

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
November 30, 1982

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce a group of high school students, who are sitting in the east gallery, from Kincaid High School. They are a group of eight grade 12 students who are with their principal, Ron Williams. They are here today to observe the session. I'm sure that all members will want to join with me in welcoming them here and wishing them an enjoyable stay and a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Education, I want to introduce to you and through you, to the Assembly, the 35th Regina Scout and Venturer Group, situated in your gallery. Altogether too seldom, Mr. Speaker, do we have Regina groups who come to this Assembly. It seems that they're familiar with it and don't come. We're delighted to see the scout group here. They're here with their leaders. We hope you find the proceedings in this Assembly educational and interesting. We wish you a good day.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce that visiting the Assembly today is the United States vice-consul from Winnipeg, Mr. Harold Foster. I'd like to ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming Mr. Foster, and I'd ask Mr. Foster to stand up and be acknowledged.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. LANE: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce that in the west gallery is a division 3 class from the Lumsden High School. They consist of 10 students and two adults. The teacher chaperone is Sonia Swork. I'd like to ask all members of the Assembly to join with me in welcoming the students from Lumsden. I look forward to visiting with them a little later this afternoon. Again, I ask all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — I'm pleased to announce today that we have with us from St. Henry's Junior High School in Melville, Saskatchewan, a grade 8 class consisting of 41 students, and their teachers, Mr. Garth Gleisinger and Mr. Haugulun, and their bus

drivers, Mr. Phil Hack and Daryl Hollack. They are in the west gallery. I would like the members here to give them a welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Renovation of Regina Union Station

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs, as I am sure he anticipated. Yesterday, you informed me that the decision to halt the renovations and progress at the Regina multimodal station was taken by the former board of directors. I gather that that information was not accurate. I, therefore, want to repeat (and I gather the decision was, in fact, taken by cabinet) my question of yesterday. Why did you bring this program to a halt? Is it part of the deep freeze into which you plunged this province by withdrawing from any public sector construction? Are you just fundamentally opposed to the sort of imaginative public enterprise that went into this concept? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . At least the information we gave was accurate; we did not give inaccurate information.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Could you give the hon. member an opportunity to ask his question? I would direct to the member that you are taking a considerable amount of time to lead up to the question. Would you get on with the question?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Why did you bring this program to a halt?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, the only mistake I made yesterday was to refer to the board that made the recommendation as the board of the STC. It was actually a decision that was reached by the CIC board prior to our taking government. They sent a decision to treasury board that involved a statement that the crown corporation, STC, would only fund up to a particular level, and the further funding would have to come from the government. We sent the statement back to the new CIC board to have a look at it, to see if they were in total agreement. To date, they have not come back with a decision.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be as many versions of this as there are statements by you. I want to quote briefly from you from the *Leader-Post* of yesterday.

After reading the notes and checking with other government officials, Schoenhals admitted that the decision not to add government money to STC funds had been taken by his cabinet colleagues and not by the previous board.

I want to ask you again: what role did the cabinet play in this decision?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, once again I will remind the members opposite not to take advice from the *Leader-Post* and the *Star-Phoenix*.

The cabinet has not seen this particular item, it has not gone past treasury board. It was sent back to CIC by treasury board and it will come to the cabinet after it returns.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I ask the minister: what commitments has the Government of Saskatchewan made to this project? What commitments are made?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the member opposite is perfectly familiar with the commitments made by the previous administration. This government has made no commitments.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. I remind the member opposite that the Government of Saskatchewan has made commitments in several respects: letters of intent have been signed with Transport Canada, with VIA Rail, and with the city of Regina. I ask why is the Government of Saskatchewan reneging on this commitment which has been clearly made in the name of the Government of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, this government has not reneged, neither have we committed. We have sent it back to CIC, that is, treasury board has sent it back to CIC for more information. When it comes back treasury board will consider it and then send it to cabinet through the normal channels, as I'm sure you are aware.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — The minister seems to need an elementary lesson in political science. A commitment made by the Government of Saskatchewan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Does the member have a supplementary?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A new question: if the project doesn't proceed, what is going to be done with the building which has been declared to be a heritage building?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I find that question highly hypothetical, and I don't believe I'm in a position at this time to answer it. We are waiting for the recommendation by CIC, and we will consider it, and decide at that time.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A final question: how can you reconsider a decision that the Government of Saskatchewan is committed to?

A new question. The Government of Saskatchewan is committed to that project in writing. How can this government reconsider something that the government's committed to?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, we are not committed to the previous financial arrangements, the same as we were not committed to the arrangements you made in Nipawin. We renegotiated to save \$10 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Before the land bank or a hundred other things. That was why we were put here on April 26 — to make changes. And this may be one; it may not. We will wait for the information. We will consider it. We will make a decision and we will let you know.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Another question to the minister. Is it not factual that you are a party to a written agreement to proceed with this project.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — No, sir. To my knowledge it is not.

Minimum Wage

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Labor and I will direct it to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Minister of Labor.

I refer to the minimum wage board of Saskatchewan and the fact that it was soliciting written submissions back in the summer, submissions which were expected to be received by mid-August. I refer also to the fact that it has been customary in Saskatchewan for increases in minimum wages to be announced six or eight weeks in advance.

My question to the Deputy Premier is: has the Minister of Labor or the cabinet received a recommendation from the minimum wage board respecting an increase in the minimum wage effective January 1, 1983.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — No.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Deputy Premier's comment to be that no recommendation has been received from the minimum wage board with respect to an increase in the minimum wage.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — That's my understanding. However, it is also my understanding that there will be an announcement made in the near future and I am not prepared to, in the absence of the minister, commit to any date at this time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the cabinet to follow the past practice of giving some weeks notice to employers, especially the small employers, of increases in the minimum wage? Or will that practice be laid aside.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, it's the intention of the cabinet to make the decision when we get together next and discuss this thing, and I'm, sure that it will be announced at the same time that the decision with respect to minimum wage is announced.

Canola Crushing Industry

MR. ENGEL: — I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Have you made presentation to your counterpart in Alberta regarding the problem that has been created by the injection of \$40 million in capital to the canola crushers by the province?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — Have these presentations been successful? Have you reached an agreement or drawn a conclusion?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — There's a new minister in the province of Alberta by the name of Mr. Fjordbotten. I have invited the minister from Manitoba and the minister from Alberta to meet with me in Regina, or any other mutually acceptable place, to discuss the problems of the crushing industry as an industry in the prairie base, as opposed to looking upon segments of the industry and the islands of distortion they create. To date

I have had a response from the minister in Manitoba. As of yet, to my knowledge, I have not had a response from Alberta. I attribute that to the fact that there is a new minister in there getting control of his office.

MR. ENGEL: — One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. According to the *Leader-Post* today.

(Edmonton) — Alberta will not abandon its \$20.4 million canola crushers' subsidy programs, says Deputy Agriculture Minister Ben McEwen . . . He said the subsidy is vital for the survival of the hard-hit crushing industry.

In light of the position that Alberta has taken, are you prepared to make a commitment to the canola industry in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — No, not at this time, or perhaps not even in the future. But I'm prepared to deal with my counterparts in the other jurisdictions to take a look at the industry as a total.

Small Business Loans

MR. KOSKIE: — I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance, in the absence of about five or six other ministers. It makes it rather difficult to direct a question, but I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

As the Minister of Finance will know, the number of bankruptcies in Saskatchewan during the past year has pretty well doubled over that of the previous year with respect to small business and to farms. He will note that the Alberta government established a subsidized loan program for the farmers and for small business. I note that your party had a promise, the PC policy for good government, of 9.625 per cent interest for small business. Since you have brought down your budget, I would like to ask the minister when it is his intention to give assistance to the small businessman, as promised in your election campaign.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, the budget came down last week. We believe that we have dealt with, over the last seven months, the question of putting dollars back into people's pockets by making the largest major tax cut in the history of Saskatchewan. We have delivered a mortgage program that we committed to the people of Saskatchewan; we have delivered the public utilities review commission; and in the budget we delivered the farm purchase program, Mr. Speaker. I would say by anybody's standards, Mr. Speaker, that's pretty fair performance for seven months in office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in that budget speech, that we would be bringing in further programs. I have indicated all along that we would be bringing in further programs as when we can afford those programs, because we want to be a responsible government in delivering those programs, Mr. Speaker.

It seems somewhat strange that the members opposite . . . First their leader is arcing and crying about a deficit. Now this man sitting behind him seems to say we should spend more money and more money and more money. We are trying to deliver our programs as we committed. We believe the people of this province are happy with the way that we have delivered these programs. We will continue to perform in the way we have performed for the last seven months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, in response to the speech by the finance minister. Indeed, he did not answer the question so I will be advising the small business community that they do not intend to keep this promise. If ever there was a time to give assistance to the small business community, it's the time when they need it. I want to ask a supplemental to the Minister of Finance. I want to ask a supplemental and I would like your attention. I ask the Minister of Finance: is his government prepared to call a conference together of the various representatives of the economic sectors of this province in order that an economic strategy can be outlined to deal with the problems that are comforting the small businessmen and the tight squeeze on the farmers?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that about a month ago we had an Open for Business conference, at a time, Mr. Speaker, when it's the lowest decline or the greatest decline in economic activity in the entire country. Here we had an Open for Business conference — businessmen not only from this province but from across the country and they attended in the largest numbers ever to attend a Financial Post . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the businessmen of this province are far happier that the commitment that we made and the commitment that we delivered was when we drove the government from office that . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Quite frankly, the business community — the ones I have talked to — have never been happier, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KOSKIE: — Further supplemental, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance has stood up here and indicated to this House that the great effort toward assistance to the business community was their conference, Open for Business. I would like to ask him: can he indicate how many jobs that has created? I would like to ask him: how many new enterprises as a result of it.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell you one of the main functions of the Open for Business conference was to deliver to the people of Saskatchewan, and I think to the people of Canada, the message that we wanted to, and I believe that every government must start restoring some confidence both at the consumer level and at the business level. And in that conference, Mr. Speaker, what we did more than in any other way was to take steps one, two, and three to start restoring confidence in our economy. It is only through restoring confidence in the economy, Mr. Speaker, that we can start turning this situation around that we find ourselves in, in this country, and in that way start seeing the economic activity that this country still holds for all its people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Office of the Rentalsman

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. This has to do with the office of the rentalsman at Saskatoon. I am advised that the office of the rentalsman at Saskatoon has taken on some temporary employees, approximately five in number according to my information. The question I direct to the minister is whether or not these employees were hired as a result of posting any bulletins in accordance with the normal prices, whether or not members of the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union were given an opportunity and whether or not members of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union on layoff were given an opportunity, and whether or not members of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Union who

were not on layoff but who are at a lower level of job were given an opportunity to compete at the higher level for these temporary jobs.

HON. MR. SANDBURG: — Mr. Speaker, the former administration allowed rent control offices in this province to fall into disarray, as everyone knows. They were in terrible shape. Cases were not acted upon promptly because of a lack of direction by Mr. Blakeney's former government. The rentalsman's office in Saskatoon has corrected this situation by hiring several people. I'll start at the top. We have a new acting rentalsman by the name of Mr. O.A. MacGillivray. He is chairman of the provincial mediation board, and he has worked for this province many, many years and done so diligently. Mr. David Forrest, appointed by the former administration, has been hired as an acting board member in Saskatoon. Previous to that he was an investigator in the office in Saskatoon. Mr. Ronald McCann, of Regina, was hired as an acting board member. He previously was an investigator in the licensing and investigation branch. And Glenn Parker, now in the rentalsman's office in Regina, was hired as an investigator also. He was on temporary appointment in another department, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition did not give direction to the rentalsman's office in previous years, but it seems evident that they were in the process of removing rent controls in this province, as I indicated earlier this week. The office in Saskatoon was in on discussions regarding the hiring of personnel. As a matter of fact, they were asked if they knew of any personnel who were qualified and interested in these positions, and we asked them to submit their curriculum vitae. The public service commission, Mr. Speaker, freed up the positions and a number of applications were reviewed. People who were qualified were hired for the positions. They are temporary positions, Mr. Speaker. These positions were needed to provide a service that wasn't there before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the minister wished to answer any question but the one that was asked. The question I asked is this: with respect to the temporary employees, were the members of the existing union, the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union, given the opportunity to bid, as is the normal custom? Were the jobs posted, as is the normal custom, or were in fact at least two of those employees taken on staff from the office of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatoon without ever having been members of that union, when members of that union are in layoff? Is that true?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBURG: — Mr. Speaker, these personnel were hired through normal public service commission channels and criteria. As far as the hiring of people is concerned, we do not discriminate against people, whether they are Tories or whether they are NDP. One of your former candidates is still working in that office.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I take it that the minister admits that two of the people he hired were from the Progressive Conservative office. I take it he admits that the jobs were not posted or bulletined. They were not posted to the employees' bulletin. I take it he admits that these employees were not given a chance, at lower level jobs, to compete for the higher level jobs. The question I ask the minister is this: is it going to continue to be his practice to hire people who were former employees of the Progressive Conservative Party rather than giving people who were

long-time members of the government staff, now on layoff, an opportunity where vacancies occur?

HON. MR. SANDBURG: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat that these people were hired in temporary positions by the public service commission, and the criteria was followed as to hiring practices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Regina Union Station

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, if I might, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced that you are misinformed today as you were misinformed yesterday about this matter. I ask you a simple question: were letters of intent signed with Transport Canada, Via Rail and others, by the former administration with respect to the multimodal station.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, in terms of the previous administration, I wasn't here; I'm not sure what they did. When I arrived in my office there was not a shred of paper in it. The shredder was worn out and it hasn't worked since. However, I will take note of your question and find out from the department.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — That is at least a step forward. Did the minister not consult with his officials as to whether letters of intent were signed before this matter was reconsidered?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, once again, the commitments of the previous administration in financial situations do not have to be honored. We will look at it. We will deal with it and we will make a decision.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — A new question, Mr. Speaker. I'd say that the minister has just written a new chapter in the law of contracts if he is suggesting that commitments made by the former administration are not binding on the government. Are you suggesting that no commitment made by the former administration is binding on the Government of Saskatchewan as a result of the election? Is that the proposition you just put to me?

