

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 5, 1983**

**EVENING SESSION**

**SPECIAL ORDER**

**ADJOURNED DEBATE**

**MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that the Assembly resolve itself into the committee of finance and the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Shillington.

**Mr. Yew:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you legislators for the enthusiasm attitude that you have just displayed. It's a great honour, again, Mr. Speaker, to rise, to rise and to take part in this debate. Once again, I want to take this opportunity to thank the people of the Cumberland constituency for choosing me to represent them in the Chamber, and I hope that I can live up to their expectations.

I have tried, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be fair in all my criticisms. I, I felt that there is no use in pointing the finger all the time, but rather that the government and opposition should work together to solve the special problems in northern Saskatchewan. However, however, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the government has let us down on that end of the deal.

I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance on his second budget, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Yew:** — He will, nevertheless, ensure a speedier return to the NDP government than any other PC cabinet minister.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Yew:** — A deficit of \$317 million is shocking, Mr. Speaker. Together with the November 1982 budget of each, each . . . Together with the 1982 budget, each man, woman and child owes \$537 in accumulated debt, and thanks to the PC government. In the election campaign year, we said, we said we could not afford all those promises. And now the bills are starting to come in — bills that it will take generations to pay off, Mr. Speaker.

Deficit Bob Andrews is definitely going to leave his stamp on the political and economic history of the province of Saskatchewan. He is following, he is following closely behind the footsteps of his mentors Allan MacEachen and John Crosbie — two other finance ministers in Ottawa noted for their deficits and financial bungs.

I say to you, Mr. Minister, stop playing with the future of your grandchildren as well as mine. Balance your books; tear up your charge accounts, charge cards; get back to sensible financing like that of the 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before: the North is shrinking. I first noticed this in the budget

speech last fall. Virtually no mention of the northern half of our province — no mention of the northern half of our province, Mr. Speaker. And again with the Speech from the Throne last month there's no mention of the top half of this province. Virtually no mention of the North. Virtually no mention of the North.

Mr. Speaker, this new deficit budget again makes no mention of the North. Shame. And it's, and it is little wonder why. The real story lies in the estimates, Mr. Speaker. Sharp reductions in jobs in northern Saskatchewan and in DNS; 16.5 per cent decrease, reductions in grants for economic development. When I heard the Minister for DNS announce July 17th of last year in his memo to the departmental staff that economic self-sufficiency would be number one and meaningful local government, it's a shame that the government opposite would reduce their budget this year by 16.5 per cent, and then again for capital projects budget a mere \$450,000. You cannot even put up a sewer and water system for one community in northern Saskatchewan with \$450,000. Shame on the members opposite.

Construction grants in virtually all sectors frozen or decreased. A paltry 4.2 per cent increase in health services. And I thought we were going to be number one in Canada in health — not number 10, not number 10. Mr. Speaker, the cuts go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to Environment for a moment. I would like to say a few words about the Department of Environment. This is an issue that is gaining support and recognition world-wide. Every day in the newspapers and on TV we hear about, of a demonstration here or a march there, all in support of a new pollution-free world. But what, Mr. Speaker, is this government's response to this call for a clean environment? A full 10 per cent cut in the budget of the Department of Environment, 20 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Down 1 million from 10 point million to 9.3, from 9, from 10.1 million to \$9,000,300. The number of positions, positions have been cut from 170 positions to 138 positions. These cuts will ensure that environmental assessments are not done. Mr. Speaker, it will ensure that mines pollution will go unchecked. It will cut non-governmental environmental groups of much needed financial support.

Let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker. Environmental assessment branch, 1.3 million down to 1.8 million. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, environmental assessment branch, 1.3 million down to 1 million. Staffing, 25.3 persons to 14 persons — a reduction, a decrease of 44.6 per cent. Mines pollution branch, \$667,590 down to \$517,140 — another decrease of 22.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Staffing, 11.9 down to 7.0 — another decrease of 41 per cent. Total staffing, 170 down to 137.8, Mr. Speaker — a cut of 19 per cent. What kind of a commitment to environment is this? Once again the people have been fooled by the, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

Before 1982 they said no deficits. Now we have two deficits worth \$500 million, Mr. Speaker. Before 1982 they said we could afford their election promises. Now we know this is not true. And before 1982 the absentee member for Maple Creek (and I notice again she is absent), now the Minister of Supply and Services, introduced Bill No. 96 of 1980-81, The Environment Magna Carta Act. I have a copy here, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The member for Maple Creek would have us believe that prior to 1982 that she really cared about the environment. Polluters would be investigated. They would be checked, Mr. Speaker. Cabinet document, documents should be examined, she said. Non-government interest groups should receive funding priorities, she said. And now that the Conservatives are in power the environment is suddenly of very low priority. Why?

