it is well on the road to it. It is well on the road to it. They have, they have . . . It has sustained deep staff cuts.

I could go on and deal with the, through the entire day, with the Department of Labour. It is clear, Mr. Minister, that, that your department had, did not fare well. The labour standards, I'll deal with labour standards. The shell game that government, that members opposite have played with the departments make it difficult to identify the precise extent of cuts, but it is clear that there have been some cuts in labour standards, notwithstanding all the moves all over the board. It is clear that there have been some, loss of some position.

That strikes directly at the non-unionized worker. He must, he, he has no one to speak on his behalf. He must depend on the, your department, and The Labour Standards Act and the other acts which your department, administers, to protect his rights. And by undermining that department, you undermine the protection which non-unionized working people have, and I say shame, Mr. Minister. You are again picking on those who are least able to defend themselves.

Pensions: again the staff of the pension department was cut in half . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The, it's, oh, it's, the comic relief is here and it's, and it's represented by the seat from Regina North West. The salaries, the staff of your pension division has been cut in half. Once again, that is, once again it's an area that's badly in need of reform. I remind members opposite, and the minister in particular, that pensions in this country simply don't work for the vast majority of people. Over two-thirds of the public wind up without anything but the OAS and the Canada Pension Plan. The vast majority of people don't get pensions.

And that's something that, that is something that we should be ashamed of, because those people when they retire, will live in poverty. It is inevitable those people will live in poverty, and they do, in my riding. And the riding represented by the member from Saskatoon Riversdale and the member from Saskatoon Centre represent those people in great numbers.

It is a deep-seated problem. It is one that I will admit we had not solved, but it was one that we, we were working on. At least there was research, at least there was research being done, Mr. Minister. We had a pension benefits act which was the finest in Canada. We had the best pension benefits act in Canada, and the department here was doing some important research. And what have you done, Mr. Minister? You have gutted that section. You have gutted that section. If the Department of Labour, if the Department of Labour received some ravishment — ravishment may be pulling my punches; rape might be a better — but if your department was ravished, so were other departments.

I was amazed to hear the Minister of Culture and Recreation — as it now is or at some

time it will be — the Minister of Culture and Recreation to stand up and say he was proud of what he saw in the budget, because every single subvote which delivers, which is responsible for delivering programs in your department received staff cuts, and the suggestion by the Premier that that's, that that's increasing productivity is just absolute nonsense. I am going to ask the Minister of Culture and Recreation in your estimates — so you can get ready for the question — how you achieve, how you achieve an increase in productivity in the film classification board, whose staff you cut. Are they going to watch films for more hours of the day? I'll tell you what's going to happen, Mr. Minister. I will tell you what's going to happen: they are simply not going to do the job as thoroughly as they have been. They are not going to be doing it as thoroughly as they have been, and what is going to happen is that films will be turned down which should have been approved, and films will be let through which should have been turned down. They will simply not be doing it as thoroughly. The, the, the quality of service which is being provided by this government will inevitably deteriorate.

Perhaps, perhaps members opposite ought to be the most ashamed of what they have done in the area of heritage conservation, the area of heritage conservation. It is difficult to know the precise extent of the, of, of the cuts in heritage conservation, again because you've gone through this shell game of shoving everything around underneath the shells to the point where nobody can, nobody will know what you have done until after estimates. But the heritage division has sustained cuts in staff and money, and it hasn't all been transferred to parks. It has not all been transferred to parks, and, and, and, and small businesses. There has been a loss of money and a loss of staff.

Every generation, Mr. Speaker, owes it to succeeding generations to preserve something of their life for succeeding generations. One cannot understand history by simply reading. People have to see and touch and feel the history, and that's the area of heritage conservation, and you people are just two short-sighted to see it, just too short-sighted to see it.

The, this province had made significant strides. We had passed the heritage act, and I can tell members opposite, I could tell members opposite that this province received, received accolades suggesting that our heritage act was the best in Canada. I have been at ministerial conferences when I was a minister in which that was said by Conservative provinces who aren't as short-sighted as the government of this province. It was succeeding, and the work of preserving this province's heritage will be retarded, and retarded very severely.

The Museum of Natural History — I'm going to ask the minister to tell us how you're going to increase, how you're going to achieve increasing productivity in the Museum of Natural History. I will tell the member, I will tell the minister opposite how you're going to do it. You simply aren't going to preserve as many artefacts, and it will be simply a holding operation until the public finally get an opportunity to boot you people out of office and return to a sane administration.

Subvote 13 — grants in support of arts, multiculturalism, heritage and museums — down 7 per cent, and it is not apparent who's catching it on the neck, because that includes a wide diversity of people. But I, but I would be surprised if museums, that, that subvote covers small museums and I would be surprised if they were particularly well treated, given your attitude to heritage matters in general. I am going to check in your estimates.

The culture and youth, all of the subvotes had decreases in staff, and I suggest that is very, very short-sighted; that will, that will be detrimental to the sports activity in this province, but I suspect that the sports activity will, I suspect that they will continue.