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I will determine if such letters were signed. I will determine if they are legally binding, and if we are legally bound we will stand by that. If not, we intend to look at the situation, make a rational decision and we will let you know.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I ask the minister: don't you think the proper time to have undertaken that study as to whether or not you are bound by it was before you started to reconsider that matter? Aren't you a little late?

MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, we have not ended any commitment. We are looking at the financial arrangements, as I have indicated six or seven times here today. When we make a decision on a commitment we will consider whatever legal obligations there are. At this time we have not made any decision; you are making that inference, which is not correct.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I say to the minister that surely the fact that someone (you say not the cabinet but the board; I'll take that for the moment), the fact that the board is reconsidering the matter is indicative that they don't think they're bound by any commitment made by the former administration. Surely the time to determine whether or not you're bound to the program is before you start to reconsider it.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, there was no question asked but I would like to respond if it's within my right. What this infers is that this administration has absolutely no confidence in the financial arrangements that were made by the previous administration and that's all it infers.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 44 — An Act to amend The Department of Finance Act

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to amend The Department of Finance Act.

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

Bill No. 45 — An Act to establish a Program to Facilitate Financing the Purchase of Farm Land

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to establish a program to facilitate financing the purchase of farmland.

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

Bill No. 46 — An Act to repeal The Land Bank Act and to make Certain Temporary Provisions for Lessees

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to repeal The Land Bank Act and to make certain temporary provisions for lessees.

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

POINT OF ORDER

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would like to direct Mr. Speaker's attention to page 1123 of *Hansard* from November 29, 1992. When the opposition House Leader was completing his speech, he made reference and I quote on page 1123:

We have a group of wife-beaters and child-abusers which in three years will be turfed out.

Mr. Speaker, I would rise on a point of order. I believe that that amounts to unparliamentary language, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that that particular comment be withdrawn by the member opposite, and an apology made to Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — The member has quoted from *Hansard* on page 1123 from yesterday. I did raise this point in a note with the member yesterday, and I find that the comments

in reviewing *Hansard* are indeed unparliamentary, and I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, as you mentioned, you sent a note to me yesterday after the speech and I sent a note back to you explaining how, in the context of the speech, I was building a case — that the words mentioned were meant as figures of speech only. If people in this legislature took exception to them, I certainly didn't mean them personally in any way, and withdraw them and apologize.

Announcement

Minister of Agriculture Hogtied

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House the Hon. Minister of Agriculture informed the House that he was going to participate in a calf-roping contest. He did this with much bravado and was busy showing his masculinity for all of us to see. I must now say, Mr. Speaker, there was no calf-roping contest last night. In fact, there wasn't even a calf! It turns out the hon. minister, aided by two others, instead decided to pick on a poor little goat. Three huge men against one small goat.

Fortunately, the others participating felt sorry and had a change of heart after it happened. And they decided to give the Minister of Agriculture some of his own medicine. They gave him the same treatment as the minister gave the goat. They hogtied him but good. There he was, flat on his back, as you can see on page 4 of the *Leader-Post*, with two legs and one arm tied together. Unlike the goat, he did not manage to limp away. There are probably few times that the Minister of Agriculture will be well hogtied, especially by the opposition.

The minister is reported to have said later that he acknowledges his quickness and his ability in tying goats due to the experience he gets tying the opposition up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATE

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

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

MS. ZAZELENCHUK: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure for me to participate in the budget debate. Mr. Speaker, my constituency of Saskatoon Riversdale includes some of Saskatoon's least affluent people and many people on very modest incomes. There are also young people and senior citizens. All these people are very vulnerable to negative changes in the economy. During the election, some of these people said at first that they were going to vote NDP. To some I asked: if the NDP has done so much for you in the last 11 years, why are you unnecessarily struggling with high mortgage rates? Why are you unnecessarily taxed? The NDP is giving 9.625 per cent money to eastern developers. Then we outlined our aspirations for the province and the people supported us. The aspirations have transpired into legislation and already some real

benefits for people.

I am pleased with the budget address as presented by the Hon. Bob Andrew, Minister of Finance. The minister accurately assessed our position in Saskatchewan when he said that we in Saskatchewan have not been immune to the effects of the national and international recession. Saskatchewan is recession resistant, not recession proof.

People of Saskatchewan knew, too, that the beginnings of an economic turnaround were out there somewhere, and that simply surviving was not enough to guarantee the healthy economic upswing we needed to enter out of the recession. The members of the opposition and the Leader of the Opposition, who also have a responsibility to the public, took their opportunity to stand in the House and say that our programs are giving money to the bankers.

The facts are simply these, Mr. Speaker. The mortgage interest reduction plan will put \$35 million back into consumers' hands in 1982-83. By July, approximately 38,000 Saskatchewan home-owners were able to receive benefits under the mortgage interest reduction plan, and housing starts increased by 48 per cent. It is estimated that when the program ends in July 1985, 105,000 families will have benefited from the program.

The last budget of the former government gave back to the people a \$3 a month extra if you own a home, \$2 a month if you rent. Meanwhile the land bank acquired 1.5 million acres of farmland.

The former government increased state ownership and reduced people's expectations, but it was individual initiative that built Saskatchewan and we will continue to allow that to happen. Our farm purchase program will provide once-in-a-lifetime loans for farmers up to \$350,000 at 8 per cent for 5 years, then 12 per cent or prime, whichever is lower, for the next 5 years.

There has indeed been a change in the spending priorities of government. The former government spent \$2 billion for crown corporations expansion at a time when markets dropped for potash and uranium. Our taxpayers carried the interest through indirect taxes and the cost of their utilities. Our government established the public utilities review commission which will permit utilities to implement increases only when they are in line with costs encountered and service given.

The last NDP budget recognized that important challenges remained in the field of health. They had 11 years here, too, and we ranked eight out of 10 in Canada in health care spending. When you consider the provinces which have colleges of medicine at the universities, we rank eight out of eight.

And what were their intentions and aspirations for expenditures related to health? Well, they would spend money advertising the 30th anniversary of medicare in Saskatchewan.

During the maintenance of operations act debate the member for Shaunavon said perhaps all members of the Assembly could reduce their wages to give the cancer workers what they asked. Well, just how feasible is it to settle every strike that way. But I would rather see the money the NDP planned to spend on advertising the anniversary of medicare go to such problems. But advertising took a priority with the NDP.

The last budget of the former government allocated \$702 million to health. Our budget allocates \$728 million — an additional \$26 million for health. Also, an extra \$500,000 will be provided to the municipal ambulance services. And in September of this year the Minister of Health announced funding in excess of \$2 million for upgrading equipment and facilities at St. Paul's Hospital and City Hospital in Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, deficit financing was unavoidable considering what we inherited and what is the real benefit to the people. No one in government would delude themselves into thinking there is going to be an easy solution. However, the impact of the gasoline price reduction has reduced the consumer price index in Saskatchewan a full three points below the national average.

We were the first provincial government to sign with the federal government for a joint job creation program for the winter months. Changes in the royalty structure in the oil industry have substantially increased exploration and production. What we have done in this province is demonstrate that we are prepared to deal with the question of inflation, restoring confidence in the economy, and encouraging economic development. Programs only government can initiate have already set Saskatchewan on the road to recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the budget and the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I want to say that yesterday was a great, not only for Saskatoon Riversdale but the Saskatoon Westmount. I had many ecstatic phone calls that our neighbor in Saskatoon west was safe and secure, and our neighbors were safe and secure from being foisted with some more NDP propaganda.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — I would like to congratulate the member for Saskatoon Riversdale for giving Saskatoon Westmount so much happiness that we have good neighbors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — It takes courage and enterprise to be the Minister of Finance after the NDP regime. Our minister has shown courage and enterprise. No governmental budget is an isolated sheet of facts and figures drawn by the arbitrary wish of the minister of finance. Our Minister of Finance was not given a blank canvas to paint his own economic scene. No, our Minister of Finance was given the task of creating economic order out of economic chaos.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — He and this government inherited a balance sheet that was not balanced; a heritage fund that had no funds, and estimates made by dreamers facing an election. He and this government inherited a provincial economy that was stagnated by a socialist philosophy and mode of operation. He and this government inherited a provincial government choked by NDP socialism operating in a country choked by Trudeau socialism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — To get a historical perspective on this Conservative budget it is important to understand what came before. Ten years of the Blakeney's gang grab for centralized state power came before. The unfortunate aspects of the Blakeney regime were (1) they kept their promises, (2) they were true to their philosophy. It is right and good that governments keep their promises and stick to their philosophy. It is unfortunate when those promises lead to statism, when that philosophy is socialism. The people of this province have paid for those promises. The people of this province have suffered under their socialist philosophy.

The socialists tell us what they are going to do, and then they go about doing it. It still takes a while to believe they are saying exactly what they are saying, and doing exactly what they are doing. Mr. Blakeney declared openly in his budget speech of 1971 that government would play a new role in Saskatchewan. It was, indeed, a new role for government. The government would attempt to solve all the ills of mankind by expanding government agencies and departments. The government would treat the private entrepreneur as a blight on the economy. The government would be involved in the economy as a principal player. It was indeed a new deal for people; it was a raw deal for people.

Whether that deal was served with socialist naivete or socialist duplicity is irrelevant to the result. The result was 10 years of oppressive, stultifying statism. But let's hear the story from the man himself, and I quote the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone, 1971:

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the operations of crown corporations during 1971. At the outset let me make clear that this government will encourage the continued operation and expansion of crown corporations. We will develop our resources for the benefit of the Saskatchewan people. Where appropriate, it will be done through crown corporations.

But people did not realize to a socialist there are no inappropriate areas for government.

According to the Vichert report on culture, a crown corporation for the arts was recommended.

He inherited a situation vastly different from ours and I quote:

The two major utilities, Sask Tel and Saskatchewan Power again accounted for a major part of the total corporation revenues and recorded surpluses of \$12.7 million and \$20.9 million respectively.

Sask Tel and Sask Power did not have a yearly growing deficit but a combined surplus of \$33.5 million in 1971. The Sask Power of 1981 had a deficit of over \$22 million. During 1971, he states:

Our crown corporations provided employment for over 6,100 people.

Now we have at least 26 crown corporations. Many employ more than 6,100 in one area alone. Yet our population has remained virtually the same. He states:

We need to find new means to cope with individual problems, to develop new institutions and policies to cope with new social problems and social demands.

New institutions to cope with individual problems? What institutions would these new ones replace? Would they attempt to replace the institution of the family? Would they attempt to replace the institution of the church? Would they attempt to replace the institution of democracy? What would these new institutions be? State control of children? State control of elderly? A state ideology? An overwhelming bureaucracy with MLAs as window dressing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS CASWELL: — And thus was marshalled in the great wave of the governmental bureaucracy complex. Government would create problems of alienation and demoralization in people's lives. Government would provide a bureaucracy to cope with that alienation and demoralization. Government would provide a bureaucracy to monitor the bureaucracy to solve the problems caused by the bureaucracy put in place by a government dedicated to bureaucratic growth. It is exhausting to say and far more exhausting to live in it.

By the way, the book, *Family, State and Property*, argues women are oppressed. It was written by Engels some years ago, a hundred or so. The women are oppressed because there is private property. And when private property is dissolved women will end their oppression, presumably then they will be public property and this will be very good. This was part of the holy writ of the Marxist and the ideological foundation of the feminist socialist. Of course, I do not think the hon. member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg would support such a heresy, but then he kept attacking our Attorney General because our Attorney General does not think that we should give taxpayer money to propagate these views and ideology in the Third World. I am rather confused about this. However, back to the hon. member for Regina Elphinstone, 1971. He promised to change an emphasis in economic growth. He delivered a change in economic growth. Quote.

This government proposed a new direction for economic development. We will support resource development but without excessive public subsidy and only under conditions which preserve and protect the natural environment.

What is the public subsidy? Letting a mine make a profit? Why have that when one can have government control and ownership? Of course resources should not be developed unless there is a department to regulate the resource industry out of operating profit, so apparently they think.

It is unfortunate I do not have organ music playing a funeral dirge to precede the next quote. Again, the hon. member for Elphinstone, 1971. Try to visualize this, who the speaker was; that's really enjoyable.

Mr. Speaker, to promote and sustain family farms, we propose to inaugurate a land bank program . . . The establishment of a land bank commission will encourage the retention and development of the family farm.

That program could well have been the death knell of the privately owned family farm had not the Conservative government wrested power from that land-hungry entrepreneur, the NDP government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — Fourteen hundred farms were lost between 1972 and 1982 and rural population declined from 438,000 to 405,000 in the same period. Perhaps we have had enough of the 1971 hon. member for Regina Elphinstone, but more schemes followed.

During this session you will be asked to pass legislation to establish a new Department of Northern Saskatchewan and to vote money for this purpose. The budget provides money for the nucleus of the new department. In the future it is planned to transfer to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan responsibility for the majority of government services offered in northern Saskatchewan. This will involve a significant transfer of staff and funds from the departments of education, natural resources, welfare and health.

Remember when a socialist government passes funding for a nucleus, the organism grows and grows. It becomes cancerous till it feeds upon its host, destroying the morale and initiative of the people claimed to need that organism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — DNS grew till it became a state within a state. It practised discrimination to rectify discrimination. It exploited while claiming to protect the exploited. It nurtured southern socialist sycophants and bankrupted northern citizens. Be he did not leave those unaffected by DNS alone. I quote:

Mr. Speaker, in this budget we have taken major steps to humanize welfare services. We believe that welfare and social security do not stop with financial assistance.

Indeed why stop at giving money to a person who is temporarily out of money when one can create a bureaucracy to run the person's life, and with a bit of effort can keep him a client forever?

Our government is increasing the staff of the regional service branches by 62 permanent positions. This includes 24 new positions and the conversion of 38 positions to permanent from temporary status.

Apparently it was planned to keep the poor poor for some time. They did not expect to solve too many problems that would render unnecessary expanded and permanent staff.

Here's one succinctly put: "A tax on wealth is a fair tax." Let's have equality at any cost. If we can't be equally rich we will be equally poor. So they think

And don't let anyone make any money in the oil and gas industry.

Our government believes that the vast resources of this province belong to the people. (I'm really sorry that I can't imitate his accent.) When resources are developed, we believe that the owners of the resources share in the fruits of production. In order to do this to a greater extent, our government reintroduced the net royalty type of oil and gas mineral land leasing.

