

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

June 25, 1982

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### NOTICE OF MOTIONS

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall, on Tuesday next, move first reading of a bill, An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — On behalf of the hon. Minister of Mineral Resources, I give notice that I shall, on Tuesday, June 29, 1982, move first reading of a bill, An Act to provide for the Taxation of Freehold Oil and Gas Production.

#### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**MR. SUTOR:** — I would like to introduce to you, and to other members of the Assembly, the grades 4 and 5 students from St. Theresa School, along with their teachers, Mrs. Perraux, Lorie Folk, and Karrie MacDonald up in the west gallery. I would like to advise them that I will be meeting with them for pictures and refreshments after. At this time I would like all members of the Assembly, on both sides of the House, to welcome them here this morning.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this House, a guest from, I guess, Ottawa these days, the High Commissioner of Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. Dumas, sitting in the Speaker's gallery. I would ask all members of the House to join with me in welcoming him here.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

#### WELCOME TO STUDENTS

**HON. MR. ROUSSEAU:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my seatmate, I notice a group of students in the Speaker's gallery. They are here from Ranch Ehrlo. They are accompanied by Mr. Russ Wilkinson. On behalf of the Hon. Gary Lane, I welcome you to the legislature and ask all members to join with me in welcoming you here today.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### QUESTIONS

#### Alternative Development for Uranium City

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I was going to say for the

Premier, but I will ask the question of the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. According to the *Regina Leader-Post* of April 21, the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, speaking in Uranium City, indicated that if elected his government would consider options for local development like expanding the fishing and tourism industries, setting up a training centre for Northerners there (that is, Uranium City), or using the town as a staging centre for new developments in the North. I wonder if the minister would advise us as to what progress has been made in considering the options for each of those three alternatives: local development such as fishing and tourism, setting up a training centre, or using Uranium City as a staging centre?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, those things have been under consideration by our government. He mentioned the date April 21. At that date the task force, which everyone will have heard of now, regarding the future of Uranium City was still involved in its deliberations. That task force report came down, as we now know, the results of its deliberations were the same as ours. There really is no future for Uranium City outside of the mining industry, and it doesn't look very good for the mining industry, as we know.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier, and this concerns Uranium City. We have already heard from the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan indicating that, in the view of his government, there are few options by way of local development — fishing or tourism or using Uranium City as a staging centre. The Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, speaking in Uranium City, as reported in the *Leader-Post* of Wednesday, April 21, indicated that, and I quote:

Devine also promised to find a fair way of compensating home-owners and businesses whose investments are suddenly worth much less because of the mine closure.

It's not good enough to say, "You took your chances and came North." My question to the Premier is: what are the terms of the compensation being proposed by his government which he will designate as fair to home-owners and businessmen whose businesses have suddenly become worth much less?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, we have been in negotiations with the federal government, the two parties, Eldorado and the national administration, on behalf of the residents of Uranium City. Obviously the responsibility for the mine at Uranium City, which is operated by Eldorado, falls in the federal bailiwick, and we have been bargaining on behalf of the residents of Uranium City to get as much protection as possible. Clearly, people are going to have to adjust to the federal government's move to move out of Uranium City, and we're making sure that we know, and the people of Saskatchewan know, and indeed the residents of Uranium City know, who exactly pulled the pin on people of Uranium City. And, indeed, it was the federal government.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the undertaking of the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party was not to bargain, not to look, but to find a fair way of compensating home-owners and businesses. The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan is quoted in the *Leader-Post* of May 27, as saying:

We do not believe the Government of Saskatchewan is one-third liable to pay this compensation.

I ask the Premier whether he agrees that the Government of Saskatchewan is liable, or is

in any way committed, in view of his comments, to pay one-third, or any amount, to the businessmen and home-owners who have lost so much, on the assumption that Eldorado and the federal government pay two-thirds or more?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the people on this side of the House learned a valuable lesson by watching the mistakes of the former administration. Let me give you an example. When the former administration was bargaining with respect to royalties, it proposed to give one-half of Saskatchewan's future old-oil royalties to the federal government, when it began to bargain, Mr. Speaker. Right now, we are negotiating with the federal government with respect to helping people in Uranium City, and we are in the process of trying to make sure that the federal government takes responsibility for what it generated as a problem.

We are not going to start that process by saying that we're going to pick up one-half of the bill, as the former administration did with respect to oil. Mr. Speaker, we are in delicate negotiations with the federal government with respect to looking after those people. We will find a solution, and it will be fair, and it won't be selling the farm.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Would the Premier indicate which officials from the Government of Saskatchewan are involved in the negotiations, and which officials from Eldorado Nuclear and the federal government?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, it is being handled through the minister and his department. Obviously a great deal of the interprovincial and federal-provincial negotiations are handled by the minister responsible, who is the Attorney General. So both ministers are involved in those kinds of negotiations.

### **Capital Construction Projects in Northern Saskatchewan**

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Since most of the capital construction projects in northern Saskatchewan have been put on hold at the peak of a very short construction season, and at a time when the need for jobs and training is extremely high, can the minister indicate when he will make some decisions so that these projects, which would generate much needed training and job opportunities, can get under way?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, yes we are very aware of the short season in the North for construction. We realize that we have put these projects on hold, and we have done so for a very good reason; that is to get a handle on some of the problems in northern Saskatchewan, which the member is very much aware of whether or not he would like to admit it. Those decisions will be made in due course, and I can only say at this time, as quickly as possible.

**MR. YEW:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that was a very satisfactory return to my question. Specifically, can the minister name five capital projects that he is prepared to proceed with immediately? Name one. Just name one.

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — I am sorry, but was the question: "Will you name five capital projects that will go ahead?" I will not name any capital projects that will go ahead at this time. The whole package of capital projects in the North is under review, as I have indicated. The answer will come as quickly as possible. We are working on it. I will give you that assurance.

### **Health Services in Northern Saskatchewan**

**MR. YEW:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Health. On April 14, the *Meadow Lake Progress* reported that Bruce Clarke the PC candidate in Athabasca constituency, commented on fair government for the North. Clarke stated that health services could be better, that we need better emergency facilities and more doctors. In view of this, I want to ask the Minister of Health if he will tell northern people what specific hospital projects or health services projects he has authorized to proceed to date?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to the member opposite that most certainly the provision of health services, and adequate provision and the best provision possible, is a priority of this government. With regard to specific announcements as to improvements in hospitals and medical services in northern Saskatchewan, I can assure the member that not only in northern Saskatchewan but in the entire province of Saskatchewan the services of health are being reviewed with a view to improving that service — not only in northern Saskatchewan, but throughout the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. YEW:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister tell us if he is prepared to proceed with the \$5 million hospital which was to be constructed in La Ronge, and will he proceed with plans for some long-term care, special-care facilities, etc. in northern Saskatchewan? If he is prepared to proceed, could he give us specifics on those projects; if he is not prepared, could he give this Assembly or this House, the people of La Ronge, and the people of northern Saskatchewan the reasons he is not prepared to proceed with those projects?

**HON. MR. TAYLOR:** — Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, we are reviewing the whole aspect of health delivery in the province of Saskatchewan, including northern Saskatchewan. I would like to remind this member opposite that it comes to my attention that a certain Judge Noble indicated that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was a department that had fraud and had run amuck. I'm sure when we overhaul that, and look at the entire picture, there should be some dollars that can be used more efficiently to help health services in northern Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **Air Line Service to Uranium City**

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, are you aware that Pacific Western Airlines has reduced its services to Uranium City to twice-a-week service, and on September 30 it will be shutting down completely?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, yes, I was aware of that announcement by Pacific Western.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Supplementary to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that he is aware that Pacific Western Airlines will be shutting down its services, and Norcanair will probably be the only carrier going in there, and at this time it is not too secure as to whether it will continue, are the minister and his department prepared to initiate a food subsidy and a feeder system to the citizens of Uranium City, and to the citizens who get their services and goods from Uranium City, such as those at Camsell Portage, Fond-du-Lac, Stony Rapids and Black Lake?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, we have been looking at the whole program of food subsidies and transportation subsidies in all of the northern communities. The specific ones that the member mentions that are in the Athabasca Basin and are directly related to the whole question of Uranium City and the diminishing population of Uranium City, are certainly a serious problem. This problem is a part of the negotiations which we talked about earlier. I can only give you the assurance that I am very much aware of the problem, and I can only say that we will announce in due course whatever might be taking place there.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. We now have a situation in Uranium City, with health services, where the doctors who now have set up their practices in Saskatoon are providing services to Uranium City five days a week; they come in on a Monday and leave on Friday. This leaves the citizens of Uranium City and the region without doctors' services on the weekend. Could you give some assurance to this House that you will have your department send in the contract doctors that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan does have to service that area on the weekends?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, yes. I was also aware of the situation the member refers to. I can't give him any assurance that we would act as he suggests, but I can say that we will look at it.

