

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
June 24, 1982

EVENING SESSION

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Address in Reply (continued)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I may say it had not initially been my intention to get into this debate for a second time. I was into the debate once. I had hoped that members opposite . . . I will sit down in due course. I at least speak from my feet, as distinct from the member opposite, who speaks from his seat. I had initially hoped that if I spoke about it once, members opposite might listen. But I may say that what has been said and, more important, what has not been done by the government opposite, indicates that the government simply isn't listening. The government isn't listening to the opposition, and the government is not listening to the people. I know members opposite in their over-blown arrogance, with 55 seats, believe that there's no point in listening to the opposition; it has nothing to contribute. I say to members opposite that a good government listens to the opposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the members opposite say they are. They certainly aren't behaving in that fashion. Nothing we have said and certainly not our amendment to the motion, seems to have made any imprint on the government and on the members of the treasury benches.

I want to say, as well, something that I said in the debate on the main motion. I want to repeat it because it's relevant here. That is, I've never seen a government start out in this fashion. A government normally starts out full of vim and vigour. You want to attack the economic problems, the unemployment. You people are starting out as if you've been in office for 10 years. I was amazed at the Minister of Education today. He was actually able to say yes or no, the first person who's been able to say yes or no to anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — We've been proposing a number of things. You people aren't even decisive enough to say no. You just want to study it. You want to review it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I am speaking on the amendment. Do you want me to read your speech? I think mine's better. The Minister of Labour made an announcement today, the singular announcement that has come from government opposite with respect to jobs, unemployment . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. Doesn't it impress the member for Regina North that that was our idea? Sorry, I may have your riding wrong. Doesn't it impress you that that was our project? We got it going. All you people did was flip the switch. That's all you people have done so far. You just flipped the switch on a project that we worked on and we got going and cut 800 jobs out at the same time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I may say, Mr. Speaker, there's a surprising amount of enthusiasm for getting into this debate, an enthusiasm which was noticeably lacking before supper. Something you people have eaten must have given you some inspiration.

I am going to deal with the amendment proposed by the opposition in reverse order. I want to deal with number 3 first:

That the following words be added to the motion:

but regrets that Your Honour's advisers, while recognizing this is a time of severe economic strain for Saskatchewan, have failed to propose any adequate measures to help those with the lowest incomes to deal with the severe hardships of rising prices.

I think many people suspect that the Conservatives represent the upper echelon of society. The way that you have behaved in government thus far shows that you are certainly not disappointing those who hold that view.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Have you ever considered the amount of land that Reg Gross has?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't know how one would add the amount of Reg Gross' land to mine. Mine would not make a significant dent in anyone's.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'll bet that you have more money than I have.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't know. We'll compare wallets when this is all done, I say to the member for Moosomin. But I think many people believe that you are the Conservative Party of the rich. You're certainly giving everyone reason to believe that they were right. For once you're proving everyone right. I predict that when it comes to people's worst expectations, you'll prove them right. With respect to the hopes which you kindled to such a bright flame during the election, you'll prove to be a monstrous disappointment.

One of those with the lowest . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I can't see your speech. If you want me to read your speech, I can't see it.

Among those with the lowest incomes, among those who are hardest hit, are the natives. Native people and the plight of native people have been something of an interest of mine. This interest comes about, in part, because of the nature of my riding. I don't think anyone could ever define exactly what a native is, nor could anyone do a head count, because I don't think a native could be defined exactly enough in the sense that they could then be counted by a census taker. Certainly, however, a larger percentage (I would think it may be as high as one-third) of my riding is native, and they get hit, and hit hard, with rising prices.

In recent times, it hasn't been the price of gold, or the price of expensive scotch whiskey, or the price of other luxuries which has been rising, it's been the price of basic commodities. It's been that of food and shelter, and that hits the native people the hardest.

Yet, we saw nothing in the throne speech which mentioned in any way the plight of Canada's and Saskatchewan's first citizens. I think native people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You want to hear that? I'm not sure the speaker will . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It may not take me 11 years to tell you, but it would take me some time to tell you what we did for native people.

Native people are one group that didn't desert the NDP in this election. There were many who did, I'd be the first to admit that. Natives (at least in the cities) were one group that did not. Native people were among those who were most realistic about what they might expect from the government opposite.

In my riding, I estimate that native people increased my majority from around 500 to 1,200. It made that kind of difference having them there.

My learned friend here tells me they remembered everything that you people had promised to do for them, which wasn't very much . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They may have remembered the Pelly by-election in which you people made an issue out of some assistance that was allegedly given to a band which in fact was never given. You alleged that we had promised something to an Indian band which in fact was not promised. But in sort of a northern version of the southern tactic of nigger-baiting, you people tried to make an issue out of a grant that was never given. And it deeply offended native people. They came at that point in time to realize how little they could expect from a Conservative government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm genuinely sorry, Mr. Speaker, that this disappointed the member for Moosomin. That hurts. I want you to know that. That really offends me that the member for Moosomin, my old stomping ground, would . . .

You further indicated to native people how much help they were going to be in the by-election of Regina North West. When you made an issue out of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You want to hear it again? Mr. Speaker, I hadn't initially intended to rise on this debate. I had hoped that what I had said . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Members opposite suggest that I'm going too fast for them. If you'd like me to slow down, I will genuinely attempt to put it slow enough so that members opposite can understand what it is that I'm trying to say. Is that slow enough for the member for Regina . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's a sharp contrast to the member yesterday. I had no difficulty hearing the member yesterday. You and I should get together. Half way between your volume and mine might do very nicely. You and I should meet somewhere in the middle and you may be able to make a sensible volume out of it.

In the Regina North West by-election you further told natives what they might expect in terms of help with living conditions. Do you remember what you did there? I can well understand that the member for Rosthern doesn't want to hear about this. Probably the Pelly by-election and the North West by-election were two of the sorriest chapters in the history of the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: — I'm having just a little bit of trouble relating what is being said to the amendment that's before the House. Would the member return to the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I was being interrupted so constantly by members opposite that I forgot myself and actually began to answer some of the tripe that was being stated.

Among those with low incomes who need help are natives. We saw nothing in the throne speech for them and as I intended to point out, they are probably the one group that isn't disappointed because they expected nothing from this government.

It might have been some additional assistance to people of low income if you had kept your promise with respect to gas tax. I know it produced great hoots of derision, but you people didn't promise 29 cents. You promised 40 cents. That is a significant difference. It will make a significant difference on a tank of gas. If you people would keep your

promises (and I want to get to some of them later), you could genuinely do something to assist low income people meet the rising cost of living. The gas tax would be one if you would just keep your promise. You didn't promise 29 cents. The bald truth is that you people can't multiply. That is how you came to get 40 cents in tax instead of 29 cents.

Another group of extremely low income people who are hurt by rising prices are immigrants. I met with some of them this afternoon — the people from Regina Plains Community College. They need help. It isn't part of this province's jurisdiction to determine whether or not immigrants come or don't come. I don't intend to get into that, it is a somewhat involved subject. But it is our responsibility to assist them once they get here. It is our responsibility to assist those people in meeting an ever-increasing cost of living. There are ways we could do that and you people have them at your disposal. I refer to the Minister of Education who impressed me so deeply in the question period today.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He is an excellent minister; he is a good man.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — He may be. You have a report on English as a second language instruction authored by Mr. Bizzarri. You did not receive it? Your predecessor did. But you have a report. He outlines for your benefit, Mr. Minister, if you have an opportunity to study it in the midst of studying everything else . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That is the only one he hasn't read.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You know, I can believe that. That is maybe why he is such a sterling improvement over the other members of the treasury bench opposite. He may have to be doing some reading. If you get to the report, you will find a number of recommendations in that report to assist immigrants when they come to this country — the lowest of low income people. I say to the minister opposite to leave aside the humanitarianism of helping those people cope with the increasing cost of living and just look upon it as a good investment. What they ask for is additional assistance in the English language and additional technical training — the kinds of things that those low income people need to meet the rising cost of living.

There is a serious oversight, perhaps, in helping those with the lowest income to deal with the severe hardship of rising prices. It is the failure to deal with the minimum wage. I may say I am still waiting with bated breath to see what is going here. I am still waiting with bated breath to see what happens with the minimum wage. I heard the Premier announced in unequivocal terms that the minimum wage wouldn't go up. I didn't hear him announce it. That is what was reported. A few days later, I hear the Minister of Labour come out with an approach that was a good deal more sensible. What I am waiting to find out is whether your Premier went off half-cocked again and announced something without having done any homework as he did with the 40 cent gas tax. Is the Minister of Labour playing games with those on the minimum wage who need help? Like I said, I can't read your speech.

The minimum wage, if I may say, deals as directly with the third part of the amendment as anything that has happened in this House. I think this House has a right to know what you are doing with the minimum wage. Are we to believe the Premier, who says it isn't going up? Are we to believe the Minister of Labour? He's listening to everyone. Are you playing games with the trade unionists and others who lobby you for a higher rate? I think the House has a right to know which of you we should be listening to.

Among those with the lowest incomes who need help to deal with the severe hardship of rising prices are superannuates, a number of whom live in my riding. The Leader of the Opposition (and I keep wanting to call him the premier, out of force of habit and partially because of the inevitable recognition that he will be four years hence) said on behalf of the caucus that that is one thing you could deal with. The bill is there. I have it behind me, in fact. I can find it in less time than it will take to tell you about it. It was introduced in March. It provides a subsidy to the pensions of superannuates, most of whom need it very badly. All we get from the members opposite is a yawn.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What kind of subsidy was that?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What was the rate? Well, I can find it for the member if you like. I am not sure that I can find it very quickly. I don't remember the number. I am not sure the Speaker would let me, if I did start thumbing through it. Yes, indeed, a short two-page bill. You aren't doing much about it. I admit individual members opposite may care about superannuates. I believe the Minister of Social Services does. I think she has a genuine compassion for low income people. I think she exhibited that in the last House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You should talk to your House Leader; he has the list of the legislation that is being introduced.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, no announcement to that effect has been made —whether you people are going to reintroduce it at this session.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You talk to your House Leader, he has the list.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Are you saying you are going to introduce this legislation again?

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . I'm not on my feet.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You seem to be doing a fine job of it so far. I really don't know what suddenly inhibited the member for Souris-Cannington, because he has been doing a fine job of speaking from his seat.

If you are making a commitment that you are going to reintroduce this in the House, that may well be the first positive thing you have done to assist people.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Are you going to vote against the gas tax and the royalty tax?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Opposition policy will be announced in due course. It's under study.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's got the habit.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It's a hard habit to break. Don't get into the habit of saying, "Government policy will be announced in due course." You'll never get rid of the habit.

The act is the act to amend the supplementary provisions act. If I got a commitment out of the Deputy Premier that you will reintroduce that, then I think I would sit down. I really would. I think I would have accomplished something. I have been in the legislature long enough to know that you don't accomplish all you set out to do. You measure your accomplishments by a fairly fine ruler. If the Deputy Premier will give me the

commitment that that is going ahead, that would make all the difference. I will wait in question period tomorrow morning, in ministerial statements, for the Deputy Premier to make that announcement.