The key to understanding socialists is when they say “the people” they mean “the state.”

To increase resource revenue still further in the fiscal year we will revise tax and royalty rates to reflect a more equitable sharing of the profits from mineral productions.

The revised rates will virtually drive the oil industry out of the province. But there will be more equitable sharing: the oil companies won't benefit, and the people of Saskatchewan won't benefit.

The scenario changes to March 18, 1982. The speaker hasn't changed. Although the past premier came to power in 1971 with 44 seats, he couldn't trust the budget to anyone but himself. By 1982 he had delegated the budget speech to someone called Tchorzewski. Tchorzewski opens his remarks by the ever-present tendency of socialists to rewrite history, and to advance dogma at every opportunity.

Our grandfathers had vision when they first came to Saskatchewan. They set out to build a society based on co-operation in which young and old alike can grow together, share together, succeed together.

Our grandparents came to Saskatchewan to own private land, to be economically independent, to be free to voluntarily co-operate when it was advantageous, and socialists keep telling us their goal was to be part of the visionary collective society.

He says electing a Blakeney government has:

Paid off with free dental care for children, and the finest array of health, social, and education programs in Canada.

How do you judge a fine array? By the centralized bureaucracy? By the dictatorial powers. By the monopolistic ideological hold on these departments? Or does one judge health, social and educational programs by accountability to the public, by diversity and by individuals in control of their destiny?

I think people rejected the NDP evaluation. I quote Tchorzewski, late of this Chamber:

The government also takes pride in the fact that Saskatchewan has the highest number of nursing home beds per capita in Canada.

Do they also take pride that we need the highest number of nursing home beds per capita because our population is disproportionately elderly, because the young have been driven away and are not here to look after the elderly?

I quote the March '82 finance minister:

When the NDP government came to power in 1971, rural Saskatchewan and our small towns were in deep trouble. Farmers were selling out. Merchants were closing their doors.

When the NDP was kicked out of power in April 1982, rural Saskatchewan and our small towns were not only in deep trouble, but they were dying or dead. Farmers who were left were becoming feudal tenants to the government, and the merchants were in

Alberta.

Tchorzewski on the heritage fund:

The management of the heritage fund requires the government and the members of the Assembly to decide what portion of resource revenue should be spent today, and what portion should be invested in the future.

Do the incumbents on the government side remember having a decision where the heritage fund would be spent? There's not much to decide concerning what portion should be spent today if there are no portions left.

To continue the quote:

This year, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the heritage fund will pay a dividend of \$750 million.

I'm sure the Minister of Finance will be pleased to receive that payment, but I think he's been looking for eight months and still hasn't found it. But the hon. member for Elphinstone tells us that we knew all along there was no money in the heritage fund. Yet his finance minister said:

In 1982 the heritage fund will invest \$200 million in resource projects that will both spur development and provide a financial return to the people of Saskatchewan.

Long before the election, potash was piling up at government mines and being sold at private mines. Workers knew there would be layoffs at government mines and there would be employment at private mines, yet the March finance minister said:

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is only one of many successful crown corporations in Saskatchewan.

Concerning an independent review board to approve utility rate increases, I quote our March hare.

Our position is clear. If our utilities were owned by the private sector it would certainly be necessary to have a review board to protect the public interest, but because our utilities are owned by the people of Saskatchewan (state) and because they're accountable to this legislature, the public interest is their first consideration. The experience of other jurisdictions has been that permanent quasi-judicial board are extremely costly and bureaucratic.

The NDP at their finest. The private sector is vicious and unaccountable. Government is humane and is incompetent and power-hungry for the good of the people. Certainly the NDP knows about quasi-judicial boards better than anyone. They always prefer them over the legislature or regular courts. I'm not sure what this has to do with the public review commission . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Next time. Sorry, next time.

Those nasty not-so-poor businesses and individuals were stomped again:

This (the NDP) believes that the tax burden must be distributed among individuals and corporations in an equitable manner based on ability to pay.

You can't get money from people who can't pay. So the businessman who, if allowed to make a profit, could maintain and expand employment must pay for the non-productive bureaucracy. It's the old "Let the rich pay so we can all be equally poor." This is called a progressive income tax system. Remember the socialists speak a different language than the rest of us. Co-operation means compulsion; equitable means equally broke; services means bureaucracy; humane means administered by the government; the people means the state.

The hon. member for Regina Elphinstone has been shouting with sound and fury signifying nothing about the atrocious Andrew deficit. Yes, Conservatives would like to see a balance budget, but Conservatives operate in the realm of reality in the real world of dollars and cents in the historical situation.

This government has inherited an economic situation not to its liking. It has acted responsibly by balancing prior commitment, campaign promises and economic reality into a sound budget on the road to economic recovery.

There is every indication that the NDP government knew their budget did not make economic sense. They knew it was not a balanced budget, nor did they care. I quote the March 1982 budget speech:

Mr. Speaker, this government believes that people are more important than balance sheets.

The NDP said government economic needs and wants are more important than a sound budget. The NDP in power believed that money in people's pockets belonged to the NDP government. The money a business makes in providing a service or a product belongs to the NDP government. The land a farmer tills should belong to the NDP government. The hopes, aspirations and creativity of a people should be channelled through their bureaucracy and agencies. If they allowed people to keep some of the money, this is considered a giveaway or it should be in the form of a government grant program or subsidy.

A Conservative believes governments exist to serve people; people do not exist for the purposes of the state. People should not have to pay for so-called services that they deem not in their best interests. People's money belongs to them. When government takes money from people through taxes, there must be continual accountability and responsibility in the manner that money is used.

This is a copy of the March 1982 budget speech — 105 glossy sheets full of colored photographs. Here is a man we don't see too often any more. There are all kinds of pretty pictures in here. I am not sure if this is showing that the people belong to the government. Here is a picture of the Roughriders. Was that going to be their next crown corporation? A slick piece of campaign propaganda at taxpayers' expense.

This is our Minister of Finance budget address highlights: a succinct eight-page pamphlet claiming no magic formulas, no verbose rhetoric, an honest evaluation of the present situation, yet an optimistic, feasible recovery program. This, folks, and this, folks, is the difference between how a Conservative government and a socialist government uses taxpayer money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: —While up North I remember the excitement of spring thaw. The ice would break on the lake and river with loud crashings. The weather was still cool with a promise of change. There was still plenty of mud and occasional snow flurry, but change was sure and spring was inevitable.

Saskatchewan has passed through the winter years, the years of socialistic propaganda and economic discouragement, the years of people being controlled by the state. The mud and debris of socialist after-effects is still with us, but the new Conservative government is the spring thaw to end those years.

I support the motion and the budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is again an honor for me to rise in the legislature on behalf of the fine people of the Weyburn constituency. And firstly, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Finance on the presentation of his first budget — the first of many to come, I'm sure.

I would like to enter this budget debate and make a few comments as relates to my constituents in Weyburn. I believe it is a budget that recognizes that these are special times in the history of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and in fact Canada. It is a budget that shows sensitivity and compassion. It is a responsible budget. The Minister of Finance has shown the people of my constituency that he is sensitive to their economic and social needs.

During the past spring's campaign the message was to get the emphasis of government spending directed back into the traditional areas: health, education, and social services. Compared to the March budget, we have allocated an additional \$26 million to health services, and additional \$9 million to education, and an additional \$17 million to special-care homes. Congratulations for what you have done in so short a time. That's what the people of Weyburn constituency were telling me they wanted: first-rate schooling, first-rate health care, and the same kind of high priority for the elderly and the disabled.

On the matter of special-care homes, Mr. Speaker, I have just to look around my constituency to see how out of touch the former NDP administration was with regard to the needs of those special people. Mr. Speaker, no less than three communities in my constituency have expressed an acute need for level 3 bed space since I was elected. Fillmore, Stoughton, and Weyburn, and the surrounding towns and villages and R.M.s have all raised this issue.

This acute need and shortage did not develop overnight, Mr. Speaker. In fact some of these communities have been raising this with the previous government since 1973. What was the former government doing, Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years? Nothing, absolutely nothing until the election campaign.

Now this Minister of Social Services has replaced that cheap political rhetoric with action. Mount St. Mary in Weyburn will be replaced as a start on the problem. I know this government's Minister of Social Services will not let the people of my constituency down over the next few years. More beds will be developed. She has already shown her

understanding of the needs of the people of this province in the dramatic increase in the number of beds being developed since she took over. We are very pleased in Weyburn constituency to have had the Hon. Minister of Social Services visit Weyburn and tour the Souris Valley regional care complex, a level 4 facility, Mr. Speaker, and tour the Weyburn Kinsmen Senior Citizens Centre, and tour the Weyburn Wor-Kin-Shop for the handicapped — tour and meet and talk to the people about their concerns. Here is a minister who cares.

This is the kind of mid-course correction the people of Weyburn constituency wanted in attitude, not to mention in economic policy, and yet this NDP opposition cannot see the light. I hear reports in the press from their recent party convention that their leader has told them to stay the course. They are determined not to change their ways despite the answer they got from the electorate this past spring. Oh, I want to tell you this: if you continue to stay the course, the next mid-course correction the people of Saskatchewan will make is to turf you out totally. You will become part of the 6/4 solution — not the 6/5 but the 6/4. There will be 64 of us and none of you. The first message will be given to you by the voters in the Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election. Mr. Speaker, the member for Shaunavon put it aptly in his 1980 budget (and I can read it word for word there, if you want) when he said on page 835, March 20, 1980, and he could have been referring to his own party. “There is none so blind as he who will not see.” How true, Mr. Speaker, and yet they want to stay the course.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, this mid-course correction by the Devine government will fulfil the commitment to the people of this province. In less than eight months, the Premier and his ministers have done so much. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, and this Assembly, to the Progressive Conservative Party commitment brochure. This brochure, Mr. Deputy speaker, that so many good souls helped me deliver to the people at the doors in the finals week of the campaign, outlines our commitment to the people of Saskatchewan upon our election. Some 10,000 of these were delivered by and to the folks in my constituency. We had listened to their wishes, their needs and their concerns and we came up with this, our commitment to the people. This six-panel brochure outlined the following eight promises as our first priorities. This, we said, is how we will look after your concerns and spend your money upon our election. The budget speech reflects this absolutely. We have not let them down.

Number one was to eliminate the gas tax, the nuisance tax. The 20 per cent gas tax is gone, Mr. Speaker, gone and my people in Weyburn like that.

Number two: Revitalize and improve health care. There has been more money, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, allocated here. Not just \$1.8 million additional from DNS but another \$24.2 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker — \$24.2 million. There is, at this very moment, being conducted a very intensive review of the ambulance services in this province. As well, funding has been improved for major hospital construction projects in Lloydminster, Nipawin, Melfort and Yorkton. The people of this province will find that we will be number one, not number eight, in health care services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — Number three read, Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mortgage interest reduction plan of 13.25 per cent. This is a program of compassion. Young families are now secure in the knowledge that their house payments will not drive them out of their homes. This is not to mention the fact that the construction industry gets the spinoff benefits associated with increased housing starts — jobs for our people. Of the

30,000-plus people who have already received their rebates, may I say to the Hon. Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services, “thanks,” on behalf of the several hundred receiving those benefits in my constituency. This has been, and will continue to be, a very successful, simple, no-strings-attached program.

Number four read: Freeze public utility and insurance rates. Not only have we frozen the rates as they relate to telephone bills, power bills, natural gas bills and insurance bills, but the public utilities review commission will monitor rates and protect consumers from unjustified increases.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — There will be no more taxation by rate increase — another example of providing protection and putting dollars in the people’s pockets.

Number five: Eliminate the 5 per cent sales tax on clothing and utility bills. We will indeed put the legislation in place to remove the education and health tax on clothing for children under 15. Further, we are committed to future reductions in sales tax and other taxes. They will be targeted as we can afford them and, even more importantly, in areas that will generate jobs and economic activity.

Number six, Mr. Deputy Speaker, read: Improve the quality of rural life. A good start has already been made on the rural natural gas network. Our farms will be served by a clean and cheap source of energy. But other impressive programs that will not only improve the quality of rural life, but in fact sustain it, and I believe, see it grow, have or will be introduced. I think specifically, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the farm purchase program, which I will address more fully later and, as well, changes to the beef stabilization program — changes that will no doubt see increased enrolment now that feedlot operators have been properly included. The jobs and opportunities and economic activity that will ensue as we feed and process 80 per cent of the cattle here in Saskatchewan, rather than ship out 80 per cent, can and will have a tremendous impact on rural viability.

While I am on the subject of beef stabilization, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for hosting the recent red meat stabilization meeting. The provincial agriculture ministers and producer groups that attended this meeting found there was a consensus for a national voluntary plan. The willingness of all players to work together on this issue was abundantly evident when the consensus was reached on the first day of what was to be a two-day meeting — a remarkable and rare occurrence in public politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — This goes to show what kind of results can be had when people are willing to work together for the common good of Canada’s livestock sector. Congratulations again to the Minister of Agriculture.

Number seven read: provide jobs and opportunities. Over and above programs like the mortgage interest reduction program and the rural natural gas distribution program, we have seen this government make a substantial commitment to job creation with the recently announced \$15 million job creation program. This was happy news to the unemployed, as well to municipalities, business people, non-profit organizations, school boards, and others. Over the next few months, this will see the creation of

several thousand jobs all over the province, including my constituency. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, job creation did not start in my constituency with the announcement of this program, but rather within days of the Hon. Colin Thatcher announcing changes in the oil royalty structure this past summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — On behalf of the many people in my constituency connected to the oil field industry, may I offer thanks to the minister on their behalf.

There were many sad faces during March and April when I was campaigning: young men with families who had never known unemployment since they had worked in the oil fields, owners and operators of service rigs wondering how long they would sit idle. Not long, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not long once the Minister of Energy got a handle on the situation.

Let's review some of the news clippings from that, Mr. Speaker. It was good stuff in Weyburn, August 6, *Leader-Post* headline. "Weyburn Oil Patch Flurry Linked to Royalty Structure Changes"; *Weyburn Review*, August 4, 1982, "Oil Business Boosted." Putting people back to work with some sensible programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — People first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — And from what I hear on coffee row, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the numbers have been whirring through the computers, and things continue to be very positive in the oil fields around Weyburn for the upcoming months and years. There is a certain excitement in the air again. It's just amazing how a little less government greed can by unleashing a little initiative, what can be accomplished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — I'm sure the Minister of Energy must be very gratified by the response to the improvements in the royalty structure.