### **La Loche School Addition**

**MR. THOMPSON:** — My question is to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Due to the fact that we had that serious fire at the school in La Loche this last winter and the community has been left without its services, could the minister inform this House if tenders have been let for the construction of the new addition to the school? If so, when were they let and to whom has the contract been awarded?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, if the member was listening carefully as I answered his colleague for Cumberland regarding capital projects in northern Saskatchewan, he will know that the school at La Loche is one of those capital projects, and it's under that review that I referred to. The situation for the next year, for this coming school year in September, is looked after. As the member will know, a school couldn't possibly be built that would be ready for next year anyway. That situation is under control. That school project is under review and, as you will know, it was under review by your administration when you were sitting on this side of the House. It was under review as to how large the project should be, whether it should be a replacement of the portion that burnt or whether it should be a new school. All of those things are being considered, and we'll be announcing it when the time comes.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister has just indicated to this House that there is no way that that school could be built in time for the new school season. I don't accept that, and I don't think that the citizens of La Loche should accept that. Education is very important in northern Saskatchewan, and the replacement of that school, Mr. Speaker, is very important. My supplementary is: will the minister and his department assure this House that they will get these contracts out as quickly as possible, and would they make sure that the contract is conditional — conditional in that it will assure that the citizens of La Loche will have an opportunity to work when that contract is given out on that project?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, he says he will not accept it. He is sitting in that caucus over there and suggesting that he will not accept that that school can't be built for next fall. With the plans that were in place, even had those guys been back here, that school would not have been ready for next fall under any circumstances. And he knows that. The member knows that and his colleague for Prince Albert-Duck Lake knows that to be the case. We are looking at the situation. The school at La Loche is under more active review than it was under the former administration. We will be giving the answer in due course, as I mentioned. When that happens, obviously northern people will be able to get jobs on that school, whatever size the project is — whether it be a replacement, as I indicated earlier, or whether it be a new school. That decision has not been made.

**MR. THOMPSON:** — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for assuring the citizens of northern Saskatchewan and the citizens of La Loche that they will be assured jobs when this project is under way. I ask you once more: will you and your department attempt to get these contracts out and awarded so that that school can be ready for this coming school year?

**HON. MR. McLEOD:** — Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member knows the problems, having lived where he lives as long as he has. We are all aware of the construction problems in northern Saskatchewan, but it wouldn't have mattered with the project that we're talking about here. With the size of that project, it wouldn't have mattered if that project were to be awarded in Wascana Park here, it could not possibly be finished by September 1 in time for the school year. You know that well. The plans are already in place for next year's school term. You have that assurance; those plans are in place. You did indicate it's your final supplementary, and I'll give you the final answer the same as last time. The school will be studied, and you will receive your answer when the decision is made.

### **Aid to Uranium City**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and it concerns Uranium City. We have heard comments to the effect that compensation to the home-owners and businesses is under negotiation with no commitment by his government, that the cost of food is under study with no commitment by his government, and that medical services are going to be looked at, but with no commitment by his government. Now, he is quoted as saying in Uranium City on April 21 that the reason for his trip to Uranium City was to show that somebody cares about the people there. Would he indicate any way that he is showing that he cares other than negotiating, studying and looking at? Has he made any commitment, any firm commitment, to the people of Uranium City.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, we have made a commitment to look after the people of Uranium City, to find a fair solution for them in response to a terrible situation that was developed by the federal government. We are in negotiations with the federal government on behalf of the people of Uranium City. As I mentioned earlier, there is nothing that the federal government would like to see more than the same kinds of mistakes that were made by the people opposite — that we come out and say that we will provide several millions of dollars so it can say, "Well, isn't that nice, we'll pick up the difference." We are in the process of negotiating on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan and when we finish those negotiations we will advise the members opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand the Premier's comments to indicate that negotiations are going on with respect to compensation. Am I to understand that negotiations are also going with respect to the provision of medical services or is not that a provincial responsibility on which a commitment could be made by his government today?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask the member opposite to be more specific in advising us what specific medical services the people aren't receiving right now.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the comments made by the member for Athabasca when he indicated that medical services in the whole Athabasca Basin are unavailable on weekends at this time because services are being provided from Monday through Friday. To follow up on the question of the member for Athabasca, there is no doctor in Black Lake or Stony Rapids or Fond-du-Lac or Camsell Portage or Uranium City on weekends, and the issue is whether or not the Department of Northern Saskatchewan would take any action with respect to that situation.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know the population of Uranium City is, as far as I understand, somewhat smaller than it was a year ago and practically the same medical facilities are there. So I don't understand to what extent there is a problem because we have fewer people to look after with respect to medical services or medical needs and we have most of the staff still there. I don't understand the problem right now. To date we are examining the whole situation with respect to compensation for people, but in terms of medical services, the hospital is still there. It is open from Monday to Friday. The staff is still there. So I really don't understand the question.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I had hoped we had attempted to make what we consider to be the problem clear. What we consider to be the problem is that prior to a short time ago, there was a medical clinic at Uranium City which provided seven-day-a-week service to the citizens of Uranium City in the same way that any other resident clinic with doctors resident in Uranium City would provide it. Now those doctors have moved away from Uranium City and are now in Saskatoon on the weekends. That is a long way to call your doctor to look after you if the doctor is in Saskatoon and not in Uranium City. That is perceived to be a problem by members on this side and what we are asking is whether or not the government opposite perceives it to be a problem, and, if so, whether it intends to take any steps to see that a doctor is placed in the whole Athabasca Basin on weekends.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the perceptions of the members opposite don't necessarily ring with validity, and we will take under consideration the fact that there are competent people involved in the health care system in Uranium City seven days a week. If there is an extensive problem with respect to medical staff, I am sure that the Minister of Health is aware of it. And, Mr. Speaker, if I can repeat my earlier answer, we have largely the same staff looking after what appears to be a much smaller population. I really don't see that there's a problem.

### **Closing of Eldorado Nuclear**

**MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Question to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Since the Premier has indicated that that minister is responsible for negotiations, would the minister name which of his officials are involved in negotiations with Eldorado and the federal government? Would he indicate how many meetings have been held, and will he indicate when the residents of Uranium City will be advised as to the action proposed as a result of those meetings?

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I believe, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question that a short lecture on ministerial responsibility is probably in order. I believe that under the British parliamentary system the minister is responsible to this House for the operations of his department. It's not incumbent upon the minister to designate specific officials; it's the minister's responsibility to answer. I'm telling the hon. member that negotiations are going on with the federal government. Let me tell him what the problem is. The Government of Canada, through Eldorado Nuclear, had a mine and they spent hundreds of millions of dollars misleading the people of Uranium City that there was a great future. They were joined in that what I call conspiracy to mislead the people of Uranium City by the active participation of the former government of this province, which put in . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. LANE:** — . . . several millions of dollars in new projects very recently. Having full knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of the uranium industry and the potential of the uranium industry, they participated in that conspiracy. There is a tremendous problem — the problem caused by the members opposite when they were in government, and by their colleagues in Ottawa. We are in the process of trying to extricate the people of Uranium City from that problem. We are attempting to negotiate and we are going to negotiate properly, as we've done with Nipawin and with every other area along here.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

#### **Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

#### **Bill No. 10 — An Act to amend The Education Act**



**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Education Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 11 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act**

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Teacher's Superannuation Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 12 — An Act to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act**

**HON. MR. CURRIE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Teachers' Life Insurance (Government Contributory) Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**Bill No. 13 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act**

**HON. MR. HARDY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act.

Motion agreed to and the bill ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Funding for World Assembly of First Nations Conference**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I am today announcing that the Government of Saskatchewan will be proposing to fund \$75,000 for the World Assembly of First Nations Conference to be held in the city of Regina July 18 to July 25, 1982. The proposed contribution is in compliance with the existing banquet policy of the province of Saskatchewan. It is based on the estimate of 7,500 delegates. As in the usual course the funds are payable after the event. The sum of \$75,000 is in addition to provincial funding for the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians in the fiscal year 1982-83 in the amount of \$2,670,000. This will represent the total funding for the World Assembly of First Nations from the province of Saskatchewan and is to be contrasted with the refusal of the Government of Canada to supply any funds. The amount should make a significant contribution to the success of the World Assembly of First Nations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the self-congratulatory comments of the minister that the application and the request by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, I understand, was for a sum of \$500,000 — a sum of \$500,000 to support in Saskatchewan a conference that is the first of its kind in the world, a conference that will bring to Saskatchewan and to Regina indigenous peoples from all over the world to meet and to discuss common concerns and problems and priorities, and also to share with the citizens of Saskatchewan and the citizens of Regina a wide

range of exhibits, cultural activities, economic development activities, sporting events and sporting activities. It will also bring to Regina and to the area a considerable amount of activity in the tourist industry and in those businesses associated with the tourist industry. The request for \$500,000, I would say, is a modest request. That amount of money will be repaid several times in business activity and jobs created in the retail trade in Regina, and I would indicate that the offer and the grant by the Government of Saskatchewan is despicable and insulting to the first Canadians of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask permission to introduce a class of students who came in late.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Yes, please do.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly, there is a class of approximately 18 grades 5 and 6 students from the elementary school of Elbow sitting in the Speaker's gallery. I ask all members of the legislature to welcome the students and their chaperones to the legislature. Thank you.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### **SPECIAL ORDER**

#### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Hodgins that a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lingenfelter.

**MR. HAMMERSMITH:** — Mr. Speaker, when we were stopped by the clock last night I had just concluded my introductory remarks, and I wish today to make a few brief comments about the Speech from the Throne delivered on June 17.