Senior citizens, another low income group who buy perhaps as much as anyone else, need help to deal with the severe hardship of rising prices. Of all the people in society, it may be senior citizens who are hurt the worst by rising prices.

There are a number of things you could be doing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We'll get to that in a moment. Let's deal with the senior citizens. There's a number of things you could be doing. The shelter allowance which we introduced in March — not all the things we introduced in March were, I may say, positively received. I would admit with humility that comes with the day after, were very positively received by senior citizens. It was something that would directly assist those with the lowest incomes to deal with rising prices.

I might say that I had a stack of little notes from out canvassing. I carry my diary with me with a notepad in it and I might say that I had a big stack of notes from senior citizens wanting more information on the shelter allowance. I'll bet you one out of three senior citizens I called on in apartments asked about the program and whether it or not was available for them.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We have stopped the rising cost of living in the province.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh, have you? It's unfortunate the former member for Regina North East can't get in and speak on this. He was a person with a genuine empathy for low income people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — His loss will be mourned by his constituents. The rent subsidy is something you could do. It would be positive and the expense is not that horrendous. Most of the programs we introduced to assist . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Maybe the Deputy Premier will give you a commitment on that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Maybe he'll give me a commitment he's going to introduce rent subsidy for senior citizens? That would be very positively received and I'll tell you I wouldn't criticize you for it publicly or privately. I would genuinely applaud it.

I can't seem to find my edition of *Pocket Politics* but you people promised considerable assistance addressed in the broadest terms. You people promised to assist senior citizens in dealing with the rising cost of living. That's a direct quote. I hadn't noticed that. No, I thought I noticed the CPI (consumer price index) was still rising . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, for one month and then it will begin again in July its inevitable march upward.

I may say that the gas tax is of extremely little use to senior citizens, at least in my riding. The vast majority of senior citizens in my riding don't drive cars.

AN HON. MEMBER: — But the groceries still have to get to the front door.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, and they haven't noticed the groceries having gone down

appreciably since you introduced that gas tax. They haven't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It has an effect on freight rates, transportation, railroads, and you get the groceries a little cheaper then.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That, in fact, is not the case, I say to the member. I say that is not the case. I have a report on my desk in the legislature indicating that is not what is happening with the trucking industry. The report is that what they are paying drivers has not increased materially, yet they have not lowered their rates. So, in fact, the trucking firms are picking up the difference. It isn't going to the drivers; it isn't going to the public . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's what Dave Barrett, the future premier of B.C., used to call the trickle-down theory. Give it all to the people at the top and some will trickle down. That's how you help those with the lowest incomes to help meet the rising cost of living.

I'm trying to impress upon you people that there is a serious problem out there with the economy, with jobs, and you just don't seem to be successful . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Sorry, but if you people would speak one at a time I would be happy to answer your questions.

Do you want to ask a question? If you want to ask a question, you can direct that through the Speaker, and I will yield to a question from the member, because then I get the floor. I'm not going to sit down and let you speak, but I will let you ask a question. If the member wants to ask a question, I invite him to do so.

I gather that the member has a good deal more courage from his seat than he does standing up. He doesn't seem to want to ask his question. Any of you people who are so anxious to get into this can do so by means of a question. All you have to do is ask if the Speaker will permit a question. I'll probably permit a question from the members opposite, if they really want to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I don't believe that this session was meant to educate the members on the other side about the rules. Perhaps we could get back to the amendment.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I apologize, Mr. Speaker. The need is so awesome; the temptation is so great. I apologize that I succumbed to the temptation to start on that horrendous job of educating those people on the rules.

The other group of low income people who need assistance in dealing with the rising cost of living is those receiving social assistance. Nothing was said about what you're going to do about social service recipients.

To show you what you might have done if you had some imagination, how you might have assisted those . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The trouble is that if I go any faster I seem to leave you people confused. I'm trying to keep it slow enough so that you will understand it.

I'm reading from a document by Midland-Doherty Ltd. I think most members opposite will know what Midland-Doherty is. If you picked the five most respected brokerage firms in the investment industry, Midland-Doherty would probably be in that number.

Listen to the opening paragraph from their report called "Saskatchewan Budget Report '82-83":

This budget employs resource revenues to protect Saskatchewan people exposed to record inflation and record interest rates, and to invest in Saskatchewan's economic future.

That's the kind of thing that our amendment is asking from you people opposite.

It goes on, on page two of the report from Midland Doherty, to say that Saskatchewan's tradition of strong social spending is maintained in the '82-83 budget expenditure plan with allowances for senior citizens, assistance and positive programs to help native people, additional grants (here I'm speaking from memory of the budget — I'm not quoting from the document) and significant increased to what we used to call NGOs or non-government organizations.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The crowd is coming in.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The word is getting out that it's a great speech.

Those were the kinds of things that that budget did. None of you people made any mention of doing it; you're not even going to bring in a budget which might tell us what you're going to do to assist people in the low income bracket.

Midland-Doherty goes on:

Promising to protect provincial residents from high interest rates, the high cost of living and unemployment. Mr. Tchorzewski plans to increase government spending by 21 per cent to \$2.759 billion. Relief from high interest rates will come in the form of a \$20 million mortgage subsidy program and inexpensive loans to farmers and small businessmen. Measures to counter inflation consist of \$6 million to senior citizens in the form of shelter allowances . . .

That's all it would cost you to introduce a shelter allowance for senior citizens. All it would cost you is \$6 million. I wish the Minister of Finance were here. I'm sure he would admit that he can't estimate his highway budget or his education budget or his health budget within \$6 million. It may sound like a lot of money, but in the terms of the budgets of provincial governments these days, \$6 million is an infinitesimally small amount of money. Yet it would have meant so much to those senior citizens who are having a genuinely difficult time in meeting their rent payments.

Measures to counter inflation would consist of a freeze on utility rate increases . . .

We see the government opposite taking our idea of freezing utility rates and announcing it afterward as their own. You people are getting used to that. You are getting good at that.

. . . 21 per cent higher family income supplements . . .

That brings me to a program that genuinely assists people on low incomes — the family income plan. The family income plan was designed to deal with the problem of what we

call the working poor, to deal with people such as those who exist in large numbers in my riding, in the riding of the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, and in the riding of the member for Saskatoon Centre. Those working poor would, in fact, make more if they quit their jobs and went on welfare. That's who the program was designed to deal with. It was designed to supplement the income of the working poor so that it could never be said that they would make more and be better off if they quit and went on welfare. It's a good program, and it's one that needs to be constantly updated and revised. I say this to the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, who may represent many of those people. If there's one group of people whom we should have no qualms about assisting (even you people can't argue) surely it's the working poor. You want to know how to do it? It's simple. Just enrich the family income program.

This program was introduced some seven years ago. When the act was passed (if my memory serves me correctly. I wasn't in the House then, I was working as a personal aide to the then attorney general), that act was passed unanimously by the then opposition, the Liberals. So I recommend to you people the family income plan, in terms of assisting those who need it most, those with lowest incomes. I say this because I know that as soon as I sit down, someone is going to say, "Well, we need time to study it. We've got to get enough time to develop new ideas and programs."

Part of the difficulty with members opposite is they take an election to be a revolution. You've got to change everything; everything has got to be thrown out; the family income plan has got to be thrown out; you've got to start all over again; you've got to reinvent the wheel. Parliamentary government is not a revolution; you don't have to re-examine every jot and tittle, in a budget of \$2.79 billion. It is an evolutionary process . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I am; I am talking about assistance for those with low income. I know the members opposite are having great difficulty understanding the needs of low income people, but it is vitally important, and I want to spend just a moment longer on it.

One area where you could assist those in low income (I know you are going to get up and say that you need to study it; you study virtually everything, except some of the reports that perhaps you should have studied) is housing. The rising cost of housing has hit those in low incomes harder than, I think, any other kind of inflation, because it has been so dramatic. There was a period of time in society when everybody, no matter what his income or station in life, expected to own a house, and that was possible. Nowadays, there's a big segment of people, a slice on the bottom, who have no hope of ever owning a house. Those are the kind of low income people whom we need to be assisting with the rising cost of living, and there are ways to do it.

I point again to the budget introduced in March. We had a program to build 4,000 houses. All you have to do is flip the switch, the same as you have to do with the Nipawin plant. I urge members opposite to seriously consider that, because the poor are going to get hit much harder, and the group of people who are too poor to buy houses is going to expand, very rapidly, I predict. I say that because we have been building not nearly enough houses over the last few years and there is a shortage and a backlog. Once the economy rights itself, as it will, this madness will pass someday. It will probably be in four years time with a more sensible administration. And when it passes, there is going to be an explosion in the price of houses and there will be a lot more people who will not be able to afford houses. Regina housing prices could well go the way of Vancouver or Toronto. That will expand that group of people you are going to have to help to meet the rising cost of living.

The way to do that is to build more houses. I urge the members opposite to consider (if you won't listen to people of a so-called socialist stripe) trying your counterparts in Alberta. During the period of time when housing prices in Vancouver and Toronto were skyrocketing, they didn't in Calgary and Edmonton — the two cities with the highest rate of economic growth. Doesn't it make you curious as to why the housing prices didn't skyrocket in Calgary and Edmonton? They didn't because the Government of Alberta had a very active house building program and it kept the supply and demand in balance. Housing prices didn't go out of sight in Calgary and Edmonton.

What I am suggesting to you people is that you need to be considering the same thing. It would assist in creating jobs. There are probably few industries that employ as many people as house building . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sorry that the member for Rosthern is bored by those who have problems with housing prices and decent housing. Sorry that bores him. It may not be a problem in Rosthern. It is a problem in Regina and Saskatoon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it isn't. It is a serious commentary that I really wish you people would take seriously.

You know, as I go out there on coffee row (and I do), I have an advantage over many of you. Perhaps I don't over the member who is speaking, but I have an advantage. It is every morning when I go out into the business world and spend the morning there. On coffee row I will tell you what they are talking about: the (inaudible) opposition amendment, the economy. That is what they are talking about out there. They are not talking about our amendment; they are talking about the economy, the kinds of things that our amendment zeroed in on. If you people really believed you were sensitive to public opinion and if you had anything like the enthusiasm . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Would you let a member introduce a guest?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, so long as my right to speak isn't . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to this House nine ladies who belong to the Moose Jaw Toastmistress' Club. They are seated in the galleries this evening. They are under the direction of Mary Drackett. I hope you have a pleasant visit here this evening. I ask the House to welcome you at this time.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — While I am on my feet, I want to extend my welcome to the ladies in the Toastmistress' Club. One of the things I have always wanted to do, and never had time to do because of the pressures of public life, was to get into Toastmasters and spend some time with them to see their program.

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There is one last program which I think was effective in assisting low income people — the so-called ESP. It doesn't stand for extrasensory perception. It stands for employment support program. Inevitably, in the course of government, we've spun off some programs which I think were less than effective. I can think of some that may have been downright counterproductive, but I will not name them. But the employment support program may well have been the most effective program that we

set up. And it's the kind of thing that can be expanded and contracted with great ease. All you need to do is add another digit to the cheque and you've expanded the program. It automatically expands by itself. It aims at working with those with the lowest income and assisting them in dealing with rising prices and getting jobs that help them to deal with inflation. And, it's a self-help kind of a project. There's no paternalism about it. It's an excellent investment and I would recommend to the members opposite that you seriously consider expanding ESP.