The multinational chemical companies and mining interests that contribute so

extensively to the PC coffers have gotten to this government. They have gotten to the Minister of Supply and Services, certainly, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we say shame, pity and shame, to the members opposite, to the members in government. We in the opposition caucus call on members of the government to stand up and be heard on environmental issues. Use your influence to ensure that we leave behind for our children, your children, a clean and safe environment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another area in terms of another world-wide topic, that of the cruise missiles. The strange silence from the government back benches also applies to cruise missile testing, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite will know my opposition to cruise missile testing. They will know that I worked the trap lines under which the missiles will fly. They will know there are people up there today that work, who work under the air space where the missiles will fly, yet not one peep, not one peep, has come out of this government in protest to the cruise missile tests in Canada — not one telegram, not one telegram, not one letter of protest. They content to ride the fence, Mr. Speaker, they content to ride the fence. This is not a defence weapon. Let us not be mistaken, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a defence weapon that will protect us; it is an instrument of attack for offensive purposes alone. And I'm not talking about bows and arrows. I'm talking about destruction. If members of government would only listen, you'd get a little sense into your noggins. Clearly the Devine Conservatives are in bed with the Trudeau Liberals in Ottawa for this major issue. Clearly they are in bed with the Trudeau Liberals, being puppets also, being puppets to the Reagan administration, Mr. Speaker. Otherwise, why would they not stand up and be heard? They're certainly heard tonight, they're certainly heard tonight. But take them out in the streets, out in the media, we haven't heard any opposition to the cruise missile testing and I question why, why.

There is a growing concern, Mr. Speaker, over this very serious issue. The people will have their say eventually on this matter. We in this legislature must be leaders and not followers. Now is the time to act, Mr. Speaker; now is the time to act. Now is the time to stop the testing of the cruise missile in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the people of northern Saskatchewan were looking for some real relief in this budget. Unemployment today is as high as 90 per cent in some communities, and probably the majority of the communities in northern Saskatchewan. Welfare has become a way of life for most families in northern Saskatchewan. Alcoholism, family breakup, and crime have increased. This is a human tragedy, Mr. Speaker.

We in the NDP propose a five-point recovery plan for northern Saskatchewan. Number one, a detailed economic development plan that would see more money in the revenue-sharing plan go to the North to expand much needed services to local communities.

Secondly, a capital construction program that would see Northerners employed in building much needed facilities like the hospital in La Ronge, the nursing care home for La Ronge, permanent health clinics in outlying, outlying communities and much needed highway improvements. Jobs today, assets tomorrow.

Number three. Deputy Speaker, a new emphasis on the traditional way of life. This would include funding for fish hatcheries, funding for wildlife operations and forestry initiatives. We do not regard this as a step backwards, but rather support for those who chose to live the traditional way of life.

Number four, Deputy Speaker, Northerners want economic self-sufficiency. This will only come about when they have a land base to work from. We propose the Government of Saskatchewan move ahead with land entitlement to resolve this quickly.

Number five, we propose that surface lease agreements, specifying 50 per cent native Northerners be hired, be extended, not renegotiated as hinted by the Minister of DNS.