First, let me say that as a short agenda for a short session intended to implement as soon as possible a very short list of campaign promises, the speech deserves some praise. It is an abbreviated package suitable for a short session. The mortgage interest reduction plan and the removal of the road tax on gasoline were the flagships of the Conservative campaign, and it is to be expected that they would move quickly on them.

The farm purchase program is another of their prominent campaign pledges, but we are told that the farmers will have to wait. My colleagues have urged the government to consider honouring the land bank commitments that are out there, until such time as the farm purchase program is in place, or, alternatively, to accelerate the introduction of the farm purchase program. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the worst of all programs is no program.

We recognize that the government requires some time to consider its options carefully and we recognize that it certainly has the power to choose the option of doing nothing while it considers its options. But surely the do-nothing option is the height of irresponsibility. And why would it want to do that? No one would criticize you, having implemented two of your promises, for temporarily maintaining existing programs while you consider your options. Instead you have deliberately and knowingly chosen the do-nothing option.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to what the throne speech does not contain. It begins by recognizing that this is a time of severe economic strain and then proposes that the government do nothing while options are considered. It goes on to ignore pledges to remove the sales tax, to reduce personal income tax by 10 per cent, to develop an industrial strategy, to provide interest rate relief to small businesses, to expand beef stabilization, to increase spending on health and education, but worst of all, it proposes no measures to create jobs. It proposes no measures in the face of the recognition by everyone that the major problem facing Canada and Saskatchewan today is unemployment.

I am particularly disappointed, after listening to the Speech from the Throne and listening to my Conservative friends opposite, to find that, in the face of daily evidence of a worsening recession, the government contends that it has done all that it intends to do and that all is well. They just issue a press release saying all is well and all will be well — government by press release. Well, press releases do not assist the students looking for work. They do not assist the unemployed workers. They do not assist the small businessmen who see the level of spending down as a result of unemployment.

This government intends to act like all Conservatives — like Reagan in the U.S., like Thatcher in Britain — and let the private sector right itself and create jobs while businesses continue to go bankrupt, close their doors, lay off employees. Nowhere in His Honour's speech is there any mention of the necessity for government to intervene, to stimulate economic activity and to ensure employment for as many Saskatchewan citizens as possible.

It is interesting with regard to the priorities of the government, that today the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs announced a grant to the World Assembly of First Nations which is bringing 9,000 or 10,000 people to this city, but the grant is \$10,000 less than the salary which is paid to the deputy minister to the Premier. That is our contribution to the World Assembly of First Nations.

This course of inaction and neglect is in distinct contrast to the Blakeney government. The unemployment rate in Saskatchewan under Blakeney was consistently the lowest or second lowest in Canada. This is the standard against which the Devine government will be tested. This should be the peak of the construction season, and the peak time for economic activity and employment. But instead, what do we have in the new Tory Saskatchewan? Layoffs in the potash industry; layoffs in the forestry industry; small businesses laying off staff and in some cases closing their doors; government construction projects, frozen; economic development loans in the North, frozen; high layoffs at Ipsco; reduction in activity in the oil and uranium industries; farm cash receipts in the first quarter, down \$311 million, or nearly 20 per cent. Over 2,000 skilled workers will be without jobs this summer as a result of layoffs, totally unprecedented during most of our lifetime. Only two months ago today everyone across the country was confident that Saskatchewan would be able to ride out the economic downturn. The government

had proposed significant capital expenditures by the public sector — provincial government departments and crown corporations — expenditures in housing, over \$200 million to create over 6,000 jobs through construction of over 4,100 new homes and apartments.

We heard the minister responsible for Sask Housing tell the House last Friday that he had authorized the construction of 1,000 of those. Because he is the new minister we resisted the temptation to put forth a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, on the argument that he had misled the House. We are prepared to forgive him for that until he learns his job a little better. The minister said that he had authorized construction of 1,000 of those, when in fact one of the first acts of this government was to cancel all of those projects, and the minister knew that.

The proposal for job creation provided for \$2 billion in job-creating capital investments through crown corporations and government agencies. That would have created 4,000 new jobs and would have maintained 18,000 construction jobs. A rural natural gas program was proposed and ready to go. Expenditures in that program would have created thousands of jobs in spinoff activities, as construction companies purchased goods and services, as consumer spending strengthened, and as retail sales expanded — public investment to create jobs today and build assets for tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

But what happened? The big freeze is what happened — Mr. Freeze and the Popsicles. Government construction projects have been frozen; crown corporation construction, frozen; highway projects, frozen; housing construction, frozen; heavy oil upgrader, frozen; government hiring, frozen; student hiring, frozen; rural natural gas program, frozen. It's the 1982 Tory version of a midsummer ice age, with 400 forestry workers laid off; 263 Ipsco workers laid off; 150 GWG workers out of work; Pacific Plastics and Grandview Industries facing difficult times and likely layoffs; hundreds of highly qualified and skilled tradesmen out of work because building starts are at a standstill; retail and manufacturing workers unemployed; persons on unemployment insurance up 67 per cent over one year ago. And this doesn't include those among the unemployed who either are not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits or whose benefits have expired and are now on welfare. It doesn't include the 1,300 people who are on work sharing. And on top of this there is to be a minimum of 1,200 additional layoffs in potash.

In Saskatchewan, on May 31, 25,000 people were on unemployment insurance compared to 15,000 a year ago. As I said, Mr. Speaker, that's an increase of 67 per cent to 25,000. What will the total be on June 30? Higher. What will it be on July 31? Higher. What will it be on August 31? Higher. On September 30? Higher. And then the peak construction season will be drawing to a close. Unemployment insurance benefits will be running out. More and more people will be on the welfare rolls. But they'll have cheap gas. The bank may be coming for their car, but they'll have cheap gas.

Consumer bankruptcies are up 40 per cent. Business bankruptcies are up 53 per cent — a sad and depressing and even frightening picture, a tough picture, admittedly, for any government to face. And across from us sits a government that rose to office having created, fuelled and fanned expectation unprecedented in the recent history of Saskatchewan. I want to indicate what their attitude was on March 10. On March 10 the Conservative leader is reported in the *Meadow Lake Progress* to have said as follows:

Conservative leader Grant Devine today urged the Blakeney government to start showing economic leadership by making decisions rather than excuses

on problems facing people in the province. He (the now-Premier) said, "They blame the federal government for lack of funds for health and education. They blame businesses for the 7,000 unemployed in Saskatoon. They blame world markets for losses in Saskatchewan crown corporations, in uranium, timber, potash and oil. The government has failed and it is time for new direction and action. A stimulative budget is necessary immediately, and excuses that others are to blame will simply not work."

Well, he has his opportunity to take the immediate action that he was calling for two months ago. He has the opportunity to present Saskatchewan people with the stimulative budget that he was calling for two months ago. He now has the opportunity to do something, for not just those 7,000 people who were unemployed in Saskatoon two months ago, but the 10,000 who are now unemployed. He has the opportunity to stop blaming the federal government for the lack of funds. He has the opportunity to stop blaming the federal government for his inaction on Uranium City. And yet he has taken the position of Mr. Freeze.

What are they doing and what are they proposing to do to meet those high expectations that they fuelled and fanned two months ago? What are they doing? Well, I'll tell you one thing they're doing, one thing they're proposing to do. On June 11, they issued a call for estimates in order to plan their 1983-84 budget. They say they need time for long-term planning. Well, what does that plan look like? A 2 per cent maximum increase on non-salary items, a 2 per cent cutback in permanent and non-permanent staff, a 7 per cent maximum increase in third-party grants, payments to individuals and income securities. That's what the municipal governments can look forward to. That's what the school boards can look forward to. That's what all the volunteer organizations in Saskatchewan can look forward to. And I remind you that Saskatchewan has a greater percentage of its people involved in volunteer organizations than any other province in Canada. What are they proposing for them in the new Saskatchewan? An increase of 7 per cent in their funding — less than inflation. They will have to lay off workers. They will have to cut programs.

And what of capital expenditures? What of the major tool that the government has to stimulate the economy? Well, their guidelines call for a maximum increase in capital spending to be held at zero per cent. That's what their long-term planning is doing. But they go even further than that. They also call for two alternative levels of capital spending, a reduction of 10 per cent. And that isn't enough. They go on to call for an alternative that outlines a reduction of 20 per cent in the proposed spending for things like highways and schools and hospitals and technical institutes, the La Ronge training centre, the rural capital program. The member for Saskatoon Fairview was up talking about all the new schools they are going to build on the west side of Saskatoon. Well, I don't think there will be many built with a 20 per cent reduction in capital spending. I don't think you're going to have any built.

The member for Kinistino wants some nursing homes. You're not going to get nursing homes with a 20 per cent reduction in capital spending. Not only will you not get the nursing homes, but you will have greater unemployment.

The member for Moose Jaw North wants an expansion to the Saskatchewan Technical Institute. Well, he's not going to get that with a 20 per cent reduction in capital spending. That's the long-term planning. That's why they're stalling. That's why they don't want to answer questions in this House. That's why they're studying and reviewing

— because they don't want the people of Saskatchewan to know, and they don't want their own members to know the severity of the cutbacks they are planning.

