

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 2, 1982

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. KLEIN: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, some 18 young people from the constituency of Regina North sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They are grade 8 students from St. Philip School. They are accompanied here today by their teacher, Glen Thompson, and their chaperone, Mr. Brodner. Hopefully, they will find their visit to the legislature here today informational and educational. I look forward to meeting with them a little later, and determining how they enjoyed our question period. I ask all members to join me in welcoming them to this Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MARTENS: — It is my privilege to introduce to the Assembly a group of grade 8 students from the school at Wymark. Wymark is a rural school, and surrounding the school is some of the best agricultural land in the province, and it's located just south of Swift Current along the No. 4 Highway. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. John Wall. Their trip to Regina includes a visit to the university, RCMP barracks, Museum of Natural History, and Agribition. I would like to have this Assembly join me, thanking them for coming and hoping their visit there will be both entertaining and education.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Access to Legislative Building

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of government services. The minister will be aware that today there was a peaceful demonstration in the Legislative Building. A number of workers, about 200, were here to protest the government's lack of job creation and wage restraint program. My question to the minister is not . . . Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is not directing dealing with the wage restraint program, or the lack of job creation, but in fact is dealing with the restraint that was placed on these workers in coming into the building. There were a number of chains up with police watching so that the people in this protest movement could not come into the rotunda of the building. I was wondering if the minister could inform the Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan if this is a new procedure or policy change in the department, and whether or not the Speaker was involved in this or was involved in the change of policy, and if she can inform the people of Saskatchewan if this is the new open government that we can expect, if this is the kind of policy we can expect in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, this is the very same matter that the hon. member phoned me about at 1:30 this afternoon. I'd be glad to expand on it. It is a new policy but is mainly a safety policy. As a result, I don't think the demonstrators were restrained in any way. They were informed of the new rules put into place.

As a result of a study done by my department in July, my Department of Government Services (but particularly the architecture and engineering branch), some very major concerns were subsequently raised after we had had quite a large demonstration here. Using the 1912 plans of the building, they found that the live-load capacity and the potential capacity did not meet today's standards. We, as a government, will not leave ourselves open to the type of tragedy that happened at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in the States earlier on this year. That is exactly the potential we have here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, there was a second part to the question. I had asked whether or not the Speaker's office had been involved and consulted on this change of policy. Another question that I would like to ask the minister is whether or not the report that you are referring to was a public report, whether or not there was any input from actual design people and who they were. You refer to them, but no one, I'm sure, knows who they were. Can you inform this Assembly whether that report is available and whether you will get a copy to me?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I think I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in my telephone call to him at 1:30, that I would be sending him over the policy guidelines. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I have been advised that the Speaker, the Clerk, and various other officials were consulted and the new policy was worked out.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting response. We called the Speaker's office at about 1:30 today. They informed us that there was no consultation taking place, hadn't been before the policy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I'd like to quote to you from Beauchesne's, no 365, and it says:

No questions of any sort may be addressed to the Speaker. If information relating to matters under the jurisdiction of the Speaker is required, it must be obtained privately.

So I would ask you, if you have questions concerning the operation of my department that you come to me in person.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, exactly the point that I was referring to. I did go to the Speaker's office in advance of asking that question. I did get a response from the Speaker's office in which they informed me that there was no consultation.

I am not asking a question of the Speaker; I'm asking a question of the minister. You referred to me not one minute ago — two minutes ago — that you had consulted the Speaker's office and I want to know now whether or not you have consulted the Speaker's office.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I indicated to you that I have been advised by my department

that in working out the new policy, I believe, the Clerk's office was involved, and the Speaker was advised of what was happening, along with various other officials. I believe EMO was in on it too. These discussions took place over the course of the summer months.

Now, I can tell the hon. member opposite that this building was designed in 1912. According to specifications that were in place at that time, a study done by the architectural and engineering department of my Department of Government Services indicates that no more than 240 people can safely be on the large step areas, and no more than 485 person in the rotunda area. The rotunda railing does not meet today's specifications either' it's not high enough, and if you get a large group of people even in that area, there is the danger that someone might be pushed over. As far as I'm concerned, its paramount that the safety, not only of the demonstrators, who have access to the building and will continue to have access to the building in an orderly fashion . . . We are concerned with the safety of the occupants also of the building.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister informed us in her last answer that members of her staff and department had told her that they had consulted the Speaker's office. I would like to know if she would not give the name of he member of her staff who had informed her of that.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, things that go on in my department are transmitted to me by my deputy minister.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting change in policy where all of a sudden after almost 100 years the Legislative Building of Saskatchewan is now unsafe.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know is whether or not the people of Saskatchewan can intend to come to this building freely as we have in the past, or whether or not we will be seeing the same type of treatment, in particular of labor unions, as goes on in Poland with the Solidarity, where the government controls them when they attempt to come into this building.

What I would like to know is whether or not on opening day of the next session, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether or not on the opening day of the next session these same regulations will apply from the Speaker's office and from the Minister of Government Services.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, we were informed that we could expect up to 1,500 people here today, and when my department officials indicate to me that only 485 people can safely be held in the outer area — in the rotunda — I think it is incumbent upon us to take the necessary precautions. I can also indicate to the member that during the budget debate there were spaces in here for 350 people, and nowhere near does that add up to 485 people.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, the answer that I received for the last question I didn't quite understand. I had asked about the opening of the next session: whether or not the minister would apply the same regulations to the public at large as she applied to the unions who were involved in the protest today.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Yes or no? If we can be assured that there won't be more than 485 people congregated in the outer are, Mr. Speaker, of course they will have access

to the building, just as the demonstrators had access to the building. They were informed prior to their coming what the new rules were, and there was no flak raised at that time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Government Services. I understand she indicated that the number in the demonstration was something less than 485. Obviously some people from her department were on hand. Did they take the opportunity immediately to remove the chains and did people get access to the building which they have always had, in view of the fact that the number could pose no threat whatever?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, I have not been downstairs yet. I was in to a treasury board meeting at 9 o'clock this morning and went down for dinner at about 12.20; I then went to a caucus meeting. I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that the barriers were taken down.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It was reasonably obvious what I meant, and I'll ask again: when it was clear that the numbers in the demonstration were well under the numbers which apparently now threaten of this building, but have not in the past, when I have seen many more than that there; when it was clear that there were not that number, did your staff, who were on hand in numbers, remove the chains so that people had the normal access to the building, which they have always had?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, they weren't, because the agreement reached with the marshals of the demonstration proposed that they would meet with the Minister of Finance in that area, so we just left them up.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Government Services. Coming into the building today I noticed that there were a number of police involved in this operation of chaining off the building. I am wondering whether or not consideration was given to their weight in numbers, in all this concern they have about the safety of the building.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the member's absolutely ludicrous question. I would say what he is suggesting is that this government forego safety measures and forget about the safety of the people who are coming to demonstrate. I think it is a responsible action on the part of my department officials to become cognizant of the fact that there is a danger out there and to communicate it to me and for us, in turn to communicate it to others.

If they had been in government, it is obvious that they would have disregarded, absolutely disregarded, the recommendations of the people who know, the people who work in those departments. They would have disregarded them and potentially we could have had a disaster here, such as happened at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in the United States not too long ago, where over 100 people were killed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. The

question was dealing with the number of police involved in controlling this group of peaceful demonstrators, who, as I mentioned, were demonstrating against wage controls as well as the lack of job creation. But what I would like to know is: if you're talking about the safety of the people in terms of the weight involved what was the role of the police in protecting them in that way?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the police were probably called in, and I don't know this for a fact, but I would assume they were called in because we were led to believe that there would be 1,500 people here. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that after speaking with the Minister of Finance the demonstrators, who were very peaceful, were invited to talk to him further and they said, "No. We want to get back to Moose Jaw so we can help get the economy of this province going again."

Wage Controls

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I wonder if might, Mr. Speaker, move from what I consider a gross breach of the privileges of this House in restricting access of demonstrators to it, to a question of the substance of what was said to those demonstrators. And as the Minister of Finance has anticipated it is a question directed to him. The 6/5 program and its offshoot were announced as a means of fighting inflation. Members of this caucus have been saying that it has nothing to do with fighting inflation. We've been saying it has a good deal more to do with controlling the sea of red ink, which the member has unleashed on the province. It's an attempt to control expenditures, and to cut out a single segment of the population to assist you in controlling your budget is unfair and unjust. And I was astounded to hear the Minister of Finance tell the demonstrators that.

MR. SPEAKER: — Does the hon. member have a question? This is not the time for speeches but rather a time for asking questions.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — My question is: will you now admit that inflation minus one, 6/5, whatever it's called, will you now admit that that program has nothing to do with fighting inflation and everything to do with you controlling your expenditures.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I suppose one has to look at the total question of inflation, that's many elements. Our view is that perhaps the cost of government, the resulting increased revenues by way of taxation, etc., is a part of what happens that creates inflation. So obviously if you're going to control inflation, government, every bit as much as the individual of the businessman or everybody else, has to play their part. And what we are doing in regard to our wage restraint program, Mr. Speaker is trying to control and manage the cost of government. We believe we brought in a program that is superior to any one in other jurisdictions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Unlike the province of Quebec, we have not asked the employees of the province of Saskatchewan to take a cut or a roll back in their salary. Unlike the province of Ontario, we have not brought in a 5 per cent guideline or eliminated the right to strike for a period of a year. We've brought in a program that basically says government is also responsible for inflation. We will tie our program to the success of inflation. If we don't make inflation come down, Mr. Speaker, then we aren't going to turn that on the backs of the workers and their salaries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that inflation is an important part, how we fight inflation is an important part with regard to our guidelines, and I believe even the federation of labor in Saskatchewan has indicated that our system is probably the fairest across the land.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, a speech is one thing; a sermon is quite another . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Just as soon as I can hear anything besides the members opposite trying to out shout me, I'll ask my supplementary.

How can even a Conservative think it fair that you balance your budget at the expense of one segment of the economy. How can that possibly strike you as being fair?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't suggest that we were trying to balance our budget. In fact, I think last week we brought in a deficit of \$220 million, and we heard the cheers and the shouts of the people opposite. "Oh, we can't have a deficit. We can't have a deficit." Now they're suggesting, when 55 per cent of the total cost of government is personnel related, that we should somehow control the cost of salaries, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to control government expenditures, obviously that has to be one element of it.

You can approach that in two ways, Mr. Speaker. You can have everybody take a little bit less, or you can have others take a lot more, and then cut off programs, cut off employees. Our view, Mr. Speaker, is job security is far more important as to whether the person gets a 15 per cent increase or a 7 per cent increase. By and large, I think, the workers out there support that type of program and see job security as far more important as to the level of increase of salary.

New President of SGI

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who, as we know, is off in Europe selling our coal, steel and potash. My question is this: has the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office engaged a new president, and what is his salary?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I would defer that question to the Attorney General who also sits on the board of SGI.

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, SGI has retained as its new president Mr. Donald Wayne Black, whose present position is president and chief operating officer of Houston Willoughby.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the question: what is the salary or remuneration to be paid to Mr. Black?

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, we will have further information as to the salary; the basic salary is \$75,000. We will be advising the Assembly, probably next spring, as to what the remuneration package for all CEOs is and tabling that in the Assembly. But the basic salary is \$75,000 and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in our letter of committal to Mr. Black, we made it clear that the Government of Saskatchewan retained the right to release the salary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Acting President of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Have you an acting president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and what is his salary, and is it higher or lower than the salary of the previous incumbent?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, yes we do have an acting president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. His salary is the same as when he was vice-president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. President, Mr. Minister, do you deny that his salary is higher than that of the previous incumbent, or admit?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, his salary is lower than the president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's was, the previous one.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Would you mind giving me the salary of the previous incumbent and the salary of the present, incumbent?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I can't see how the vice-president of mining had a higher salary than the president had, and there has been no negotiation on his salary since taking over the acting president's job.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I was not asking what the minister can see, I was asking him whether or not he agrees that the salary of the present incumbent is in fact higher than the salary of the previous incumbent.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I just finished saying that is' lower. We haven't changed it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, once again: I did not ask the minister whether he has changed it. I asked him whether it was higher or lower. He said it was lower. I asked him then to give me the figures. He has declined to do so. Would you kindly, sir, give me the figures for the salary of the previous incumbent and the salary of the present incumbent?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, all I know is that the salary of the former president was \$140,000 a year plus benefits. The vice-presidents' salaries are lower. We have not even talked or negotiated salary with the vice-president of mines.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Minister, for the record then, for the record I am asking the minister: is he advising this House that the salary of the present president of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is less than \$140,000 a year?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take note of the question, and I'll bring you the exact figure.