I go now for a minute or two, Deputy Speaker, to a meeting I attended a week ago last Thursday, a meeting of northern Saskatchewan local elected leaders. This meeting was attended with an open mind, an open spirit of co-operation by the locally elected leaders in Prince Albert. They came in to discuss issues of prime concern, education being one of them — training and education, local self-government being another, economic development being another. And when the minister came into this meeting, he came in, not in a spirit of co-operation, but in a spirit of confrontation. He perpetuated confrontation with the, with the northern local governments that were elected to do a job, that were put there to do a job, that were given the responsibility to look after the residents of northern Saskatchewan, to look after the communities of the North, the northern administration district, to look after the welfare of the people up north. And what did he do? He perpetuated the confrontation, and I will get after that minister time and time again until I can get some concrete, solid commitments — concrete, solid commitments that he will advocate for the welfare of those people, because that is the responsibility that this minister has been given: to advocate and to look after the health and welfare of those people in the, in the top half of this province.

I mentioned earlier that the top, that the top half of this . . . that this province was shrinking. It was shrinking and shrinking. I note from the former budgets presented by the government that the North is neglected. It's neglected; it's ignored. It's neglected, and it's ignored. Now, compounded with that fact, the minister responsible to advocate for the people of the North has perpetuated confrontation.

Getting to the number five . . . Getting back to number five on surface lease agreements, Mr. Speaker, I know that in that meeting that the minister came out with a new plan. He came out with a new plan, and I asked the minister during question period in this legislature whether he had been petitioned by an organization, whether he had been petitioned by a community or the North as a whole, and he said, 'No.' He responded, and he said, 'No. I hadn't been propositioned or been given a formal presentation by anybody,' but that there were individual representations.

I question the minister: where are his priorities? I thought you were supposed to have taken directions from communities and from organizations that represented people such as was represented at the northern area meeting. That northern area meeting was represented by locally elected local government officials.

And now I find that the minister has turned around and he wants to do away with the surface lease agreement that were, that were advocated by the communities throughout the northern administration district, commitments that were derived at by large, full-scale, provincial-scale, provincial inquiries. The Cluff Lake and the Key Lake inquiries took in a large part of the provincial population. And they looked at the problems at the local level. They look at the problems of the people at the community level in northern Saskatchewan and what we had to contend with to get jobs up North.

But now the minister tells me that those surface lease agreements . . . He's telling them, the residents of northern Saskatchewan, that those surface lease agreements are not right. They don't serve their purpose. Well, I'll tell the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan that that meeting which was represented by at least 24 northern communities out of 33, that those surface lease agreements are actually supported, encouraged, and they want this government to maintain those surface lease agreements. But what does this government want to do? They want to disperse, do away with the surface lease agreements. They don't want to have any preference for northern natives. That's what it boils down to, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This five-point plan would be a start to reducing the massive unemployment in northern Saskatchewan. But these are only short-term, temporary solutions, Mr. Speaker. The Conservatives have been quick to dismantle DNS without proper consultation, without proper involvement, without proper participation by the people who live there. But so far they have not offered their solution to replace the department of northern Saskatchewan. What is the solution? Why dismantle a department that was doing a job, that was responding to the needs of the people in that particular area? Where is the solution for the dismantling of a department that was doing a fair and adequate job?

**An Hon. Member:** — A heard something about running amok once. What happened there?

**Mr. Yew:** — Running amok. That's a good question, Mr. Minister of Health. I would challenge you to show me the facts and figures that that department was running amok. What about the people themselves? What about the people themselves, the northern communities? I challenge the members opposite to go into northern Saskatchewan and face, face the people of the North.

I'll make this officials, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to make this official, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I hope the media gets this because I suggest that the media is in their pockets. Where there are, where there are serious issues in northern Saskatchewan, will you hear a peep of those very serious issues? Not a one.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my five-point plan, I also call on Premier Devine to call an all-party committee together, composed of members of this legislature, to hold public hearings, public hearings in northern Saskatchewan, and to hear the people out, to hear the people out. Let's hear the people out in northern Saskatchewan, as to your government's performance. Let's hear them out. I challenge you. Let's find out what they have to say, for, for, for an instance.

This, Mr. Speaker, this all-party committee, would be charged with recommending long-term economic strategies for northern Saskatchewan. That is what it would be charged with.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say to, to the Premier of this province that the boundaries of Saskatchewan do not end at the northern end of Shellbrook-Torch River. They don't end north of Prince Albert and Meadow Lake. They go further. They go beyond P.A. and Meadow Lake. Your government is responsible for all of this province, right to the end of the 60th parallel.