I want to deal for a moment, if I might, with students. I think that young people are the most tragic victims of an economic slowdown. I think how I might have felt if I had been 18, well-trained, well-educated, and not able to find a job. Nobody wants you; you're useless. I think that has a very deleterious effect on young people, on their attitude to their work, and on their attitude to society. I think that 10 years later when an employer hires someone who is 18 and has spent the first two years on the dole because he couldn't find a job, that employer is going to know it. Because I don't think that person is going to be as good a worker; I don't think he'll have as good an attitude. If there is one area in which we cannot afford unemployment, it is for the young and the students. I think a prolonged period of unemployment is debilitating to middle-aged men, much less students. I think we permanently warp their attitudes.

And, so far, we've seen very little from this government opposite, except that its prepared to study and review. It will consider.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Consult.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Yes, consult. Consult. Certainly, a certain amount of that is necessary, but anyone can play that game of consulting a problem to death. That doesn't help the students. That doesn't help the students one bit. If you come up with a good program in September, it's been a make-work project for the public service but not for anyone else, because it isn't any good to students come September. Something is needed now. There are all kinds of things we might do.

I refer to the Minister of Finance who, in speaking to the report of the public accounts committee last year from opposition benches, referred to an idea which I think this House should consider. It would assist student employment. As well, I think, it would educate students genuinely in the way of parliamentary government. The idea was that serious students of political science would be assigned for a period of time to government and opposition caucuses — not one per member, but one for every four or five members. They would be assigned to the caucus; they would work for the caucus. They would do research and write speeches. I'd hope they would also have their turn at dealing with constituency problems. The members opposite will begin to realize that what we're going through here is but a tiny fraction of your work. The vast majority of your work doesn't take place in this red carpeted Chamber. I hope the students will have time to go out into the constituency. That is the student employment program which not only employs students but would make a positive contribution in assisting the public to understand our parliamentary government

It seems that the members opposite were somewhat more decisive during the election campaign than they are now. They didn't have all these hesitations. I want you to contrast the present indecision and procrastination with what you said. You had good words. You surely can't implement them, but they were good words. I say to the member for Turtleford, people will judge you. The members in this House are so new, I simply cannot set this thing down and be sure I am going to identify members correctly. Just

contrast the difference between what you said during the election and what you have done since. I say to the member for Turtleford that you will be judged not on what you said in the last election, but on what you do. Here is what you said, as distinguished from what you actually did:

A new PC government will be committed to providing immediate opportunities for our workforce — jobs will be created, a rural community development program, and a rural gasification program.

It seems they are having some trouble with that one. We'll get to the rural gasification program. They are having some trouble with that one.

An industrial strategy will emphasize the development of renewable resource potential.

I want to get to that in a minute, too, because that is one of the things you people really lack; any kind of overall strategy.

Education and training programs will be upgraded so that young people can take advantage of the opportunities and workers can improve their skills.

I urge upon the Minister of Education, as I did previously, to look at the Bizzarri report on immigrants. It probably wouldn't cost you any more than it cost you to print these for the province, and it would genuinely assist immigrants to become adjusted.

There are all kinds of models that you people could use to assist students. The problem was certainly high profile when I first became interested in Saskatchewan politics in the 1960s. I remember Ross Thatcher bringing in a program, I think the name of it was STEP (student temporary employment program). Another program was YES (youth employment services). There were endless numbers of programs. All of these provided a very real measure of relief, and none of them were very expensive. I don't have the estimates with me, but my guess is that you could introduce a meaningful program along the lines of STEP or YES, and it wouldn't cost you \$5 million. The way you guys are going through money, that's not even a blink of an eyelid.

Many students look to construction jobs for work. It doesn't help female students as much, because not many want to work in construction. The industry genuinely helps a lot of students. What has happened to the construction industry in this province seems an almost intentional bit of destruction. I am not blaming the construction strike on you. I am not suggesting that it is something you designed, fermented or inspired. But it is a serious problem, and one which I think you simply have to concern yourself with.

I want to read an editorial on that very subject from the Monday, June 21 *Leader-Post*. It shows you how far the construction strike is going. The headline is "Labour Dispute has Domino Effect."

The strike that has kept building construction trade unionists off the job since May 1 has created a dangerous limit around the time needed to complete Sears Cornwall Centre store and the Victoria Square Mall.

It goes on to say, and I won't read it all, how many people are going to be employed. There are 50 businesses in Victoria Square.

Unions have been without a contract since April 30. The blame must be shared with the contractors, but both sides must determine quickly the need for a reasonable settlement, unless they contribute to the community-damaging syndrome that has hurt so many cities in these rough times.

It goes on to say that if the construction strike isn't settled soon these projects will simply be delayed for one year. There are only 186 days left before Christmas. It means that for Regina the clock is running out even faster for waiting jobs. It means better fiscal help.

I know the Minister of Labour cannot directly involve himself in the strike. That isn't the system. Neither side particularly wants that. But there are subtle, behind-the-scene things that can and should be done by the Minister of Labour. You can put subtle pressure on both sides to get them moving. A degree of obstinacy may exist in both camps. Yours is a very prestigious office, Mr. Minister. Your influence may just be what is needed to break the deadlock. I urge you to involve yourself, but not in a highly public way, like bringing them together and banging their heads. That won't work. That's what the member for Rosthern was continually insisting the former minister of labour do. He never did that; he had more sense. I suspect the present Minister of Labour has more sense than to do that as well. But the former minister of labour, in subtle, quiet ways, did bring pressure to bear on both sides to settle the strike, and I urge the Minister of Labour to do the same.

The first portion of our amendment is the all-encompassing one. It says, "Help people who have jobs to keep them." That's really what is needed. It isn't enough when you are in government to point the blame somewhere else by saying, "Oh those people in Ottawa should be doing something. Oh, it's Reagan."

I suspect you wouldn't blame a lot on Reagan, because you seem to be adopting some of his policies. I want to get to that in a moment. You people have the responsibility now to deal with unemployment and people becoming unemployed. I know the traditional capitalist philosophy that you people espouse and believe in with almost a religious fervour says that in a capitalist society what we need is less government. "Get the government off the backs of the people. Stay out of it and let the cycles run their own course." The problems, as people have known for a long period of time . . . No thanks, I don't need a bucket. With Regina water, probably the less I drink, the better it is for me. Too bad the city council is not more co-operative, then we might have a proposal for dealing with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I've heard you can get new jobs. Go and clean up the water.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I say to the members opposite that that simply doesn't work any more. The reason it doesn't work is that a recession feeds on itself. My father used to repeat something that Herbert Hoover apparently said during the Depression, and it was the subject of great derision at the time and since. My father repeated it to me as an indication of how insensitive politicians can be. What Herbert Hoover said at the height of the Depression was, "What this country needs is a good laugh." In a strange way, there was a bit of truth to that, because the mentality of recession feeds on itself.

When I go downtown and sit in the coffee shop and listen to those businessmen and their employees talk about how tough times are, I know it's a vicious circle, because the more they talk about it the less confidence people have. The less confidence they have, the less they invest in new plants and farm machinery. The less consumers spend, the

fewer expensive items they'll buy. That's why the economy has needed governments to pull them out of the economic slumps. It's government that gets the system going and gets the mentality turned around. If only there were a cheap way of turning around the mentality. I think it would be all that's needed, but there isn't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Turn then both around.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That's good advice. I don't know who asked him to shush, but that's good advice. I hope the member heard that, if he hasn't heard anything else.

There is so much that you people could be doing. I refer again to the report from Midland-Doherty Ltd. on the Saskatchewan budget. Instead of picking the crown corporations to pieces, instead of setting up the Wolfgang committee to devour the crown corporations, you might have recognized them as a very positive instrument to be used to expand and assist the ailing economy. I'm going to read to you what they said about the former Saskatchewan budget:

The important role played by crown corporations in the provincial economy will enable the treasury to insulate Saskatchewan's manufacturing and construction from the global malaise to some extent, through large infusions of resource revenue cash into public companies. Mr. Speaker, 1982 will see a major residential construction initiative as well as the expansion of the Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation's Regina plant and a Saskatchewan Telecommunication Corporation contract for Northern Telecom to build a fibre optic plant in Saskatoon. Another positive factor is the momentum established by major ongoing projects that develop the province's resources, such as the Key Lake uranium mines, the Nipawin hydro-electric generating station . . .

You finally got that one going today; it should have been going eight weeks ago.

. . . and a \$1 billion heavy oil processing plant on the Alberta border.

The Minister of Mineral Resources confesses to be up to his ears in trouble with that one. It's amazing how the mentality of this province has changed since March 29. Well now let's go back to March 29, the day the election started.

If you listened to businessmen and employees, they felt they were living in a province which was the island in a sea of storm. They felt this province had a different future from that of the other provinces, which were in dire economic straits. They were optimistic about their province.

I think that a lot of that had to do with the kind of things that Midland-Doherty referred to with approval: "1982 will see a major residential construction initiative (4,000 houses compared to a paltry 1,000 from members opposite) as well as the expansion of the Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Corporation's Regina plant." If you people could ever get your act in gear on the farm gasification, they might get going again.

But those kinds of projects were fuelling Saskatchewan's optimism. You know what happened April 26? You guys came in and you put the zipper right around the whole province. You wrap 'er up. Nothing goes ahead — construction strikes, public construction gone. Major projects which are needed and ready to go are put on hold.

You put everything on the burner, and all of a sudden Saskatchewan optimism which has been a part of this province since 1971 has gone whistling down just like a spent rocket — splat!

AN HON. MEMBER: — How do they put that in *Hansard*?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That may be challenging I must admit; that may be challenging. But that optimism is gone and I honestly think that you people were a major factor in destroying that optimism because everything came to a halt. All the reasons why they thought that this province would be different, you people brought to a halt.

Father had a saying that "Tory times are hard times." You guys have proven that true. I used to think that coincidental. I'm now coming to believe that it's not coincidental. It's part and parcel of the philosophy — the "do nothing" philosophy — every 60 years. God, I can hardly wait until 2040 when you guys are back for your third term of office.

There are some other things that are just inexplicable. You put a halt to highway construction; had to look at everything; had to review everything. You people again see an election as a revolution. It's supposed to be us who believe in the revolution, not you but you saw it as a revolution. You had to rethink everything; review everything; and redo everything. It's an evolutionary process. You come into office; you change some things. A good deal doesn't come from a Liberal administration to a CCF administration to a Conservative administration to a NDP administration. Many of these programs never change. You guys are so inept, so inexperienced . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you're proving that there are some constants in this world. I say you are proving that there are some constants in this world.

Why halt in a time of economic distress; why put the zipper on construction? Why put a zipper around the province's construction? Why lock it up? What on earth was the sense in that? Again you people have contributed to the lack of optimism. You've destroyed it in three short months. Part of it may be as well your whole approach to economics and I'd be interested in hearing from the Premier, who has a degree in economics, and the Minister of Finance, who is proving himself to be somewhat adept in the area. I'd be interested in hearing you people outline your economic philosophy. I get the impression it's Reagan economics. I get the impression that's what it is. I get the impression you people are simply reimplementing the philosophy that Reagan tried and failed with and failed very badly.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Margaret Thatcher.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Margaret Thatcher. In England they talk about deindustrialization — the reversal of the Industrial Revolution.