Control of Expenditure in Department of Finance

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, I wonder if we could get a similar bit of honesty from the

Department of Finance. The minister talked about the need for control of expenditures. I wish you could control some of the members on your own side so you could hear me. The minister talked about the need to control expenditures. May I ask you if you were able to control the expenditures in your own department? Did the number of person-years remain the same? Did the average salary of the employees in your department remain the same? I suggest they went up dramatically.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Are we into estimates? Mr. Speaker, I could undertake to answer that type of questions in estimates. I don't know what all the people in my office are paid. I can advise you with regard to any senior officials within my department that there has been no salary increase since we have taken office. They are the same ones that were in existence prior to that. Anything other than that, Mr. Speaker, would be adjustments with regard to the agreement, with regard to the union contract, and how they then filtered through the rest of the. But what type of question I would certainly be prepared to answer when estimates come and when the officials are here and can give you exact details.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Can the minister name a single executive assistant employed by this government who is making within 10 per cent of what the EA in the minister's office made before March 31, 1981? Can you name a single EA who is making anywhere near the same amount as that they made under our government?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, obviously that type of information I don't have at my disposal. Although I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of the people that we've brought . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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 committee of finance, and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Koskie.

MR. MEAGHER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is an adage often used facetiously to illustrate a contradiction in many of us as we go about our pilgrimage through life. It is: humble and proud of it. While it may appear contradictory, it does, I hope convey to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the members of this House, the people in my constituency, and the people of Saskatchewan my sincere sentiments as I speak for the first time as the member for the historic constituency of Prince Albert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — I am greatly humbled by both the responsibility and privilege placed in me by the people of Prince Albert. I am honored when I look about this great cathedral of democracy and think about some of the past members for Prince Albert who have contributed so much to the political traditions of Saskatchewan. It is also, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pride that I represent Prince Albert as a Progressive

Conservative member of this Assembly. Prince Albert is a community with a political tradition unique in Saskatchewan, and indeed, in all of Canada. It has been represented in Ottawa by three prime ministers, the most recent being a man who I have had the honor and privilege of knowing and working with, who has been an inspiration to me since my childhood and the singular reason for my being a proud member of the Progressive Conservative party. I refer of course to the late, great Right Hon. John Diefenbaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker, speaking to the House of Commons on July 1, 1960 said:

I am a Canadian, a free Canadian, free to speak without fear; free to worship God in my own way; free to stand for what I think right; free to choose those who shall govern my country. This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold for myself and all mankind.

That was an inspiration to me then, Mr. Speaker, and as a proud Progressive Conservative member of this legislature, I am proud of the team under the leadership of Premier Grant Devine. It is an inspiration to me now.

The new direction to the province of Saskatchewan has taken as a result of last April's overwhelming rejection of the socialist disease that has so crippled the initiative and spirit of the people of Saskatchewan is being watched by all in Canada, and indeed, around the world.

We have been given an opportunity like no other to show moral, spiritual and economic leadership. We and will, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate that our heritage of freedom and free enterprise which built this province will be restored and upheld, not just for ourselves, but as a beacon for the rest of Canada, and indeed, all freedom loving people everywhere.

While this, Mr. Speaker, is my first opportunity to speak in this Assembly as the member for Prince Albert, I have in fact been elected since April 26, but by virtue of some legal manoeuvring by my NDP opposition, I am giving the unusual distinction of having been declared elected four times before ever taking my seat in this House. I was declared elected on the night of the general election and immediately dubbed by the Prince Albert press as "Landslide Paul," a title I inherited from Dave Steuart, the last elected Liberal in Prince Albert who has since retired to the Senate.

My opposition suggested the results could be overturned by the hospital vote so upon completion of the official count I was declared elected again. Then on the last possible day the NDP asked for a judicial recount. As a result of that recount, I was declared elected again. My election was no relegated to the second page as old news. By this time, Mr. Speaker, almost everyone in Prince Albert hoped the election in Prince Albert was finally over, and that the member for Prince Albert could take his seat in the first session of the twentieth legislature.

Alas, that wasn't to be. The NDP appealed the judicial recount on four votes, Mr. Speaker. Had that appeal been successful, the four votes counted and all of them been NDP . . . You are not able to overturn a 26-vote plurality with four votes unless they intend to apply some sort of socialist math the way that they do to their budgets and make four in 26 the way they show millions of dollars in any empty heritage fund.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the people of Prince Albert were beginning to suspect the

NDP were misusing the judicial process simply to stall and deny them representation in the legislature, a performance they are about to pay dearly for in the upcoming by-election in Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the court of appeal not only denied the appeal but assessed the costs to the NDP and I was declared elected again. There hadn't been an election in Prince Albert for a few months so it was back to front page news.

After being declared elected four times I began to feel like a veteran before ever entering this Assembly.

During last April's election campaign I was supplied with some documents and other material by conscientious civil servants in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan who were disgusted by what appeared to be at very best a grossly mismanaged program in economic development, or worse a scandalously fraudulent attempt by the NPD to buy votes in northern Saskatchewan and at the same time, place many of the people in the North under tyranny of debt to the NDP bureaucracy.

I raised this issue of mismanagement in DNS and realized that I had indeed struck a nerve in the NDP. The then minister, Jerry Hammersmith, who I regret is no longer with us, responded with a typically socialist defence. He accused me of being a racist, and of attacking the integrity of northern and native people, completely avoiding the question of the incredible fraud of the economic development of what northern Saskatchewan had become.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the voters of Prince Albert were not fooled this time. For years they had seen millions of dollars pumped into northern Saskatchewan in the name of economic development. But where was the economic development? Where was there even a sign that funds were being directed toward viable projects and enterprises that would genuinely benefit the northern people by establishing a last economic base? I couldn't see it; the people of Prince Albert couldn't see it.

So then what had been developed in northern Saskatchewan by the economic development fund? Let me answer that. What had developed was a scandalous system of political pay-offs, designated to perpetuate the popularity of the New Democratic Party in northern Saskatchewan. What had developed was a system based not on sound management principles, but based on high-level political interference. Simply stated: vote buying. What had developed, Mr. Speaker, was a dependence on the provincial government: government loans, government grants, government subsidies. A deliberate socialist experiment, designed not to enhance the independence and skills of the northern people, but to gather the people under the government's wing. Now if that isn't a lesson in political hypocrisy, I don't know what is. The people of northern Saskatchewan were promised economic development, but what they were given was a ball and chain. They were in effect slaves in their own land, slaves to the then provincial government, slaves to the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you and to this Assembly that the former government's short-sighted approach to economic development has caused the problems that the North finds itself in today. A plan based on a four-year horizon is not good enough. Playing politics with the economy of a region blessed with an abundance of resources, and a dedicated people, is despicable and it reflects on the philosophy of that party there in

the corner — that party that once formed the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, some Northerners took advantage of the programs, and through good times and bad have labored to retire their debts. They are, unfortunately, too few. Those who listened to the purveyors of economic development loans have been the victims of a socialist experiment of a degrading nature. Against the judgment of professional loan officers, many of these people were placed in a financial state that removed their independence and replaced it with a sort of fiscal slavery.

From 1973 till 1982, Mr. Speaker, over 400 commercial loans were made, totalling about \$12.7 million. In August 1982, the books show \$7.2 million still outstanding. That means that about 56 per cent of money loaned for as long as nine years remains unpaid. There are among these cases many which are sad tales of people who in all that time have not been able to retire a single dollar of the principal. They are buried, Mr. Speaker, in a hole dug for them by the previous administration upon whom they had become dependent.

I have not yet addressed the rest of this appalling situation. Even a cursory examination of the record shows loans made with no security, totally non-viable projects encouraged by the easy-money tactics of our predecessors in office.

A responsible banker, whose business it is to loan money and wants to write all the loan business he can, finds that he must say no to many requests. He must in fact say no because it is in the best interests of all involved. He realizes, Mr. Speaker, that projects must be viable and it is his job to determine whether or not each case merits action. That has not been the case in our North. In fact it seems these things were just the opposite. The abuse of trust in the administration of the commercial loans fund meant saying yes far more often on election years, regardless of potential to retire the loan, regardless of any reasonable date of maturity of the loan, regardless of the dire future consequences to the Northerners who took the loan, and regardless of the costs, past, present, and future, to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

There are lists of statistics on this scandalous situation and they are endlessly depressing. I shall give a few examples in a moment, but first let me share with you an observation. In scanning a list of the number of loans made each year, one notes that a significant peak is reached in 1975 — an election year. Suddenly the number of loans written drops notably, only to peak even higher in the next election year — 1978. The question must be asked: was someone trying to buy votes?

Let me examine a sample of two of the so-called economic development. In May 1976, an individual was loaned \$150,000 to expand his business. Well, Mr. Speaker, after that expansion, and more than six years later, this individual has managed to pay enough so that the balance outstanding on his principal is \$148,879.44. In six full calendar years that principal was reduced by a paltry \$1,120.56. Where is viability; where is accountability?

Let's examine a smaller loan. Another individual, in October 1974, borrowed \$6,000 to purchase a taxicab. In August 1982, eight years later, he owed (as you might have guessed) \$6,000 — a sad record of no accountability and no viability.

A third example, in this case a project one would have to question as vital to northern development — a pool hall, Mr. Speaker. The loan of \$13,269 was made in December, 1977. In August 1982, the outstanding balance was \$11,936. Apparently, the people

of the North could not have wanted a pool hall if only \$1,333 could be paid in five years.

There are far too many others; in 1976, a café project — \$56, 674, outstanding balance, \$56,674; in 1978, a clothing store — \$9,600, outstanding balance, \$9,600. As I have said, there was a scandalous case of gross mismanagement, and worse, as two fraud convictions have clearly shown Time and time again, for projects that may or many not have been desirable to Northerners, today's balance is exactly the amount of the original loan.

Fiscal responsibility as a keystone of business seems to be a concept that eluded the former government entirely. If they cannot accept that statement, they must then admit to purposely deluding the people of northern Saskatchewan, and to attempting to ensure the perpetual dependence through massive indebtedness of those very people. The message I would like the people of the North to receive is that they need no longer look over their shoulders with apprehension as they deal with the Government of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — The message is clear. It has been shouted across the nation and abroad: Saskatchewan is open for business. It is open for business that is fiscally responsible, for projects that are viable and for people and businesses that want to be strong and independent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — The first important steps have been taken, Mr. Speaker. This government recognizes the unique problems of the North and the need for real development, both economic and social. We began immediately with the freezing of these scandalously mismanaged loan funds to stop the abuse of trust.

The new Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, the Hon. George McLeod, assures me that his department has been and continues to undergo a realignment designed to eliminate duplication of services and of bureaucracy. The economic development strategies are being redesigned in a positive and efficient manner and the old programs will continue as a stopgap only until they can be replaced with well thought out, positive programs that will indeed serve the people of the province, not make them slaves to fiscal irresponsibility

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of the new team under the leadership of Premier Grant Devine — a new government that has already demonstrated, not just to northern Saskatchewan, but to the rest of the province and indeed all mankind, that honest, integrity and common sense have not perished in the province of Saskatchewan. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KLEIN: — Out of respect to the House I'll keep my feet on the floor, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join in with the Leader of the Opposition, as he did last Friday, in congratulating our Minister of Finance for a budget delivered with vigor. However, the Leader of the Opposition also said that the minister did very well considering the difficult material that he had to deal with. Mr. Speaker, our minister did much better

than very well. He has done a masterful redirection of governmental expenditures that were grossly underestimated, coupled with maximizing the use of revenues that were extremely inaccurate — revenues and expenditures, Mr. Speaker, estimated by the past NDP administration whether the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone wants to admit it or not. I have no hesitation in saying estimates not at all within the realm of reality. They really lost touch with reality, their estimates, as well as with the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there is famous old song known to most with the familiar title of "What a Difference a Day Makes." I suppose that in the world of politics the same principle may be used with the words "What a Difference a Decade Makes." The living proof of this analogy comes from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is beyond my comprehension how he can stand before this Assembly, displaying his usual wit and eloquence, while condemning our government, a government, Mr. Speaker, that will prove to be viable and effective, a government of the people, listening to the people and working for the people's needs.