They also call for alternatives in program services, third-party grants and payments to individuals, and those alternatives ask for a 10 per cent reduction in all of these areas. I say to the member for Melville, who presided at the dawn of the new Saskatchewan, and the member for Saskatoon University, who gave such a fine and sincere, believable maiden speech in this House: included among third parties are the universities. And if you think that you are going to present to the people in Saskatoon University the evidence of the new Saskatchewan that says what you have planned for in 1983-84 is a 10 per cent reduction in university spending, I think you might have a problem with those people. I think they might express some concerns.

And if you say, when you are apologizing for the Minister of Highways, that the story is a 20 per cent reduction in capital spending, I think you might have some problems with those people.

They also advise the departments to concentrate on specific program deletions rather than across-the-board reductions, that is, cut out certain programs. Well, what programs are you going to cut out? I say to you in the government caucus that you had better start asking those cabinet ministers what programs they're going to slash, and what impact that will have on your constituencies.

The government, Mr. Speaker, asks for time to study and consider. Well, we recognize that these are just guidelines; this isn't a final budget; these are just proposals. I am sure that, in this approach to open government, they have shared these proposals with all the members of the government caucus. I am sure that it is no news to you that they are planning to cut capital grants by 20 per cent, to only increase third-party grants by 7 per cent and, perhaps, cut third-party grants by 10 per cent. I know that the cabinet informed you of all these plans before they proceeded with them, that no final decisions have been made and that those decisions will be made in the government caucus. I know that this open government will not want to isolate itself and sit by itself in that cabinet room and make those decisions unilaterally. I know that they will want the input of the members of caucus. I know that they will want the input of Saskatoon members who want more nurses and they will certainly bow to the input because those are the people who are responsible.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that a new government should be granted some time to study and consider, providing that it is prepared to thaw the frozen projects and programs until it has figured out what to do. I don't think that all the people of Saskatchewan need to stand in the midst of this midsummer ice age perpetrated by Mr. Freezee while they're making up their minds, because when we see just one example of what's coming out of all the studying and considering, and the cutbacks that are being studied and considered, I think that we need to get concerned. We need to get concerned about whether this is the new grand design for Saskatchewan, because what we see are cutbacks, program deletions, staff reductions, and reduced grants to third parties. Do we see any evidence that their studying, planning and considering is concentrated on developing a way out of the recession? No way, Mr. Speaker. No way. They are deliberately planning to deepen the recession and I ask those private members opposite how long it will be before they prod their ministers into action. How long will it be?

You've all made your maiden speech. You've all made fine speeches. What worries me a

little bit is they have you believing that on the one hand, and on the other hand there's evidence that what they intend to do is slash those very programs and services that you were talking about and that you were so optimistic about on behalf of your constituents. And I ask private members over there what they are going to do. Are you going to go out of here as the flak catchers for this self-congratulatory star-struck study group, apologizing to your constituents, explaining that the waiting period is only going to show them how much less they can be, or will you prod this government into action?

You have the power and you have the responsibility. They can't govern unless they maintain your confidence and the confidence of your constituents. You can prod them into action or you can apologize for their inaction. It's in your hands because we know and you know and the people of Saskatchewan know that the decisions are made in the government caucus and not in the cabinet room. The government caucus members will communicate those decisions to their constituents, and you can decide whether you want to communicate apologies or communicate a fulfilment of the promises that you made. But how long will it take before you're ready to take action to stimulate economic activity and provide employment for our people. You weren't elected to study and consider, but to act. The summer, the peak time for economic activity in employment, will soon be over. Winter has come already in terms of activities on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan. There's a deeper freeze than there has ever been in the middle of January. But when fall and winter come and the conditions are no better, what are you going to tell the student who doesn't have enough money to go back to school? What are you going to tell the potash and the forestry workers who are not called back to work? What are you going to tell the Saskatchewan construction companies and their employees who were expecting to work on government contracts? What are you going to tell the small businessman who has gone bankrupt? What will you tell his employees who have been laid off? What will you tell the volunteer organizations when they find they can't keep up with inflation? And, if you can't prod that cabinet into action now, this month, it'll be too late.

They are the government only because each of you won your seat. They are obligated to you, just like you are obligated to the constituents who elected you. It isn't the other way around. You have an obligation to exercise the power and responsibility that your constituents have given you. You have an obligation to show them that their confidence was not misplaced.

This government thinks that cheaper gas and money off on mortgages for people who already own homes will solve all of our economic problems. Well, the people of Saskatchewan are in for a big shock if that's all this government is going to do. I had hoped that we would have an opportunity during this debate to hear about the government's economic plans. So far, members opposite have been strangely silent.

The citizens of my own constituency and my neighbouring constituency have a special concern. They want to know whether it's the intention of the government to proceed with the construction of a thermo-mechanical hardwood pulp and paper mill in Prince Albert. The government says no. Since the Conservative candidates in both Prince Albert and Prince Albert-Duck Lake assured voters in the recent election that a second pulp mill and a newsprint plant would be built in Prince Albert, the people of Prince Albert want to know whether the proposed sale of the Prince Albert pulp mill will be conditional upon an agreement by the purchaser to construct a second pulp mill and a newsprint plant. They want to know what steps will be taken to assure that a major sawmill is built in Prince Albert . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I promised the citizens of Prince Albert that I would do everything I could to convince the Premier to put the member for Moosomin in the cabinet. I still have to work on that. I can't understand why he didn't.

The people of Prince Albert want assurances that the institute of applied arts and sciences slated for Prince Albert . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I think that the member for Moosomin wants the floor. If he has a question, I'll be glad to yield . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Am I to understand that the smell I heard coming from over there was your question?

The people of Prince Albert want to know what the government intends with regard to that institute of applied arts and sciences slated for Prince Albert. I have some confidence that we may hear about that from the Minister of Continuing Education. He seems to be one of the ministers prepared to make decisions and to make announcements and to proceed with some programs. So I look forward to that announcement.

The people of Macdowall and Duck Lake want to know the government's intentions regarding the Saskatchewan rivers heritage complex. The people of Davis and Macdowall are anxiously awaiting news of the government's natural gas program. The people of Beardy and Muskoday Indian reserves want to know your intentions with regard to treaty Indian land entitlement. Metis and non-status Indians want to know about the economic development, training and job creation that will enable them to participate more fully in the economic and social life in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, also of concern to the people of Prince Albert and indeed to many Saskatchewan people is what this government is going to do about the minimum wage. We have heard a lot from members opposite about how they represent the individual and the little guy. The member for Melville represents the individual and the little guy and I trust that he will use his influence on the cabinet and that he will recognize that this matter of the minimum wage is going to be the test. Are you going to act in the interest of the many people on minimum wage, mostly women, and let the planned increases in the minimum wage go ahead? People earning minimum wage are the people who need help most now. They will not benefit to any significant extent from the cheap gas and mortgage plan because they don't drive much and they can't own a home. These are the people who really feel the burden of unemployment and the reduction of economic activity. I urge the Minister of Labour to clarify immediately what this government intends to do about the minimum wage.

I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments, to the question of housing, because members on this side of the House are especially concerned about the intention of this government with respect to housing. We have now at least seen the much-heralded mortgage interest reduction legislation. I'll leave my detailed comments for debate on second reading of this bill, but the initial fears of many people have been confirmed. The program will do little to get people out of apartments and into houses as was promised.

It is unclear whether this program will do much to stimulate new housing starts. I notice that the government is especially silent on projected housing starts and the number of



jobs to be created as a result of this program. I notice that even in its internal documents it has avoided discussion on the number of housing starts and the number of jobs to be created.

One of the political attractions of that program was the commitment by the Conservative Party that its program was unconditional — unconditional. Those who could not afford housing at the existing rates would be able to buy a home. That was a commitment made time after time; it is a commitment well-understood by the people of Saskatchewan. And it is an appealing commitment. It is one of the major reasons, if not the single most important reason, that expectations out there are so high. Voters had every reason and every right to expect that their expectations would be met. No conditions — no conditions. This was confirmed and reinforced on April 1 when the Leader of the PC Party promised in a press release that there would be no means test to qualify for assistance.

Many young couples in Prince Albert, as in other Saskatchewan communities, live in apartments because they cannot afford to buy a house. On April 1, the Conservative Leader said that the mortgage interest reduction plan would enable these people to buy a house, but now these people are told that only those who can afford a house at the going rates will be eligible, and the going rate is 20 per cent. Most of these people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Yes, I understand why the private members in the Conservative caucus say, "Read the paper," because that basically is how this government governs. It governs through the newspaper, through press releases. We want to see the details of the program, because most of the people referred to in that April 1 press release will have to stay in their apartments. The plan will have a means test. It won't discriminate against the rich, just the poor.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is a family income level above which assistance cannot be justified, just as there is a level below which assistance is absolutely necessary. I am not sure what that level is, but surely families earning over \$70,000 a year can manage. Surely families earning \$94,000 a year, living in a large, luxurious home on Albert Street, can manage. Certainly, it is true, Mr. Speaker, that families in the \$25,000 to \$60,000 bracket will benefit and can use the assistance and should have that assistance. But how many families earning less than \$25,000 could be helped if there were an income ceiling on the plan?

Besides helping middle-income people already in their own homes, why not structure a plan to help those low-income families who surely have the same desire, and who surely have the same God-given right, to own their own home? Why leave them out? If someone has to be left out or if someone has to receive less, why does it have to be those who need help most?