The inaction, Deputy Speaker, the inaction your government has shown in the North so far is a disgrace. That is what it is: it's a disgrace; it's neglect; it's ignorance. That's what it is. It is. You will be leaving behind, when you leave office, a legacy of 100 per cent

unemployment. That is what you will be leaving behind. A reliance on welfare; that is what you will be leaving behind. A deteriorated public service; that is what you will be leaving behind. Social unrest; that is what you will be leaving behind: social unrest, and high unemployment, welfare reliance, deterioration of public services and programs.

The time to act is now. And with that, Deputy Speaker, I thank the legislators for having heard me out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dutchak:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise today to speak in favour of a budget that's addressed itself to the needs and aspirations of the people of this province. All aspects of the budget have been carefully planned with a high degree of autonomy between the various departments. In the past we've seen waste, we've seen confusion too, through duplication of services. It's crucial to note that this duplication was not conducted to help the people and to assure that they receive the various services. It simply happened because one department didn't know what the other was doing. And that's what we inherited when we took power.

Now, the direction established by this government through our budget is for growth in the '80s. In order to advance economically we must become more competitive and productive. It's as simple as that. For years we've been proud of this province's natural resources and yet we have generally forgotten about the most important resource — the people resource. For years the previous government has been satisfied with simply scooping up our natural resources and shipping them away to the markets which waited.

And our educational system turned out people that were educated in limited educational fields, and also the markets waited for these people outside of our provincial boundaries. They too were shipped away.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the budget has altered the priorities in this province. Our people will receive a higher degree of education with the view to applying their skills right here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Japanese entrepreneur, for example, was baffled and are baffled when they look at Saskatchewan. We have so much potential; we're sitting right on the resources; and yet we're not producing the way we should be. The reason for that was the misdirection and mismanagement of the previous administration. And now we've changed that. We turned in to a new direction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our budget has provided a key to enable us to achieve our economic goals. The high priority of technical and trades training in the budget is long overdue. I'm pleased that education in the province will be enhanced to the level that our people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, not only will technical training spaces increase by 60 per cent over four years, the educational system in this area will adapt to the needs of industries and enterprises that are interested in locating in this province and that are already located here. It does us no good to teach people skills which they can't use, where there's no demand for these skills.

This government has knit related departments together so that those who help develop

curricula will realize the needs of this province. The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower will keep its finger on the pulse of the economy in order that we as government can join all sectors in the province and form a powerful economic unit. As an autonomous unit we will lead this continent in growth and economic activity and development.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud that the Prince Albert trade school is part of this process which I've just described. The trade school will be one of the most advanced in North America. And I again commend the Minister of Education for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, for too long the Prince Albert area has been considered a northern outpost by other government — Siberia, in fact. In fact, my predecessor, the ex-DNS minister, the ex-MLA, once called Prince Albert a government town. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's nothing to be proud of. If Prince Albert is, in fact, a government town, it's only because the former administration did nothing to encourage growth of other sectors in our community.

I look forward to the opening of the trade school in Prince Albert which will cause people to refer to Prince Albert as the educational hub of northern Saskatchewan, instead of Prince Albert, the government town . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It would have replaced Spiritwood.

Mr. Speaker, this government is confident in the people of northern Saskatchewan. A few days ago, one of the opposition members — I believe it was the member from Regina Centre - referred to Northerners as unsophisticated. This was the attitude of the former government, and it isn't the attitude of our government. The people of northern Saskatchewan are just as energetic and ambitious to develop as anyone else in this province. All that the people require is an assurance that the government believes in their strengths and initiatives, and this budget delivers a clear message that we, as Northerners, will not be punished for working hard and utilizing our entrepreneurial qualities.

The budget clearly indicates to us in northern Saskatchewan that the new government is more interested in seeing northern people acquire strength, rather than the previous administration's attempts to make government more powerful than it should be. Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government has changed its priorities from government to the individual, and I commend this government for doing so.