It would be bad enough if it were a brand new idea that you people cooked up in opposition but it is Reagan economics; cutting the taxes and running up deficits. (A little loud am I?) That's exactly what Ronald Reagan has done in the U.S. It hasn't done anything to ease inflation. Inflation is at record heights. It's done obviously nothing to spur on the U.S. economy. The U.S. economy is at a lower level than it has been since the Depression and you people visit upon the province of Saskatchewan that tired, worn-out philosophy after it has been discredited elsewhere.

It would be unforgivable enough if you were the pioneers but surely if you can't look to the U.S. and you can't look to Britain, surely you can look across the Manitoba border.

During a time when the Canadian economy was, generally, fairly buoyant, Manitoba stagnated. It didn't share in the growth and prosperity of the late '70s that the other provinces experienced. It was because they had a government that was trying to turn the clock back to the 1930s and 1940s.

You people are reimplementing that tired, worn-out philosophy, and that's why we make a special point of urging you to assist those who have jobs to keep them. That means a direct reversal of your whole philosophy. Cutting taxes doesn't spur the economy. Surely Reagan has learned that.

As I said before, you have to be some kind of a genius to be a Republican president, to be in office for 18 months, and have Wall Street furious at you and think you incompetent. That's not easy. That's what he has managed to do. My guess is that by the time you boys have been in office for 18 months . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not only Wall Street will be mad at them.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — It will be everybody . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm not even sure Boyd Robertson will be their friend. I'm not even sure of that. I'm not even sure Boyd Robertson will have anything good to say about these guys after 18 months, when he sees what devastation you are visiting on Saskatchewan.

But I say to you people, rethink what you're doing. You are going to exacerbate the unemployment in this province and exacerbate a weakening economy. And I say to you, rethink what you're doing. It hasn't worked elsewhere. I don't know why you think it will work here. I would be delighted if you would tell us why, when it didn't work in the U.S., and it didn't work in Britain or Manitoba, it will work in Saskatchewan. I would just be delighted if anyone would get to his feet and tell me why it's going to work here when it hasn't worked elsewhere. I assume that the Deputy Premier is going to get back in the debate, and I'm glad to hear that.

I think you people know that you cannot depend upon much from the federal government. I note in today's paper . . . Why on earth Allan MacEachen is calling this thing a budget, I will never know because he doesn't seem to have a lot to say. But he's saying it's a difficult situation, that people should not expect too much. He's going to introduce non-inflationary growth. What he is saying, as I read it, is that he really has nothing to offer. Either that, or what he is going to introduce is going to be very, very destructive.

One thing that I think would be as serious and devastating as anything Allan MacEachen would do, would be to put on foreign exchange controls and artificially lower Canada's interest rate. The interest rates need to be lowered; there are ways of doing that, but exchange controls are not the answer. I'm disappointed that members opposite haven't taken the last few days to make representations to Ottawa as to what is needed in that budget, because no matter how good a job you do, and you haven't done anything so far . . . But let's suppose that you were on the road to Damascus and you saw a blinding light, and changed your ways entirely. You became brand new people, and decided to do something about the problems. Supposing that miracle happened to you, the amount you could do would be limited because you would import the recession from the rest of the country.

You could have a fairly expansive job-creating program here, but, inevitably, once it takes effect and the word gets around to the rest of the country, all of the unemployed

come here. So you can't deal with the problem in isolation. You have to deal with it in the Canadian context. I'm disappointed, as I think many Saskatchewan people are, that you have chosen to do nothing in terms of that federal budget. You have made no representations at all.

I think it would be different if there were some Liberal members west of Winnipeg sitting in the caucus, but they're not. We all know that. In as far as there is a spokesman for the Canadian public, it's you people, and the Canadian public and the Saskatchewan public look to you for leadership. So far, you have been woefully short of it.

I want to mention just for a moment the promise that they would bring gas to all Saskatchewan farms. At noon hour today, I was reading a report from the Saskatoon *Star Phoenix*:

Canada Manpower Centre has 25,000 people now applying for unemployment insurance, versus 15,000 a year ago.

That's a 60 per cent increase.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We inherited a real mess.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — No, you didn't inherit a mess. You inherited a difficult situation and you rapidly made it much worse. The optimism that was a hallmark of Saskatchewan people just disappeared like smoke on a windy day . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Coffee shops are filled with doom and gloom . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, I'll tell you, it's not down at the Tommy Douglas House, it's downtown Regina.

Frankly, I do not fathom the reasons why you are procrastinating on bringing natural gas to farms. The program was started. You may feel we were proceeding too fast. Well, that would a strange turn of attitude. You may feel we were proceeding too slowly, but the thing was in motion, and you people won't put it in motion any differently . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

You're waiting until Ipsco goes flat broke before you'll get going — that's what you're waiting for. Basically, Ipsco produces steel fabricators and gas pipe and that's what you people could have had them producing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You want to ask a question? I told you. Well, then, if you want the floor to ask a question, I'll yield it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think the man may lack the courage of his convictions. He doesn't want his question recorded in *Hansard*. The only difference between yelling from your seat and getting up and answering a question is that *Hansard* records the question.

I see I am lecturing the members again. I have once again, Mr. Speaker, succumbed to the awesome temptation to do something about that horrendous problem of the ignorance of the rules on the other side. I should leave that to your very able hands.

The gasification project was something you could have done. It was ready to go, and you could have helped it. I wonder why you didn't. I think we got the answer today in the question period, when the Premier admitted he had no idea what it was going to cost him. He doesn't seem to have a pencil and a piece of paper to figure these things out with. When he gets into government and he goes and talks to the officials, all of a

sudden the enormity of what he has promised suddenly begins to come home. The most surprised premier in the country . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — A politician turns mathematician.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I don't think we'll ever make a mathematician out of him, but we are making a politician out of him in the worst sense of the term — someone who procrastinates, someone who says, "Yes, rural gasification is necessary but not as necessary as rural gasification." We're not going to make a mathematician out of him but, by golly, we're going to make a politician out of him.

I say the reason why you people haven't proceeded with that project, which would considerably assist unemployment, is because you're finally starting to do some of the sums that you should have been doing months ago, which you should have been doing before you made those promises. You're suddenly starting to realize that you cannot implement all of what you promised — \$1.2 billion . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Yes, indeed! Indeed I will. I will table my notes when I'm done here.

The final thing that I want to say, and I know this will come as a great disappointment to members opposite . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, keep going.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, if there is a popular demand I will keep going. If you people are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, you have indeed. I have some hope for the member for Turtleford — he has indeed been listening. Unlike some members opposite, the member for Regina North West has been listening, and I have some hope for you. Yes, you're going to make it. We're going to make a member out of you yet.

What you people really lack is a comprehensive plan, an industrial strategy. What you're doing is poking away at the problems one by one. I'll say to the member for Wascana you have a little experience with football. You Tories are like a poorly trained football team. You pick up a ball and run with it without any thought at all. You do the same with ideas. You have an idea and just pick the thing up and run with it. You haven't any overall game strategy as to what you're going to do to make a serious dent in this province's economic problems, and these economic problems will do you in. You will go the way of the last Conservative government if you don't deal with them. If you want to deal with them, you're going to have to develop an industrial strategy and a comprehensive plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You better quit before there's dissension on your side.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh, I don't know. Do you think I may be causing dissension? You need to develop an economic strategy. I may say I have precious little faith that you ever will. It's not in your nature to plan; it's in your nature to react. You did that when you were in opposition. I hope you new members have a positive influence on those people because they certainly didn't plan any kind of strategy; they just reacted with a knee-jerk reaction. So, I say what you need is a comprehensive industrial strategy.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I, too, have some extra things I want to talk about, especially as they relate in this amendment to helping those people who don't have jobs, and also helping those people who can least afford not to have a job, deal with the severe hardships of rising prices.

While I was thinking about this, I thought about a remark the Minister of Labour made about a committee that was visiting while he was involved with a plant up at Yorkton at Morris Rod-Weeder. He was being derogatory when he said that I kind of recommended that maybe he should be selling his product to John Deere. I think Morris Rod-Weeder is in the same boots as my friend, Mr. Friggstad is and there are some slowdowns there. And I wonder if that was such a terribly bad idea. Kilberry for example, makes swathers, and I don't think Kilberry had nearly the same slowdown when he started painting some of his swathers green. In fact, I'd make a little wager that he sold more green swathers last year than . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He talks about how many people are working and how many people have jobs. Exactly. And if you paint some green and you paint some yellow and you paint some blue, different companies sell them. I'm a farmer and I would like to tell the Minister of Labour that last spring I bought a red Morris Rod-Weeder from a John Deere dealer. They have a connection there. But if all the John Deere dealers would just sell Morris Rod-Weeders or Morris cultivators, there would be lots around. So I don't think it was that bad an idea.

In fact, one of the recommendations our committee made when we were in Moose Jaw and we were listening is one the Attorney General will remember. He's just sitting there. I can't see him now. But he was on the committee as well. And the Attorney General today was on that small business committee with . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — I thought you were going to talk about swathers.

MR. ENGEL: — No, no. Just listen. The Minister of Health lives on a farm, and he does some farming as well, so maybe he knows about equipment. But Fairford Industries Ltd. came to our committee meeting and I made the same kind of a recommendation to them. They decided to get Poole to sell their building and Fairford made a heck of a lot more buildings than they did when they were trying to market them themselves. So, I think one of the ideas this government should take on and promote is discovering what kind of connections can be made to really put Saskatchewan in the forefront in manufacturing, so that they become an international company.

I was pleased to see Fairford buildings last fall, when I was in Africa. I saw buildings from Moose Jaw that were erected over there, and I think that the base that Saskatchewan has in manufacturing can grow and expand.

If you boys across the way use your imagination you can provide a little initiative and create jobs like that. I think that is a message that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Maybe the minister shouldn't laugh about it. Maybe he should sit back and seriously think about it, and make a recommendation to his company in Yorkton, the company he was involved with, and perhaps it can do some good.

Now, about the housing construction and the slowdown in housing — the 2,100 or 2,500 housing starts that Sask Housing would have begun could have created a lot of employment that our country needs badly. In fact, when I was reading a clipping in the Regina *Leader-Post*, I learned that the spinoff from housing is much more intense than you people may realize. Northern Telecom laid off 19 more people, bringing the total to 44 laid off, and attributed the layoffs to a decline in orders for telephones and telephone accessories, adding that was not related to the strike. You people like to blame all the slow down and the depressed feeling in Saskatchewan on the construction strike.

It's not only due to that; there are other reasons. The complete standstill in house building has been the result of the layoffs of these people here, right in Regina — 44 people at Telecom. How many jobs and how many people are affected by that and by the painful situation?