I must address, for a moment, the matter of tourism, highways, and highway safety. This Assembly will know that just recently the Hon. James Garner, Minister of Highways, has officially designated the Red Coat Trail. The distinctive signs soon to be seen along Highway No. 13 will see this become not only a major tourist route through southern Saskatchewan, but continue to be a major business artery. You are to be commended for this, Mr. Minister, and for the improvements on this highway that you have already made. The people of my constituency were very excited with your announcement to designate Highway 13 as the Red Coat Trail. They also congratulate you for your common sense as it relates to the intersection of Highway 12 and 39 near Weyburn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — People have been killed here. Numerous trailer trucks and cars have rolled over at this intersection. The pleas of the city of Weyburn and of the Red Coat Trail Association to previous government and minister of highways had gone unanswered. You came to Weyburn, you drove the intersections, you realized it was an accident waiting to happen, and because your primary concern is the safety of the

people, you are going to fix it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you from all the citizens of Weyburn and all the people who travel that major route. Another example I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of a minister who cares.

Let's talk a little more about opportunity in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The Open for Business conference left no doubt that the potential is here in Saskatchewan. We now have hundreds of new salesmen for the province as a result of this conference. They are excited and enthusiastic about what this province can be. They are looking to locate here: they are looking to come back home. The climate is better here now, they say. They see encouragement, not discouragement. They see a government that says to business, "What can we do for you"? Rather than a government saying, "What can you do for us"? We know what they can do for us. They can create wealth and jobs in Saskatchewan for Saskatchewan people.

And finally, the eighth panel in this brochure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the eighth and final, and perhaps most important promise was: "Protect and preserve the family farm." You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many people think the first promise that the Devine government kept after its election was the elimination of the gas tax. Everyone thinks that was the very first act that was accomplished — eliminating the gas tax. But it wasn't, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The very first thing the new Progressive Conservative government did was to stop buying farmland. That happened immediately — April 26, 1982. It had been almost 10 years to the day, in 1972, when the monster known as the land bank was created. It was in April of 1972 that the bill creating land bank was being debated. The Progressive Conservatives were not in favor of that scheme then, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are not in favor of it to this day.

Of all the things that the new government has done, probably none is so philosophically important to us and to the people of this province as the cessation of the state purchasing of farmland. The creation of the land bank monster struck at the very heart of the pioneer spirit of people like my grandfather. He homesteaded in 1906 because of a dream to have his own farm. He fulfilled that dream — turned raw prairie into one of the finest quarter sections in the country. But the land bank was a monster that sucked at this very lifeblood, sucked at the very heritage of Saskatchewan, our land. It was a demeaning and belittling act, creating tenant farmers on state farms.

And if these self-proclaimed fat cats to my right are listening, Mr. Deputy Speaker — they refer to themselves as fat cats, and in *Hansard* you can find various other references: state capitalists, power brokers, public loan sharks, architects of the socialist squeeze — I will tell them what the issue in rural Saskatchewan was during this past election, for they did not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was the land bank. State ownership of farmland was the issue, no ifs, ands or buts.

On April 26, Saskatchewan was saved, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Rural Saskatchewan under the NDP and under the land bank monster was going down the drain. We had seen 6,000 fewer farmers from '71 to '81 — 6,000 down the drain. If a Progressive Conservative government had promised nothing more to the rural farm community than that the government would stop buying their land, we would still have won by the same landslide, Mr. Deputy speaker. Be we recognized the problem and the need for a

mechanism to assist in transferring the family farm from one generation to another. We recognized that there must be a way to facilitate this transfer so that the young could meet their financial obligations and yet allow mom and dad a comfortable retirement. The answer is the farm purchase program, Bill NO. 45.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — Bill No. 45, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is history in the making. The Minister of Agriculture (and I congratulate him) has placed before this Assembly a bill that will permit young beginning and developing farm families rebates on loans for farmland of up to \$350,000. The effective rate of interest will be, not 20 per cent, not 18 per cent, not 16 per cent, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, 8 per cent. It will be 8 per cent for five years and 12 per cent thereafter unless, of course, interest rates come down. This will ensure that farm ownership is within reach of the young farmers. It has always been our heritage, and it will always be our heritage. The bill recognizes that interest rates, although not set in Saskatchewan, were threatening the viability of our farms and the historic transfer from one generation to another.

I congratulate the Devine government for its understanding of rural Saskatchewan and its willingness to grab the bull by the horns, to wrestle interest rates down on the farm, not unlike they did for the home-owner. This program announced in the budget may well be the most exciting event in the history of Saskatchewan agriculture. I am proud and happy to be part of that historic event, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I can only echo the prediction made by the Minister of Finance. More young people will be helped to own their own land with the program in one month than land bank did in 10 years. Let that be on the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In 10 dismal years of land bank, 152 (the most recent statistics I have been able to get) actually became owners — 152. What a dismal failure; what an absolute shame.

Let's check into the details, the details being the 1981 Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission annual report. It shows that in 1981, out of 1,151 lessees eligible to purchase, 25, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is all that were able to purchase at the high interest rates and the high land costs. Some would argue that an unfair year was picked — interest rates were high, land costs were high. We have only to back up to 1978 to see it was just as dismal, 31; 1979, 42, and so on.

It is not surprising that that program is considered one of the great miserable failure in the history of this province. It is not surprising also that the Devine government understands farming and farmers, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Premier, the Minister of Agriculture and some several other cabinet and government caucus members are all permit book holders. This is not matched by any other government in the country.

So, members of the Legislative Assembly, you can see what a fine job the Minister of Finance has done in bringing this all together. There has been some yipping from the opposition about the deficit, about the budget not being balanced. They do know they are in large part responsible for that in overestimating revenues and underestimating expenditures. But we forgive them for that, Mr. Speaker. As the Leader of the Opposition has said on the evening of November 24, 1982, and I quote:

Well, everyone, I think, knows that compounding estimates is not an exact science.

And the hon. member for Shaunavon has in a previous budget debate noted, perhaps I should use his exact words, from page 835 of *Hansard* March 20, 1980 Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

That is why I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that whether or not a budget is balanced is the most important feature. One must look to see whether or not the budget fulfils the government's obligation to maintain and expand services to its citizens.

End of quotation, Mr. Speaker. I've gone through this pamphlet panel by panel, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we have indeed met our commitments and given services to the citizens. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Shaunavon and his colleagues will agree that this Progressive Conservative budget and the programs it addresses, as I have gone through them in the commitment brochure, and this government does recognize and meet the needs and wishes of the people of Saskatchewan, 1, 2, 3 right on down the line to 8. They are all taken care of. We told them we would do it, and we have done it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — Let's talk about fulfilling commitments. Because this government is understanding, we invite the NDP members to join with us in supporting this budget. Join us up on the deck of the new ship of state now headed on the proper course, instead of fumbling around with your deck chairs down in the darkness of the hold. Come on up and see what is really happening in this province.

Some three years ago almost to the day, the then leader of the opposition, the hon. member for Souris-Cannington who today you will note is the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, and the government House Leader, offered you — the NDP — some very sage advice. It bears repeating as it was found on page 81 of *Hansard* that day on December 4, 1981, and I quote:

The current (and he was referring there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the NDP) government does not listen, merely boasts of how good it is; and that is ironic, Mr. Speaker, and sad. If a government does not listen, then it cannot learn. If it cannot learn, then it cannot understand. If it cannot understand, then it cannot respond.

That was the now Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture giving some very sage advice. What he was saying, Mr. Speaker, is that a government must respond to Saskatchewan families. A government must respond to Saskatchewan youth. A government must respond to Saskatchewan workers, and to Saskatchewan pioneers. The government, these ministers, and this budget is an example of that kind of response, Mr. Speaker. I will not be supporting the motion and I invite and encourage all members of this legislature to do the same. There is so much more we can be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Finance on the first Conservative budget presented in this House in many, many years. I want to indicate that I consider him a very courageous minister to stand in this House and present and defend a budget that contains a \$220 million deficit — the first, I predict, of many

deficit budgets to come. A budget that has dealt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a very serious blow to the future of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a citizen of Saskatchewan and a resident of the North, I can't fully describe to you what it means for me to take part in this discussion and the Conservative budget. It causes a surge of many feelings. It marks the end of our province's ability to achieve positive goals for our people, and it ends a stage of real development in Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Conservative budget is a clear signal to the people of Saskatchewan in general, and to the people of the North in particular, that their government has retired from taking any real and lasting action on matters affecting our economy and our lives. While their bodies warm the benches on the other side of this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Conservatives by their callous and vindictive approach in this budget have clearly shown to the people of this province that they obviously don't care about issues that the people who live here care about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House do care. We care about the crushing burdens placed on the backs of our people because of the deliberate failure of Conservatives to have either the will or the intent to deal realistically with their responsibilities as a government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope no person will underestimate what this budget has done. Conservatives have now and forever more marked themselves as a Saskatchewan government that failed, failed in the very first test, failed to provide the people of this province with the direction and the means of building a future for themselves. For the first time in 20 years we have a deficit budget in Saskatchewan, and the Minister of Finance says easily:

I see nothing particularly wrong with deficit financing when times are tough. That is usually when you see a fall-off in revenues, and it would be inappropriate to make significant cuts. It would be impractical to try and balance a budget because that would require substantial cuts in social programs.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after you wade through the huffing and puffing of the Minister of Finance, and when you consider what he is saying the light of the loose promises made by his party during the election campaign, it's easy to see why the member for Kindersley, the Minister of Finance, is trying to blame his failure on anything or anyone he can find. It's easy to see why he is desperately racing from one corner of the province to the other to cover up this budget, this Conservative record of failure.

Mr. Speaker, when all is said and one, when you hand out millions of dollars to the oil companies when they aren't producing, exploring or doing anything more than they ever were; when you cut useful and workable gas taxes that have helped to keep our roads in shape; when you cut back on your level of compassion by slashing benefits for senior citizens and others who have grown to trust their government; when you hold huge Hollywood style Open for Business conventions for the people who pay your bills, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can't balance your budget and the only promises you keep are to your friends.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this budget is historic. As a new government, the Conservatives were faced with a major responsibility for the future of our province, a choice for generations to come, and they fumbled the ball. Members on this side of the House will

recognize that governing is not an easy job, balancing budgets is not an easy job, but as a government we were able to do this for 11 years running, both in bad times and in good times. We were able to balance a budget and provide for our people because we on this side of the House know that you don't govern on the basis of creating gross inequities, inequalities, among the people who live here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a new government they had a choice, and in his speeches their leader said he wanted to make government as good as the people. After hearing and reading through this budget, I can assure the people of Saskatchewan they have every right to be certain they are better people than the Conservative government they so innocently elected — better than the Conservative government that loves to talk about rural Saskatchewan families and bringing the kids back home. While their government talks, these rural families in the North, at Ipsco, at potash mines, and businesses all over this province, are looking for work. While those real families struggle to balance their own budgets and pay their own bills, their Conservative government talks and talks. Then, when the government has a chance to pull its irons out of the fire, these Conservatives brutally and impersonally attack their own employees, private citizens, and organizations, the weak, the already destitute, and more important, Mr. Speaker, they attack and vilify this institution to justify their own lack of ideas and solutions, and their own failure to deal with the problems of government in a real way.

To shore up their falling support, they attack government itself — the very institutions they have been elected to preserve and build. Day by day, they whip and tear at the very fabric of our society, built over many years of hardship and caring by dedicated men and women. They say, "Government is the cause of your problems. Let's fire a few hundred more people. Let's dismantle this and that government department agency. Let's do away with them; they are all bad. We'll give you freedom by destroying the very institutions you have built to protect yourselves. Then you'll be all right."

Mr. Speaker, it's an unfortunate way to govern and it's an unfortunate way to treat contributions of many, many hundreds of good people over the years. Yet I believe that Saskatchewan people aren't easily fooled by that kind of talk. Nevertheless it is shameful, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The barbarians are inside the gates; it's the Conservatives' wrecking crew.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you get a good idea of how far the Conservatives are prepared to go in destroying the fabric of our Saskatchewan society when you take a specific look at some of the things they have done in this budget. I would like, for a few moments, to talk about just a few matters that touch upon tourism and the North. Many of us will remember that the Premier was trotting around Saskatchewan making promises during his third election bid. One of the promises he repeated was that tourism would be given a higher priority by his government if he was elected.

Yet, check this budget. Support for tourism has been sharply cut. Over \$136,000 or 7 per cent has been cut in tourism marketing programs. Over \$603,000 or 72 per cent has been cut in grants to the private sector for tourism development. We can only assume that this government is only open for business to other businesses than those engaged in tourism. These cuts are an insult to those private operators who look to their government to help them in hosting travellers in Saskatchewan in the coming year. Surely these deep cuts in the tourism budget show that Tories have no intention of developing tourism and no confidence in the private sector to develop tourism, though, as I recall, the Minister of DNS said recently that maybe we should open up the North to

American tourists in the wintertime. Maybe he has a special plan for developing tourism up North. It would be interesting to know what his plans are, if any.

If the Conservative government has confidence in the private sector, as they always tell people they have, why don't they have confidence in the private tourism sector to develop tourism? Why would they cut grants that would help the tourist industry promote Saskatchewan? There is no doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this 7.2 per cent cut in grants will seriously hinder organizations like the Saskatoon and Regina convention bureaus who do an excellent job of bring conventions to our major cities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as usual the finance minister and the government didn't apologize. With true fanatical Conservative zeal they slashed the budget. Over \$1 million has been cut from the Qu'Appelle program. I find this one very interesting. The Qu'Appelle Valley program involves a number of programs worked out with local governments and agreed to by them. This Conservative government prides itself on how much it cares about local government. Local decision-making Conservatives say, "We'll give it back to you," but in this one instance alone they have taken away a local decision made by the Qu'Appelle Valley local authorities. A loss of \$1 million in projects means a further loss of 40 jobs for the people who live in the valley, and no further improvement in the quality of water in the Qu'Appelle lakes.