The people whom it will really shackle is the arts. That is very short-sighted, Mr. Speaker. The goal of the department of culture and youth, in so far as it relates to the cultural side of life, is to strengthen this province's culture and enhance people's awareness of it. People who have an appreciation of their culture have a better idea of where they came from, who they are, and, by far the most important, where they are going. The short-sighted approach which you people have adopted to the, to the department of culture and youth, and the, your short-sightedness in dealing with heritage matters specifically, but cultural matters generally, shows that this government is short-sighted, and I think it goes on and, to show that the Conservative Party has simply no philosophical base.

You people don't want to save the world. You just want to save your hides. And that's what this budget is all about, to save your hides. The, the lack of short-sightedness appears in the Urban Affairs in spades, in spades, in spades. Of the eight subvotes, of the eight subvotes of the Urban Affairs which reflect program delivery, five show staff reductions, and three show no increase. The deepest cuts . . . Where, where would we expect to find the deepest cuts? It'll be in those subvotes which have the least effect at the present and, and to which we'll pay the highest price at some time in the future. They're what I call the future-oriented services.

Municipal management and finance — deletion of four positions. One deletion in emergency measures, emergency measures organization. Two in the urban development. And what would members opposite expect in the area of community planning, given all the minister has had to say about the planning act? There are eight deletions in the area of community planning, eight deletions in the area of community planning.

The minister has repeatedly said that he is, he is in favour of 'streamlining' the planning act to cut the red tape to make it easier for developers. There are, there are, there are, there are two forces at work. One is the community planners whose goal is to enhance community benefit from the property existing within a community. The other is developers whose goal is by and large to maximize profits. This minister has come down clearly on the side of developers and profits, and by so doing you have given short shrift to the interest of the community. And you have shackled, you have shackled and strait-jacketed the community planners. And it's . . . I, I was not at all surprised to see the cuts in community planning, giving, given what you have said about the planning act.

Grants to local authorities. If we thought the . . . I'm keeping a watchful eye on it too, Mr. Minister. You've only got 15 more minutes. I am, I if, if they were irresponsible in the area of the future of our society, they have not only, they have, they have not only been irresponsible themselves but they have sought to pass on the burden of irresponsibility to local authorities and third parties. And I want to, I want to, I want to review those subvote items. And I will do so, and I, and I will do so in just a moment.

But most of those grants are a pale shadow of what they were under the former administration. This government has not only failed to discharge its own responsibilities, you are making it doubly difficult for local authorities and third parties to discharge theirs. And let us just go through the list of grants to local authorities and third parties. Subvote number 9, reduced to one-ninth of what it was, under those

neighbourhood improvement programs. Urban revenue sharing — the minister has said in the urban revenue sharing that you will see, that, that, we will see much of the increase in the area of ambulances. I'll tell you, in this one, I'm from Missouri; I wait to be shown. But I'll pass over that one for the moment.

The minister spent some degree, some weeks travelling around the province listening to a variety of complaints about water and the ability of this province to provide water. What happens to grants for water supply projects pursuant to the water development agreement for regional economic expansion and drought proofing? Cut to one-eighth of what it was.

What have you got against the Meewasin Valley Authority? What . . . Since the minister is from Saskatoon, what do you have against the Meewasin Valley Authority? It has sustained a decrease in its grant of 25 per cent, but it's easy to see that the, that the minister's from Saskatoon, because the poor souls from Moose Jaw, theirs was decreased by 40 per cent — reduced by 40 per cent of what it was.

Grants to Community Planning Association — reduced by 17 per cent. Of course, that's community planning. I would have expected that.

Grants to municipalities and organizations for local studies and research — reduced to a third of what it was.

Grants for municipal transit and transit assistance — reduced by \$200,000. Grants to municipalities for waste treatment pursuant to the Qu'Appelle implementation agreement — reduced to 60 per cent of what it was. Grants to the city of Regina for rail relocation assistance — reduced by 25 per cent.

I just go through these items. You are not only being irresponsible yourself; you are passing on the burden of that irresponsibility. I will not get into the . . . I will not get into the area of consumer and corporate affairs, except to point out that every single subvote item in that department, as well, sustained a decrease in staff. Every single subvote item sustained a decrease in staff.

I want to deal, Mr. Speaker, before time runs out, with the whole area of job creation. It did not take long for the, for the ball of wax which you people tried to wrap up on election night to become unravelled . . .

An Hon. Member: — Budget night.

Mr. Shillington: — Budget night — to become unravelled. As I was driving home, I heard commentators on the provincial, on the commercial media, describing your job creation program in less than flattering terms. It was pointed out, of the 16,000 jobs which would, which you people claim, approximately 10,000 of those jobs would have come on stream in any event — the Nipawin power project, which you had already announced.