You don't have any imagination, as shown by that and by your throne speech. That's why we say in our amendment:

but regrets that Your Honour's advisers, while recognizing that this is a time of severe economic strain for Saskatchewan, have failed to propose any adequate measures to:

1. Help people who have jobs to keep them;
2. Help students get summer jobs.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's great. I'm not saying anything about it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think that's one aspect of your throne speech that's great, but why get to be a one-issue government? Surely there's more in Saskatchewan than mortgages and the gas tax. There's got to be more; there's more and so you've made a lot more promises.

There are spinoffs from sales of equipment; people selling bath tubs are out of business; people selling showers are having trouble . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I knew I'd get a reaction out of you with that one! Even the sale of telephone . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I was impressed, too. I watched my friend, your minister, Mr. Rousseau — what constituency is he in! He's in Regina South; he's the member for Regina South. I watched him on TV, and he had this white apron on, and he pulled a switch and he pushed a button . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, he wasn't in a bath tub and it wasn't a shower. He pushed a button and out came mud and he started making bricks. He just took all the credit, as if to say, "Look what our Department of Industry and Commerce has done. Yeah! Look what our Department of Industry and Commerce has done!" He got himself off his butt, off his chair, in two weeks, and he had a plant open that took two years to build. It took two years to build and he took all the credit in his department.

Now, the interesting thing is that when I read the article about it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm getting too excited about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just keep your cool.

MR. ENGEL: — Keep my cool?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just slow down. You have an hour and a half, yet.

MR. ENGEL: — I don't have to sit down in five minutes, they tell me.

You know, you opened a plant that was started in good time, a plant that manufactures a good wallboard, and I think that the Hon. Mr. Rousseau's comments were extraordinarily brief. He said, "It's nice to see such a business opening up, especially in the current economic conditions." But his remarks were quite brief; he really didn't stay and dwell a long time on the opening. Meanwhile, company president Ken Sexton is not

too confident, and he's hoping some quick orders from the government housing agencies will reduce his inventory and increase his cash flow. By way of reminder, the company makes a brick-type panel moulding of polyurethane and plywood which can be used as an insulating exterior . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

If you want to talk, you're going to have to tell the Speaker. Do I have to give him a lecture too? He's been around here for five or six years and he should know. Are you going to ask me a question? My hearing isn't so good and I'm proud to wear a hearing aid, so you'll have to speak up.

Meanwhile, listen to this. While they were waiting for Mr. Rousseau to show up, the company notice board, which your agent subtly perused, reported that strict controls on purchase and rentals have been implemented and that the 18 employees could have a sort of combined holiday-layoff this summer. He opened the plant, took all the glory, and stood on TV in his white apron, and the plant was already planning layoffs, because of your inactivity, because your Minister of Housing hasn't got Sask Housing on the road. If our Sask Housing program would have been implemented, there would be 4,000 housing starts.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They didn't buy them.

MR. ENGEL: — No, they didn't, but they're not going to be buying their panelling either if you're not going to get your program implemented. They are not buying this panelling either. The housing industry and the building industry, in general, are not exactly buoyant. But, now he is hoping some orders from the government for building projects will come through, and I'd encourage my friend to place a few orders. If you had the same people in Sask Housing, they would have been there; they know how to get things done. They know how to build some buildings. Get the plans out there, and get some contracts let. Get these people working. It must be depressing to have a grand opening and have the minister there, and then have a notice on a bulletin board that some layoffs are imminent. I think it's serious.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Does he know the meaning of depression?

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, I wish you knew what the meaning of depression was. Tory times are hard times.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of Sundays ago we had a picnic barbecue at our farm, and about 200 people were out and some of them were older people. And one lady got me in a corner and said, "Tory times are tough times and things are getting tough." Things are getting tough even in the new industries that have just opened.

Let me turn to a situation that has been raised by both the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He has a law office in my constituency in Coronach, and this is why I want to raise the issue about Coronach. It's the natural gas program that was planned earlier and that Sask Power has in place. It would include new trunk lines. You people are talking about plastic pipe. I don't think anybody would consider it wise judgment to use a plastic pipe for a main transmission line from one community to another. And from Assiniboia to Coronach is about 80 miles or 50 anyway. If you go as the crow flies (maybe you can get there in about 50 miles) you would touch the community of Willow Bunch and then Coronach and Rockglen. If a trunk line were placed down there, you could service the farms in between as well as

these communities. These are towns and villages and communities and farmers whom you say you're going to serve with natural gas, and that one trunk line would make work for Ipsco.

Here's a quote from June 5, 1982, under the headline "Ipsco Personnel in a Predicament."

Ipsco layoffs this week provide yet another painful indication that the economic noose is tightening and many Regina's, even those without direct Ipsco connections, will feel the rope burns.

I think the people who are going to feel those rope burns are the people in Regina who have direct and indirect connections with Ipsco — people who own 20 per cent of the shares; the people sitting on treasury board are the ones who are going to feel the rope burns. They expect you to do something about it. They know you cancelled contracts, and they know there were plans in place to lay that pipe and to service that community.

Now, there's another reason to get the guys down there and keep these people at Ipsco working, and that's that power generating plant at Coronach. For your information, to burn coal at Coronach, you need to use oil to start it, and if they're going to shut down the burner, they use oil to slow it down. You can't just turn the coal off. I talked to engineers down there and they were explaining it to me during the opening and on a number of other occasions. If Coronach would use natural gas instead of oil for the start-up and the burn-down in that plant, that would be the cleanest, most efficient plant in North America. It has the latest techniques. You've inherited a wonderful plant there.

The second phase is well under construction. It will likely be fired this fall, and I'd suggest you seriously reconsider your decision to put it on freeze, as Sask Power officials say. That project was put on freeze and they're not going ahead with a gas line now. I'd suggest you seriously consider building that gas line down there — building some pipe — keeping your people in Regina happy and the members happy, because then they can answer their constituents. Those rope burns would be pretty painful for all the members who represent Regina seats.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You should know.

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, I should know. I suffered the consequences sitting in backbenches and I've made excuses for the government. Don't get involved in that kind of an operation. Get in and tell these boys what should be done. Get in and make sure that that gas distribution system gets in place. I think that would be a tremendous asset to all of the people of Saskatchewan. Everybody would benefit. Those of us using electricity could turn the power down, and it would help people in lower income brackets deal with the severe hardships of rising costs.

If that generating station would be efficient, you could maintain a lower rate of electricity. I think there are very important reasons to go ahead with that gas line.

Another gas line that should be built and was on the program . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you feel this way last year?

MR. ENGEL: — I exactly did. I promoted that and that's why . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why didn't you support it when it was brought up? You changed your tune quickly.

MR. ENGEL: — Listen. That's why it was in this year's program. You cannot plan a program and get it operational overnight. It takes a year or more to plan it. That planning has been done. The design is in place. The maps have been drawn. The right of way has even been surveyed, and you people aren't going ahead with that project.

I want to explain about another line that's ready to go. There's a gas line that comes down to Assiniboia that would tap off to this Coronach line. There's another line at Lafleche and another one over at Kincaid. The Shaunavon-Kincaid line get the major bulk of their feed of the gas on a trading system that they've got in place, where the gas comes in from the United States. Now, if you'd build the line from Assiniboia to Kincaid, you'd tap three lines by linking three lines together and completing a loop. That means you don't need to depend on American gas to handle our southwest corner, where you're buying gas and selling it to them at the other end. So I think to solve that problem, the link should be built this year. The design is drawn, everything is in place and I really wish you'd consider going ahead with the Assiniboia-Kincaid link.

You know, there's even a personal reason to consider. We had organized a little group of farmers. There's seven on the loop where I live, where my own farm is. We were counting on getting that gas put in this spring. All of a sudden we got a letter that says: "Dear John, Sorry, we hate to write." They cut it off. They said not to go ahead with this program. Our young people wanted to work; it was a self-help project where we do the digging ourselves. An inspector from Sask Power would come out and watch us put it in. It was a wonderful program. I think you should consider that seriously, Mr. Deputy Premier; go ahead with that kind of program where we do our own thing, and everybody helps themselves. We can get it in cheaper that way. Maybe the only reason you are holding out on the gas installation thing, to make jobs at Ipsco, to make jobs for these young people, is that you don't like the contribution that Sask Power has. Maybe you're worried about that one.

The program that was in place was a considerable injection of cash by Sask Power that would make it possible for a farmer to do it. Now, say the member for Moosomin wants gas to his place, and the project would cost \$3,500. With no government contribution, he would pay \$3,500. With this new program, Sask Power would put in the first \$1,000; then the farmer would pay half of the balance, which would make the \$3,500 come down to about \$1,200. This would be attractive, and would put the gas in at an affordable price.

I think you should seriously consider the gas extension program, particularly in the 40 communities which were ready to go. The designs are drawn; the plans are there. The jobs are there and you are sitting on it.

When they announced this massive layoff, an Ipsco employee, a Mr. Phillips, said, "Let's hope it's not another case of too little too late." He was referring to the federal government as well. I think you people should seriously consider that. You have shares in the company. There is a tremendous hardship for the people in Regina, and the consequences are felt throughout the entire province.

I just have one more area to discuss, and I'm sorry the Premier is not in for this. I want to talk about jobs in coal. I hate to say this, but the former member for Estevan was my best

buddy. I just thought he was a wonderful big guy. He really was. He reminded me a lot of the Deputy Premier. I don't know if you and I could be so close friends, but I thought he was a good guy. I think if he was our member today, instead of the Premier, maybe this wouldn't have happened.

Estevan Area Coal Mine to Shut Down. Manalta Coal Limited is shutting down its Climax mine east of Estevan for at least one month.

The shutdown (now listen to this line), the first one in more than 18 years . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . (My colleague said that Tory times are hard times. He knew what he was talking about). The first shutdown is scheduled for July, and it means that 23 coalminers will be laid off. Layoffs have already started, with the people who were most recently hired laid off first.

Early this year, Manitoba and Saskatchewan Coal Company, the other private coal company operating in southern Saskatchewan, laid off 33 workers from its Boundary Dam mining operation.

Although May is usually the busiest month of the year for job vacancies (what happened this year, with 45 layoffs) the number of people registered for work during May remained high at 1,150 people. The 10-year average is 600.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What was the date on that?

MR. ENGEL: — June 8, 1982.

I don't think you are doing a good sales job. If the Premier knew what is happening in Estevan, he'd be out there selling that coal, and the layoffs wouldn't happen. I think it is a sorry story for the people of Estevan. If you get those miners upset, I feel sorry for our Premier. I think there will be rope burns in more places than Regina. There might be rope burns in Estevan as well.

Jobs in coal, jobs in Ipsco . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is the member threatening me?

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the government's throne speech failed to recognize that this is a time of severe economic strain for Saskatchewan. It failed to propose any adequate measures to help people who have jobs keep them, to help students get summer jobs and to help those with the lowest incomes deal with the severe hardship of rising prices. Let me just give them one more idea to help those with the lowest incomes deal with the severe hardship of rising prices.

Down in Willow Bunch they had a little make-work job that went every summer. The Department of Social Services hires 10, 11 or 12 people. It had a project that the town foreman would supervise. These people, instead of just taking home their welfare cheques — and the feds contributed half of this program — had these make-work jobs. It would be worth your while to go to visit Willow Bunch and see what has been accomplished. They've been able to clean up their park; they've beautified the town, painted fences, done work for senior citizens. I think this kind of thing could have been recommended in the throne speech. You could have set this money aside, you're going to spend it anyway.