But these same Conservatives managed to find many millions of dollars for their friends in the oil companies, and money for mortgages for many people who didn't need mortgage money. But no money for tourism development, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and no money to live up to promises made to local governments. The loss of the people of the valley isn't just the \$1 million and the jobs. It also means a loss of over \$500,000 in shared federal government money for residents and travellers in the Qu'Appelle Valley.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, other cuts to the tourist thrust in Saskatchewan are even more serious — a blow to this vital part of the economy. I speak, in particular, of the 97 per cent cut in heritage fund expenditures of \$2,920,000 from the department budget. This cut means that new and much-needed improvements at Cypress Hills Provincial Park won't go ahead. Mr. Speaker, these improvements had overwhelming support from the people of the Maple Creek and Swift Current area. It's too bad the opinions of the Minister of Revenue and the Minister of Social Services didn't have any impact. It didn't carry any weight with their own cabinet. After all, both ministers are from the southwest. More important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this means that 100 potential jobs will be lost to residents of Maple Creek and area, which could have been there had the NDP budget been left as it was — 100 good-paying jobs, Mr. Speaker, many of those permanent jobs, jobs that would create a worth-while development when finished, and not the kind of jobs the Minister of Finance talks about that leave nothing when the snow has melted in the spring. Mr. Speaker, tourism isn't important to Conservatives. The budget clearly and finally shows that.

Mr. Speaker, I will turn now to some comments I have about my own constituency of Athabasca. As I prepared these remarks, I was filled with a great sadness. I remember how it was in northern Saskatchewan in 1971 before the NDP government made a promise to the people who live in the North. Over the years, as a resident of the North and a representative of the people, I saw those promises kept: hundreds of miles of new roads, scores of new houses, new hospitals, schools, telephones, sewer and water. That was in communities that had never had these benefits that people in the South take for granted. When people came there to work, Mr. Speaker, doctors, dentists, community workers, teachers, they were part of a promise kept. Though DNS may not

have been the most acceptable way in which to develop and implement these promises, DNS worked well, for northern people. It helped them to become a real part of their province and their country.

And now it's over, Mr. Deputy Speaker. With the stroke of a pen this Conservative government has said. "It costs too much to help build the North; it costs too much for education in the North." So Conservatives cut community college budgets by 50 per cent. Conservatives don't think local governments in the North are important, so they are cutting northern revenue-sharing by 25 per cent. In our budget last spring, we budgeted \$1,651,000 and that's gone. Northern children aren't in the schemes of Conservatives, so they have cut support for day care by 49 per cent in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker. Older people in the North aren't important, so Conservatives have cut them off too. They're reducing support to senior citizens in the North by a massive 50 per cent. Conservatives have said no in this budget to employment support in the North and cut it by 50 per cent. Community recreation is cut 50 per cent and operating grants to northern schools are cut 28 per cent. Conservatives say the shortfall in health services will be made up in private service, by transfer to SHSP or MCIC. Who do they think they are kidding, Mr. Deputy Speaker? That money for health care and those professionals are gone — gone for good. They won't be back and northern people will be the worse for it.

Valuable facilities for education and other essential services have been scrapped — a total of \$5 million in needed facilities. Highways, which are the lifeline to a better existence, have been scrapped. The Beauval-Pinehouse road has been cut from the budget at a cost of \$2.6 million. Highways 105, 106 and 155 won't go ahead at a cost of \$14 million.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. Close to 2,000 jobs have been lost in the North, jobs that help rural Saskatchewan families make ends meet, jobs in the North that don't matter to southern Conservatives.

It makes me sad and it makes me angry when I talk to my neighbors in the North, and they can only assume that it's because they didn't vote for this Conservative government that they are being so severely and harshly treated by it. They can only assume that special friends of this Conservative government are heard. Northern people's futures, and those of their children, have been cruelly and roughly snatched from their hands.

There are many devastating aspects to this hacking and slashing in the budget to the lives of all the Saskatchewan people. It has undermined their confidence, and it has made good and decent public servants feel afraid. It has caused the people here to wonder at a government, their government, which seems to value the opinions of people in the United States and Europe more than it does its responsibilities here at home. After all, how do you justify a jaunt to Europe by members of our government at a time when it just declared the first deficit in 20 years?

By its crass attitude to the people and its irresponsibility this government has revealed itself for what it is: financially concerned only for the rich and a few dedicated only to themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I have been criticizing the budget up to now. I want now to offer some solutions — solutions I feel are very real solutions to the problems we are facing. When the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and the minister in charge of provincial parks

was talking about selling winter holidays and frostbite to the people in the United States, I just wonder what he really had in mind.

I want to offer my comments to the remarks he has made. I think we do have an opportunity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to develop a year-round resource atmosphere in the province of Saskatchewan. He talked about selling the North, and I fully agree that we do have the Clearwater valley in northern Saskatchewan, one of the most beautiful valleys in this nation. It is a valley that has large, large hills for downhill skiing. This valley is approximately 20 miles northwest of La Loche, and runs right into Fort McMurray in Alberta. This valley, if made into a provincial park, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said, would provide tremendous downhill skiing, cross-country skiing, skidoo trains, not to mention the type of camping and beautiful fishing in that Clearwater valley and the Clearwater River plus all the contributory rivers and lakes that lead in within a 50-mile radius of the Clearwater valley.

I would ask the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan and the minister in charge of tourism to seriously consider, Mr. Deputy Speaker, taking a feasibility study, or whatever it takes, and check into the possibility of creating a provincial park in the Clearwater valley. I think it would be a great asset, not only to just the people of Saskatchewan, but in particular to a depressed area of La Loche. It would create so many full-time jobs for the people there who need jobs so badly.

I want to say that northern Saskatchewan is an area where government just cannot shrug off their responsibilities. They are going to have to continue to spend money in northern Saskatchewan. They are going to have to continue to subsidize industries in the North because, due to our geographical location, being so far away, everything costs so much. And we just have a limited amount of resources in the North.

As you know, no farming takes place and most of the soil up there is acidic and in a frigid zone. But we do have tremendous human resources up there and we have to look after them. We also have tremendous resources in the wood industry. And I ask the Conservative government to take a serious look at developing the wood industry. I know that the wood industry is depressed at this time, But as I said before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to have to develop these resources and we are going to have to subsidize them in order to get the North back on its feet.

I indicated before that under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, 80 per cent of the services have been provided to most northern communities. We were just about to launch the second and final phase which was to establish a good, solid economic base once all the services were put in. There are still about 20 per cent of the communities that need sewer and water and other facilities. But we do have to make a major start on an economic base and I say that it's ridiculous to continue to spend money on social services when we could be putting that money into good, solid jobs and good, solid industries. The Minister of Social Services has indicated that she is looking at this.

I sincerely believe that you, as a government, have that responsibility to not just continually throw that money out there. You have a responsibility to get in there and take a look at that wood industry that we have. We have tremendous stands of poplar and white spruce. We have millions and millions of fence posts up there that I am sure the farmers of southern Saskatchewan, western Manitoba and parts of Alberta could sure use. My suggestion is that they start these milling operations; saw the lumber, plane it, cut the posts, peel them and treat them, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Then we would be getting away from the heavy burden of transportation subsidy costs. And I think once

you have treated posts in La Loche, Beauval, Ile-a-la-Crosse — any of the communities in northern Saskatchewan — the farmers would enjoy coming up there to pick up the fence posts, to buy them right there and then take advantage of some of the resources that we do have, as I mentioned previously, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We have tremendous stands of timber that should be selectively cut — overmature, a lot of it — in the Grizzly Bear Hills in the Clearwater valley. This is a waste of a resource and I think it should be utilized.

Another part that we have to take a serious look at in northern Saskatchewan is the fishing and trapping industry. The fishing industry is having rough times now. Prices are depressed. They are totally controlled by the freshwater fish marketing corporation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so as a result all the fish that is produced in northern Saskatchewan, with the exception of the winter months when local fisherman are able to peddle their fish, goes to Winnipeg, and then is distributed there. The worst part of that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the fish is taken down there and processed. We lose all the processing. And I think that we have to take a serious look. With all the thousands and thousands of lakes (and I'm not exaggerating) that we have in northwestern Saskatchewan in my constituency, it would be quite easy to produce 10-million pounds of fish. If we were to process that fish in northern Saskatchewan, set up filleting plants that we always had before, and freezing facilities, for the million people in this province that would be 10 pounds of fish for every man, woman and child in this province. And I ask them to take a serious look at that.

Trapping is going through tough times, especially this winter as we have very deep snow in northern Saskatchewan and trappers are finding it very difficult to get out to the traplines and also to work the traplines. You have no snow down here in the South but I assure you up in northern Saskatchewan, in Cree Lake, they are ploughing through two and two-and-a-half feet of snow at this time.

I think we have to continue with applying the subsidy that we have for fish, and we have to make it more attractive, as I said, to put facilities in the North where Northerners can take advantage of not only the fishing, the producing of the product, but can also process the product that they are producing.

I was very disappointed to see a 50 per cent cut in community colleges, the West Side Community College. I think this is a very devastating blow to the citizens of northern Saskatchewan and especially my constituency on the west side, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we have a tremendous population that is unskilled, and they need these types of training, the community college types. I sincerely hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government will reconsider that massive cut, and I ask them to increase not only the budget for the West Side Community College, but I ask them to expand the West Side Community College and increase educational spending in northern Saskatchewan. This is one area, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot renege on. We have to continue to go ahead. We have to spend more money on education, because really, in the long run what is going to solve the problem in northern Saskatchewan is well-educated young men and women.

Over the last 10 years I've had the opportunity of watching so many young men and women, young boys and girls, who never had an opportunity to get a good education before, who now have that opportunity, and I would sincerely hate to see any slowdown

in this process. I have watched young men and women grow up and become nurses and social workers and RCMP constables, and they're very proud of that, and they were on the threshold in northern Saskatchewan of continuing this. I think this cutback in spending in northern Saskatchewan — social welfare cases that have never been opened up for five, six, seven years and now being opened up, and this is very degrading to northern people because they thought they were going to continue to go ahead. They had the services that they never had before.

They had the pride, and they were very proud people. They were very proud of their young boys and girls who were starting to graduate out of grade 12. Very few graduated, Mr. Speaker, prior to 1971, and I am very pleased to say that I have attended graduations every spring since 1972 when I got involved in politics, and the graduations are getting larger and larger all the time. We have to continue to provide an opportunity for these young people.

So I ask this government: don't cut back on education. I ask you to rechannel the money that you are putting into social services into worth-while projects. I have mentioned some of them here, and there are many more that you can get by consulting with the local governments and leaders in all the communities and reserves in my constituency.

I think that we have to continue to expand our health services in northern Saskatchewan. We have a new hospital in La Loche. People up there are very proud of that. The minister had an opportunity to tour that facility and the community up there is very proud of that, but I think that we need more facilities of that type, in particular in my constituency. I would ask the Minister of Health to take a serious look at that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Thank you Mr. Speaker. The minister has agreed that he is going to go up and take a look at it and I would only assume that by that that there will be an announcement, probably in the next budget, of the new hospital at Buffalo Narrows.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be up here representing my constituency and expressing on their behalf the problems that they are facing in my constituency and the rest of northern Saskatchewan. I ask this government to seriously consider new types of programs, new agreements like the Manitoba government has just signed with the federal government, and I will just read this, Mr. Speaker, to put it in the record.

The federal government and the province of Manitoba have signed a new five-year \$186.2 million agreement to develop the northern part of the province of Manitoba. "The northern development agreement which replaces one that expired last March is proof that two senior levels of government can work together." Manitoba Premier Howard Pawley said at a signing ceremony Monday.

We had an agreement in the DREE Northlands agreement that it was very positive. One just has to go through northern Saskatchewan to see what has taken place. A large part of this is the result of an agreement signed by the then premier, Allan Blakeney, with the federal government, an agreement that has interjected a large amount of federal money are there for everyone to see and we are very proud of that. I would urge the new Conservative government in Saskatchewan to attempt to sign another agreement of that type so that we can continue on the second phase of the development of northern Saskatchewan, and that is to create a good solid economic base, not only in the North but all over this province.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take my seat, and I will not be supporting this budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOMOTOR: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance on his excellent budget. He has shown leadership in his approach and has done an admirable job considering the budget he had to work with when he undertook the position of looking after the finances of this province.

We have been sitting here listening to the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts attack the budget, particularly the fact that a deficit has been announced, which I may add is a result of the miscalculation of the previous administration when they wrote up their budget. I suppose part of this miscalculation resulted from the fact that they were in a hurry to run to the electorate and they did not have time enough to double-check their figures.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition on Friday vociferously used the term cut, cut, cut, cut. Where, there was a cut all right. That cut was in the reduction of the gas tax which saved the consumers thousands of dollars. Another cut that was mentioned can be related to the 13.25 per cent mortgage interest reduction program which helped save the average worker his home from the high interest rates and yes, probably saved his family.

Another cut he may be referring to is the fact that instead of letting utility prices rise, they were frozen. This type of cut, cut, cut helped the average working citizen, the unemployed, those on fixed incomes and even helped the members opposite, even though they may not wish to acknowledge it.

Those who are in need are still receiving their benefits, so there has been no reduction in that department. Senior citizens are still receiving their pensions, and are not having them reduced as some members opposite would like to suggest.

Furthermore, to set the record straight and to inform the hon. members opposite, pension cheques come from Ottawa and not from Regina, as the members opposite liked to pretend when they were on the election campaign.

When the senior citizens receive full supplement, then the provincial governments adds their supplement accordingly.

Members opposite were trying to say we use speech writers. Being Tory, we are not in the habit of such luxury; we have to be careful with our money. Perhaps the member opposite is speaking from past experience and therefore should not judge others by what he may be doing or saying.

I really like one of the statements made yesterday by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. To quote the famous line, "Let's have some competition. Why can't we have a little competition?" he says. Mr. Speaker, I wonder why he didn't ask that question when he was a member of the government.

Competition was something foreign to the previous administration, because they were attempting to set up state capitalism. The only competition they were in was with the

people of Saskatchewan, and the people won.

We were given a lecture, Mr. Speaker, on the Tory deficit. Well, I have in front of me the Manitoba budget address of 1982. The budget address of 1982 is right here. If they would care to take a gander at it or look at it, they will see the financial position as of 1981-82: expenditure, \$2,432 million; revenue \$2,180 million; deficit \$252 million.

Then you have the 1982-83 Manitoba budget. Do you know what their deficit is for this year? It is \$334.5 million, and ours is a mere \$220 million. Does that sound like an NDP balanced budget?