This program will be of immense benefit to the banks. People will not be encouraged to maintain high equity in their homes. There would be a real rush to get \$50,000 at 13.25 per cent. The banks will love it. Who wouldn't want to pay cash to mortgage for an existing \$20,000 mortgage at 10 per cent? There will be little incentive for banks to offer a better mortgage rate or for people to shop around from institution to institution for a better rate.

Coupled with the mortgage interest reduction plan is the legislation to end the mortgage interest tax credit. No one mentioned this during the election campaign. This

is another surprise. They are going to take that away. Surprise! That program brought benefits to 75,000 Saskatchewan home-owners during its two years of operation. I ask the government: how many people who were getting the mortgage interest tax credit will be unable to qualify for the mortgage interest relief? I would suggest that a number of home-owners in the co-op housing and farm housing program will be in this category.

I also ask the members opposite, and in particular the Premier and the Deputy Premier: have you told us the true cost of this program over three years? You say it will cost \$56 million for the first year, with mortgage rates at 18.5 per cent. What is the total cost for the three-year program, assuming 19 per cent and 20 per cent mortgages? Won't the three-year cost be closer to \$475 million or \$525 million? Won't it, in fact, at 19.5 per cent, be \$477.1 million?

Why haven't you told us that for most people it will not be a three-year program? For most people it will be a two-year program, perhaps a one-year program. I think it is time that you 'fessed-up to that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to some other aspects of this government's housing program. Today we have long waiting lists of working people requiring subsidized low-rental housing and senior citizens requiring low-rental housing. What's being done to meet these needs? Will the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation inform the House whether the corporation will be proceeding with the construction of over 4,000 new housing units announced in the March budget? I know he said he was proceeding with 1,000 of them. I also know that two weeks before he said that, he had cancelled them. That construction program would generate more than 6,000 new jobs for construction workers and it would generate many more jobs in plywood plants and sawmills. It would stimulate the small business sector and it would increase employment for retail workers.

Indications are that the greatest interest in the mortgage interest reduction program is from people who already own homes. When does the government propose to revive the construction of apartment buildings and new housing units? They've been strangely silent. They said that there will be many housing starts, but they haven't said how many they are estimating, how many jobs will be created and the like. I think it is important that they do that.

Another program that the government has withdrawn has been a withdrawal from the senior citizens of the proposed enrichment in the senior citizens' home repair program. Only people who haven't applied in the last four years will be eligible. Here is another group being ignored by the government. This is a program that could have, and would have, provided much-needed winter employment. With the pattern we see unfolding in summer and fall employment, winter employment will be much needed in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act for those who have been left out is now. The government brought forward its new mortgage subsidy program. It can now address itself to what it will do for those left out of that program. They don't need to be left out. A few modifications of the proposed program could include most of the thousands of lower-income people in Saskatchewan who will be left out. Immediate implementation of a new house and apartment construction program, a program that's been ready to go for weeks, could meet a great deal of that need. Many more thousands of Saskatchewan people would benefit from this program. Many more thousands of Saskatchewan

people would have jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a bit about promises, because, as I watch members opposite, it becomes increasingly apparent that all their energies are concentrated on finding money to pay for a couple of their election promises. This whole exercise of studying programs and putting programs on hold and freezing programs is a cover-up. It's a cover-up because they know they can't afford these programs. It's a cover-up, we know, because we've seen the guidelines they've issued for their '83-84 budget. They know that they must cut and cut deeply as evidenced by those guidelines. They want to hide the real truth about those cuts from the people of Saskatchewan as soon as possible. That's why they say they're studying. That's why they're reviewing. That's why they're considering. They don't want the people of Saskatchewan to know what they're proposing in '83-84.

Throughout the election campaign, you told the voters that you were going to give back resource revenues to the people. You said you could do anything by just opening up the heritage fund. We kept telling you that the money available was limited. We kept showing you what the cash flow was and we kept showing you how it was being used, but you kept insisting that we were hiding a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. You kept telling the people that there was a pot of gold hidden at the end of the rainbow. Now, you're changing your tune. You're busy telling the people that because of NDP error there isn't as much in the heritage fund as you thought. If you didn't know it wasn't there, if you didn't know what was there, it was because you refused to listen. You were told; you were shown; you knew the situation; and yet you kept insisting that there was a hidden pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. And now the Minister of Health admits that the PCs may have had a lapse of integrity during the campaign. Now he says, "Just because we criticise the NDP for not spending enough on health care doesn't mean that we'll spend more." The minister responsible for SGI is busy telling the people that he is really going to reduce SGI rates by increasing them just a little.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce says that the interest for small business is not a priority. Small business bankruptcies are up 53 per cent and increasing, but it's not a priority. And the Minister of the Environment has decided that he suddenly doesn't need those scrubbers at Coronach, that they are too expensive. And how do you explain it? Well, the Minister of Environment at least was honest. He said, "Well, we're just politicians, and that's politicians for you."

Well, your day of reckoning will come. Saskatchewan voters will not forget that you promised a long list of new programs without cutting back existing programs, and I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance's first budget. I intend to continually remind you of your promises and to expose your shortcomings as they appear.

I don't know whether the Minister of Mineral Resources or the Minister of Finance has told the caucus this, but you've already revised your heritage fund cash flow \$217 million downwards. You will revise it again at the end of June, and you will revise it further down, and even having done that you are still proposing to reduce the cash flow even further by reducing royalties on oil.

And after you have cannibalised the heritage fund, what will you do? What will you do? After you have cannibalised the heritage fund, you'll sell off SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), if you can find a buyer with the kind of uranium market that's out there.

We've already heard an indication in your 1983-84 budget planning; if you can't find a buyer and you aren't going to sell things off, then you're going to cut. You're going to cut capital spending; you're going to cut grants to third parties; you're going to cut staff. What else? What else are you planning to cut? The guidelines call for complete program cuts. Have you identified them? Has the caucus identified which programs they want the cabinet to cut? We'll await that budget with anxiety.

I know you feel that if you are prepared to make very drastic cuts in programs and in staff and in grants to third parties, you believe that there's a chance, a slight possibility, that in three years you will have a balanced budget. At what cost?

Mr. Speaker, because of the failure of the government to move beyond stargazing, the failure to stimulate the economy to create jobs, to stimulate the construction industry, to assist small business, to assist the agricultural industry, to initiate the rural gas program, to approve government and crown corporation capital projects, to stimulate the housing industry by helping those who need it most, because of their intention to cut back capital spending, slash programs, cut back staff and financially cripple volunteer organizations, I will be supporting the amendment moved by my colleague, the member for Shaunavon, and I will be voting against the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter into the debate, and may I first of all take this opportunity to congratulate you. During my association with you (I recall when you were the critic for the Department of Social Services and I was minister), I want to say that I found you to be tenacious but fair. When I had an association with you, and when you were chairman of the public accounts, again I found you determined but reasonable. So I wish you the very best in this important position and I can assure you that we on this side will give you our full co-operation. Indeed, I might say that I would try to emulate the high conduct of one of your colleagues, the member for Thunder Creek.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Premier Devine and his colleagues on their electoral success.

During the debate on the throne speech, many government members were given the opportunity to speak, and certainly it was fairly obvious from the remarks that they were feeling very good, and I really think that they should. I think from their remarks it was fairly obvious that they were gloating over their success and I want to say that, in fact, I would recommend them to enjoy fully this fleeting moment of success.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I want to remind all of the new members that four years will pass very rapidly, and what started out as a new and challenging career will suddenly come to a crashing halt. I want to take this opportunity again to wish Premier Devine well in assuming the premiership because with the premiership goes a great deal of responsibility. The premiers of recent years in my memory have served this province well. We look at the record of T. C. Douglas, of Woodrow Lloyd, the late Ross Thatcher and, more recently, our present leader. I want to say in respect to Premier Blakeney, as he then was, that we have been proud to work with him as premier, and I want to say that

we are proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in opposition.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I think it's a tribute to this man to have been defeated but still have the respect that he has from the general population. Certainly, I hope the new Premier will receive the same support from his members during the good times and the difficult times that I predict will come.

I want also to say a few words about that outstanding constituency of Quill Lakes. Many will know that due to some computation on election night we were not able to celebrate although we should have. We should have won that seat on election night. However, with the type of people in Quill Lakes, we nevertheless had a good turnout and a good celebration. It guess it was a celebration.

I want to say that I am very pleased to have been able to hold that seat during a time when there was a landslide victory for the Tory party. I want to say that one of the most enjoyable parts of public life is working in the real arena of life at the constituency level. Certainly the legislature is an important part of government; certainly the premiership and cabinet ministers are important. Often associated is the bureaucratic jungle, the paper pushing, and to some extent an intellectual exercise of analysis for analysis' sake. I think it sometimes becomes removed from the reality of the real world.

You know, after it was on the news that I was re-elected, I received a letter from a well-educated and leading citizen in my area. He wrote to congratulate me and he urged me to continue on, and to work hard to provide good opposition. And whether or not he was right, he went on to suggest that the problem with our government was the weakness of the previous opposition. Those were his comments. I want to say that in this caucus there will be no doubt that we will be vigilant and work on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, in providing an effective opposition.