All these people who are on unemployment and those who can't get unemployment — you're not going to let them starve. Tory times are hard times, but you're going to have a heart and you're not going to let them starve. You're going to give them some welfare. Instead of giving them welfare, you could have make-work jobs like that.

I'd really like to talk to your people in social services who know about these projects, and who can create those kind of make-work projects. They included all age groups from young people — high school students coming from poverty-stricken homes — to older people who were on the job, who did what they could for the minimum wage, instead of getting welfare. That kind of program is really essential in times as tough as they are going to be this summer. Like my colleague said, "There will be a zipper around the province." I think you have zippers around just too many projects. There are just too many projects that are frozen and shut down.

The construction industry is really something. I'm glad I haven't any more construction equipment because it wouldn't be working today. I was in the construction business for quite a long time, and by 1964 everything stopped. All the grants to the small towns were frozen and cut off exactly as they are today. I can see a repeat of what happened when Ross Thatcher got elected. I think you have people close enough to him to know what's happening. Take his advice if he gives you some recommendations . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I sure am. I sure am. And the only thing we can learn from history is that it repeats itself, and if you can't learn that lesson, that's why you're sitting on the outside corner, my dear friend. That's why you're on the outside corner. You should learn from history; you should learn how to respond to the needs of people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you'd let me, I'd quit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that I will not support the main motion, but I will support this resolution.

MR. LUSNEY: — I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to get into it. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the amendment that was proposed by my colleague, the member for Shaunavon. That motion expresses the regret that this government has failed to bring in programs. It has failed to state in its throne speech ways that it could help the people of this province keep their jobs, help students get summer jobs, and to help those with the lowest incomes deal with the severe hardships of rising prices. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government should have been doing. It neglected to do that.

I intend to bring some evidence forward that will indicate to this House that this government has not been trying very hard to do many of the things that the people of this province expected them to be doing. I believe that in the last few days the members opposite and the ministers have demonstrated that they are intent on studying and reviewing and considering and delaying as many of the programs as they possibly can.

I don't know why they want to delay those programs, Mr. Speaker, because I think the people out there expected a little more than that when they elected them to office. My colleague says they shouldn't have, but they did. But nothing is happening now. They talk about some of the programs that they are going to be bringing in, and yes, I think there are some good programs. But even with the programs they are bringing in, we still have to improve them a little, because some of these programs, although they may appear to be reasonably good, may only assist a minimal number of people out there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member asks if I have really examined them. Well, I think in the next few days we'll have the opportunity to go through every one of those

bills and see just what they will provide for the public, how many jobs they will create out there and how many of the people on low incomes are going to benefit from them.

Somebody mentioned the number of jobs that these programs will create, and my colleague mentioned Ipsco and I just wonder how many of the people who have been laid off at Ipsco right now feel that 29 cents a gallon for gas is really a great big saving to them. If they have no job, they really don't need that cheap gas to drive to work with. What they need is a job and a pay cheque. This government has not been addressing that problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — If they would introduce some of the programs they promised during the election campaign, Mr. Speaker, and one is the rural gas program. . . I think a lot of people expected that they were sincere when they were making those promises. If they were sincere about those promises, it would help Ipsco to build pipe, it would keep those employees working, it would benefit the people out in rural Saskatchewan who are waiting for cheaper fuel, waiting for the natural gas up there. But what do we see in this House today? We don't see any action. We don't see anything happening with the rural gas program. We don't see much happening with many of their programs that are needed out there.

We should be looking at moving ahead with construction projects. But that isn't happening, either. They have cancelled some programs that were out there, some programs that the people were expecting. For example, there are no senior citizens home repair grants. Many of the senior citizens were waiting for that. The people have been waiting, and if they could get the grants that were proposed, the construction industry would also be working. But the dropping of many programs has escalated unemployment in this province today. We won't be seeing the senior citizen housing going up there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . As my colleague is saying, "Nothing for the senior citizens."

Frankly, it doesn't appear that there is much for anybody. There is absolutely nothing in the throne speech that would indicate that this government is going to provide any kind of assistance for the people of Saskatchewan that is really going to be of benefit to them.

If it would go ahead with many of these construction projects, we wouldn't see all the layoffs that are taking place at Hudson Bay. The pulp mills would be going. They would be moving lumber out of there. The people would not be unemployed. They would be working. That would improve our economy.

But no, we don't have that happening. We see a delay in highway construction projects.

We have about three of them that . . . The minister said the other day that he had awarded about \$3 million worth of projects so far . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right. Out of a \$200 million budget, he let about \$3 million worth of contracts. Even if we go with what he is proposing to let in the future, which has something like \$14 million out of the \$200 million, all that's going to do is put maybe a couple of stockpiles up someplace, and maybe build 10 miles of road and maybe oil a few miles of road. That, Mr. Speaker, is not going to create employment in this province. This government should be moving ahead and getting this work started, getting all of these projects under way, because I think that is what the people of this province are expecting from it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — We have a lot of unemployment in this province, and what do we hear? I saw an article someplace in the paper that the Premier says that the answer to unemployment is keeping the wages down, that if the wages stay down then the employers are going to hire more people. I suppose that is Tory logic, that if you can keep people working cheap enough then somebody may hire them. But I don't think that is what the people expected out there. They expect a reasonable salary; they expect to be out there working. The member for Moosomin says that somebody is grossly overpaid. Talk about the pot calling the kettle black. He says somebody is grossly overpaid for what he is doing, and I don't know if he was referring to himself or who he was referring to but . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's a good guy.

MR. LUSNEY: — Somebody says, "He is a good guy." I'll accept that. I'll say that the member for Moosomin earns what he gets paid.

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the members giving me something to talk about. I think it helps. As long as they want to keep on talking from their seats, I'm willing to stand here all night if I have to. I really don't mind.

But while that government is talking about lower salaries for people, about keeping down the minimum wage, what has been happening recently to the people they have been hiring? Do we see some of those political hacks working for minimum wage? They get \$85,000 a year. That's right. They are making sure that they are paying their people well. But they are telling the public that they should be sitting on a lower minimum wage. They tell them that they should be working for less. If they work for less, somehow they will get more jobs. That's what they are telling the public.

They recently announced that they will go ahead with the Nipawin power project. I think we should congratulate them on that. That will provide a bit of work. It took them a long time to get that program going again. It will provide some jobs for the people.

The Nipawin power project wasn't the only delay by this government. It is not the only project they have delayed. I think we have to look at one other one, and that is the Canora ethanol plant. That was another project slated for this year. The engineering work was being done on it. What has happened? They have cancelled all of that. It is another project on hold. I suppose one could venture a guess as to why it was put on hold. Like some of the other projects out there that would have been of benefit to the people of Saskatchewan, they put it on hold because very likely they will be giving it either to a private company, or they will cancel the program altogether. They will be saving some of that money to pay for the programs which they have been promising — programs they really didn't consider very closely when they made their promises during the election. They just went out there and promised and kept on promising. Now they have to start cutting to pay for them.

I suppose if they wait long enough and delay enough of these projects throughout the year, before they know it, fall and winter will come, and they will save themselves millions of dollars, because they will not have done anything all year. There won't be anybody working out there. This economy will continue to go down and down as long as the government sits there and does nothing. The people expect the government to

get this economy moving and get some projects going.

What is happening to people with low incomes? We have many people with low incomes. Have they been proposing any programs to assist these people? As far as I can see, there have been none. They cut programs. They cut, as was mentioned, the housing program for senior citizens. They haven't provided anything for people with low incomes, who have a job at minimum wage or below minimum wage and who are trying to work. They haven't been assisting those people. They haven't increased the family income plan. The poor people really aren't benefiting that much.

They are proposing a 13.25 per cent mortgage. Is this going to help those people with low incomes? Is it going to help someone with a small mortgage or no mortgage at all? Is it going to help the individual who will not qualify for that mortgage? According to the bill before us, there is nothing that would indicate that a person with a \$10,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 income will qualify for that program. So there are a lot of questions there that have to be answered. I think we will want to see, before we totally agree with that program, just who it's going to help. It may help the member for Estevan. It may help him buy a house here in Regina, someone who is making about \$90,000 or \$100,000 or whatever his salary may be. It will help someone like that, and he would qualify for the program. But will the individual earning \$10,000 or \$15,000 qualify?

What are they providing for communities that have, in the past, been receiving grants to keep people employed throughout the summer? They're not providing any of these grants any more. There are many communities out there that kept people employed throughout the summer. They kept them employed and kept them off welfare. Are they providing any of that? No. They are saying, "We're going to give you 29 cents a gallon, and that should be benefit enough." These people who don't have a job to go to and very likely, don't have a car — are they going to benefit from the 29 cents a gallon? Those people don't benefit from it. So it appears that the people who are going to benefit are really the people who don't need that benefit very much. It seems that that's the way all the programs this government has been introducing are designed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're doing great, Norm. Keep it up and you just may make some dent in them.

MR. LUSNEY: — Well, we've only got about an hour to go, so maybe I should keep it up.

What have they been doing for students in this province? Absolutely nothing. Many of them are out of school now. They are out there; they've applied for jobs or they've got their names on the list at the unemployment office, and how many do we see employed at this time? I have just to use a few statistics here, if you really want to look at it; I think it's a very sad situation out there. We have in Regina about 1,200 of them who are registered and who don't have jobs. We have about another 1,200 in Saskatoon who are looking for jobs. You go to Prince Albert and there are about 650.

You can go to every town and city in this province, and you'll find that there are people, students, looking for employment and it's not there. Why isn't it there? Because this government has not seen fit to release some of the projects that were ready to go. They have not initiated any new projects. Even if they didn't want to go ahead with some of the projects that the previous government was trying to go ahead with, they should have been working, in the past two months, to get their own projects going and to provide some employment out there. They haven't been doing that.

I think the Premier has stated that he was intending to open some offices in foreign countries. One of them, I think (there's a news clipping here), is in Japan. Now, that should help some of our employment here. He says he might even consider opening some offices in other countries. And he feels that will somehow help employ our people here.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Maybe sell them some coal. Get those coal mines going again.

MR. LUSNEY: — Yes, they would have to. You mentioned a coal mine. Yeah, there's a number of people who are unemployed there. People who are looking for work and don't have it. And it's the coal mines; it's the lumber industries; it's the construction industries. And no matter what area you look at in this province, you see that this government has not been making any moves to create employment and to help the people of the province.

I'm sure they'll be glad to see the 13.25 per cent interest, but I don't know whether that's really going to satisfy all the people. The thing I can't really see with that bill is how it's going to create employment. Some people who have mortgages may be able to renew them at a lower rate, if they qualify. That seems to be the thing, you have to be able to qualify. And if the banks want to be nice to you and if they feel you have enough money, I suppose they'll allow you to qualify for it. But if they don't feel that you can afford it, then you won't qualify for it and the very people this program should be helping will not be getting any benefit from it.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think, has been the shortfall of this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — One of many, one of many.