Of the remainder . . . Of the, of the, of the remaining 6,000, you had attributed 4,000 to the job creation program. And I want to express my condolences to the member from Meadow Lake because I think the member from Meadow Lake must have made the Premier very, very angry to have been made responsible for this program because it is a boar's nest. It is going to be a boar's nest. This program is simply incapable of proper

administration. Ask the Attorney General. Ask the Attorney General, who was part of the former Liberal government. They had problems in spades with a similar program. I think, Mr. Attorney General, it was called the PEP (positive economic program) program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, he has since learned the error of his ways, I gather. Has he? He may have learned the errors of his ways. He's still, apparently introducing programs which you can't administer. You can't administer it. You can't administer it. I say to members opposite, because it is virtually impossible to control abuses.

First of all . . . Stay with you for the moment. Yes, you may go. The, the . . . Ah, welcome to the member from Meadow Lake. You missed my, you missed my condolences. You must . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You were sitting at the back, were you? Well, I'm glad you, I'm glad you took your seat.

This program is simply going to be incapable of administration. There will be abuses. The abuses will be impossible to control. Anyone who suggests . . . Anyone who suggests that they will not hasn't been there. I heard the, I, I, I heard the Minister of Education suggest that his program, which is somewhat similar . . . There wouldn't be any abuses to it because people wouldn't cheat. I say that that simply has not been the history of these programs.

The Liberal government, which introduced the PEP (positive economic program), program and the former NDP administration, which introduced a STEP (student employment program), program found out what, what happens when you try to pay people to hire people. What happens is that you cannot control the abuses. Farmers, instead of hiring their own sons — and there's nothing unique about farmers; everybody gets in on the act — farmers, instead of hiring their own sons, hire somebody else's son. Then, of course, they don't work on the neighbour's farm. They work on their own, but nobody ever knows.

And you are going to have abuses, Mr. Minister, coming out your ears with a, with a program that is as rich as this. It is a rich program. Of the \$5,000 . . . For \$5,000 you are, you are going, you are going to encourage ingenuity in, in trying to find ways around this program, and you're, you're going to get it. Unfortunately, if the, if the benefits of all this were, were going to, going to small businesses and those who needed it, I would not be so critical, but that is not what is going to happen.

An Hon. Member: — How do you know?

Mr. Shillington: — Because, because it is a tax deduction; that's why we know. You have said, you have said that you can only claim this by virtue of a tax deduction, and you incur \$5,000 tax, Saskatchewan tax, leaves you with a pretty, must leave you with a pretty high, a pretty high net income. I can tell you that there aren't any businesses . . . None of the, none of the corner grocery stores in my riding, I suspect, are going to be able to claim under, under this program. I suspect they're not going to be able to claim under this program.

One . . . I, I was, I was, I was interested in your statement, Mr. Minister that you, that this program had been received with interest. I grant you it has been received by the business community with interest, but not with approval. The business community has been cool; yes, they have been. The business community has been cool to this program because the business community knows what's going to happen. It's just that this program is going to make a mockery out of job creation. And I do feel . . . I'm, I'm going

to leave the subject by again expressing my condolences, Mr. Minister, your luck has ran out; your luck has run out.

I want to deal finally, Mr. Speaker, with the, with the suggestion, with the, with the very suggestion that this, this deficit was, arose because of an attempt to create jobs. Let's just look, let's just look at who's getting the money created by the deficit: \$66 million worth of the deficit going in interest payments to banks and bond dealers. I'm going to ask someone to explain to me how many jobs that creates in Saskatchewan.

Another 130 million worth of this deficit is in the form of lost oil revenue, much of which can be attributed to the Devine government's tax cuts that the big oil companies introduced last summer. Another 120 million is lost potash revenue, much of which can be contributed, attributed to your decision to reduce the share of PCS in the market.

And, finally, there's the millions of dollars a year, millions of dollars a year given to interprovincial trucking companies, like CP Transport, through the elimination of the road tax on gasoline. When you add up all that lost revenue, you can see that this record deficit is not the result of a government effort to create jobs; rather it is the result of government give-aways, often to large corporations which can afford to pay more.

Mr. Speaker, one's criticism of this budget could continue almost indefinitely. It is so full of, full of so many flaws. I do, however, have a, some practical limits on my time, and I'm therefore going to conclude by moving an amendment to the motion. I will move, seconded by the member from Athabasca that . . . member from Cumberland, thank you . . . that all words after 'That' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

That this Assembly express its shock and dismay with the budget because: (1) it . . .

. . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I recognize there will be few who will see it realistically and honestly.

That this Assembly express its shock and dismay with the budget because: (1) it contains the largest deficit in the 78-year history of this province, \$317 million; (2) coupled with the deficit in 1982-83, the Government of Saskatchewan is now more than half a billion dollars in the red; (3) this record deficits, these record deficits are not the result of government efforts to create jobs, but rather the result of government give-aways to big oil companies, to American-based private potash companies and to interprovincial truckers such as CP; (4) it offers a totally inadequate job-creation response at a time when unemployment is at its highest level in Saskatchewan since the Great Depression; (5) it contains no assistance to Saskatchewan farmers to deal with their worsening job-price squeeze, with the worsening cost-price squeeze; (6) it contains no economic development plan for the people of northern Saskatchewan; (7) it contains savage cuts in needed government services for thousands of Saskatchewan people.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.