In his budget address some 10 years ago, he gleefully gloated over his newly won mandate and indicated how his party offered the people of this province a clearly outlined program. From that very first moment the seeds of doubt were already in place, indicating that our province would be dictated to the in the manner that they, the socialist, saw fit, and not governed by listening to the people and providing a government that was responsible to the people.

Mr. Speaker, he promised a new deal for people but he didn't tell them then that he planned on dealing from the bottom of the deck. Further, he has the audacity to stand before this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and condemn our government for lack of job creation, as well as the state of unemployment.

This, in spite of our new youth employment program recently announced by our Minister of Culture and Youth, and the job creation funding announced the other day by our social services minister, coupled with the fact that Saskatchewan has the lowest rate of unemployment of any province in the country. All this, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that our government has been in power for only a short seven months.

Yet, last spring, what did you people offer? What did you have in place for this summer? Nothing, but you don't mention that. You don't mention the fact that in the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but you don't mention that. You don't mention the fact that in the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's budget of 1972, when he referred to unemployment and inflation, he said, and I quote: "We look to the federal government for leadership in meeting this challenge." Quite a statement, "looking to the feds."

Our government, Mr. Speaker, although we recognize the federal government does contribute dramatically to the overall spectrum, doesn't look to the feds for leadership. Our government feels that we can effectively contribute to both of those problems on a provincial level, and thereby assist the people and citizens of this province in their fight.

There is no question that the removal of the gasoline tax by our government effectively contributed to that end, while the people of our province enjoy the lowest rate of inflation in our country.

Other programs that we have implemented such as the mortgage interest reduction plan, have also contributed significantly to helping our people. This is so good that it is presently being copied across this nation.

However, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that problems remain in both of those areas, and therefore, we will continue setting about the task of further improvement on both of those problems. In spite of our present excellent statistics compared to other provinces, we strive for even greater improvement.

Again in 1972, the opposition leader indicated that he learned how unreal the budget presented by his prior administration was. Also by his admittance, that was almost 12 months after the presentation of that budget. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that it only took our government some very few short months to determine how unreal our prior administration's budget was. How the hon. members opposite predicted a \$200 million surplus when in fact, if we had done nothing at all but operate this government in the same stale socialistic manner, it would have provided the people of our province with an almost \$200 million deficit. And yet they stand before us and disclaim any responsibility.

None the less our administration did not sit idly by. We grasped the situation and recognized the sad state of affairs that they really left us in, and slowly, with careful cautious optimism proceeded through the web of mysteriousness that they had created. In spite of it all we were still able to provide our people with the single largest tax cut in the history of our province.

We were still able to provide our people with the great Canadian dream of owning their own home. And soon, Mr. Speaker, we will introduce our farm purchase program which will immediately stop the stagnation of our rural population.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KLEIN: — Further, Mr. Speaker, it will rid our agricultural sector of one of the worst schemes cast upon our people, that of state-owned farms.

A decade ago the NDP promise of continued operation and expansion of crown corporations was made. Well, they operated these families of crowns regardless of the cost to our people. They expanded the growth of the public sector to the point where now almost one-half of our entire annual budget is destined as pay roll. We have an unprecedeted record high level of numbers of civil servants and accompanying costs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our government will not promote further expansion of these crowns. However, there is no question that we will promote professionalism and productivity from within the ranks of our civil servants. We want these employees to be happy and proud of their association with our government.

Further, there is no question that we will promote and encourage expansion of our resources through the private sector, and not through the public purse. It is not our intention to nationalize existing industries, such as the opposition did to the potash industry during their reckless term as government.

We will not introduce and fund new departments such as their miserable attempt that ended in total failure — their human resources development agency, or other extremely serious failure, such as the Department of Northern Saskatchewan our government is presently in the process of dismantling, and not with cries of outrage from the people, but rather with support and encouragement as we seek to administer the public purse properly, without waste and mismanagement.

Our government, Mr. Speaker, will promote the development of tourism and its associated service industries through the private sector, items such as the recently announced venture near Regina of a major waterslide down by private enterprise. They didn't like that announcement, but it was a lot better than the stunt like a wave-making machine that was promoted by the members opposite as tourist attraction for this province to invest money in.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that our government will continue its policy of studies and listening to people, rather than being pushed or humiliated by the opposition into speedy irrational decisions that will not achieve what is right and proper for our people.

And again, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the Leader of the Opposition condemns our practice, it was he who in 1972 made the same observations to his opposition at that time. Yes, as I mentioned earlier, what a difference a day makes; what a difference a decade makes.

Mr. Speaker, as we progress through our committee of finance and the estimates, it will be come very clear that we have not cut spending overall, as is stated, but in fact you will see that our spending has increased.

It will also be determined that through careful, cautious measures we were able to successfully reduce expenditures, and yet without significant program cuts that were not in the best interests of our citizens. Our Minister of Finance will and has restored confidence to this province and stimulated our economy by returned to the people what rightfully belongs to them.

As pointed out by our Minister of Finance, although Saskatchewan is not recession proof we will and display a strong resistance to it. There is no question that time will determine the success of our newly announced job creation programs. And while admittedly unemployment across this nation will remain high, our province is expected to remain with the lowest rate of unemployment in Canada. Time will also dictate the success this government will enjoy in bringing Saskatchewan health care to number one in Canada.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that all of those programs will fall into place and will be accomplished. No longer will the family of crown corporations be supplied with huge spending allotments to satisfy their enormous appetites as was done in the past. Rather, the public purse will be returned to the people to properly supply for their needs and wants, not only in the field of health but in other areas as well.

Mr. Speaker, it also disturbs me greatly to hear our Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as well as the others members opposite, condemn our social assistance program expenditures. Do they have no compassion? Do they not recognize that in spite of all the abundance of wealth that this province holds, we still have the unfortunate in our midst? Mr. Speaker, while we set about the task of self-sufficiency for all, there was no question that we also recognize the assistance required by these unfortunate few within our province. And the opposition should be ashamed of their attitude in condemning us while we try to assist those in need to re-establish themselves.

We are indeed very proud, Mr. Speaker, of our record to date. There is absolutely no question that the people of our fine province of Saskatchewan share in this pride with us. Our accomplishments during our short administration thus far have been well

received by the people who placed their confidence in us last April. And further, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that our record will continue to improve, and not in our eyes, but rather in the eyes of the electorate. We will not operate this government and administration the way we want but rather the way our people want.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a day makes. What a difference a decade makes. We look forward to completing our first decade of serious, responsible and attentive service to our people. There is absolute no question. I support this Devine government, our Minister of Finance and his newly aligned budget. Thank you.

MR. PARKER: — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise in the House today and participate in this important debate. I feel its' important because it's the first honest, open budget tabled in this legislature for decades. My congratulations to the Finance minister for his ability to take a document which shouldn't have escaped the shredder and add to it the ingredients it lacked, namely, realism and honest. The resulting document has been accepted overwhelming by the people of Saskatchewan just as they overwhelmingly accepted the Progressive Conservative Party on April 26.

With respect to the contents of the revision, it's refreshing to note substantial increases in spending, particularly opposite health care, social services and education. I think its quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, to the members on this side of the House and to the people of Saskatchewan that it was impossible to have an honest budget that would be other than deficit. It's also obvious to everyone else in Saskatchewan that the previous NDP budget was balanced, but on paper only. Let's take a look at the reasons.

While a recession was creeping across the country it went unnoticed because the previous administration didn't feel it. Their heads were buried — buried in their sandbox of crown corporations. So why did the people of Saskatchewan get stung by the recession while the government did nothing? Because they had a hedge. They had the heritage fund. They couldn't understand what all the fuss was about. So while the sandbox gang were enjoying growth within themselves, the real families of people were as usual being ignored and paying the price.

Mr. Speaker, if the former premier had the foresight to put aside even a portion of the heritage fund for a rainy day there would be no deficit budget today. So when he was busy running around a couple of days before the budget speech trying to convince at least the members of the immediate families of his party that the budget would be a deficit, they all anticipated that. They, as well as everyone in Saskatchewan, anticipated that when they voted on April 16. So really all the former premier was doing was reconfirming in the minds of the public that the heritage fund was gone.

Our hedge against recession — at least what we, the taxpayers of the province, the ordinary citizens of the province, though was our heritage fund — was gone. I guess the message was never conveyed to the public the way the former premier intended it. That message has been documented loud and clear. The heritage fund was not intended for the average person. It was designed as a fund to promote security and growth of the sandbox gang — the crown corporations.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on some of the issues raised earlier this week during the debate. First, I'd like to offer a bouquet to the member for Shaunavon to assist in this leadership profile in the NDP, which is becoming quite commonly known

throughout western Canada and particularly in Saskatchewan as the now disappearing party.

I want to thank the member for his interest in the backbenchers on the government side of the House. We appreciate his assistance in pointing out how we as backbenchers can best achieve results for our constituencies by raising our concerns at caucus. To show our appreciation I offer a suggestion to members opposite.

As you are well aware, you too have a responsibility to your constituencies, and your opportunity to appeal to the cabinet ministers come during question period. Because of this, you assume additional responsibility — responsibility to the press. They anxiously gather, together with swelling galleries, in anticipation of meaningful question concerning important issues. Well, apart from the Leader of the Opposition, the rest of you are bad. I mean bad! It's gotten so bad, once the former premier sits down, the press is starting to go for coffee.

Well, let's take our two northerly members opposite, for example. And let's take the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Now he's a great guy. I mean he's a really great guy. Now if you two members want to get things you need in your constituencies, then tell him what the problem is. And tell him why it's there.

For example, tell him that since April 26 you've experienced an influx of people into your area unlike anything ever before during your 11 years in office. Don't be afraid to tell it like it is. Blame him if you want. Tell him that before his government took office and created this new atmosphere and attitude, you didn't have to worry about anyone moving into your area. Now you have an alarming situation. You require bridges, roads and buses like never before. Maybe throw in some statistics indicating what the population was prior to April 26. Show how it swelled to the enormous level that now causes these problems to surface. The fact that you use a question, plus repeat it with four supplementals, tells us of the sudden alarm, but I'm sure if you explain the causes to the minister properly, he'll gladly listen to you.

What about the upgrader? The smug interjections by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg come from across the floor constantly. But we're not going to give up on the upgrader as a possibility for the Moose Jaw area just yet, although we recognize that it's not nearly as viable a possibility as we were given to believe by your administration prior to the last election. But if we don't get the upgrader in Moose Jaw, one thing the people will have learned is that they now have an honest government that will not lead them to these kinds of false expectation in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PARKER: — Yes, you may be able to sit over there and chuckle at the expense of the citizens of Moose Jaw one more time, as you've done on numerous occasions in the past. Your party's tactic of offering teasing announcements just prior to election has certainly played an important part in getting some of your members re-elected in the past. But I'm afraid those days have gone by. As a well-known adage goes, sure you can fool some of the people most of the time and you can fool most of the people some of the time, but you guys can't fool anybody anymore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PARKER: — The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg might even find in the next

provincial election that the citizens in his constituency might not appreciate having that kind of representation voicing their concerns in the legislature.

The member opposite for Quill Lakes said something earlier this week in the budget debate. But actually, we on this side of the House, as well as, I'm sure, the members opposite, are anxiously waiting to read about it in *Hansard*, to find out exactly what he did say.

The member for Shaunavon and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg keep bringing up the question: what about the Saskatchewan Technical Institute? Well, what about the Saskatchewan Technical Institute? Another example of typical NDP falsehoods. NDP: Notorious Disregard for People.

Remember the announcements? Not likely. That came from the *Moose Jaw Times Herald*, October, 1978:

A \$2.6 million expansion of facilities and an extension of programs at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, starting next year, was announced this morning by John Skoberg, MLA for Moose Jaw North.

And just for the record, that's a former MLA for the NDP.