MR. LUSNEY: — As my colleague has mentioned, it is one of many. Yes, I think it is one of many and it will probably be one of the continuing many within the next four years.

We haven't seen anything happening in the past six weeks. They have put holes in just about every program that they had. And it doesn't matter where you look. You can pick up any paper today and what do you see? You see layoffs. You see people becoming unemployed. You see companies that are going broke. And yet every bankruptcy that occurs in this province was one that was never supposed to happen if that government got into power.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They were going to.

MR. LUSNEY: — Yes, they were going to get industry going. They were going to develop everything in this province. But after about six weeks in government, we don't see more industry; we see less industry. We see some of them going. We see some of them closing down . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from across says, "What about the brick plant?" Well, they opened up one plant, but probably about two or three of them closed down. I suppose that's one way of boosting the economy in this province.

They talk about agriculture being number one. I have seen, to this day, no indication that somehow agriculture is going to be number one with this government, because many of the things that affect farmers, they haven't been addressing.

The people were looking at the property improvement grant increase, which was introduced in the last budget. What happened? No increase in the property improvement grant.

Nothing for the farmers. What have they been doing about the crowrate? And that's a very big concern to the people of Saskatchewan, to the farmers of Saskatchewan. They haven't talked to anyone. They haven't written any letters to the federal government; they haven't discussed it with them. They don't know what's going to be happening with the crow, or so they say. So, when you talk about making agriculture number one, we have not seen any action from that side of the House that would indicate that they are even interested in agriculture.

But, I'm sure that eventually it will come to their attention that they should be looking at some of the things that they said they would be looking at. They should be looking at the one industry that is supposed to be number one: agriculture. I do believe that agriculture is the number one industry in this province. It's something that we should be considering very seriously when we look at programs in agriculture.

The Premier used to be a teacher at the University of Saskatchewan — or a professor, pardon me. He was a professor of agriculture, he's a farmer himself, and yet, in this past week and a half we have hardly heard anything about agriculture.

If farmers have the income that they should be getting, that would also improve the employment situation, because instead of farmers going bankrupt (like many of the industries are today), if they had the income that should be coming to them for the product they produce, then they would be looking at hiring people, too.

Someone brought up the beef stabilization program. What have they done with it? That was a program that would have brought some benefit to farmers, and it did last spring when they received their subsidies. But now it's another one of those programs on hold. They don't know if it is going to continue.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's right, the Deputy Premier wanted to hear it.

MR. LUSNEY: — I didn't realize that the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Agriculture are right here, and maybe I should be directing my speech in their direction.

Mr. Speaker, in the past two weeks we have seen a typical example of what we are going to be seeing for the next four years, and that's a government with no action. We see a government that will delay and try to put money into the hands of people who donated, as opposed to people who need it. People who need help are the senior citizens, students looking for work now, the farmers, industry and small businessmen. There have been no programs introduced by this government for small business. There are many small businesses out there that employ people, and a lot of those have been having problems. Many small businesses were looking for programs that would help them keep their businesses operating in the small towns of this province. There is nothing for small business whatsoever.

It appears that they intend to do very little about the economy and the unemployment of this province. They are going to introduce a couple of bills that will help some people but very few bills that will help all the people.

That, Mr. Speaker, is going to be a mistake on their part if they do that. The people of this

province will not sit back and allow any government to introduce programs that are going to benefit only a few people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm afraid I didn't hear the comment of the member opposite. Oh, the 38,000 families that it's supposed to help.

I suppose many of those would be in the same income bracket as the Premier or maybe some of the civil servants. But, Mr. Speaker, the 38,000 families are just a few of the people that really need that help. I know some people in my constituency who don't make \$1,000 a month and have a mortgage that's more than \$50,000. Now they are on the verge of losing their homes, but under the bill that's been introduced, if the banks are allowed to decide who qualifies and who doesn't some of those people are not going to get the benefit of that program. That's a working individual who is going to have to lose his home if he doesn't get some kind of help. So, I think there are a lot of people out there who are not going to qualify under that program, Mr. Speaker.

Those opposite seem to be very critical of the former government's programs, but I think that these people themselves are now failing to address the problems of the very people who need their help.

The other night on TV, the Premier said that that program was going to help anyone, whether he lives in a trailer or a cabin, or what have you. Yet, when you listen to some of the comments coming from the bankers, I cannot see people living in trailers qualifying. A lot of people living in trailers are either minimum wage earners or have incomes that are far below what that bill is going to allow.

Now, some of the members opposite say that is not necessarily true. If it is not true, I would like to see where in that bill it says that everybody is going to be eligible to receive under that program. I would like to see where it says that there will be no means test. We've heard it when they were the opposition. Whenever they would introduce a program, there would be no means test. Now they come out with a program that was supposed to benefit everybody, and suddenly, you have to qualify. There's a means test there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Somebody said there is not test. Well, maybe there's no test, but the test is going to be when you go to talk to the banker, and he says your income is not high enough to afford a \$50,000 mortgage. He is going to tell you that you just went through the means test — you don't qualify. Now, if that happens, I think it's going to be a bad program. And I would like to see that program introduced, but I want to see it introduced in a form that is going to benefit a lot of the lower income people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The hon. member is not even able to get the floor. He has the floor. Would you give him an opportunity to speak?

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It was interesting to listen to some of the comments coming from the members in their seats, although they were coming from every side of the House, and I don't know if they were coming from our members or the opposition because I've got them on both sides of me. I have the opposition on one side and my colleagues on the other side. But I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for bringing them to order.

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the government has been talking about helping a lot of people out there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You went through that already.

MR. LUSNEY: — How's that?

AN HON. MEMBER: — You went through that already.

MR. LUSNEY: — Somebody said I went through that one. I was just looking at what the Royal Bank expects there, and I don't know if I want to bother going through that one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's a real bad one because what they expect out of it really isn't going to help the people that I would expect it to help.

We have another article here with another 223 people unemployed at Northern Telecom. And when we're talking about telephones and the likes, again we have a government that was promising people — the senior citizens — free telephones. Here we have telephone companies that can't move telephones anymore.

So we have a lot of promises that that government made that they are not addressing right now. And if they did, I think that would improve the unemployment situation in this province. It would improve it quite a bit.

I see the Minister of Industry and Commerce moved in. We're just looking at the problems that even some of the telephone companies are having or the telephone manufacturer is. And I had asked when some of the promises that that government had made during the election were going to be introduced. And one of them, Mr. Minister, was the promise of free telephones for senior citizens. Those I am waiting for and the senior citizens are waiting for.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't you believe in that?

MR. LUSNEY: — Sure, I believe in that. But I'm waiting for it and it's not happening. The senior citizens are waiting for it. Northern Telecom is waiting for it. They're hoping that more senior citizens might get some phones. They might put an extension in if it's free. And that would assist Northern Telecom and that would help their employment.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'll pass it on to him.

MR. LUSNEY: — He says he'll pass it on to the minister. So, that will be good. I'm glad to hear that. I'm glad to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can see that the members opposite are getting a little annoyed. They are getting a little annoyed, I suppose, with the fact that we are out here today — the nine little members on this side against the 55 — and we're trying to keep this debate going. We are keeping it going because the members opposite could not seem to generate enough of their members to get up and speak. Fifty-five against nine, and you can't keep it going. They couldn't get their people to keep this debate going until 10 o'clock this evening.

I wouldn't mind that so much, Mr. Speaker, if there weren't an agreement made with the government that we would have so many of our members speaking and they would have so many of theirs, and that would have filled in today. But we have seen that happen when they were in opposition. We see that happening now that they are in government, and they're a big government now. I think, Mr. Speaker, that only indicates

one thing. That should indicate to the people of Saskatchewan that if they promise you jobs, or if they promise you industry, or whatever they may promise you, you can't believe them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know more of my colleagues would like to say a few words in this debate, so I will close and say that I think it is time the government realized that it is a government with a lot of members. And it should be getting out there and doing some of the things that it promised, and get on with providing employment for this province and improving the economy of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to get up and participate in this vigorous and exciting and scintillating debate tonight. Since I have not had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak in the throne speech debate, I will be addressing both the main motion and the amendment.

I want to offer my congratulations to you, sir, first of all, for your re-election as the member for Rosetown-Elrose and, second, on your election as Speaker of this legislature. I think everyone of us who has served with you before knows and appreciates the respect and high esteem you hold for this House, and for its procedures and its traditions.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — I know that you will preside over this House with a high degree of fairness and a strong sense of tradition, and I want to assure you that you will receive the greatest respect and highest degree of co-operation from members of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I feel a particular sense of pride in the speech of the member for Melfort in moving the motion. As some of you will be aware, my parents are constituents of his, in the small community of Gronlid, 20 miles north of Melfort, and I grew up in that area and went to high school in Melfort.

I also want to congratulate all the newly elected members of this House. I want to particularly congratulate a long time friend and acquaintance, the new member for Cumberland, who received 67 per cent of the vote in the Cumberland constituency.

I would like to congratulate individually each of the newly elected PC MLAs but there are so many of you, and so I hope that you will understand . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. Oh, you're unfair. You're unfair. You always seem to be out of the House when I'm being nice to you.

I want to say to the new members that you're now part of a very small community of Saskatchewan citizens who have had, or who have, the privilege to serve as members of this Legislative Assembly. It's a community with special responsibilities and a community with a special set of relationships.

Many of you may have been as surprised in first taking your seat in this House as I was when I first came here that members of the opposition and the government actually speak to each other and smile at each other and can be friendly on occasion. I think that

the public is not generally aware of the special kind of relationship that I talked about. In this House, and on the hustings, politicians of all political persuasions fight hard because we hold strong beliefs and strong opinions. But it is important for all of us to remember that when expressing ourselves no personal malice is meant nor should it be taken because, while we may frequently disagree, for the most part we do respect one another. I for one very much value the friendships I have made on both sides of this House and I look forward to getting to know the new members.

I want to congratulate the Premier and the members of the cabinet on first of all leading your party to what is clearly a resounding victory on April 26. I know that each of you has by now recognized that you take on a heavy responsibility and a heavy burden and again it is one that those who have not been there cannot appreciate. I think that if anyone tried to describe to you what the job of a cabinet minister would be like and what happens to you within a day (or sometimes three days if there is a weekend in between) of being sworn in, either you wouldn't believe them, or, if you did, probably you wouldn't take the job. But I suppose that one of the things that is common to most of us who engage in this profession is that we are seldom accused of choosing a sane and rational profession. I wish you well and you will understand and not take offence if I say but not too well.

I want to particularly congratulate all the private members. I mentioned the member for Melfort and the member for Saskatoon Riversdale who moved and seconded the throne speech and did a commendable job. I want to congratulate every other new member who spoke for the confidence with which he began his new role in this Assembly, and with which he delivered his first speech. While I may occasionally have had some disagreement with some of the content, I nevertheless have a great deal of admiration for the delivery, and for the effort . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I say to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, that all those years he was in opposition, I tried to tell him that I really did like him. He was one of the guys in opposition who I thought was a good guy. I withhold judgment on him in his new role, but I hope my judgement will not be too harsh.