Mr. Speaker, we the opposition and, I think, the people of Saskatchewan, waited with eager anticipation for this Conservative throne speech. Here was the obvious opportunity for the new Premier with his massive mandate to provide the people of Saskatchewan with the philosophical basis on which the future social and economic decisions of the province would be charted. Premier Devine had repeatedly stated that "There is so much more we can be." I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan whose hopes and expectations have been raised by that Conservative campaign eagerly awaited this first Conservative speech in over 47 years. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, our dismay and the disappointment to the people of Saskatchewan when they were presented with a throne speech that was notable for two things: its brevity and its lack of content. There may be so much more we can be but we will have to wait and see.

For agriculture — still the keystone to our economy — little was said and nothing is being done. The only action of this government on agriculture is to dismantle the program that was working effectively for many individual young farmers — the land bank. Their action was to put a hold on it and not to put into place an alternative program.

For job creation — with layoffs and unemployment rising rapidly — no assistance was mentioned. The only contribution of this government was to lay off the potash workers throughout the province. For assistance to business, the key to the prosperity of our small towns and villages, there is nothing. In fact the 9.625 per cent interest loans

which they were going to provide to businesses is no longer a high priority.

For education, which the Premier himself said was of the utmost significance, nothing was said. For social services, which remains for those in need the sole source of assistance, there was nothing said. For health, where the Premier promised he would be number one, again nothing was said. Mr. Speaker, I ask: how long will we have to wait and see before we can see how much more we can be.

Mr. Speaker, what does concern me most about this throne speech is that perhaps it does contain the Progressive Conservative philosophy of government. A throne speech is an opportunity for a government to indicate its priorities to the people of Saskatchewan. What then, are the priorities of this government? I think that this throne speech is an interesting contrast with the throne speech which was brought down by the previous government. Our throne speech chartered a course; this throne speech contained nothing of assistance to small business, nothing in the area of job creation, nothing to stimulate the development of provincial industry. But it did contain an amendment to the education act to repeal the ward system for urban school boards before our urban ratepayers had an opportunity to see if it would be beneficial to them. And surely one must wonder about that priority.

I think it is important to remind the members opposite that under the NDP government our province had an enviable record. This province led the rest of Canada in economic growth. Its growth was far better than in any other province of Canada, and was nearly three times the rate of growth of the national economy. Manufacturing shipments exceeded 18 per cent, second only to Alberta. Last year alone, 9,000 new jobs were created, and consistent with the strong economic performance of our province it experienced the lowest unemployment in Canada.

Figures released in March of this year indicated the unemployment rate for Saskatchewan was 4.5 per cent. This, the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, compared favourably with the national average of over 8 per cent.

The previous administration demonstrated thrift and responsibility with the public's money by bringing in successive balanced budgets. This kind of management kept Saskatchewan away from the massive borrowing that other province have had to do.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of these economic plans it is apparent that we are entering difficult times here in Saskatchewan. Many of the reasons for this have been generated outside our province, and I think it would be most unfair to blame the new government for all of these economic problems. But I think it is fair to comment on how this new government attempts to deal with these problems which are reaching Saskatchewan — problems such as the policy of high interest rates pursued by the federal Liberal and Conservative administrations and which are, of course, of great concern to all Canadian citizens, with Saskatchewan residents being no exception.

The monetary policies pursued by the federal Conservatives under Mr. Clark, and carried on by Mr. Trudeau, are directly responsible for layoffs and bankruptcies and unemployment. Small businessmen and farmers are being squeezed out. Low- and middle-wage earners struggle with high mortgage obligations, pensioners scrimp to save money for food, and students are concerned that they won't have enough money to go back to school. These people, the average people of Saskatchewan, are those who are being hardest hit and those who need protection most.

This throne speech provided your government with a glorious opportunity to outline in detail the economic and social priorities. As we face these difficult economic times, the people of Saskatchewan will judge your government by how you react to them. Who will you help? How will you help? When will you help? You have provided us with some indications, and they do provide a glimpse of your priorities and your underlying philosophy, but they do not provide us with an idea of whether or not you have a coherent economic strategy to meet the needs of the people of Saskatchewan.

First you reduced the gasoline tax. Who were the primary beneficiaries, Mr. Speaker? A lot of people were beneficiaries. Obviously, the large interprovincial trucking companies were beneficiaries. Owners of large cars were beneficiaries. Tourists were beneficiaries. But who stood to lose from this decision, Mr. Speaker? I say, and I fear, that highway construction will suffer because revenues will be reduced substantially. I fear that the automobile accident insurance fund will have a shortfall, and that the consumer will have to pay.

Also, I want to say that those who believe that we should be conserving a non-renewable resource and who took steps to reduce their energy consumption and equipped themselves for alternate energy will be the losers. And for those for whom energy use is vitally important in the day-to-day operations of their business, our farmers, this decision provided little or no assistance whatsoever.

I want to say that during the campaign hundreds and hundreds of farmers were led to believe that the 40 cents, which wasn't 40 cents, was going to apply to farm fuel. And I want to say that many of the farmers today are starting to ask what happened to that promise that was made by that party opposite.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Well, there are some obvious short-term benefits to this legislation. I believe that your government has not examined closely the long-term implications of the revenues lost by your decision.

The second piece of legislation introduced in the throne speech is the mortgage assistance program limiting interest rate charges to 13.25 per cent. Again, this will be welcomed by those whose incomes are not large and who have been faced with mortgage increases of 8 to 10 per cent. For those in danger of losing their homes, this will be a welcome relief.

But once again one must examine the rationale of the program and examine its long-term implications on government revenues. Here is a program that will assist those in need, and that is good. But here is a program that also provides assistance to the most affluent people in the province. Mr. Speaker, to qualify for maximum benefits of this program, it is not how little you earn, but how much. The more you earn, the larger your home, the bigger your cheque.

Have you, as a government, examined the implications of such a program in such areas as the nature and the cost of new residential construction or the impact on housing prices in the large urban markets? Let us examine just some of the probable results of this program. A general increase in the cost of housing — what impact will this have on the rental market? There is no comment in the throne speech dealing with renters or the protection of renters. I want to say that when we were in government we had a

rentalsman office and rent control. I want to say that we maintained reasonable rate increases in rent. I want to say that the minister has recently announced that rent controls would be maintained. But I want to go on record and warn renters here in Saskatchewan that although they may well retain what they call rent control, it will be modelled after the Ontario form where last year there were up to 36 per cent increases in rental rates.

And who else will be penalized under this program? Those home-owners who own their own homes will receive no benefits, and, in fact, they are going to be the loser. Because what you have done is to cut, and not implement, the proposed increase in the property improvement grant — some \$40. Many other home-owners will not in fact be beneficiaries. Those home-owners who have a mortgage of 13.25 per cent or less will not be beneficiaries of this program and I want to say that they will be losers. They will not get the increase proposed by the previous administration in the property improvement, nor will they receive the benefit under the mortgage interest tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, when we examine this program again, some interesting comparisons and some of the philosophy of the Tory party come forward. Home-owners will receive an increase of up to \$250 a month, seniors under this Tory government so far less than \$5 per month. Renters will receive an increase of \$2.93 a month by way of the renter's rebate increase. Renters and senior citizens will receive very little assistance, but everyone in a home with a mortgage above 13.25 per cent, regardless of income, will in fact get a substantial increase. One might also ask, "What is the future of the senior citizens shelter allowance that was announced?" Many of the seniors are looking for further protection in the area of high inflation. Again, no mention is made in the throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, a disturbing pattern is emerging in the activities of this government. Presently you are debating whether or not the economy of this province can afford an increase of 25 cents per hour in minimum wage, and at the same time you are prepared to provide massive tax reduction to the oil industry and to those who least need the assistance. I want to say that the policies that were tried previously by Premier Thatcher did little to stimulate the oil activity in the province, but they did serve to increase the profits of the multinational corporations. In the Monday edition of the *Globe and Mail* the Minister of Mineral Resources indicated that the welcome mat it out for foreign oil companies. In his words, "We are going to make Saskatchewan safe for foreign oil companies." If such is the case, perhaps we already know the future of Saskatchewan oil and rather than invest in our own, we are going to give our resources away once more, with no assurance that the benefits will accrue to the people of Saskatchewan, the owners of those resources.

Mr. Speaker, what does this tell you? I think it is obvious that Reaganomics is alive and well here in Saskatchewan. It is a perfect example and illustration of the old trickle-down theory: give the rich more, because they deserve it; give the poor less, so they will work harder.

**MR. TUSA:** — Could I ask permission from the member for Quill Lakes to introduce some guests?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Leave has been asked to introduce guests. Is leave granted?

## **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**



**MR. TUSA:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the Assembly this morning, a group of grades 8 and 9 students from Nokomis. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Grant Asseltine. The group will be touring various points of interest in Regina today.

I would like to take this opportunity to put in a little plug for the town of Nokomis. When you enter the town of Nokomis you will see a large sign saying they have the finest water in western Canada. Perhaps Mayor Larry Schneider would like to hear about that.

I hope the group enjoys its visit to Regina and to the Assembly. I would like to ask all members to welcome them here.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — I had been saying here that we have evidence of a direction being created. They are prepared to provide programs to assist the wealthy, the corporate sectors, oil, trucking, but for those who need assistance most, this government provides little.