Well, let's look at what we have so far. A major expansion to start if we assume that 1979 would follow 1978, then it should start in the year 1979. Right? I think any reasonable resident of Moose Jaw should interpret the message to be that way. Well, 1979 came along. 1980 came alone. 1981 came along. No expansion, of course, came along. I quote from the newspaper:

Skoberg, making an announcement on behalf of the Minister of Continuing Education, said the new construction will include 20,000 square feet of classroom and lab space, while an additional 20,000 square feet is required for the driving and heavy equipment training now located on the exhibition grounds. The estimated cost of capital projects is \$2.6 million for the entire 40,000 square feet of new construction — a planned budget of \$2 million starting next year.

That's 1979. Well, I don't know what it was spent on but it wasn't spent on an expansion at the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw.

Skoberg also said that private homes are doing their best to provide accommodation for students but cannot meet the need. He said one of the areas the government is looking at is a student accommodation project similar to those located in university centres.

Another farce.

Then we have an announcement just prior to the next election by the continuing education minister, Doug McArthur. Just prior to the 1982 election we have some crews show up to start, apparently, doing some work on the project that was announced prior to the 1978 election.

So now we've got to throw another plum out to the people of Moose Jaw. Skoberg is resigning. He's not going to run any more as an NDP. He's fed up. I don't blame him.

Now we've got one member that's still there. He's been there 22 years so he's going to try it again. So he announces, in addition to current expansion already under way — and I'm assuming he's talking about the one that was supposed to start three or four years previous — another expansion costing \$5.1 million and providing an additional 250 training spaces. That was the minister of labor. Announcements like you've never seen before. Well, the people of Moose Jaw finally got sick of it and they saw through it and they got rid of both of them.

Just to keep the record straight. I would lie to announce though that there was an expenditure on behalf of the members opposite while they were in administration, and that occurred just about a month or two previous to the last election when the Hon. Mr. Blakeney decided to visit the school. And so just prior to his visit about \$30,000 was spent on ceiling tiles, floor tiles, painting the hallways and bulletin boards in the areas that he was to parade around the school in. so we'd like to thank you very much for those.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote some comments made by a member of the opposition who sits in the legislature (not right now he doesn't). His comments are, and this comes as a member of the government's side, criticizing comments made by the then opposition to a budget speech that had just been tabled in the legislature.

And I quote:

In many cases they are the things which a few months ago the opposition party opposed vehemently on the grounds that to do them would bankrupt the province. They are now attempting to belabor us for not having done all of these things in eight short months.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House will proceed to introduce our program. We are impressed neither by the opposition's former cries of stop, stop, nor their new cries of hurry, hurry. At the end of this session and based upon this budget we will be proud to report to the people of Saskatchewan on our election program.

Sound familiar? It should. Everyone realizes, naturally, that the quote came and was made by the then premier the Hon. Allan Blakeney in his budget speech tabled in the legislature Friday, March 10, 1972.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the end of this session and based upon this budget, we as members of this government will be proud to report to the people of Saskatchewan on our election program. And I, on behalf of the citizens of Moose Jaw North, will be supporting the motion. Thank you.

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to have this opportunity to enter the budget debate. Let me say at the outset that this budget will be long remembered by the electorate as a budget inherited from a discredited previous administration. It will be remembered as the budget which was made necessary due to the many flaws in the budget introduced by the previous administration, and for which they received their just reward on April 26.

Mr. Speaker, before I go any further I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Bob Andrew, for the dynamic manner in which he presented his first of many, many more budgets to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TUSA: — Before I comment directly on our budget, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to an article out of Winnipeg by Canadian Press talking about the impending Manitoba budget. I'd like to just say that in a few short months it seems that the NDP Government of Manitoba has been enlightened by our own government, for according to the Canadian Press story the Manitoba government will be bringing in a budget which has a \$400 million deficit. And I'm hopeful, Mr. Speaker, and I'll be looking forward anxiously to the contents of that budget to see if that budget has approached the problems of Manitoba in the realistic manner which ours has.

I'll be looking to see if the farmers of that province will be getting any assistance to purchase their farms, if the home-owners will be getting any assistance to buy their homes. And I'll also be looking, Mr. Speaker, to see if Manitoba drivers will have an opportunity to travel on some cheap gas. Maybe I shouldn't say that. Maybe I shouldn't say that because we want them to come to Saskatchewan and drive around on our cheap gas, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance for our government had an onerous task, since he himself said that it was necessary to make amid-course correction. And we all know that any time a project is begun, and we must make mid-course corrections, there are great difficulties to be faced — which he did. And he faced these difficulties, and to his credit brought in a budget which was favorably received by an overwhelming majority of our people.

He was able to receive this support because he brought in a budget which clearly demonstrated intelligence, realism and compassion for the people of this province. In short, this budget was a budget which responded to the needs of the people. This is the quality which the previous administration sadly lacked, and because they were totally out of touch with reality the people of this province have banished them to the opposition benches, where four of them sit this afternoon — half of their caucus.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it was left to the Minister of Finance to make amid-course correction. It was another way of putting it. He said he had to make order out of chaos, Mr. Speaker. And in this regard I trust that the House will bear with me while I relate the following story.

It seems that a physician, an engineer and an NDP politician were having a discussion to decide on the first group of people who came to inhabit the earth. The physician said, "Doctors were the first group because, after all, we took a rib out of Adam's side and made woman. Therefore, surgery was the first thing that had to be done." The engineer said, "No, you weren't the first group. Engineers were the first group, because we had to make order out of chaos"; at which time the NDP politician piped in and aid, "No, the NDP politicians were first. We created chaos."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TUSA: — So you see, Mr. Speaker. They were creating chaos then, and they are still doing it today.

Before I comment directly on our budget I should like to make one or two comments on the NDP budget of 1972. In 1972 the NDP attacked the budget of the previous administration. They called it a bogus budget. The bogus budget predicted a surplus of \$300,000, but in reality it turned out to be a surplus of about \$ 2 million. Because there was a larger than projected surplus, the NDP called it bogus.

In 1982, the NDP introduced their last budget. That budget projected a surplus of \$200 million, which, in fact, was \$200 million deficit. Because there was a \$200 million deficit instead of the projected surplus, the NDP called this an honest budget. It is this kind of trickery, Mr. Speaker, which led to their shameful defeat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have sat in this House and listened to the NDP complain bitterly about the deficit. They have complained about the gas tax. The other morning I listened to an open line show on which the former premier said that he likes cheap gas, but it isn't wise because it contributes to the deficit.

I ask, Mr. Speaker: what is the position of the hon. members opposite in regard to the elimination of the gas tax? According to the opposition leader's statement on the open line show, they are opposed. If that is the case, would they stand up in this House and say so plainly? Will they stand up and say plainly that if they ever get returned to power they will immediately reinstate the gas tax?

According to the prices, which will be in effect after this temporary gas war is over, that would amount to about 35 cents per gallon or 7.5 cents a litre. I invite the members opposite to have the courage of their convictions, to stand on principle in this House and admit to the people of Saskatchewan that they will reimpose the gas tax if they ever have the opportunity. I am sure the members opposite do not have the courage of their convictions, and I am sure when it comes their turn to speak, they will not admit this reality.

Mr. Speaker, without a deficit there would be no mortgage interest reduction plan, there would be now way of making certain that the people of this province have their fundamental right to own their homes. The NDP are opposed to people owning their homes. Over 30,000 home-owners are receiving assistance from our government at this time, enabling them to meet the payments on their homes. I think those 30,000 people should be informed that the NDP oppose them. They should be informed that the members opposite have no interest in helping people own their homes. No doubt, the members opposite would be interested in buying their homes and leasing them back to them. Then they could set up another wonderful crown corporation and call it a house bank. I am sure the hon. members opposite would be very willing to set up a house bank, but apparently are not willing to help our citizens own their homes. That's the difference between Progressive Conservatives and socialists. We believe in helping people; socialists believe in controlling people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TUSA: — Another program, Mr. Speaker, which our deficit will help finance is recently announced farm purchase program. Even the agricultural critic had to reluctantly agree that this was an excellent program. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will provide loans of up to \$350,000 for young farmers at 8 per cent and 12 per cent. This is a realistic program, which, for the first time in years, will do something tangible to help young farmers get started and at the same time own their farms. This is something

the land bank was never able to achieve nor was it intended. The land bank was intended to make sharecroppers out of Saskatchewan's people. And indeed I must admit that in that regard it was doing a remarkable job. Of course the previous government said, "Don't worry. After leasing it for five years you'll be able to buy it. You'll have all this money saved up because you are leasing and you can't buy it." Well, Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years that the land bank was in existence only 152 farmers were able to buy their farms.

On the other hand, our farm purchase program will help more farmers buy their land in one month than the land bank did in 10 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TUSA: — It has never ceased to amaze me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how the NDP were willing to betray their own forefathers with the introduction of that plan. How many of us would be here in this House today if our forefathers had been signs in their homeland advertising: "Land for rent in Saskatchewan. Come and get it"? That is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has always been a mystery to me how the members opposite could support a plan which betrayed their own forefathers. It shows, Mr. Speaker, how little regard they have for the hopes and dreams and ideals of those people who settled this beautiful and productive province.

But we in the Progressive Conservative Party have not forgotten why this province was settled and the people who settled it. That is why we have introduced our farm purchase program. The advent of this program, Mr. Speaker, means the death of the land bank. The death of the land bank, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the greatest single service that any government in the history of Saskatchewan could give to the people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. TUSA: — these, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are just some of the programs that the members opposite oppose when they oppose our deficit. I could go on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and list many more. However I believe this adequately points out to the people in this province that the members opposite do not support progress. They live in the past. They do not believe in helping people to help themselves. Their opposition to these important measures demonstrates their continuing desire to control the electorate. Their opposition clearly demonstrates their elitist attitudes, their belief that people cannot be trusted to make decisions for themselves but rather they must be carefully controlled by Big Brother. The budget introduced by the Hon. Bob Andrew clearly rejects that belief. It is an honest, common-sense budget which contains numerous measures that help people without controlling them. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this afternoon to state my support for the budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FOLK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it also gives me great pleasure to rise and enter this debate on our first budget as a government, I would like to commend the Hon. Minister of Finance for disclosing to the people of Saskatchewan our financial picture the way it really is. A realistic budget.

The economic times are difficult, not only here in Saskatchewan, but in Canada and indeed the world. The people of Saskatchewan were looking for relief, for help in these difficult times. On April 26 the electorate of this province elected a new administration,

a Progressive Conservative administration, an administration that promised relief in the form of policies sensitive to the needs of the people of our province.

The mid-course correction which was announced last Wednesday incorporated real benefits for Saskatchewan as promised in the April campaign. The elimination of the provincial gasoline tax was the largest single tax cut in Saskatchewan's history. The average driver will save about \$200 a year, and we now have the lowest gas prices in Canada.

The mortgage interest reduction plan was brought into effect in July, providing people with relief from high mortgage costs. The public utility review commission was established, and various utility rates were frozen. Also, the Saskatchewan Farm Purchase Program was included, a program which will assist young farmers with the purchase of farmland. The health budget allocation was increased. The education budget allocation was increased. A \$15 million commitment to job creation over the next four months was made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all these beneficial programs have been added to the March budget of the previous NDP government — an election budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an election budget which refused to come to grips with the realities of the times, an election budget which was defeated by common-sense, realistic programs.

As was mentioned earlier in this debate, estimates can be hard to gauge at some times. I look at potash revenue estimates, out by over \$126 million; oil revenue estimates out by almost \$100 million; expenditures costs underestimated by \$100 million. Mr. Deputy Speaker, these three estimate inexactitudes alone add up to a \$326 million error in the NDP election balanced budget.

I would now like to address a few comments to some of the remarks made in the past few days by members of the opposition. The member for Regina Centre accused our members for Arm River, Thunder Creek and Regina South of being adamant about the Regina water problem while in opposition, but now not caring. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is my view that our government has addressed this matter more in the past seven months than their administration did in 11 years. The same member also made mention of high schools in Saskatchewan when he was speaking of educational needs. I believe he needs to be reminded that our Minister of Education recently announced that two new high schools in Saskatoon and two in Regina will be constructed starting in 1983.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FOLK: — In Saskatoon these will be the first new high schools built in the last 17 years.

Also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Regina Centre seemed to enjoy talking in riddles on Tuesday. I have one for him regarding one of this favorite topics, jobs. Will there be more jobs if our oil industry is operating at 40 per cent slack capacity or 100 per cent full capacity?