Just to set the record straight, another comparison in Ottawa brings Trudeau's administration into the largest deficit in history. Do you know what the local philosophy is in the minds of Trudeau and Lalonde? It was quite easy for an NDP member, recently, to join the Trudeau administration. And Hazen Argue — do the members opposite remember him? Where is he now but in the administration happily speaking for the federal deficit.

The reason I made these comparisons, Mr. Speaker, is to emphasize to the members opposite that their red machines are carrying much heavier deficits than the Conservative blue machine.

During the debate we heard how we have been helping the oil industry. Well, on previous administration spending estimates of approximately 1980-81, they had spent \$47 million to assist oil companies actively drilling in Saskatchewan. Besides that, Saskoil with the taxpayers' money was sent into competition with them. And in the previous administration's budget we heard much rhetoric as to how they were going to save the rural communities and revitalize them. Still, a decline continued.

Today, with the budget and the climate created for an Open for Business climate, communities are beginning to feel an air of confidence, and investors are taking another look at Saskatchewan as a place where they can have security and an expanding workforce.

People are coming back home from other provinces because of this new shift in direction. I know, because I have spoken to them.

We heard mention of the land bank and FarmStart helping individuals to begin farming. Well, the land bank went into competition with the farmer who wanted to buy a parcel, indeed even bid him out of the land with his taxes. And that is a fact. I've talked to a few of those who wanted to purchase the land and the land bank competed against them and therefore the individual was not able to purchase it. This is the type of competition the members opposite liked. And further, the transfer was not always completed to the family farm.

How did FarmStart fare? The concept was to assist farmers; however it made them take a larger debt load than they wanted in several cases and placed them in severe financial difficulty. An individual wanted to keep his existing operation and expand from that, but no, the bureaucrats said that that wasn't good enough. They said he had to go ahead and build a big operation, and borrow thousands of dollars, rather than letting him continue from his little operation that he already had, just raising a few animals, beef or pork, whichever the industry he might have gone into. This they considered help?

Our program will assist the farmer to become established by injecting \$150 million to the land purchase program, where the farmer will be able to own his own land and feel proud of it. On top of that, there is the beef stabilization program that will be changed and will be more conducive to producers and not to the government and bureaucracy as previously was the case.

In this budget we see money injected into hospitals, nursing homes, schools and technical institutes. The member for Weyburn mentioned nursing homes and rightly so. Where was the first-class care that was supposed to be so indicative of the previous administration? They were behind in their money to provide care to senior citizens.

Is this government not interested in the welfare of its citizens? I should say that this is a government that is a caring government, a government that is willing to act to help those who are unfortunate, the needy, and is also a government that is willing to encourage independence. The approach is different, Mr. Speaker, because this is an open government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise and scramble for my paper. If I had a speech writer I would have someone to scold right now about the way this paper is put together. I certainly don't have one and I am pointing that out to the members opposite who seem to be making great bones on that fact.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have pointed out the positive nature of the budget. I want to, if I can, go through some facts and figures and underline some of the important points which have already been raised. I also want to point out some differences between our budget and the NDP's March 1982 budget.

In their last budget the NDP proposed a further \$2 billion to the Saskatchewan family of free lunches. That's the kind of budget they had. I would like to compare it with our budget. In these hard times when the rainy day comes Alberta uses part of its heritage fund to umbrella its people. The same rainy day and touch economic times come to Saskatchewan, we try to put our umbrella and we find just spokes, Mr. Speaker. The umbrella has been eaten away by interest-free advances to the NDP's favorites, the crown corporations. There is nothing left to shelter the people.

Here are some of the facts, Mr. Speaker, of interest-free loans from the heritage fund to the crown corporations: SGI, \$72 million; Sedco, \$33 million; Saskatchewan Mining and Development, \$110 million; Saskoil, \$54 million. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that Saskoil, I believe, is probably the only one of the oil companies in the world to lose money in the last few years. To Sask Power, \$48,750,000; Sask Tel, \$41 million; the potash corporation, \$418,554,000; Saskatchewan Development Fund, \$2,226,000. The NDP were out of touch. Today they condemn us for a \$122 million program to give the cheapest gas in Canada to the people.

Our mortgage program reduces and stabilizes high and fluctuating rates for our people on their mortgages. Our farm purchase program will inject \$150 million to young, needy farmers. The old land bank program in its 10 or 11 years of operation, Mr. Speaker, only assisted 132 farmers to become owners. We hope that our program in its

first year of operation will do better than their whole program did in the last 10 or 11 years.

Now, I appreciate the fact that the opposition is to scrutinize our budget and point out any possible shortcomings. I also appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Shaunavon and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition are the only two with the necessary gray matter to attempt this job. However, I'm still at a loss to understand some of the criticisms that they bring forward. Do they want us to continue to spend nearly \$7 million a year, \$6,983,000 to be exact, advertising the Saskatchewan family of crown corporations? Monopolies? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, no reasonable, thinking person could justify a monopoly advertising. Do they want us to continue buying farmland even though people in this province in April clearly rejected both that policy and the NDP government?

On Monday, Mr. Engel, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, suggested we keep the land bank. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of out of touch attitude that still prevails in the NDP party. Is ownership bad? Certainly, I would suggest that in their heart of hearts, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and the member for Shaunavon don't think it really is. Both of those members are probably one of the largest landowners in their community. Yet, they want socialism for others, free enterprise for themselves — somewhat of a hypocrisy, I would say, Mr. Speaker.

Do the NDP want us to continue underfunding health, education and social services, as they did? Mr. Speaker, our minister's very responsible budget suggests spending on health is up \$26 million. We have an improved grant system for municipal hospitals; \$45 million for hospitals in Melville, Yorkton, Lloydminster and Nipawin; \$3 million for hospital renovations; \$500,000 extra for ambulance service, over and above the \$3.2 million announced by the NDP in their March budget. Do the NDP disagree, Mr. Speaker, with the massive injections of help we've put into the health care system?

The NDP deceit, Mr. Speaker, has been shown up. They ranted and raved in elections of the past — "Don't let them take it away" — playing on the fears and the uncertainties of the old and the sick who depend so much on our health care system. Well, they choked health care spending so they could feed their pet crown corporations. Choked it off, Mr. Speaker, until Saskatchewan ranked 9th out of 10 provinces in Canada in health care spending. Shame on those rascals, Mr. Speaker.

Our budget increases social services' budget by \$35 million. Do the NDP want that cut out? Social services, Mr. Speaker, and health go hand in hand.

Recently I had the opportunity to tour a number of urban hospitals. Each one of them had upwards of 10 per cent of its beds filled with level 4 patients who should have been in home care situations, or alternately, in special-care situations. But all of the homes were filled. There was no place for these poor souls to go. They had been admitted to the hospitals with an acute problem — they had a broken hip, or pneumonia, or something of that nature — and when they recovered, the circumstances behind them had changed. They couldn't go back to their old residence. They had to stay in the hospital. The hospital was thus inefficient, using expensive acute care beds for nursing home care. As a result of our concern, Mr. Speaker, for the aged and the sick, some \$3.3 million in all will be spent on construction of special-care homes. This, coupled with more hospitals as I mentioned earlier, will be a godsend to the people of Saskatchewan. Do they want us to cut these expenditures?

The NDP record on special-care funding as compared to ours speaks for itself. As pointed out by the Minister of Social Services in her address, special-care funding: 1979-80, \$213,000; 1980-81, \$834,000; 1981-82, \$834,000. This year, Mr. Speaker, the first PC year, \$6.4 million, compared to the NDP's record of less than \$1 million in the year previous. We are far, far ahead, Mr. Speaker, of the NDP in our concern for health in this province.

My constituency probably has the largest concentration of nursing and special-care homes in the province. I know more are needed, and members opposite for the last 11 years have turned a blind eye to these needs.

Members opposite last year voted against rural gasification. When the then and now member for Arm River brought it up, the Leader of the Opposition, the then premier said, and I quote from *Hansard*, November 18, 1980:

I regret to say it is unlikely the provision of natural gas to farmers would in any relieve their financial squeeze.

Jack Chapman, MLA for Estevan, said on November 30, 1981, and I quote:

I would like to take a few moments to discuss the Devine natural gas megaproject. Of course the Conservatives don't say what taxes would go up to pay for the project.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP in their March election gimmick budget all of a sudden found the resources and they were going to come on with this project that we'd been asking for for so long. Mr. Speaker, we will provide natural gas to the farmers; 11 years of NDP government has done nothing toward that end. I think that our record is going to be far ahead of theirs. There's no way but up on that particular line.

In November 1979, we begged the NDP to put in a public utilities review commission. They voted us down. I quote Don Cody, NDP, *Hansard*, December 4, 1981. "What good is a rate review board?" Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what good it is. Since being elected, rates have been frozen; they haven't gone up one inch. That's what good it's done for us.

In 1981 the then Premier Blakeney said, "I regret that Saskatchewan is not in the happy position of being able to have no tax on gasoline." Mr. Speaker, we are now in that happy position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk of debt. There was certainly some misunderstanding and, for the record, when we took office, Mr. Speaker, we were saddled with a debt. The consolidated fund gross debt, as of March 1982, was \$3,374,100,000. That figure is so large I can hardly read it out. Approximately 92 per cent was used to finance investments by the crown corporations. For every man, woman and child, it was \$3,500; for a family of four it came to \$14,000. We certainly did inherit a debt from the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

My colleague from Humboldt has pointed out some cuts: interest rate cuts, utility rate cuts, cuts in the price of gas. We have cut 1,500 civil servants, \$6 million in advertising crown corporations. We have made a lot of cuts, Mr. Speaker, cuts which I feel the

people of Saskatchewan elected us to do.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the budget in the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I want to say what a pleasure it is to take part in this throne speech debate. I have been waiting for some time to point out to some members opposite how some of my constituents are losing. Members on this side have been talking about the losers in this budget for the last few days. I may say a number of them live in my riding and look forward to the opportunity to express their anguish at what members opposite are doing to them.

I had hoped, I may say, that members opposite would finally tire of gloating over the events of April 26. I had hoped that they would finally get on to their responsibilities of governing the province. By and large that hasn't happened. By and large we have been treated to the same speeches we heard in June, the same tired speeches about what a grand bunch they are and what a bunch of rascals we were. I wonder if they really think that the public of Saskatchewan thinks that's relevant.

I may say I was amazed to hear two ministers get up — and I wouldn't have known they were ministers by their speech — but it is a time-honored tradition in this House that when a minister speaks on the budget speech, he outlines in general terms the programs of his department. I heard two ministers get up and speak and I'd scarcely have known they were ministers. By and large we heard a great deal about the election, little about what they were going to do. It may be because members opposite aren't very proud of this budget. I may be because there isn't a lot to talk about. I may say that I've never heard so many members get up from government benches to talk about the throne speech and say so little about the throne speech. The member for Weyburn today said more about the budget speech than both ministers put together. Surely there must be something in that budget that you people aren't ashamed of. Surely you have something in that budget you can talk about. But you people get up one after the other and have nothing to say about the budget. There must be something in there you are not ashamed of.

I may say that members opposite are going to get the chance to talk about this budget because you won't be able to forever avoid the by-election in P.A. When you get into the by-election, you are going to talk about the budget because you are going to find people out there are concerned about it. People are concerned about it. You are going to find out that you have a problem.

The biggest problem you have, of course, in the by-election, quite candidly and I think in a non-partisan sense, is the numbers you have. You may have some difficulty convincing people you need yet one more member. But you have aggravated it with a Tory deep-freeze. You have virtually withdrawn the public sector portion of the economy. The economy has contracted and you have made the recession much, much worse than it needed to be. People of Prince Albert who are enjoying record levels of unemployment are painfully aware of that, and members opposite are going to be

painfully aware of that when you finally get the courage to call that by-election in Prince Albert.

It's even more remarkable when you consider that members opposite took over this government a scant seven months ago with a buoyant. . It seems like forever, but it's really just seven months — not a long time in the history of a province. You took over this province seven months ago. You had a province whose economy was buoyant. Now you have a province that is on the skids.

You said that you'd make this province number one. Boy, you sure have. Number one in record increases in the numbers of unemployed. Record increases in the number of unemployed. No other province has matched this one — record increases in the number on welfare. And record increases are going from one to the other, from the unemployment insurance row to the welfare.

You folks will get an opportunity to talk about the budget. What happens in P.A. I don't particularly think you are going to enjoy.

The cynicism with which this government has proceeded is remarkable. It appears (and most members opposite will be unaware of this not having sat in opposition benches with the 12 or so of your colleagues who did) you people seem to think . . . You say one thing in opposition and another thing in government, and it doesn't matter because who is listening anyway? It seems to be the theory by which you people conduct yourselves. Issue after issue after issue you experienced a transformation from this side of the House to that side of the House that is really remarkable.

I want to just give you a few examples. Members might be interested. I really wonder when the member for Arm River is going to end the charade that he has been put up to and bring in the cabinet's decision on a water pipeline. I really wonder when he is going to end the charade of that study . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it seems it is going to take you folks 11 years, too. You are well on the way to equalling that record.

Talk about speaking one thing in government and the other in opposition, the member for Arm River (by and large an honorable man) is a prime example. You folks are, no doubt, dying to hear what the member for Arm River had to say about the studies on the water problem when he was in opposition. You are, no doubt, dying to hear his comments. Well, I want to repeat them to you. It was not long ago, on March 19, 1982. It was not many months ago, but in terms of this man's thinking it seems an eternity. He asked a question on March 19:

A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. This is the fourth year that I have been expressing my concerns in this House about drinking water. The drinking water in Regina, Moose Jaw . . . and intervening towns . . . (At this point in time, he was getting so much help from his colleagues that Mr. Speaker had to quieten them down, and the Speaker did so. Then he continued.)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the drinking water in Regina, Moose Jaw and intervening towns is at a low quality level. There have now been reports that Regina has levels of arsenic in its drinking water. When is this government going to wake up and do something, Mr. Minister? Will you explain why your government insulted the people of Regina, Moose Jaw and area in yesterday's budget? There wasn't one dollar for water improvement.

Will you explain that? Not one dollar!

I wonder what the member for Arm River thinks of the budget delivered a few days ago. If ours was an insult, we at least were taking some action on it. Your budget which was absolutely silent on the issue must be more of an insult.