I want to say to the private members and the backbenchers (some of them sit in the front), don't ever downplay the importance of your role. Through caucus, you are important participants — particularly because you are members of the government caucus — in the decision-making process. You, the private members, have the power. You hold power in your hands. Your constituents have expressed confidence in you, and, because so many constituents expressed confidence in so many of you, the cabinet ministers have their jobs. But never forget that they can't hold those jobs without you. It is you who have the power; it is you to whom they are obligated; it is you who have the responsibility and must answer to those people who placed their confidence in you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just comment on the unusual seating arrangements in the 20th legislature. I suppose the most interesting experience for me is that I never have been nor did I ever expect to find myself, to the right of the PCS.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested that in the Speech from the Throne that the government chose to ignore 50 per cent of the geography of Saskatchewan. And again, in the maiden speech in this House made by the Premier there was no mention, not one reference, to 50 per cent of the province of Saskatchewan, and I speak of that part of Saskatchewan that we know as northern Saskatchewan. I know that many people

would think that the member for Shellbrook-Torch River or the member for Meadow Lake or I from Prince Albert live in the North. Northern Saskatchewan begins 95 miles north of Prince Albert and we heard not one mention, not one word, about that very important part of the province of Saskatchewan.

I was sorry to hear that although the government made no mention of that part of our province in the throne speech and although the leader of the new government, the Premier, chose to ignore that part of our province, there were others in the government caucus who attempted to speak knowingly, albeit with a sad lack of information, about northern Saskatchewan. I was glad that the member for Athabasca and the member for Cumberland were able to point out to the House and to the members of the Assembly and to the new government some of the things about the nature of that part of Saskatchewan and some of the concerns of the people in that part of Saskatchewan.

I point out that we recognize and accept that south of the northern administration district, the Conservative Party did get 54 per cent of the vote and has a mandate to implement its program. We accept that. It's part of the process and we respect the process. On the other hand, I ask you in all fairness to recognize that in the northern administration district, in the area served by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and in the only part of the province where there are people who have had the opportunity to deal directly with that department — the only people who have had the opportunity to judge directly the quality and the nature of its services, programs, policies and approaches in that part of Saskatchewan — 54 per cent of the people voted for the programs of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and the New Democratic Party.

I ask you to consider that as you make your decisions about what you will do in the North because as far as I am aware (I may have missed it) the Conservative Party did not put forth a northern program, did not put forward ideas for the people of the North to judge, as they did for the people in the rest of Saskatchewan. So I take the position that because you did not put forth a northern program and because 54 per cent of the people of the North voted for the northern program of the New Democratic Party, your obligation to continue that program is equal to your obligation and mandate to implement your program in southern Saskatchewan.

Because some of the comments with regard to the North and northern people that were made by some of the members of the government caucus appear to be somewhat uninformed and somewhat lacking in a true perception of what has been taking place in northern Saskatchewan, I would like to spend a few minutes and take some of your time in this throne speech debate to clarify for you some information with regard to that very important part of the province of Saskatchewan.

The last 10 years have been a most exciting chapter in the history of northern Saskatchewan — probably the most exciting chapter. That 10 years marks the end of an era in which the people of the North had been treated shabbily — their dreams quashed, their desires unfulfilled and their voices not heard.

My own involvement in the North covers almost 20 years as a teacher, as a bush pilot, as an outfitter, as a consultant, as a community development worker and, for three of those 20 years, as the minister responsible for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. During that period of time I watched the phenomenal growth which occurred. I've seen the average annual income more than double while social assistance dependency decreased threefold. I've seen communities acquire their first

schools, while others celebrated their first grade 12 graduation. I've seen the health care delivery system improve and the introduction of free children's dental care. I've attended graduation ceremonies for everyone from truck drivers to teachers. I've seen many of the 1,800 new houses, the new sewer and water systems and the extension of the electrical power grid.

But more important than all of these things, I've seen northern people taking control of their own lives. I've watched with amazement as communities have adopted local government and, having acquired these powers and responsibilities, they began pressuring the government for more sophisticated systems of local control. My colleague, the member for Cumberland, talked about that today, and I think he gave an indication to the government that it may be well advised to tread softly if it has any ideas about quick elimination of the programs, policies and services to which northern people have become accustomed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAMMERSMITH: — And when I'm talking about northern people, I'm talking primarily about the northern people who make up 70 per cent of the population of the North. I'm talking about the Indian people, the Metis people and the non-status Indians — the people who are always left out, the people who were forced to stand by as passive participants in what passed for a development process in northern Saskatchewan prior to 1971 and what still pass for development processes in other parts of northern Canada.

But over these last 10 years, I've watched as Northerners took control of the education system, opened community day care and child care facilities, commenced alcohol rehabilitation centres and opened over 400 of their own businesses. I've seen a steadily increasing stream of northern young people go to the universities and other institutions of higher learning in this province, and then return to take up positions of authority and responsibility in the North. The North is now embarking, Mr. Speaker, on what I call the third transition.

I put the errors of change in the North into three rough categories. First came the fur trade, which changed forever the economic, social, and political foundations upon which traditional Cree and Chippewa societies had been built.

The second era saw the first decade of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. This era began the process of addressing the almost overwhelming ranges of social, economic, and political inequities that had been allowed to grow over decades of neglecting and ignoring the North. During that time of neglect, the rest of Saskatchewan concentrated on agricultural development and, more recently, on the growth of the oil, gas, and potash industries.

The third transition, Mr. Speaker, represents the stage at which the North is at present, after an intensive 10-year period of trying to make up for those years of neglect. Its physical facilities are now nearly on a par with the rest of the province. However, northern people are only just beginning to take up the opportunity to exercise the freedoms, rights, and responsibility which have long been taken for granted in the rest of the province. The third transition represents the future, and while it is the most important and stimulating era of the last 100 years, its success or failure is better left to the historians to determine.

The first 10 years of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan represent a remarkable achievement. That the North has come this far is a tribute to the strength and tenacity of its people. It is also a tribute to the Government of Saskatchewan for its philosophical commitment to redress the wrongs of the past, and to the civil servants of Saskatchewan who have themselves demonstrated determination and an openness to change.

You know, the line which divides southern Saskatchewan from the northern administration district is really a mythical one. It is simply an administrative aid. The people on both sides of that line have worked hard together to ensure the unity of the province and to share a common destiny. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am proud to have played a part over the past 20 years in the development of that destiny.

Northern Saskatchewan's mineral resources, particularly uranium, have brought about a tremendous interest in the northern part of the province. The money being generated by the development of these resources has the potential to provide a substantial boost to the economy of the entire province for many years. It's not a new kind of situation. That situation is not unique. In the 19th century, the resource which created so much attention was fur, and it vaulted the North into world-wide prominence long before the first furrow was ploughed on the Prairies. None the less, when the fur trade ebbed, toward the latter part of the century, that prominence collapsed.

The residents of the North were left with a much more lasting legacy. It was the legacy of disease and death, of dependency on alcoholism, of distrust and despair. Their initial contact with European communities altered the lives of northern people forever.

What was happening in the North was easy to ignore. It may still be easy to ignore. The throne speech ignored it. The Premier's speech ignored it. The area was so remote, and its scant population, primarily of Indian descent, had no understanding nor willingness to take part in the development which was sweeping the rest of the province.

The ever-widening gap between the two halves of the province did not go unrecognized. But it was easier simply to ignore the area which accounted for almost half of the province's land mass. It was an area of high death rate and higher birth rate, and of untended illness. It was a social and economic situation similar to that of a third world country — before that term was ever popularised.

Governments did begin to extend some services to the area. The federal government was responsible for servicing the needs of treaty Indians; the province, the remainder. But it was not until the 1940s that the provincial government began to take positive steps to bring conditions in the North more in line with those in the rest of the province.

Outpost hospitals, schools, fur and timber marketing agencies, government trading stores, and even a government air line were introduced in a two-decade span. The subsequent narrowing of the gap between the two unequal halves was barely perceptible. But something was being done. But then a change in governments in 1964 brought the process to a standstill. And I hope that the absence of mention and intention in the throne speech and in the Premier's speech are not signals that developments in the North, for northern people, with northern people, under the direction and control of northern people, are coming to a standstill.

In 1971 a new government was elected in this province, and one of its planks had been

a new deal for northern Saskatchewan. To fulfil that promise, the government of Allan Blakeney created the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and made its headquarters the tiny northern community of La Ronge. The department was given a rather broad mandate of enhancing the quality of life in the North. The new department's objectives were to establish a single agency that would co-ordinate all provincial government services and programs in the North, as well as to develop programs and policies which were sensitive to the unique northern situation.

A second objective was to establish local governments and assist northern people to acquire control over their own affairs. A third objective was to develop viable social and economic alternatives to reform and replace the prevailing welfare culture that had developed in the years 1964 to 1971. And a fourth objective was to develop natural and human resource potential . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I don't want, at this late time in the day, Mr. Speaker, to test the memory of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or test the perceptions of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, so we will not respond to his question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, intergovernmental affairs. I'm sorry. The perceptions of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, with regard to the North, are well known. He is the discoverer of torture camps and the like. The discoveries subsequently were proven to be without foundation.

The new department, Mr. Speaker, was envisioned as a facilitator of change, rather than as an implementer of that change. It was necessary for the department to undertake a mammoth construction phase — houses, roads, airstrips, schools and the like, in order to hasten the catch-up process, which was so desperately needed. In the first five years of its existence, the catch-up phase provided more than 600 new houses, five new airstrips, extension of power grid lines, telephone and television services, improved health care, new schools and much, much more. The provincial government's activities in the North for the next five years were something unmatched in any northern jurisdiction in Canada.

The shift in emphasis began toward human resources, and the department became much more of a facilitator, as the North moved toward a standard of living much more in line with the southern part of the province and the rest of Canada. While The Department of Northern Saskatchewan Act did not contain a so-called "twilight clause," it was never intended to be a permanent institution. But the men and women who were responsible for its creation did intend that the North would never again be a riches-to-rags story. The people of northern Saskatchewan are not, and will not be, just hewers of wood and haulers of water in the developmental process. They are full partners in a shared destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I note that it's approaching 10 o'clock. I did want to move on to further discussion, to enlighten the members with regard to the development of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, but I will do that later in the debate.

Just for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I want to outline the reason that we are in this rather lengthy debate this evening — a debate that all evening the opposition has had to carry.

We have witnessed, Mr. Speaker, a government elected with an overwhelming majority of 55 members, a government unable to sustain a throne speech debate for three days. When one looks at what is not in that throne speech, one can understand why they cannot sustain the debate, and why they would not wish to sustain the debate.

The arrangements, as you know, Mr. Speaker, about business in the House, are traditionally made each day between the two House leaders, and the order of speakers established by the opposition and government whips.

The understanding today, Mr. Speaker, was that this afternoon there would be two speakers from the opposition side: the member for Shaunavon, who would be followed by one or two speakers from the government side, and the member for Cumberland would speak, and the members from the government side would continue the throne speech debate until 5 o'clock. The government was unable to do so and attempted, through the inability of the member for Rosthern to resist any opportunity to demonstrate to the new members on his side that he has read the rule book, to force a vote on the amendment.

I note that the Deputy Premier has called it 10 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.