I was also honored last Friday when the Leader of the Opposition made reference to a speech I had the pleasure of delivering in September to the Industrial Developers Association of Canada. He quoted me as saying:

These conditions created a favorable climate for consumer groups,

environmental groups and labor organizations to propel themselves into powerful positions in our economic profile.

Well, he seems to have missed the statements immediately before and immediately after that quotation. I will not try and fill these in for him, and I quote:

In my opinion, Saskatchewan's business community has suffered greatly under the past government's marketing and industrial strategy for the past 11 years.

The NDP's social orientation to economic strategy created very adverse conditions under which business people struggled to make a dollar. These conditions created a favorable climate for consumer groups, environmental groups and labor organizations to propel themselves into powerful positions in our economic profile.

The previous government, by its policies, inhibited a group of business people that, excluding agriculture employs over 40 per cent of our workforce.

Please be assured, the business community will not be neglected in the future.

A supportive government climate is essential to fostering business confidence. A government that believes in the productive abilities of the individual and, thereby, the collective capabilities of its constituents, its citizens, is now in place in Saskatchewan.

The above quote indicates that we, as a government, are prepared to respect all segments affected in the development of an economic strategy on a fair and equitable basis.

I went on to introduce the now established Saskatchewan Development Committee, and I quote again:

The goal of this committee is to have the industrial strategy result in a healthy, vibrant industrial sector in Saskatchewan that is competitive in the world environment and that derives much of its direction and thrust from the efforts of the people of Saskatchewan.

As well, I think that one of my first remarks in that address to the Industrial Developers Association of Canada may be of interest to the members of this Assembly:

I understand that this is the first time that your conference has been held in Saskatchewan.

Now isn't that a coincidence? The first time for the IDAC conference to be held in Saskatchewan, within five months of the election of the first Progressive Conservative Government in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government has shown by its actions that we are sensitive to the needs of Saskatchewan and are also working hard to expand on our economic and productive advantages of the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. A government as

good as the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FOLK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very honored to be an MLA in this Progressive Conservative Government of Saskatchewan. As the member representing Saskatoon University, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the hon. finance minister's budget, and therefore I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased to enter this important debate today, to enter the debate on the amendment moved by my colleague for Quill Lakes. I agree totally with my colleague that this House, and the people of Saskatchewan, should be expressing shock and dismay at the budget now before us. They should be expressing shock and dismay, this being the first Tory budget and the first Tory budget in Saskatchewan for the past 50 years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they should be expressing their shock and dismay on this first budget from the Tory government across, because it is also not only the first budget, it is a deficit budget — a deficit budget by some \$220 million.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if one looks back through Saskatchewan history, you will find that over the last 77 years as a province, the successive governments of this province have usually come up with balanced budgets. Very rarely did you see a deficit budget in this province, until 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In fact, if you add up all the deficit budgets since 1905, the total is only about \$20 million — since 1905. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not a very bad record compared to most other provinces. But this year we see that, not over 77 years but over seven months, we go into about a \$220 million deficit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether it was an NDP or a Liberal government, in the history of this province they always attempted to live within their means and attempted to exercise some good financial prudence in the administration of this province. But this government has changed all that, Mr. Speaker. Seventy-seven years of responsible financial management has gone down the drain — \$220 million in the red, Mr. Speaker — \$220 million deficit. That was what the first Devine government budget was all about, that \$220 million deficit. More than 10 times the total of all the previous deficits in the history of Saskatchewan. Not a very great start, Mr. Speaker.

This is why I can understand that the Minister of Finance was very reluctant to accept the responsibility for the budget he introduced the other day. It was rather amusing to listen to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, amusing to hear him say in one breath that Saskatchewan had been launched into a brave new era by this Tory government, that things have changed so much since April 26, that the government should get credit for totally all the things, all the good things that happened in this province since they took government on April 8. But then in the next breath, you see, the minister was trying to explain how the huge deficit had nothing to do with what that government was trying to do within the province.

He said all the tax cuts were the cuts of the Tory government. And then he says: Love us for all those tax cuts, but don't talk about the price tag of those cuts; and when it comes

to paying the bills created by those tax cuts the government takes no responsibility for that. In short, what the Minister of Finance was trying to tell the people the other night, he was trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan that they are not responsible for any deficits. Just for the good things. And no one seemed to pick up on that, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Finance in his budget speech actually introduced a fairly radical new concept to our political system I would call it the selective responsibility concept, Mr. Speaker. This new concept says that in a parliamentary democracy a government will accept full responsibility for any benefit providing to voters, such as tax cuts, but the opposition will have to accept the responsibility for paying the price tag. A radical concept, Mr. Speaker, and a ridiculous one. But when you think about, that was what the Minister of Finance was actually trying to tell us. The Tory government takes full responsibility for the tax cuts but no responsibility for the deficit.

The people of Saskatchewan are not buying it, Mr. Speaker. They are not buying the government's suggestion that somehow (and we heard that in this Assembly on budget night) they are just reworking the NDP budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they were just reworking an NDP budget, they could have done that, and they could have had that prepared for the June session. It's not a reworked budget, Mr. Speaker. This government took more than six months to prepared their first budget. IT took them ore than six months to cut an umber of programs, to introduce a number of their own programs, and to scramble to find the cash to help pay for their April promises.

So let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker. This budget is a Tory budget. This budget is a Devine government budget from cover to cover. They are the government now. They have been since May 8. They set the government's spending priorities. They've set them now, and they have been setting them since May 8. They decide the government's financial plan now, and they have been for more than six months. In short, Mr. Speaker, no matter how hard they try to orphan that budget, that budget is their baby and theirs alone.

I said that I can understand why the Minister of Finance was reluctant to accept full responsibility for a budget introduced with the largest deficit in the history of this province. I can also understand his reluctance, Mr. Speaker, because of a second point mentioned in the amendment moved by my colleague. That is, the budget offers totally inadequate expenditures on job creation. At a time when unemployment is at its highest level in more than 20 years, they provide no money to create programs and create employment for our people.

Mr. Speaker, this budget does contain more than \$30 million for welfare payments to unemployed employables. Shame! These are people who want to work, who are able to work, but who cannot find the work and are forced to go on welfare. More than \$30 million is included in that budget before us, Mr. Speaker — \$30 million for payments to people for welfare. These people don't want government handouts. They want work. They want a full-time job, meaningful jobs, but the Tory government obviously doesn't want them to work. If you just take a look at the budget, less than half that amount which the government has set aside for welfare payments to the unemployed employables has been budgeted for job creation — less than half that amount, Mr. Speaker. This Tory government is prepared to pay people not to work, and that is a foolish economic policy, and I would suggest it is basically immoral social policy.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because for a provincial government to accept high unemployment, for provincial government to fail to do everything within its power to

reduce unemployment, means that a government finds acceptable all the hardships and all the human suffering which unemployment creates. I say again, I find the attitudes basically immoral. What Saskatchewan needs today is for this government to come to its senses and to free up the hundreds of construction projects of every description in this province, all the job projects that they have frozen or shelved since May 8 when they took power.

Mr. Minister, now the government members have claimed that our call for a major job creation effort is inconsistent with our attack on the size of the provincial deficit. I wold like to make a couple of points about that claim, Mr. Speaker.

The first one is that Saskatchewan's Tory government has not only adopted a deficit budget and the policies of the Trudeau Liberals in Ottawa, but it is stealing the Liberal lines. Every time that the opposition parties in Ottawa demand action from the Liberal Government of Canada, high unemployment is the response — high unemployment from the Prime Minister and from Mr. Lalonde. It's the excuse that they use for not being able to create more jobs, for not being able to put more money into their budget where it would create employment. No, Mr. Speaker, that kind of argument, that somebody else is to blame for the unemployment problems in the province, is a specious argument in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I wold even say it is even more questionable in Regina.

That brings me to my second point. The federal government has been running a large deficit budget for nearly 10 years, so its room to manoeuvre to revise the spending priorities is somewhat limited. But the Saskatchewan government is starting down the same Trudeau trail of deficit budgets. There is still time for this government to run back. There is still time for them to come to their senses, Mr. Speaker, and we're saying: Before it's too late, take another look. Revise your spending priorities. Reduce this record deficit. Drop your massive tax breaks for the multinational oil companies and put that money into meaningful major job creation efforts. That is what we are saying in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and that is perfectly consistent with what we have been saying all the time.

Another point raised by our amendments, Mr. Speaker, is that this Tory budget contains dozens of destructive cuts in programs and services. Throughout this debate, my colleagues have listed many of these cuts, particularly those in health and social services fields. Now I would like to bring some additional cuts to the attention of this House.

The first cuts, Mr. Speaker, are the highways department cuts. You may recall that all summer the Minister of Highways complained loud and long that he could not build any roads because the NDP had failed to set aside enough money. But this budget shed little light on those complaints, Mr. Speaker. Let me put it this way. As the Minister of Finance presented his budget to the legislature, the Minister of Highways should have at least had the decency to blush. So the truth is out. The culprits were not the NDP but his own cabinet colleagues. They cut his budget in highways. There is a purse of \$20 million less in the budget now before us for road construction, \$20 million less than had been introduced under the NDP budget last March. The March budget provided over \$95 million in the regular highways capital budget for rural surface transportation. The Tories cut this by more than \$5 million. The March budget provided almost \$14 million for northern highway construction, plus \$2.6 million for the Beauval-Pinehouse development road. All of these items, Mr. Speaker, have been wiped out in the Tory budget. The only offsetting item was an increase of less than \$2 million in DNS

road construction programs. So money available for northern roads has been cut by almost \$15 million in total. Add the \$5 million cut that I mentioned a moment ago, and you get an overall cut of close to \$20 million.

These cutbacks by the Devine government have created chaos in the road construction industry, and have contributed to the decline in economic activity throughout the province. In fact, the situation has become so bad that I hear some people have started a campaign to change the minister's title from Minister of Highways to minister of signs, because road signs are about all his department can afford at this time.

Mr. Speaker, one could go back to last sprig when the minister said that his priority was to four-lane all the major highways in this province: the Yellowhead and No. 1. Hopefully he will even put the Red Coat Trail on it one day. His emphasis was going to be on four-laning these highways. What did we see happening through the summer? A stretch of road between Swift Current and Webb was built, where the money was already allocated. What happens? What happens to that road, Mr. Speaker? That road is sitting there right now producing weeds rather than creating a safe road for the people who travel on it. At the same time, by completing that road and providing some safety for the people on that road, the minister could have created some employment, because the asphalt plant at Moose Jaw would not have had to lay off about 20 employees two months earlier than they normally do. They only had to lay them off because the Minister of Highways cut his budget to the point where there was no road surfacing going on this year.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that this minister's lack of clout with his own colleagues is even evident in the area of traffic safety. If one studies the budget plans for the highway traffic board you find that the traffic safety division has been cut by almost \$200,000 compared to the March budget.

Some of the members opposite say, cut, cut, cut. Well, I agree with them that is exactly what they did in their budget.

In summary, there is a series of gaps between what this minister says he is going to do and what the minister actually gets done.

Let me turn now to some other cuts in the budget which concerns us, Mr. Speaker. IN the Department of Rural Affairs, I notice one major cut from March. Gone is the \$1.5 million in grants under the rural capital assistance program. Many municipalities have planned to take advantage of this grant program. They were going to buy a new grader or erect a needed building or renovate an existing facility. Mr. Speaker, \$1.5 million was set aside in the March budget for such grants to rural municipalities. On that basis, many of the R.M.s went ahead with their plans, never dreaming that any government would renege on such a valuable program. But sure enough, the Devine government has scrapped the plans, leaving many rural municipalities sitting high and dry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to another area that concerns me greatly and that is the area of agriculture. The member for Moose Jaw North in his speech a while ago said that this government will not raise the expectations of the people of this province. And I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this government has done anything else it has raised the expectations of the people of this province. It has raised the expectations of the people that are on the land bank land, and the people that were looking to purchase land through the farm purchase program.

But when you look at the program, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be a few people who will benefit, and it's going to be a program and a bill that is going to affect the land bank lessees, affect may other people in a way they never expected. And that, Mr. Speaker, is going to be something that they will know once they read that bill, and when that impact hits them.

Another budget cut of concern to the people of rural Saskatchewan, and this, Mr. Speaker, goes for some of the bills that have been introduced just a few days ago, is the \$30 million that have been cut from funds from the land bank commission.