Mr. Speaker, this throne speech is notable not for what it contains, but what it does not contain. Again, we must come back to the economic philosophy of the members opposite. What is the vehicle which is most readily available to the provincial government here in Saskatchewan for managing the level of economic activity in this province? The answer is obvious: crown corporations. This government is opposed to crown corporations. I am going to say that in the years ahead, and not many years, months, there will be an undermining of our crown corporations. In fact, in the potash industry, this government has announced, without even taking the time to have any consultation with the union or the employees (a standard procedure which was followed by the previous administration) layoffs of hundreds of potash workers. The minister, in this House, had the audacity to lay blame on management, rather than being a big enough man to take responsibility, because he is, after all, chairman of the corporation.

I want to say that with the crown corporations in the potash industry (because there is one adjacent to my constituency) there was consultation with workers. During short cycles of inventory build-up we would look at alternative employment, like refurbishing the mine and maintaining the mine. This government's new attitude to labour is no consultation. I want to say that there is evidence here that this government has changed a co-operative policy of working — government and workers. The losers are going to be the provincial economy and the workers in the potash mines.

It seems to me that one of the most important responsibilities of a democratically elected government is to uphold or act as trustee for those political ideals which are most treasured in a free and democratic society. The preamble to the bill of rights, enacted by the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker, affirms that the Canadian nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person, and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.

It appears that the Premier of Saskatchewan and his government do not subscribe to these views. Whereas the bill of rights says:

That it is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed, and shall continue to exist, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly and association.

What did the new Premier of this province set forth as the new open government? He said, "We want to ensure that no civil servants hold membership cards in any political party." I want to say that either we have elected a closet separatist or those Tories across the way have disowned John Diefenbaker. You know, the Premier's view that civil servants cannot belong to any political party has resulted in mass firings of civil servants who were keen and conscientious workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is not only a matter which involved a few hundred civil servants. This is an issue which involves the rights and the liberties of every Saskatchewan citizen.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — For if you accept the principle that government can dismiss employees merely because they do not share the same political beliefs, where would it stop? Would we say after awhile we would stop giving contracts and government business to any individual who holds a membership in a political party, or who holds a political belief different from our own? Do we stop the certification of school teachers who express opinions which we don't like, or who support some ideology with which we differ? If the provincial government can do this, why can't the municipalities do the same with their employees, and the library boards, and the school boards, and the hospital boards? I want to say that when we get to that day, to the day of character assassination and guilt by association, then we have truly reached a sorry state.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that what the Premier really meant when he said that civil servants shouldn't hold membership cards in any political party is that no civil servant should hold a membership card in any party except the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, we look not at the words of Premier Devine, but at his action. Let us examine those appointments that have been made by Premier Devine — the man who said he was going to bring only professional, non-partisan people into the civil service, into the crown corporation boards of directors. Let us look at his non-partisan appointments.

First of all there is Staff Barootes. He is now a member of the board of the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation. Is he the same Dr. Barootes who is the chief Conservative fund raiser in the province? Ah, surely not, Mr. Speaker, surely not. For Premier Devine says that that would not happen and you know Premier Devine is an honourable man.

Ross Reibling has been appointed to the Sedco board, as well. Is he the same Ross Reibling who was the PC candidate in Regina Elphinstone?

Larry Kyle has also been appointed to the Sedco board. Is this the same Larry Kyle who was the major campaign official for the federal Conservatives? Surely not. Premier Devine says he would not allow that to happen.

Ted Hanlon is another board member of Sedco. Is this the same man who was the campaign manager for social services minister, Patricia Smith. I think that surely it can't be, because we all know that Premier Devine says he would not do such things.

George Hill is now a member of the board of SPC. Is this the same George Hill who is the past president of the Conservative Party? Surely not, for Premier Devine says he expects public servants and boards of directors to be non-political.

Another appointment to the board of SPC is Dan Meyers. I wonder if this is the same Dan Meyers who was the federal Tory candidate in the last two general elections. Surely not, because Premier Devine said there would be no such hirings.

Morris Chernesky has been appointed to the board of the computer utility board. Is this the same Morris Chernesky who was the former PC leadership candidate in 1973. And a provincial Tory candidate in 1975? Surely not.

Mr. Speaker, what really is illustrated here is what concerns us most about this government. I want to say that they were prepared to say anything that was necessary, or that they thought would help, to win an election. But now that they are a government, they are reversing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, when we examine this throne speech in terms of its content and in terms of the actions of this government, what do we see? Is there a coherent economic and social strategy that will provide us with the programs necessary to deal with the recession that we are facing? No, Mr. Speaker, there is not. Rather, we have programs whose base result is to protect those who need help least at the expense of those who need help most. Has this government, whose leader has talked so proudly of how God and the family come first before party, acted on those laudable sentiments? No, Mr. Speaker. Rather, this government has taken vindictive glee in the manner in which it has routinely destroyed the livelihood of many families whose only crime, Mr. Speaker, was to have been hired by the previous government.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of this government to date have been a grave disappointment to the people of Saskatchewan. And I want to say that, if you continue in the direction that you're going with your firing squad, in the next election you'll receive the same treatment that Sterling Lyon did in Manitoba.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Speaker, the thing that is of great concern to me is in fact the firings that have been going on. There was a speech in the 1950s in this legislature when there were allegations of two civil servants having participated in a particular meeting. And the Liberals came to the House — CCF was the government — and the thing they wanted to do was chastise the civil servants for their association. I want to say that one of the great premiers of this province, one of the great fighters for people and civil liberties, entered that debate, and I want to say what he said in closing his debate. This is what Tommy Douglas had to say. You had better keep these words in mind, chief of the firing squad.

Mr. Speaker, as long as it is possible to do so, we want to keep this province where people can think what they like, and say what they think. Freedom, like peace, is indivisible. I must protect my neighbour's rights in order to safeguard my own.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to support the amendment and obviously don't support the motion.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 8**

Blakeney  
Thompson  
Koskie

Engel  
Lingenfelter  
Hammersmith

Lusney  
Shillington

**NAYS — 46**

Devine  
Muller  
Birkbeck  
Taylor  
Andrew  
Bernston  
Lane  
Muirhead  
Pickering  
Saudberg  
McLeod  
McLaren  
Garner  
Katzman  
Martens  
Currie

Duncan  
Schoenhals  
Smith (Swift Current)  
Boutin  
Hampton  
Weiman  
Bacon  
Tusa  
Sutor  
Hodgins  
Sutor  
Sveinson  
Sauder  
Peterson  
Glauser  
Schmidt

Parker  
Klein  
Rybchuk  
Young  
Gerick  
Domotor  
Maxwell  
Embury  
Dirks  
Hepworth  
Folk  
Myers  
Zazelenchuk  
Johnson  
Baker

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Debate continues on the main motion.

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with, I believe, all the other members of this Assembly in congratulating you on your appointment as Mr. Speaker. The office of Speaker is fundamental to the parliamentary system in the democratic process. I have every confidence, and I think all members have confidence, in you to undertake that job and to do it in a very professional and appropriate way.

I would also like to welcome all the new members. I think this is probably the largest contingent of new members in this Assembly in a long time, if not ever. You will learn the system, and I hope you learn the respect for this system. It's a great institution. It takes time to learn it; it's fundamental to our democratic process, and it's fundamental to our freedoms.

I would also like to briefly thank the people of Kindersley who returned me to this Legislative Assembly once again. The last election, 1978, was the first time in history that the people of Kindersley had elected a Progressive Conservative member. There are many other people in this Assembly who can make the same statement now, I suppose, and members opposite sometimes suggest that history will repeat itself. Well, the Kindersley constituency elected me in 1978 with 38 per cent of the vote. I can tell you that on this occasion they elected me with 68 per cent of the vote, a full increase of 30 per cent.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to make a brief statement to this House and to the people of Saskatchewan about the state of the province's finances.

Three short months ago, the former government presented its 1982 budget, and many of us in here remember that budget. We remember the raving reviews of the now few members opposite. Everybody said this was an election budget, a masterpiece. They would take it to the people, and they laughed at the members opposite at that time, saying they had no chance. They did take that budget to the people, and on April 26 the people of Saskatchewan spoke as to how they received that budget of only three months ago.

And now the members opposite seem to be obsessed still with their defeated budget of three months ago. They continue their questioning what are you going to do with this, and what are you going to do with that? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have not yet learned the message of April 26, and that lesson is that they rejected that budget and they rejected it soundly, like no other budget has ever been rejected in the province of Saskatchewan.

That budget proposed, Mr. Speaker, a balance in the consolidated fund — a balanced budget in the consolidated fund. It went further, Mr. Speaker, and indicated or projected \$208 million as a surplus in the heritage fund. It was my unhappy task to advise the people of Saskatchewan what we learned on taking power. These budget projections were by anybody's imagination wildly out of line with reality. We estimate now that had the NDP budget of March been passed and implemented, the province of Saskatchewan would have seen an overall deficit in the consolidated fund and in the heritage fund of approximately \$200 million, not the \$208 million that they projected as a surplus. That, Mr. Speaker, is a difference of \$400 million. When the members opposite have the audacity to say, "You are studying the programs," I will tell those members that when they are out \$400 million you can bet we are going to study those programs. Obviously, there are some reasons for it. It's not all their fault. Some of it is.