The member went on, and with his usual clarity, expressed his view on the necessity of any more studies on the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What did he say about studies?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — What did he say about studies? A supplementary to the minister by the member for Arm River:

This is the fourth year that I have heard nothing but that studies, studies and studies are being carried out. Are you or are you not, Mr. Minister, going to do something about the quality of the drinking water in Regina and Moose Jaw? Are you going to do something besides saying that studies have been made?

We see the very same member today, engaged in a study.

But the member for Arm River wasn't the only one who held fairly pungent views on the quality of the water in Moose Jaw and Regina. The Member for Thunder Creek, expressing himself with his usual guarded caution, went on to make some comments about the quality of the water.

Mr. Speaker, this is the member for Thunder Creek, December 8, 1982. This is eons ago, oh yes, it's almost a year ago. Heavens!

Mr. Speaker, let me give them an example of how reprehensible they are. The city of Regina is very fortunate. You're lucky the city of Regina is in Canada because if Regina were in the United States (where according to the member for Thunder Creek all good things happen), do you know what would happen? The federal department of the environment would walk in and say that this water is unsafe and condemn it. There would be no water supply here. Do you know what they'd say? They'd say you have a river up there that's the envy of the world. Get your water in from there. (Can anybody guess which river he was talking about, and how he is going to get the water down from that river? He wasn't carrying it down in pails.) Get your water in from there. You have in this province the Department of Environment, and the Department of Health, which allows 1,400 parts per million solids and bacteria content. They allow it to be as high as 1,400.

Doesn't that shock members opposite that the quality of water in Regina is that bad? It really is that bad.

Then he got some help, this time from one of his colleagues in the opposition. One of his colleagues said, "It's so bad you can chew it." The member for Thunder Creek went on

Just about. Do you know what the standard is in the United States? It is 500 parts per million.

You know, in Regina it never gets below 500 parts per million — never. You have, to the north of us, one of the great resources of the world

Does anybody guess which river he is talking about? Did any member opposite guess how he was going to get the water from that river down into Regina and Moose Jaw? Then he says:

Can you imagine what they would do with that river if it went through Utah, Arizona, Texas . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Arizona

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Arizona — I wonder how he came to pick that state? I imagine that was just an unfortunate coincidence. He goes on:

. . . they would use that water, and they would turn it into a garden. What do you people do over there with \$100 million? Oh, no, that's fine, let Regina drink slough water. Let 175,000 people drink slough water. What do we care? They are only people.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you may have come in a little late. I am reading from the speech of the member for Thunder Creek last year. These were his pungent views on what we should do with the water.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you agree?

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I suggest to the member who has come in late that there's a great deal of cynicism. Mr. Thatcher wasn't the only one, nor was Mr. Muirhead, with some strong views on the water for Regina and Moose Jaw.

The member for Regina South, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, also had some views, and he took the time to express them. Again, he seems to have experienced the blinding light from this side of the House to that side of the House, because he totally changed his views on the subject in that short 20-foot walk, or whatever it is.

A second subject, and this is the member speaking on March 22, 1982. Again eight months ago, but an eternity, a different era.

The member for Regina South said:

A second project about which I personally feel strongly is the quality of the water supply serving the Regina and Moose Jaw areas. The current Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Smishek, through his deputy minister has already told the people of the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw that the NDP government takes no interest in the quality of water consumed by the people in these areas . . . Yes, he did say that. Yes, he said that. I guess, Mr. Speaker, that he would rather use the taxpayers' money to buy himself and his colleagues an airline or a Marathon Oil. Now is that, Mr. Speaker, a people first attitude?

In contrast (the member for Regina South went on), I believe that a high priority should be placed on improving the quality of water consumed by the

people of this area.

Who said that? The member for Regina South said that.

I believe that provincial development funding from the heritage fund should be used for such a project and I think that it should be done now. The people of this area have too long been forced to live with water which has . . .

Listen to this. This is how the member for Regina South described the water.

The people of this area have for far too long been forced to live with water which has such a bad taste and foul smell that it has earned a reputation for being the worst water in Canada.

The completion of a program to upgrade the quality of this water will generate the need for new materials and manpower.

Fancy him thinking that this province needed this construction project. But he did then. The member for Regina south went on:

So let's get on with the job. Between 20 and 25 per cent of the population of the province lives in this area. Gentlemen, let's get on with that job.

I may say that when I raised the issue of the purchase of the members' purifiers I was surprised by the reaction. What I had intended to highlight was what I felt and still feel was an illegal purchase. I'm not suggesting the purchase was criminal in any sense. I am suggesting it was contrary to regulations. I still feel that way, and I will be raising the subject again in estimates, and in due course in public accounts when that year finally comes under review. But I was surprised at the public outrage. While the public raged about the manner in which they were purchased, that wasn't the only reason the public were so upset. It doesn't matter whether I was in Gull Lake or whether I was in Saskatoon, that's what people were talking about.

And they weren't talking about it because the people of Gull Lake felt strongly about the kind of water being drunk by the people in Regina or Moose Jaw. What bothered them was the arrogance of this government and the insensitivity of this government which would look after itself and let the public be hanged. And that's the way they felt, and that's the way they reacted. You have the minister of Revenue, Supply and Services, saying she wouldn't brush her teeth in water that 180,000 people have no option but to drink.

The cynicism of members opposite and government opposite in the public accounts committee . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They remember the history of this. They are suffering from bad memory. I would too if I had gone through the transformation you have. When the Minister of Finance was in opposition he had nothing but good things to say about comprehensive auditing, nothing but good things to say about the need for open government, for economy, for efficiency in government, and nothing but good things to say about the need for a public accounts committee and an auditor with full power to investigate the government's activities.

The member for Rosthern also held some views which he took the time to express — the same member, I might add, who moved the motion in the public accounts committee

that comprehensive auditing be deferred two audits hence. But this member, in speaking in the debate . . . (inaudible interjection) I can see I've hit a tender spot with the member for Rosthern. He does pride his integrity. He said on May 14, 1981 — and I repeat for the member for Rosthern.

Thirdly, it is time we decided if we are getting value for our money when we spend it or if we are going after strictly political partisanship and, therefore, the public review committee is not allowed to decide if we are getting value for our money.

Somehow or other, he changed his views. We've seen that happen time and time again, and I'll be referring to it later in my budget speech.

I want to begin by, I think, congratulating the member for Saskatoon Riversdale on her recent election to the House. Not everyone gets the opportunity to kill a giant in Canadian politics. The member for Saskatoon Riversdale had that opportunity and took it, and I congratulate her on her election.

I want to say that I'm delighted to speak on this budget speech for yet another reason, because this marks, I think, the end of an era. Mr. Speaker, it marks the end of an era of balanced budgets, of responsible fiscal management, of budgets which were controlled and made and relevant decisions decided by people in this Assembly. And that era has come to an end. The first Tory budget in almost 50 years is making the start of a new era, what I call the red ink era, the era of red ink — \$220 million in red and just after six and one-half months of Devine government.

The Conservative Party in opposition said they were going to make Saskatchewan number one. Well, you sure have. No other province, not other province — number one in unemployment, number one in increases in welfare and number one in increase in the size of the deficit.

There certainly isn't any government in existence now which has increased a deficit as dramatically as you people have. You have gone from zero to 10 per cent in one year. The deficit problems the government of Manitoba has have accumulated over several decades. Yours, which are almost equal in percentage of budget, arose all in one year. This problem arose all in one year. In fairness to other provinces, they got into theirs slowly. By the time they realized what deficits meant to a government, they were irretrievably into deficit financing. You people with the benefit — you should have had the benefit of hindsight, the benefit of the experience of other provinces — waded into it and you got into it all in one year.

Had it not been for the fortuitous timing of a payment, it would have been \$330 million — 330 million. The Minister of Finance may claim that that was not fortuitous but I can tell you what, you aren't going to have that next year. You aren't going to have that next year. If you expenditures don't increase (which will be a miracle because your interest payments are certainly going to increase) and if you revenue doesn't decrease (and that would be another miracle because by the way you people have savaged the economy of this province, you may well expect your revenues to decrease), if you expenditures don't increase and your revenues don't decrease, next year your deficit is going to be \$330 million. So it's fair, I think, to talk of a \$330 million deficit as being the norm in this province.

Now, let's deal with the artificially shrunken deficit of \$220 million. Let's deal with that.

That means the government opposite is borrowing 8 per cent, a little over 8 per cent of what they spend. The government of Ottawa has been pilloried and rightly so, because they borrowed some 25 per cent of what they spend. But their problems arose over decades. Their problems arose over decades. Your problem arose all in one year because of an irresponsible, irresponsible series of election promises.

You claim that you were going to pay it out of the heritage fund. I would invite you to review the annual report of the heritage fund which was tabled before all members last year. As my colleague, the opposition leader, said: you don't have to be sophisticated. You don't have to know how to read financial statements. If you can look at a pie chart, follow a pie chart, you know that there's no huge bank account which we, for some inexplicable reason choose not to spend. If you had been able to read, if you had been literate enough to be able to look at a pie chart, you would have known that that money wasn't there. To this day, I really don't know whether you were blind to the facts, whether you weren't being candid, or whether you were just being plain stupid when you talked about that fund and the heritage fund . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I see there are all kinds of different theories about which one it is.

But that's what this budget and this debate are all about, Mr. Speaker. In April our new Premier promised that the Tory government would represent a new beginning for the Saskatchewan people — and oh how he was right. If only the people had known then what they know now. If only they had known. With this first Tory budget the people of Saskatchewan can legitimately ask . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, that's right, your deficit would have been \$500 million or \$600 million if we had had a Tory government four years ago.

I see the people of this province asking and asking very legitimately when this province is going to see a balanced budget again. How long is it going to take to dig ourselves out of this financial canyon into which the Tory party has plunged us? Mr. Speaker, I say, in this Assembly today, that it will be a long, long time before any government is able to balance the budget again. I am confident that in three or three and one-half years the management of this province's affairs will return to saner hands, but I think we are going to have some difficulty with the deficit, which by that time will simply be out of control.

By saying that, I am suggesting to the members opposite and to this House that it is going to be a long, long time before the budget decisions in this House are taken by this House and by the members of this House, before it's their decision alone. Because the red ink era takes the control of the province's finances out of the hands of the members of this Assembly. The greater your deficit, the less control you have over your own affairs. It takes away from the role of the elected members and places much of the setting of the budget priorities in the hands of the eastern bankers and the bond brokers.

It stands to reason that as you go deeper and deeper into debt, they begin to demand a bigger and bigger say about how you spend your money. They begin to demand a say in your spending priorities. There used to be a saying in the district in which I grew up, that if you can't manager your own affairs you are soon going to find someone else doing it for you, and that's going to be the experience of this government. If you can't manager the affairs of this province you are soon going to find the eastern bankers and the bond brokers doing it for you.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . the six and four solution.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I'll have something to say about six and four later on. Perhaps some of the members opposite think it's a good thing that the control of this province's finances passes out of our hands and into the hands of the bankers and brokers. Come to think of it, I think they must all approve because they appear to all approve of this budget, so they must all approve of that loss of control.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that indeed the members opposite think that Saskatchewan's budget decisions should rest, in an indirect sense, with eastern bankers and bond brokers. That is not the view of the members of the opposition. I have found, over the years, that what is in the best interests of eastern bankers and bond brokers is seldom in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan — the working people, the farmers and those who I represent.

There are patterns to which the members opposite can look; there are well-established patterns as to what happens. They have been established in other provinces, almost all of whom now enjoy Conservative governments, and in Ottawa where there is a Liberal government: they are only different from a Tory government because the Liberals are in and the Tories are out. But those governments have stumbled into the red ink era, they did not willingly walk in as you people did. Every one of them began the red ink era in a fashion which was a good deal more modest, and a good deal less vigorous than the fashion in which you got into it.

What do the bankers and the bond brokers demand of these governments, Mr. Speaker? Why, cuts in public spending, savage cuts and massive cuts, cuts in benefits and cuts in services. It has been said and said with some justification that this government is learning financial management from the Trudeau government, because it is going the same way. Even a government as callous as that which is in Ottawa, and as uncaring, would not cut planned increases in old age pensions because of some philosophical commitment to doing senior citizens in. They did it because they were under pressure from their financial interests to do something about their deficit.

Surely even a government as uncaring as the Tory government in Ontario, surely even a party as uncaring as Tories would not have jacked up medicare premiums, already the highest in the country, unless it was told by bankers and financial interests that they had to do something about their deficit. Fifty-four dollars a month — that's what it now costs a family in Tory Ontario to gain access to medical care, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how long it will be before the government of this province is driven to the same desperation. I wonder how long this province will avoid medical care premiums.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that's not a Tory philosophy. Surely that's not something that the Conservatives believe in. Surely it's a philosophy forced on them by financial interests. Surely it's a philosophy forced on them by their inability to manage the financial affairs of the province of Ontario.

But the prime example of what happens when bankers and bond dealers take control, Mr. Speaker, the prime example of what happens has to be the Draconian wage controls now being enforced by the Trudeau Liberals with the assistance of Tory provincial governments across Canada. And I was delighted, I may say, to see the city of Regina with the courage and the integrity to speak out on the issue.

Just think about it for a minute. For four years, Canadian workers have lost ground to inflation. No one, no one can legitimately argue, based on any reference to the facts,

that Canadian workers have worsened the inflation. No one can argue that. And yet, Trudeau Liberals and Tory governments at provincial levels have imposed wage controls — not because any reputable economists believe that that will cure either inflation or unemployment, but because they must do it to control runaway deficits. Controls have nothing to do with fighting inflation, and everything to do with keeping the bankers happy.

And so the pattern has been established, Mr. Speaker. It's clear who the winners are and who the losers are in our society. When the bond dealers and the eastern bankers take control, government spending no longer depends on decisions which you make locally. It depends on decisions which are indirectly influenced by those who don't either operate or work in Saskatchewan.

Government decisions indeed, Mr. Speaker, begin to depend on what I call the clout factor. Clout factor — who's got the clout to fight back? Who's got the fight to clout back when the conservative government opposite sets its spending priorities. And who's got the clout to have a voice in the setting of those priorities? This first budget makes it clear who doesn't have the clout, and I want to name some of those people who don't have the clout.