Of course, the land bank is being scrapped by the Devine government. It is being scrapped to make way for a farm purchase program. And I tell you, the way the Minister of Finance talked the other day when he introduced his budget, you would think that the farm purchase program was going to be the salvation of Saskatchewan agriculture. But by tacking their program onto the farm credit corporation the Devine government will be giving away control, giving away all the control and giving over to the farm credit corporation . . . The farm credit corporation, don't mistake me, has done a lot for the province of Saskatchewan and for the farmers of Saskatchewan but it has never been able to fulfil the credit and economic needs completely.

That is why our government created land bank. It helped many young farmers who did not have the capital base necessary to qualify at the farm credit corporation. It helped in transferring land from one generation to another. And, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency we probably have more land bank land than anywhere else in the province. And a lot of those young farmers would not be there today if it wasn't for the land bank, and I would like to see those young farmers continue to farm. But by the two bills that have been introduced in this House, I would question, very much, how many of these farmers will be able to survive on those farms.

Mr. Speaker, while the land bank is being scrapped there are some very serious question s that we have to ask about the new program. Farmer reaction was shown on televisions on Tuesday night, and they made it quite clear: one farmer said that the land prices are sky high now, so the new program won't really help much; while another said that it would likely be used by well-established farmers to expand their operations. And, Mr. Speaker, I think I would have to agree with that farmer.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government should wait until it is certain that the new program will do the job, do the job that was expected out there, before they destroy land bank. That would be a logical thing to do, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what this government is doing. Indications now are that the Devine government will not be satisfied just with destroying land bank. The Tories will try to kill all the existing land bank leases that are out there by giving the government the power to change leases and to jack up rents to any level they choose. And why are they doing this, Mr. Speaker? Because they know that their plan cannot compete with land bank. So they are trying to drive the land bank lessees off their land.

There are many more cuts in the programs and services in this Tory budget. But I'd like to move now onto a final point mentioned in the amendment moved by the member for Quill lakes. And that is that this budget fails to recognize the role of Saskatchewan's crown corporations in maintaining economic activity in this province. Mr. Speaker, the NDP government which was responsible for the administration of this province for 11 years believed that both the public and the private sectors had important roles to play in

our economy. Throughout our 11 years in office the private sector continue to invest heavily in our province and the result was balanced, sustained economic growth. The Devine government seems determined to change all that. With each passing day, this government is looking more and more like a collection of narrow-minded ideologues blindly devoted to the virtues of unfettered free enterprise, oblivious to the costs of such a devotion.

The Minister of Finance speaks in his budget of the need for co-operation between the various sectors of our economy and claims that there is a role for crown corporations to play. However, the budget documents and the government's actions suggest otherwise.

Let's just review the record, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service has been dismantled. SaskMedia is gasping its last breath. Sask Tel has been stripped of an important source of revenue, the sale of auxiliary telephones. These were used to keep the price of basic telephone service down. SMDC has been robbed of the guarantee which allowed it to invest in any new mineral developments in the province on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

And of course, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — this great Saskatchewan success story is being thwarted at every turn by a government determined to reduce their role in the potash industry. The decision to kill PCS International, the decision to allow only private sector expansion in Saskatchewan in the future, and the decision to lay off some 1,200 employees over the Christmas holidays — all these decisions and more indicate that the Devine government is determined to undermine this great public corporation. Perhaps to soften up the people so that the government will be able to sell off PCS assets, they are trying to make it look as though somehow this corporation is not doing well. And if they can convince the people that it is not doing well then they can have an excuse to sell it off to their private sector friends. Mr. Speaker, such a scenario cannot be ruled out with this Tory government, this radical, right wing government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I agree that this Assembly should express shock and dismay with the November 24 budget. The Devine government's budget is a shock and a dismay I think to everybody in this province. This budget starts Saskatchewan down the Trudeau trail of deficit budgets. This budget proposes to spend more on welfare payments than on meaningful job creation. This budget contains destructive cuts in programs and services for those in need, and it refused to recognize the real need for public sector involvement in Saskatchewan's economic future.

Mr. Speaker, for these and many other reasons, I will be supporting the amendment moved by the member for Quill Lakes, and I will be opposing the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the member for Thunder Creek would hardly know what's decent and what isn't. He hasn't heard any speeches in the House. He hasn't been here. Welcome back from Arizona. Welcome back from Palm Springs, Mr. Member for Thunder Creek.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Compliment on his tan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It is a nice tan, it is a nice tan. Now I've been nice to you, you be

nice to me. I couldn't help making a comment about the wizardry of members opposite in their mathematics. We have been complaining about the deficit and suggesting that the reason why the members opposite got into this deficit was because they couldn't add. I may say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've had another example of that — the member for Rosthern. The member for Rosthern stumbled upon the astounding fact that there was a deficit, an unfunded liability in the teachers' pension plan — something that had been well known in public for five years, but apparently not to the member for Rosthern.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Five years? Forty years.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Forty years. At any rate, this was all news to the member for Rosthern. It was all news to the member for Rosthern. The member for Rosthern listened to a few figures in the public accounts committee and concluded there was a \$5 billion deficit. The member for Rosthern concluded this morning that it was really only \$3 billion — just missed by \$2 billion. Just \$2 billion. What's \$2 billion? What's a couple of billion?

The member for Rosthern is later day edition of C.D. Howe. What's a billion bucks? Not much to these people opposite.

I may say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this province had an experience in the 1930s that we had thought it was not going to repeat. In 1929 this province was among the most prosperous in Canada. The recession came along. The depression came along. I think there were many people of the day who believed the Conservative government causes it, and they voted them out of office. They voted them out of office with such enthusiasm that I think they believe the Conservative government had caused it. But I think in retrospect that wasn't wholly fair. That wasn't wholly fair. I think in retrospect they may not have caused the entire recession.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they did run up deficits. They did allow deficits to grow. By the time they left office in 1934 . . . It's worth noting that every single member of that conservative government left office. They formed a government in 1929 and were not re-elected in 1934. Not a single member. When they left, they left the finances of this province in absolute shambles Absolute shambles.

The Liberal government of the day was not only running a deficit, they were unable to borrow any money. I remember speaking to the members of the CCF government — people who had been ministers in the CCF government in the 1940s and 1950s. They left the Liberal government in such bad shape that that government couldn't borrow money. The member for Rosthern asked today . . . We were talking about the relative size of deficits, and whether or not \$220 million was as manageable as \$1 million in 1940. I tell the member for Rosthern there is no way the government of that day could afford \$1 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I don't want to miss the point of this, if you get to it.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, the member for Thunder Creek may be interested in spending some more time in the Chamber. He might find it easier to follow the debate on the budget if he spent a little more time here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mind you, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that when he's absent, the decorum in the House improves markedly, and I'm not sure I should be urging him to come.

AN HON. MEMBER: — But he's got a nice tan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You've got a nice tan. I'm sorry, I'll get back to your tan and leave your manners alone; you've got a nice tan.

In 1940 this province thought it had seen the last of Conservative economics, and thought it had seen the last of runaway deficits. They may well be wrong. The way the government opposite is going at it, they may well find their deficit getting out of control. When they go from a balanced budget to borrowing 8.6 per cent of what they spend, that is a huge leap. That is a huge leap in the deficit of the province.

I'm tempted, Mr. Speaker, to try and do something about the abysmal ignorance of members opposite with respect to unfunded liabilities and pension plans. I have a suspicion you would rule me out of order, so I will not tempt fate, but it is a temptation to try and do something about the abysmal ignorance of members opposite. I'm beginning to think the members for Rosthern is leading light over there on pensions.

What do we get for this deficit, Mr. Speaker? What does the province get to enjoy for this deficit? Well, it gets vastly larger subsidies to oil companies. Oil companies are the single biggest winner in the budget; they ran away with the lion's share of the money. I'm going to ask the member's opposite, in estimates, to try and calculate the cost per job. How many new jobs in the oil industry and what was the cost per job? I'll bet it comes in at hundreds of thousands of dollars per job that is an expensive job creation program, Mr. Speaker, that is an extremely expensive job creation program. There are other better ways the money might have been spent and I'm going to suggest some of them to the members in a moment.

Another major winner was CP trucking and the various trucking firms. The members opposite pretend that major benefits of the gas tax went to the Saskatchewan people. That is just simply not accurate. The major benefits of the gas tax went to the trucking companies. They got far, far more money out of that gas tax cut than the public of Saskatchewan did. It would have been possible, Mr. Speaker, to construct a gas . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're in *Hansard* now, against the trucking companies.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh, if you want to run through my riding and tell them that I'm against CP trucking. I don't think I'm going to stop you and I'm probably not going to deny it. The folks down in my riding don't vote for CP trucking, but if you're for them, we'd be happy to announce that in your riding. We'll be happy to spread that. The major benefit from the cut in the gas tax did not go to Saskatchewan people, it went to the trucking companies.

I happen to have an illustration of this, Mr. Speaker. This is a true story. I picked up a young native couple during the election at Lebret, Saskatchewan. I asked the couple how they were going to vote; they actually lived in Regina Victoria. I asked them how they were going to vote and they said they were voting Conservative. Why? Because of the gas tax. It caused me to think — that this native couple in Regina are voting Conservative in the April election. I saw them later in a drugstore; it was about six weeks

ago. I couldn't help but go over and talk to them just to see what they thought of it all. Do you know what he said to me — just as crisp and just as short? He said, "We traded the best government we ever had for a few dollars on the gas tax."

There are more and more people beginning to realize that they traded the best government they ever had for a few dollars. And it turned out to be a lot few dollars than they ever thought it would. Have the unemployed benefited from the tax cuts? They sure haven't. They've been the major losers. This province has been plunged into a deep-freeze as the government has withdrawn almost all expenditure in the public sector in construction — almost all.

I'm delighted to see the Minister of Highways here. For most of the summer there was a standing prize going to anyone who saw a highway construction machine in motion and it went unclaimed most of the summer because nobody ever found one. The overpass at Moose Jaw was damaged — I am sure the member for Moose Jaw South who I see sitting behind you must be deeply ashamed of this — sometime in the spring, I think it was May, and the damage remained until October. It was that long before you people got around to making some relatively simple repairs.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I thought they were concerned with safety.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Concerned with safety they may have been, but for most of the summer, all the traffic that went down the Trans-Canada Highway followed through one land underneath the overpass at Moose Jaw.

Government services is at its lowest level in years. This is a Keynesian economics seen through a mirror. This is Keynesian economics as seen by Alice in Wonderland. You're supposed to be expanding construction in the public sector in hard times to expand employment. What do these people do? In hard times, they withdraw — withdraw into a shell. You're not social minded either.

When we were in office, we used to do design work from year to year. When the construction industry was busy, all we did was design work. You put that design on the shelf and left it there during busy times. During many of the times we were in office, Mr. Speaker, during many of the times we were in office this province was so buoyant, we couldn't get competitive bids on public construction. For much of the period of time we were in office we did design work and didn't do the construction. But the design work was sitting on a the shelf ready to go. And when the construction industry slowed down, it was easy to pull that design work off the shelf, call the bids and away you go. What about these people? Just the opposite. Absolutely no thought to the unemployed at all. Absolutely no thought for the unemployed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't know, did the unemployed not make a contribution to the Tory election coffers? Was that the problem? It may be. I say to the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster: it may be that their contribution to your war chest didn't equal Imperial Oil's — the oil companies — maybe that's the explanation.

But the real tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is in the area of housing. I think housing is probably the quickest return from dollars spent — the jobs created — undoubtedly the quickest return. I may say this province is in need of a housing program. We have for some years been building fewer houses, and the market really needs, and that is basically because

of interest rates, a massive housing program. And if we don't have it, we are going to meet a day when we will face the kind of increases in housing prices that have been seen in Toronto and Vancouver and others. Because there is out there a latent shortage of houses. It's not apparent because of the interest rates, but it's out there and it's going to hit us. So, we could have put unemployed people to work.

I may say the housing industry was not affected by the construction strike. I don't know whether that ever occurred to the people opposite, but they were largely unaffected by the construction strike. That could have gone ahead. You could have put the unemployed to work. You could have forestalled what is going to be serious social problem, as housing prices go out of sight when the economy rights itself, as it usually seems to sooner or later.