Clearly, the oil revenues and the potash revenues are not what was projected, and, to be fair to the members opposite, perhaps there has been a downturn since the March figures were given. I would concede that to them, but the projection now is something in the order of \$250 million less than what was projected in the March budget. One could allow a bit of room for mistake, but not \$250 million, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the projected expenditures of the government did not take into full account all the costs to be paid this year. If we implemented the previous administration's budget, our projections would now be that expenditures would exceed revenues by some \$100 million. They would be up \$100 million from what was projected in the blue book.

I also would like to say a few words about the heritage fund. The heritage fund was brought in, I suspect, after the Government of Alberta brought in a heritage fund — if they can have one, we can have one. I think the general consensus, the belief of the average person out in Saskatchewan (that's what counts), the average view and the average opinion of the people was that we had accumulated large sums of money that would be readily available for use by the provincial government, particularly in tough times. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker.

The heritage fund, under the previous government had become little more than a source of interest-free money for its growing family of crown corporations. By the end of this year, Mr. Speaker, over \$800 million, 70 per cent of the assets of that heritage fund, had been advanced to the family of crown corporations, interest free. Further, Mr. Speaker, an additional \$130 million was advanced, interest free, to other departments of government. About \$100 million was in fact loaned to the family of crown corporations at interest-bearing amounts.

If any lesson is to be taken by the members opposite from the April 26 vote, it is that the people of Saskatchewan are tired of government giving interest-free loans to the family of crown corporations and not giving any break in interest to the families of the province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — If the members opposite want to talk about a change of philosophy, Mr. Speaker, one change of philosophy of this government is going to be that the real families in this province are not those crown corporations. The real families are the men and women living in our cities, our towns and the farms of this province, and they are the people who will get the benefits of the results of this government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The remainder, Mr. Speaker, of the heritage fund is in what a normal person would see as real money, money that can be spent, money that is readily available, is \$80 million — 7 per cent of that 11 years.

The members opposite, I'm sure, will be saying, "Well, yes, but these crown enterprises are going to pay big dividends to this government." Unfortunately, rather than generating profits, Mr. Speaker, the family of crown corporations has collectively lost almost \$100 million this year. In short, Mr. Speaker, to coin the phrase of my learned friend, the member for Souris-Cannington, "Mother Hubbard's cupboard is bare." That is the situation we find ourselves in. Expenditures will outstrip revenues. The heritage fund is locked up in the crown corporations, and the crown corporations are going to lose money, not make a profit. That is the sad state of affairs as we assume office.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to repair that damage, but the process of revitalizing this province is going to be hampered by the state of the national economy. In Canada today the national economy obviously has seen better days. We have high inflation, double-digit inflation, punishing interest rates that are in the area of 20 per cent, the lowest value of our dollar ever, and the highest unemployment in the history of this country. Mr. Speaker, there's a sense almost of aimless wandering and lack of leadership at the national level. Hopefully, the federal budget that will be coming down Monday night

will restore some confidence in the national economy to the people of this country and to people abroad.

There is a temptation to surrender to these present difficulties, to merely blame others, to simply endure the situation rather than take up arms against it. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell the people of Saskatchewan: that temptation is understandable, but to the members on this side of the House it is not acceptable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — On April 16, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan asked Grant Devine and the Progressive Conservative Party to deal with the real problems with practical solutions and to take decisive steps. Mr. Speaker, we have done that, and we will continue to do that.

The gasoline tax is gone, as we promised. But it is gone in a way, Mr. Speaker, that helped people. It put dollars in people's pockets. It was one of the major tax concessions made by a government in this country to stimulate the economy, Mr. Speaker, to help people out, to help businesses out, to help the consumers out. It's going to cost them less. The members opposite criticize that. But that seems to me to be what the people of this province want and I think what the people of this country want is a government, number one, that listens, but more than that, Mr. Speaker, a government that is prepared to act.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we have implemented — it's before the House — a 13.25 per cent interest rate mortgage program. Again, Mr. Speaker, what we have said is this: one of the problems facing the economy is inflation; we've dealt with it. Another of the problems facing this country is high interest rates. We don't set those; Ottawa does. We aren't prepared to simply sit and blame Ottawa like the former government did; we're going to act, and we're going to act decisively. We are going to protect what we believe is the most important heritage in this province, and that's an individual's home — not the crown corporations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I also want to emphasize that this government is going to be committed to fiscal responsibility. This government is committed to an overall program of balanced budgets. But that process, Mr. Speaker, is going to take some time. The member opposite carps about a deficit, Mr. Speaker. I would like to go back to *Hansard*, February 9, 1973, to a statement by the then minister of finance, Elwood Cowley, the guru of the NDP:

Should the economic situation warrant expenditures in excess of revenues, to create jobs or opportunities for the people of the province we will not hesitate to deficit finance.

The member opposite now seems to have changed his tune. Mr. Speaker, we are committed to deficits if we have to, but we intend, Mr. Speaker, to move towards balanced budget situations. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is to avoid the situation we find now in Ottawa or in the province of Quebec or perhaps in the province of Manitoba. We believe that is a dangerous course to follow; we do not intend to follow that course.

**HON. MR. ANDREW** — By the same token, Mr. Speaker, we were elected to provide a new government. And in providing that new government we are going to bring in new programs. And, Mr. Speaker, we do not feel we are committed to each and every program advanced by that previous government over the last 11 years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Later in this year this government intends to present to this Assembly revised spending estimates for 1982-83. In the meantime, this government intends to carry on with the use of special warrants. We believe, Mr. Speaker, as I said, that we are not prepared to back down from this fight of the difficult economic times. We look forward to the future of this province with great optimism. National economic mismanagement and high interest rates are hurting everybody, let's not kid ourselves. But the basic strength of this province remains. We have tremendous mineral wealth and resources in this province, potash, uranium and oil — the envy of Canada and clearly the envy of many of the countries of the world. And those developments are going to continue under this administration. We, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, are going to move to encourage the private sector. Now the members opposite seem to think that somehow this is nasty, somehow there is no place in this province for the business community, for the small businessman, for any other business. They seem to think there's no place for business in this province! I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell the members opposite and the people of Saskatchewan, as the Premier said some time ago, that the province of Saskatchewan is open for business and it is going to stay open for business.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Unlike the previous government, Mr. Speaker, we intend to pursue an active policy in renewable resources, an area they didn't seem to think counted — agriculture, tourism, various other renewable resource industries like that. It is going to take some time, Mr. Speaker, to get our program in place. Anybody can grant that time, so we give notice now, Mr. Speaker, to a new direction for agriculture, for tourism, for timber — that's the area we are going to move.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, the national economy, as I said, is going almost to the point of desperation in many people's minds. We believe that as a province we can do something. And we believe philosophically on this side of the House, that as an individual we can do something and we are going to continue to do something. I think, statistically, the last CPI figures show what you can do. As the national average on inflation, the CPI took the largest jump in years — 1.4 per cent on the national average — what was the average in Saskatchewan? Zero, Mr. Speaker. That zero came after the first numbers came out after the election of a Progressive Conservative government in the province of Saskatchewan. We take credit for that, and we intend that credit to go on and on and on.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — The cost of housing, the cost of transportation, and the cost of food are what drive the consumer price index up. We have moved on the cost of transportation. We are moving on the cost of interest, the cost of housing, the cost of



shelter.

Mr. Speaker, we believe as the Government of Saskatchewan we can make a difference. We are going to move to encourage the oil industry. I thought the members opposite might howl or hoot at that, but when you see the revenues reduced by \$250 million, something has to be done about the oil industry in this province. We intend to bargain and we intend to bargain hard, but we have and we will make changes in that. Mr. Speaker, the changes have just begun. The people demanded changes. The people want to see significant changes, and the people of this province are going to see significant changes over the next four years, over the next decade.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ANDREW:** — In closing, Mr. Speaker, on a personal note. I look forward to the challenge of this office. I think we look forward to the opportunity, above all else, to serve the people of Saskatchewan, to move Saskatchewan ahead, to capture the potential that is there, and to address the challenges of tough times. We are going to be there, Mr. Speaker, and this government is going to be around for a long time.

We have acted. We have made our dent. That will continue, Mr. Speaker, and as a member of this side of the House I intend to support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

### YEAS — 43

Devine	Duncan	Parker
Muller	Schoenhals	Klein
Birkbeck	Boutin	Rybchuk
Andrew	Hampton	Young
Bernston	Weiman	Gerich
Lane	Bacon	Domotor
Muirhead	Tusa	Maxwell
Pickering	Hodgins	Embury
Sandberg	Sutor	Dirks
McLeod	Sveinson	Hepworth
McLaren	Sauder	Folk
Garner	Petersen	Myers
Katzman	Glauser	Zazelenchuk
Martens	Schmidt	Baker
Currie		

### NAYS — 8

Blakeney	Engel	Lusney
Thomson	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Koskie	Hammersmith	

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance:

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

**HON. MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a routine motion. I don't want too many people to get excited about it because it doesn't necessarily have to be followed and, therefore, it won't. I move, seconded by the Premier:

That this Assembly will, at the next sitting, resolve itself into a committee of finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and to consider the ways and means of raising the supply.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:47 p.m.