It's clear the elderly don't have a lot of clout. I suppose they're not usually the biggest customers of the banks and bond dealers. They're neither organized nor very vigorous in their opposition to programs which aren't in their interest. And I suppose by and large they're not contributors to the Tory party coffers. They don't get to call the shots, and the budget makes that eminently clear. The planned increase under the Saskatchewan Income Plan, the low-income senior citizens — gone. The senior citizens' shelter allowance — gone. Monthly charges in Saskatchewan nursing homes increased by a paltry \$27. So the elderly have no clout with this government. The elderly have no clout at all.

Are these decisions in this budget based on need? Hardly! I defy the Minister of Finance when he stands up to close debate to suggest that the elderly are not needy. They are a group, I suspect, which are recognized by all people, whatever their philosophy, as a group in need of assistance in dealing with the problems of inflation. But the elderly, it seems, don't have any clout.

Women, well, that's a large group who don't seem to have any more clout. Women obviously don't have any clout with the Tories and their bankers, because programs for women have been cut and cut sharply . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. I don't mind a bit of heckling but when all members opposite are shouting, trying to outshout me, I will admit that you can outshout me and if you insist on trying, you may succeed. The women's division in the Department of Labor, which has had a special role in assisting women in realizing their proper place in the economy, has had its budget cut by 10 per cent — cut by 10 per cent. The pensions benefit branch in the same department has been cut back.

Grants to day care centres across the province have been cut by 12 per cent and they were already at a level which many consider only marginally adequate. Mr. Speaker, the day in the House when the Leader of the Opposition first mentioned the cuts in the programs and services to women, I was shocked and dismayed to see two women members of this House applauding wildly. The member for Saskatoon Nutana and the member for Saskatoon Westmount were applauding wildly at the cuts in the women's

division. Cheering on cuts for women, a pretty sorry display.

Need. Was this based on need? Hardly. The situation of women in our economy is a situation of injustice that cries out for redress. Women are entering the labor force in ever larger numbers and they are staying at the bottom levels of the economy. Their average pay is far less and it is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . if you would have repeated your remark I would have too, so it would have been in *Hansard*.

The average woman makes far less than the average man. The Government of Saskatchewan is a good example. The government employs far more women than men and yet they are a rarity in upper levels of government. We were in the government the last 11 years, but we had set up a program to deal with that, and that was the women's division. And you people have cut the women's division down by 10 per cent and you obviously don't think women have a lot of clout. The only conclusion that can be drawn is no clout, no clout.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if women have no clout, I wonder if children have any clout. Let's see what happened to children in the budget. Well, let's see if we can make some predictions, Mr. Speaker. Children, I suppose, don't whip out the cheque books for Tory candidates. They don't get to vote, so one might assume that they don't have any clout. Do they have any clout? I suggest that they have no clout at all. What other possible explanation can there be not to enrol 12,000 four-year-olds in the Saskatchewan Dental Plan. What other possible explanation can there be, Mr. Speaker? How else can you explain decisions to slow up plans for improved facilities at the University of Saskatchewan? How else can you explain the delay in the construction of high schools in Regina and Saskatoon? How else do you explain, as I am told, that the library at the Kelsey Institute in Saskatoon closes at 5? How else do you explain that.

Need. I would have thought that in a world that is changing rapidly, a world that is rapidly becoming more complex, this would have been seen as a prime need.

The working poor — well here we see the clout factor in full flight; here we see it in full flight. The working poor obviously have no clout with this government, this bankers' government. No group has a greater need when dealing with the twin evils of inflation and unemployment. These two twin evils stop the working poor as is the case with no other group. No other group has been as ravaged as the working poor.

And what happens? What happens? Sixty thousand people in Saskatchewan who earn at or near the minimum wage have had their wages frozen. That's not a 12 per cent increase, it's not a 10 per cent increase, it isn't inflation minus one, it isn't six, it isn't five, it isn't anything at all. Frozen. How on earth do you explain that on any basis connected with need? No increase in July. And if the normal practice, I may say, of giving six weeks notice is followed, there will be no increase on December 1 either, no increase on January 1.

The family income plan which provides assistance to Saskatchewan's working poor, intended to ensure that they will receive at least as much as they would have received on welfare, has been cut back.

We had announced increases for the family income plan payments but the Tory government scrapped those increases and cut the money available in that program by \$2 million. Saskatchewan's working poor obviously lack clout with this government.

What about those concerned about the environment? Boy, do they lack clout! And they found that out early. It is funny how environmental groups tend not to get along with the bankers, the bond brokers, and the right wing governments, funny how they have a problem. They're sincere; they're well intentioned; they speak up for what they believe in, and they tend to speak out on the government. Their problem is that their time horizons are just too distant. Those people haven't learned that when you look beyond the end of the next fiscal year, you have looked beyond anything that is relevant to a Conservative government. Their problem is that they are not worried about the bottom line at the end of the next fiscal year.

It is obvious from this first Tory budget that those concerned about the environment will have far, far less clout than those who ignore environmental standards in the interest of a better bottom line. It is obvious by simply looking at the money allocated to a number of important environmental programs. Funds for environmental policy and planning are down 13 per cent. Funds for mine pollution control are down 37 per cent. Too bad the members opposite had not heard all that the former opposition had to say about the necessity for controlling mines and uranium.

Once again you say one thing in opposition and a totally different thing in government. Funds for mine waste research are down 76 per cent. Funds for environmental assessment, 20 per cent. Funds for research into the hazards of low-level radiation eliminated entirely — clearly it's a program that matters when you are in opposition, but doesn't matter when you are in government. Those concerns . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . No, I'm just getting started. Those concerned about the protection of the environment seem to have no clout with this government.

If all the people I have mentioned lack clout, let's take a look at those groups which seem to have clout. What groups seem to have clout, Mr. Speaker? If the elderly don't and the women don't and the children don't and the working poor don't and the environmentalists don't, who does have clout? Well, let's take a look at those who seem to have benefited under this budget, Mr. Speaker. Let's hear it. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, those at the top of the list are the defeated Tory candidates. No one will ever equal their success in impressing their interests upon the government opposite. No one will ever equal their record, no one will equal their record . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's a good thing. You would have bankrupted the government if you had many more of them.

No one, I suggest, will ever equal their record, but right next to them the bankers and the bond dealers top the list. Their clout with the government is made clear by the fact that they are the biggest single winners in this budget. Forty-four million dollars, and that's just for up-front money, Mr. Speaker — \$44 million is just the up-front money. That's how much this Tory deficit is going to cost the people of Saskatchewan in interest payments — \$44 million. Money direct from the people to the banks and the bond holders and that, Mr. Speaker, is double what it was last year, double last year's interest payment, and next year's interest payments are going to be double this year's interest payments. And, as I said, that is just the up-front money. There are all kinds of other benefits given to the banks.

The other things in this budget of indirect benefit are, I suggest, of questionable value to the people of Saskatchewan. And perhaps, the massive oil clout the member for Souris-Cannington has such an interest in is perhaps a sort of prime example of something that is of considerable interest to the bankers. At a time when a government is running the biggest deficit in our history, a deficit which has every chance of spinning out of control, does it make sense to provide big oil with the largest tax break

in the history of this province? Do those two actions make sense that they should go together? The timing, Mr. Speaker, could not be more questionable, but that is what this government has done.

This government is in the red. It has given away tens of millions of dollars to big oil. And who benefits from the tax break? Big oil directly, but indirectly the chief beneficiaries are the banks. It may come as a shock to government members opposite, but the economic interests of the banks and big oil are widely suspected of being intertwined. That explains the federal government's bail-out of Dome. The federal government did not bail out Dome Petroleum because it wanted to salvage the exploration of the Beaufort Sea. There were far cheaper ways of doing that. They bailed out Dome because of the anxiety in the management offices of Canada's chartered banks.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the cut in oil royalties in Saskatchewan is not only welcome news to the headquarters of Exxon or Texaco, but it's also welcome news to the increasingly anxious management of Canadian chartered banks. Good news for oil companies — and what's good news for big oil is good news for the banks.

Even two of the Tory government's most popular electoral campaign promises provide massive benefits to the banks. The mortgage interest reduction plan and the farm purchase plan — both of them are banker's programs. They provide increased business to the banks at taxpayers' expense, with no increase in risk to the banks because only those who meet the banks' qualifications get that assistance. Both of these programs are a banker's dream. I suppose that should come as no surprise: after all, it was the banks who indirectly wrote them.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the rich and the powerful (the banks, the oil companies in our society, and large land developers) are the people who have clout. They're the big winners in this first Tory budget, while the less fortunate in our society have to pay. Free enterprise for the poor; socialism for the rich — the motto of the government opposite.

I may say that nowhere is this maxim of free enterprise for the poor more apparent than with the unemployed in this province. At a time when our provincial government should be building things like hospitals, schools, highways . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're building highways? Some unfortunate trucker ran into an overpass in Moose Jaw in May, and you people didn't get the thing fixed until October. That's not a very vigorous highway program.

Multimodal stations — it doesn't seem that that one's proceeding very quickly, notwithstanding what I allege is a commitment by this government to that program, not just to keep people working, but to build assets for tomorrow. We have a virtual freeze on construction. At a time when there's lots of money for big oil, there's no money for a meaningful job creation project. The result of the withdrawal of the public sector from the economy is that our economy's contracting. As it contracts, people lose their jobs. Unemployment has rocketed to record heights in the past six and one-half months. I can well appreciate that the member for Souris-Cannington is not enjoying these remarks. I can well appreciate it that he's not enjoying them.

In April, just before the Tory government took office, Saskatchewan's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 5.6 per cent. In October it was 6.7 per cent — up more than a full percentage point in six months. In October, Mr. Speaker, there were 28,000 Saskatchewan people unemployed — 28,000. Do you know what the figure for

October was? It was 18,000. That's an increase of 10,000 — a 56 per cent jump in one year.

Even more worrisome, Mr. Speaker, is this province's growing youth unemployment problem. New job opportunities for young people leaving schools are scarce indeed. In October, more than half of the people out of work in our province were under the age of 25; 15,000 out of 28,000 were people under 25 years of age. A year ago, there were 10,000 young people looking for work. This October, there were 15,000 — a 50 per cent increase.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's new Tory government and this party are, I suggest, poles apart in their approach to unemployment. We believe that any government which operates with anything less than a full employment policy is wrong. We believe they are wrong economically, and we suggest that they are wrong morally.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker. First, to do nothing in the face of rising unemployment, as this government has done, is bad economic policy. People who can't find work end up on the unemployment insurance rolls. When the unemployment insurance benefits run out and there is still no work available they go on welfare. This year, the government has budgeted more than \$30 million in welfare payments for what are now called the unemployed employables. They are people looking for work, able to work, but are unable to find it. These people don't want welfare. They don't want handouts. They want work. But the Devine government is prepared to pay more than \$30 million this year not to work. That's more than twice the amount he has set aside for a 1930-style relief-camp work project. Surely that's a misplacing of priorities. That doesn't make any economic sense, no matter what your philosophy is.

Perhaps even more important, high unemployment is a bad social policy. It is morally wrong. The human costs of high unemployment may not be as easy to measure as the UIC payments or social assistance benefits, but they are every bit as devastating both to the individuals involved and to society. Just ask any employee of any social service agency about the human cost of high unemployment, about the increased caseloads of alcohol, drug abuse, marital problems, or child abuse. Just ask about the crime rates. Ask about the suicide rate. Ask about the broken homes, and perhaps more important the broken spirits. These are just some of the high costs of unemployment. That's why our party says, and continues to say that it is every government's obligation to provide the largest number of jobs possible for the largest number of people at all times. Anything less is an abdication of responsibility and anything less is morally bankrupt.

At this point, I have come across the quotation, some time ago, that sums up our attitude toward unemployment and a government's obligations very well. I would like to read it onto the record, Mr. Speaker:

The primary purpose of any economic system should be to serve the basic needs of all people required for a more human life. In Canada today, despite many efforts to deal with the urgent needs of our people, our society is still a long way from achieving this principal goal. The poorest and the weakest members of our society are made to suffer. As a modern capitalist society, we have reached the point where maximizing profits takes precedence over the goal of serving real human needs, where protecting private property exists to the detriment of the right to work for thousands of people.

Members opposite suggest this was written by Nadine. They suggest it is radial and

socialist. They would be interested on the source of this quotation. It is from the document called, "Unemployment: The Human Costs." It was published by the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. I quote here just to remind members opposite that governments, as people, have a fundamental obligation to each member of our society. It is not just a question of political ideology, it is a question of morality, as well. There is more to government than just the balance sheet test, although you people have dismally failed that test, as well.

Governments have an obligation to look beyond the narrow profit goals of individual private corporations, an obligation to be more than just an interested spectator.

During the last great depression, the American president Franklin Roosevelt, put it this way:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who already have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little. That is the overriding test of our government. Have they done everything possible to make our society a truly caring, sharing, compassionate place in which to live?

That is not just a question of democratic, socialist philosophy. It is a question of Christian morality — the kind of positive government role in which it is not pursued at the expense of individual freedom; indeed, it enhances it. It provides those who are less fortunate with greater freedom, both economically and socially. It confirms the individual worth, the human dignity of each member of our society. The choice, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is clear. Do we want governments which encourage us to look after number one, or do we want those which encourage us to look after our neighbor?

Mr. Speaker, our party's commitment is to a positive role, to a government which encourages us to look after our neighbor. A full employment policy is a key pillar of that program. We encourage this government to look beyond a winter works program conceived in October and implemented in January. We encourage them to look beyond their 20-week make-work policy, and to pursue a full employment program. We urge this government, above all, not to let its devotion to unfettered free enterprise blind it to its fundamental obligations to those in need.

It will be obvious, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said, that I will be voting against the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to join in this debate and after the sleepy tone of everything I've heard, I'm so relaxed, I thought rather than start up again today I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned

MOTION

Substitution of Member on Public Accounts Committee

MR. LINGENFELTER: — With leave, I move, seconded by the member for Quill Lakes:

That the name of Mr. Engel be substituted for that of Mr. Thompson on the list of members comprising the crown corporations committee.

Mr. Speaker, if I could make an amendment to that, please.

I move, seconded by the member for Quill Lakes:

That the name of Mr. Engel be substituted for that of Mr. Thompson on the public accounts committee.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:24 p.m.