We had a \$200 million program in our budget. I remember the present Premier on one of the open line programs being asked where he was going to get this massive amount of money for the mortgage interest reduction program. He was looking apparently at a copy of our budget. He looked down and said, "Housing. There's where we get a million." I thought it was just a flippant answer because of the way it was given. It turned out to be the gospel. That's exactly what happened. Housing programs in this province were gutted. The members opposite instead chose not to rely on expenditures in the public sector. They chose to rely on the private sector.

The members opposite are going to find out that that is a terribly expensive way to solve any programs, to rely exclusively on the private sector. You are undoubtedly going to find out when it's too late to save your own hides. I just hope you don't find out when it's too late to salvage the fiscal affairs of this province, because it is going to be a very expensive program.

It's also becoming apparent to the people of Saskatchewan that the tax cutters inevitably become the program slashers. The mathematics of these people would somehow suggest that they could add a couple of hundred million dollars to the program of this province and not cut taxes, and that what they said during the election. The public are not coming to find out that is just simply not the case. There was no magic wellspring of money into which they could dip, and all that was apparently to anyone who bothered to read the annual reports.

I can forgive the member for Kelvington-Wadena, who I think made the comment, for not reading them. He wasn't a member of the House and wasn't handed a copy of it. No excuse for the Minister of Finance. I widely suspect that some of your colleagues may be close to illiterate, but I don't suspect that of the Minister of Finance. I suspect the Minister of Finance can read, and I really wonder why he didn't read the annual report of the heritage fund. I honestly wonder why he didn't read it, because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm glad the member for Saskatoon Nutana knows why he didn't read it, because everybody else is trying to figure out how he could have been so confused as to the financial affairs of this province.

If you know something, then I wish you'd tell the rest of us, because we are wondering how he could have overlooked something that had been told to him year after year after year. And he was the chairman of the public accounts committee, no less. But apparently was unaware of that.

What happened to programs? Well, it isn't Imperial Oil that gets hurt — not Imperial Oil.

They've done not bad. I suspect that they're not feeling too bad right now. But some people who may not have made the same contribution to the Tory war chest aren't doing quite as well. Let me just run through a few examples.

MR. KATZMAN: — Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — State your point of order.

MR. KATZMAN: — Earlier in the member's comments he referred to me and the references of yesterday in public accounts. If he will check yesterday's verbatim, plus the verbatim today, he will discover that the statement made by the officials being interviewed was in the teachers' pension. It was \$1.3 billion to a possible \$1.5 billion. Yesterday he had suggested it might be as high as 1.5. He also said that my figures weren't correct a minute ago in his speech. The second point is that the member yesterday . . . The figures were presented today, and if he can multiply five times \$747 million he will come out to \$3,835 million. Therefore, I wish he would correct his statements about my figure of \$5 billion.

MR. SPEAKER: — I find that the member's point is not well taken. I ask the member to proceed.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you. I can only express a prayer of thanks that the member for Rosthern doesn't teach my children mathematics. I'm glad he's still trying to learn it himself. One of the groups, I may say, which got hurt, was those who have depended on a housing program for rehabilitation of existing houses. Those are not wealthy people, probably not major supporters of the Conservative Party. Our program was announced in March would have given that program \$2.79 million. Last year \$2.3 million was spent. What about those people opposite? What do they give the relatively low income people who need to rehabilitate older houses? Not \$2.7 million that we had budgeted; not the \$2.3 million last year; down to \$2.1 million. That's for the lowest level, the lowest economic level on the ladder. That's for people who live in older houses which are often in very bad repair, who need assistance in repairing those houses if they are going to be livable.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, that program slash could hardly have been based on need. I suspect the folks down there — a lot of whom live in my riding, some in Regina Elphinstone, some in Regina Victoria — I suspect those people just weren't quite quick enough in flashing their cheque book when the Tory bagman went by.

Senior citizens. I don't know what happened to senior citizens, but they sure didn't get the ear of this government. While I was sitting here, I just made a few notes on some of the programs. The senior citizens non-profit housing — we had budgeted \$1 million and if that is what was spent in '81-82, it's cut, cut, cut — \$880,000. I can see the look of shock from the member for Saskatoon Westmount. That's a fact. Look it up in the estimates yourself. On you think she will get up and speak. That would be expecting a lot.

Senior citizens home repair program — we had budgeted \$3 million. Let's keep in mind what this is. Let's keep in mind what the program is. This is not a subsidy to rich people. By definition anyone who makes more than a few thousand dollars a year isn't eligible for the program, so you have to be eligible for the guaranteed income supplement.

AN HON. MEMBER: — When does this project have to take place, I wonder. In the

wintertime?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — In the wintertime. Of course, that's when you need a winter works project the least. We all know that, we all know that. That's when we need it the least.

A senior citizens housing program available to people who live on a few thousand dollars a year and not available to anyone else to repair houses, many of which need repair and need it very badly — what happened to that program? We budgeted \$3 million for that program. That was more than double what was spent in '81-82. What do members opposite do for senior citizens? A cut of \$1.1 million, a cut of 10 per cent. How on earth can you people justify that kind of thing to yourself? How on earth do you square that with your conscience? How on earth do you square treating the lowest and the poorest level of our society with that sort of program? I'd love to hear the answer to that; I'm sure I'm not going to, but I'd love to hear you people justify that.

And, of course, there was no senior citizens shelter allowance. When I was campaigning in the election that was the program I think I was asked the most about. How does it work Do I qualify? It was a program that many of them needed and needed very badly. There was a great many senior citizens who live in apartment, who live in terror, and terror is not being melodramatic. They live in terror. They live in relatively cheaper apartments but they still can't afford them, and they are laying out a very large portion of their income for the rent. Sometimes the rent is under controls; sometimes the apartment isn't controlled. And many of them really wanted a senior citizens shelter allowance program; they were looking forward to it. What happened to it? Nothing — nothing.

Senior citizen's services — I just picked this out of the figures. Senior citizens' services. We had budgeted \$1.6 million. That was an increase from \$1.5 million in 1981-82. What do you people give them? No increase at all — no increase at all.

I suppose in some fashion, senior citizens who rely on senior citizens' services are immune from inflation. Is that the logic you people are proceeding on? Or are they somehow or other worthy of the support of a Conservative government and assistance from a Conservative government? I would be interested in hearing any member who follows me justify that program: no increase for senior citizens' services.

There are others as well who hardly rank high in the list of those who do well in our society.

Getting back to senior citizens, I may say that I went through the estimates. I went through the estimates — took some time at it, but not exhaustively. I couldn't find a single senior citizens' program that had been increased. Now I probably overlooked one or two somewhere, but I didn't see them. The vast majority of these programs have either been cut or held. And of course in constant dollars, when you hold the program at the same level, you in fact cut it.

Day care — \$999,000 spent in '81-82. We budgeted \$1,090,000. Did they get \$1,090,000? No. Did they even get what was spent in '81-82, \$999,000? Not these women. They got \$966,000.

I ask the members again: how do you square that? By and large these are single-parent families who use the service. Are single-parent families immune from inflation? Has their cost of groceries not gone up? Is that the theory? Their rents haven't gone up? Is that the theory? Or is the theory that this group is not organized? They're not going to be

out there clamoring against the chains and the police that you people have at the front door. They won't be out there because they're not that well organized. So we'll cut them because we won't hear about it, because these people aren't organized enough and militant enough to come and bother us about the problem — too busy with their own problems. And that's why single-parent families were hurt in this budget and they were hurt, they were hurt. Do any of you people opposite have an explanation for that cut? I want to tell you I'd be delighted to hear it, delighted to hear it.

Women's division — I spoke of this yesterday but I want to reiterate for members opposite, some of whom seem to applaud the loss. The member for Meadow Lake has missed it and he is insistent that I repeat my comments so I will, because I feel strongly about this.

Of all the injustices in our society, one of the ones which cries out for relief the loudest and the shrillest is the position of women in the economy. They earn vastly less than men . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, they sure are and they're all at the bottom of the economy. And as long as this government remains in office, they're going to remain at the bottom.

Yes. I'm looking across the House. I'm looking at two members, not three — not the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, but two members who applauded the cut in the women's division when my colleague for Regina Elphinstone spoke about it. I'm looking across the House and that is why I'm bothered by that cut. I have a feeling the members for Saskatoon Nutana and Saskatoon Westmount feel that women's place in society is at the bottom of the economy. I have a feeling that's what you must feel. I have a feeling that's why you applauded the cut in that program. I'd be interested if you'd get up and speak on it in the House and let us know how you feel. I can only assume that you didn't, that that's your view: that women's place in the economy is exactly where it should be. I can only assume that's your view.

If you had restructured the program, if you had brought in a different program because you felt this one wasn't working and you had a different one, I would have applauded that and I would have said so. But that wasn't in fact what members opposite did: they just cut the program. What is there for working women? Cuts — the same things there are for single-parent families. It's the same group, by and large, the same group: single-parent families and working women. It's a lot of the same people. Same for senior citizens, same for children.

Natives? Well, I want to refer to the social planning secretariat, a group which had an area . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that's what I've got, the estimates for 1983 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, well, it will be in day-glo orange in the not-too-distant future. The social planning secretariat vote no. 7 in the urban affairs: in 1981-1982, \$329,000 was spent; in 1982-1983, there was a cut, to \$201,000.

I suppose this is another group that doesn't need any assistance. I would be delighted to take a representative delegation, or the whole works of you, for a trip through my riding. I'll let you see how the native people live in Regina, and I'll let you decide for yourself whether or not you think this is a group which is in need of any assistance from government. I'll let you make that decision for yourself. I can only assume that members opposite did this in abysmal ignorance. I have accused the Conservative Party in times past of playing the racial cards, but I am not making that accusation at this point in time. I'm assuming this was done in abysmal ignorance of what these people really need.

Let me go onto . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You go ask them, you go ask them. I'd be delighted to see the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster go through Regina Elphinstone, which ahs probably the largest native population in the city. I'd be delighted to see you go through the riding of Regina Elphinstone and explain this vote no. 7.

Let's get on with it, to the Wakamow Valley Authority. Again, these are just figures I picked up roaming through the book. The book happened to open up at urban affairs and that's what I went through. I happened to come to Wakamow Valley Authority. This may have had something to do with the fact that the member for Thunder Creek, who I assume has paid his monthly visit and is now gone until sometime in January, was upset with the former head of the Wakamow Valley Authority. Perhaps that explains why they got a paltry \$5,000 increase. What is it about the Wakamow Valley Authority that makes it immune from inflation? Are you interested in hearing, anyone?

Transit programs: again, the people who use transit are by and large not the wealthiest people in society, not the people who drive to the Legislative Assembly, not the people who by and large whip out a cheque book when a Conservative candidate walks by. It's not the people who ride transit. The people who ride transit are by and large the poorest people of society.

In 1981-82, \$3.8 million was spent. We had budgeted \$5.5 million. You people are giving them a paltry \$4.4 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll give you lots of time to close debate before we vote on the amendment.

I just have a couple of other comments I want to make and I'm sure the members opposite are dying to hear them .One is parks. People who use parks by and large are not the wealthy people who go away for holidays, they're the people who spent a lot of their leisure time in the city because they do not have enough money to leave. Fifty thousand dollars was spent in 1981-1982. We had budgeted \$236,000. Did you people spend \$236,000? Spend \$100,000? \$75,000? A paltry \$50,000, a paltry \$50,000.

I've just one more item, one more item, and it is an important one. I spoke yesterday about how these people seem to experience a metamorphosis as they go from opposition to government. They say one thing in opposition, and then they get across there and the world looks different. There is something about the world from the other side, it looks very different, it looks very different.

Ambulance services — there was no end of ballyhoo when the members opposite were in opposition about the amount spent on ambulance services. We had budgeted \$465,000. Did you people spend \$465,000? No. \$400,000? No, \$352,000, that's all there is.

I had a good deal more I wanted to say about crown corporations. I recognize the afternoon is drawing late. I would gather my safety could not be ensured if I were to go on and bring this House back to sit tonight. I will save for a later day my comments about the role the crown corporations are going to be playing in the future. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said, that I will be voting in favor of the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with regard

to the debate, in particular the vicious attack from the members opposite. The basis of that attack, Mr. Speaker, seemed to centre around the deficit. They were so wrapped up in the whole concept of the deficit.

Well, let's look at the numbers in the deficit, Mr. Speaker. What we see from the March budget to the November budget is a drop in revenues of \$420 million, Mr. Speaker — \$420 million. That's their projections, Mr. Speaker, that we're out. Now, you can attribute \$120 million of that to a cut in gasoline tax — a cut in tax that I think is well received by the people of Saskatchewan; a cut in tax, Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, that when the matter was introduced in this House, every person in the House including the opposition were standing and voting in favor of that particular legislation, voting in favor of that particular move by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — They supported it, Mr. Speaker. So where were we? \$300 million we're out by revenues. Now, all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, those \$300 million didn't just happen after the election. Anybody that could project and read could see that in fact the revenues were going down. Potash mines were stacked up to the roof with product that wasn't being sold. The revenues from potash in fact are down \$200 million, Mr. Speaker. Those are the reasons for it.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the members opposite had spent so much time telling the people of Saskatchewan how wealthy they were, how greatly they had run the economy of the province of Saskatchewan, that when the downturn came, Mr. Speaker, they weren't prepared to own up to it and admit it. In effect, Mr. Speaker, they had spent more money on television advertising the crown corporations, telling people about the wonderful heritage fund, than was actually left in the fund when we took over — more money on advertising, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Let's go further, Mr. Speaker. They would have had, as we announced earlier, a \$200 million deficit. But the thing they don't ever want to mention is that after they brought down the budget they called this great election. "Oh, we are going to get back into power stronger than ever," said the former premier. Well, sir, two weeks into the campaign and things are starting to slide down a little bit. So down they go and they get some sharp pencils out here and say, "Hey, we'd better get some more programs in." So, with what did they come? They brought another budget in, Mr. Speaker. The expenditure in that budget didn't pass either. That budget, Mr. Speaker, was equivalent to what we brought in with all our programs.

Let's go through that. The universal dental care plan — another \$30 million. They were going to bring in \$30 million. Number two, Mr. Speaker, they are against the Tory tax cutters. So what were they going to do? They were going to eliminate the school property tax — \$100 million. Where were they going to find this? They pulled that one out of the pocket halfway through the election because they started to see her slide, or some of them did, Mr. Speaker. Some of them did.

What else did they have? They were going to double the mortgage tax credit another \$10 million. First-time home-owners' grant was going to be \$2,000. That was another \$8 million. Safe drivers insurance rate was another \$8 million. And, in desperate times,

can you recall the former premier saying, "Now we are going to have vision care"? That was about the eight day in a row they announced a program and that cost another \$161 million — \$161 million on top of the \$200 million deficit they had already created, Mr. Speaker.

What would we be left with, Mr. Speaker? Members opposite are great for saying that you can't cut programs, so where do you expect they probably would be cutting?

What would we be left with, Mr. Speaker? Members opposite are great for saying that you can't cut programs, so where do you expect they probably would be cutting?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Agriculture.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — They wouldn't have got into that. But the fellows over there? I think the member for Regina Centre alluded to it today: Tax cutters. I'll tell you where they would have been coming, Mr. Speaker. Instead of eliminating the 20 per cent sales tax on gasoline, do you know what we would have had? A 40 per cent sales tax on gasoline. We would have had a higher tax on gasoline than the province of Quebec. Great progress, great progress, Mr. Speaker. What would their next move have been? Up would have come the sales tax on gasoline. Up would have come the sales tax on products, the E&H tax — probably up to 10 per cent. They are tax raisers, Mr. Speaker, tax raisers.

Then the former premier says, "We wouldn't only have to balance the budget, we would want to have a surplus, too." Do you know what the surplus is for, of course? They would have created four or five more crown corporations. That's the direction they would have been heading, Mr. Speaker. That's the direction we would have been heading.

Mr. Speaker, I think when you come down to this debate all you have to do is look at the reaction of the people. You know, sometimes it is good to stand back and remember that we live in a democratic system. Maybe those people out there aren't as gullible as a lot of times we think they are. I think the people spoke; I think they spoke very loudly, Mr. Speaker. They accepted this program; they rejected this program. There are eight of them over there, the rest are over here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Now the Leader of the Opposition seems to indicate that the NDP don't agree with deficits. They don't agree with deficits — not the NDP, no not us. Let me read from the *Financial Post* of December 1, about the province of Manitoba.

Manitoba's troubled economy will get special attention when the legislature gets under way on Thursday, says Premier Howard Pawley, Canada's only New Democratic Premier.

They brought in a budget, remember, about the same time as the former government.

The government expects the 1982-83 deficit will top \$400 million (in Manitoba, \$400 million!) on the spending of about \$3 billion.

\$400 million! You ask yourself, Mr. Speaker: Why would they want to have that kind of deficit? An NDP government? Let's look at the explanation. Not my explanation, Mr. Speaker, this is the explanation of Howard Pawley, the Premier of Manitoba. Here's how he explains it, Mr. Speaker. For this point of view, I'll give Howard Pawley credit. At least he tells it as it is.

Revenues are down. Revenues are down in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, despite a new payroll tax introduced by the first NDP budget and expected to raise more than \$100 million a year. And unemployment is up. Approaching 6 per cent? No, 10 per cent in Manitoba, 10 per cent in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

What about their national leader, Fast Eddy, down in Ottawa? Where does he stand? Well, he is sitting here telling Mr. Trudeau: more injections of money, more injections of money. That deficit? Don't worry about that deficit; it's only \$24 billion. Spend some more. We can spend our way of it More government buildings; buy a couple more companies — -that's the advice of the NDP in Manitoba. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the deficit philosophy of the NDP is just about gone. The Leader of the Opposition, I suggest, probably is the last one who will ever advance a balance budget. Because now their party will shift; you're going to see a shift. He'll go onto better things and one of the fellows over there will rise to the top. And they will adopt some of the philosophies of their brothers across the country. So you will see them going back into the deficit situation, Mr. Speaker.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition tends to try to make is, he says, "Well, you gave all the money to the oil companies, gave it all away to the oil companies." Well, let's go back and remember and recall what it was like during the election and just after the election in the province of Saskatchewan.

Members that live down in the southwest corner — oil producing was just flowing, never seen the like of it — zero, shut in, nothing left. Well, you go down to the southeast side of the province, Mr. Speaker, and they were better than that. They were up to 5 per cent capacity. Well, sir, Mr. Speaker, we . . . (inaudible) . . . we have to do something about this situation, obviously. Revenues are going whoosh — something has to be done; the oil companies are pulling out, jobs are being lost.

What do we do? We make a modest adjustment to royalties, Mr. Speaker. And what are the results? And what are the results, Mr. Speaker? And it's hard for them to understand this. What are the results, Mr. Speaker? Well, I'll tell you what the results are.

Southwest region, approximately one-third of our oil production, is no longer at zero; it's now at 100 per cent capacity. The southeast part of the province, Mr. Speaker, is not at 5 per cent now. It's full out — 100 per cent. In fact, in the entire province of Saskatchewan right now, the nomination are being completely taken up, Mr. Speaker. We are producing and selling oil in this province at 100 per cent, not at 40 per cent like the former government ran.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — And what does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Well, I'll tell you the first thing it means to the Minister of Finance. It means more revenues coming in to us. We are in fact going to receive \$20 million more after the adjustment in royalties than was projected at the time of taking over of power. Twenty million dollars more, but also, Mr. Speaker, the oil companies are back working. The oil companies are back working. And I'll tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker, you might not see it because in Regina you don't have a lot of oil wells. I happen to have them in my riding. And they're working, Mr. Speaker. They're working and they're making good dollars and they're spending those dollars, and if dollars spread around, the economies of those regions and the economies of this province start to show an upturn. That, Mr. Speaker, is positive action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Everybody gained, Mr. Speaker, everybody gained. The government gained, the companies gained, the employees gained; and that's what they never could understand. They could see one way of doing it. The only one that should have all the money — the government. The government, Mr. Speaker, the government, that's all they cared about, because they saw themselves as everything. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why they're sitting over there' that's why we're sitting over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, sir, I'll tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker, that's how they come with their numbers. The thing I give them credit for, Mr. Speaker, some and mirrors — I'll tell you nobody can compete with them. Nobody can compete with them! The former premier is saying, "Double the cost of borrowing on the provincial debt." Double it, this number up to this number — 100 per cent increase.

Well let's look at the numbers, Mr. Speaker. Go back to the budget estimate of 1981-82. They had tagged in there, in their estimate book, \$22.3 million — \$22.3 million. What the actual cost was, Mr. Speaker — \$43.3 million.

So now they come, Mr. Speaker, now they come to the 1982-83 estimates, and of course interest rates were going up at that time, not down. So now they're going to have another go at these estimates — not 22, and they spent 43 — well, they'll saw off and put it at 35. Saw off and put it at 35. The actual number that we're projecting, Mr. Speaker, is 44.7, an increase on expense to the public debt actual — over probably actual — 3 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That is a far cry from 100 per cent, a far cry from 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, here is where their problem came. All summer they were sitting there with their research staff and their pens and they were whipping away, and they said, "Hey, I know where these guys are going." I remember Romanow used to say in this House, Reaganomics . . . (inaudible) . . . Hey? That's what they expect, so they had all their anti-Reagan-bashing speeches ready to go. They worked on them all summer — cut in medicare, cut in medicare. Some of you around here may recall that in 1978 the Leader of the Opposition was trucking around and saying, "Don't let me take away medicare. Hey, they're going to take medicare," him and Tommy Douglas. Well, I tell you, they were having their speeches all ready for that same old '78 pitch. The problem, Mr. Speaker — medical budget, health budget, up to \$26 million. Social services, Mr. Speaker, up what? \$50 million. Back to the poor, Mr. Speaker, back to the poor . . . (inaudible) . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what we have seen is a government that brought in programs. We said what we were going to do and we delivered on those promises and we not only delivered on those promises, Mr. Speaker, but also on the gasoline tax. Members opposite stood up and voted for it, supported it, Mr. Speaker.

The mortgage program — the members opposite stood up and supported it, Mr. Speaker. Now I wonder when the farm program, the third big chink in the campaign, Mr. Speaker, I wonder where they're going to stand that. I hear that the member for Assiniboia came out on TV when it was announced. Grand program, yep, one of the

better programs, quite surprised to see it's so wonderful.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they are going to vote for us on that program as well. I would be very surprised if they didn't. It was very well received out there in the farming communities across the province of Saskatchewan. So what's that say, Mr. Speaker? What is says, Mr. Speaker, is that we promised commitments to the people of Saskatchewan, and, Mr. Speaker, we delivered on those promises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, having come to the conclusion the delivery of those three programs — three programs that the members opposite stood in their places and supported — I would simply invite the members opposite, in all fairness to vote for once, Mr. Speaker, by their conscience. Maybe they had lost touch with the people. I invite the members opposite to stand in their place and really tell it the way it is, Mr. Speaker. I invite those members opposite to join with us and together unanimously vote for the budget delivered down, Mr. Speaker, one of the better budgets delivered in this province in some time. The people of Saskatchewan delivered it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 8

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Thompson	Koskie	Yew
Engel	Lusney	

NAYS — 41

Devine	Duncan	Rybchuk
Muller	Smith (Swift Current)	Caswell
Birkbeck	Boutin	Young
Taylor	Hampton	Gerich
Andrew	Bacon	Domotor
Berntson	Tusa	Maxwell
Lane	Sutor	Embrey
Hardy	Sauder	Dirks
McLeod	Petersen	Folk
McLaren	Schmidt	Myers
Garner	Parker	Zazelenchuk
Klein	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Johnson
Katzman	Hopfner	Baker
Currie	Martens	

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 41

Devine	Duncan	Rybchuk
Muller	Smith (Swift Current)	Caswell
Birkbeck	Boutin	Young
Taylor	Hampton	Gerich
Andrew	Bacon	Domotor
Berntson	Tusa	Maxwell
Lane	Sutor	Embrey
Hardy	Sauder	Dirks
McLeod	Petersen	Folk
McLaren	Schmidt	Myers
Garner	Parker	Zazelenchuk
Klein	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Johnson
Katzman	Hopfner	Baker
Currie	Martens	

NAYS — 8

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Thompson	Koskie	Yew
Engel	Lusney	

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

AGRICULTURE

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 1

Item 1

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:05 p.m.