I listened with interest to the member from Cumberland. This afternoon in question period he used the figure 99 per cent as being the unemployment rate in communities of northern Saskatchewan. And I am familiar with all these communities — I'm sure he's referring to La Loche, Buffalo Narrows, and so on. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is exactly what I'm talking about. The budget that we have seen from our government addresses itself to a long-range plan, something that makes sense, something that's going to build and grow, something that will result in stability that won't be shattered by the next economic recession if we should have one.

The member from Cumberland clearly admits that his government failed — totally — because here we are; we're in power for less than a full year and already there's 99 per cent unemployment in the area that he speaks of. Well, surely he's not attempting to tell the people of Saskatchewan that it's the new government's fault that his government

didn't build anything of any lasting stability, and that's really what he's getting at.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I predict accelerated economic growth and advancement for northern Saskatchewan. This government has changed its priorities in Prince Albert and area. We are not going to build more government towers and fancy buildings. We believe in channelling the funds, as this budget has channelled the funds, to trade schools and technical institutes. That's where the real building takes place.

With a trade school in place, Prince Albert and area will be qualified to offer itself as a viable location for new business and industry. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these advances in our educational system will allow us to take a place in the high-technology field. This exciting new field has an unlimited future. High technology developed in Japan and the United States and has moved into Canada, and Canada has done well in that area.

For years we've suffered an economic hardship in Saskatchewan. That economic hardship or handicap is transportation. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the field of high technology, this handicap is negligible. The saleable product generated by this industry is generally compact and easily transportable, and because of this we are eligible to enter into this field with all of our energies and initiatives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government's advancement of technological training facilities coupled with its progress to support high-technology development in the province will produce results. This is because we are new and we're not afraid to break new ground. I'm proud that our finance minister, our finance minister does not sit back and focus on the dark side of every issue that faces him. Our venture into the field of high technology will be successful. Some criticized our home mortgage plan, for example, but we knew it would work. It was new and yet other provinces are now copying it. It was a good idea. Like the good people of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are innovators.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has criticized our deficit. However, the Leader of the Opposition fails to tell the people of Saskatchewan that if his government had acted responsibly, we wouldn't have a deficit.

In the field of education this government would not have to spend \$120 million over the next four years as we are going to, to expand our technical training. In the 1983-84 fiscal year alone, we will spend \$7 million to fund 1,200 new training spaces. The people in my constituency are asking me why. Why are we in such a position that we have to play the catch up game? The people of Saskatchewan are looking beyond the political rhetoric emanating from the members opposite. The answer is simple as to why we have to play catch up. They, the opposition, the former government, were spending too much time in other areas. They were empire-building. And the education expenditure slipped.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a newly elected member, I look at things probably quite similar to the way the public does. I found it amazing and disappointing that the Leader of the Opposition condemned the budget, the deficit budget, and yet asked for more spending. He stayed away from suggesting increased taxation, which his colleagues in Manitoba opted for.

However, Mr. Speaker, I intend to function in the political arena in the same manner in which the good people of this province would prefer, in an honest manner. I therefore



decided, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when I found a politician stretching the truth, or saying things that would mislead the people of this province, I would take it upon myself to produce the real facts and bring it to the attention of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan. I notice a news clipping, and I have a copy of it here, from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* dated March 17, 1983 wherein the Leader of the Opposition was reported to have spoken to the University of Saskatchewan students. The article reveals that as usual, the Leader of the Opposition rode in like a white knight, as if he were the champion of the students, and spoke to the masses.

It's reported, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition stated that the NDP increased operating grants to universities by 155 per cent, 155 per cent. This must have truly impressed the student body that were listening. I found the information interesting when I saw it, and I decided to do a bit of research on the point, and as I suspected, the facts were not consistent with the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, I studied the figures supplied by the universities commission, which sets out exactly what the operating grants were. And I studied the figures dating back to 1974, just in case the Leader of the Opposition was talking about some other year.

But let's consider what the Leader of the Opposition said in relation to education. He said that the NDP increased grants to universities by 155 per cent. Now what does that mean? Does that mean in one year? I suggest that that's what he was trying to tell the students, or will he now say that he meant a combination of 2, or 3, or 4 years? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I took the facts and figures, and the facts reveal that you, if you add all of the increases from 1974 to 1982 inclusive, they only add up to 125 per cent in total. Where did he get the 155 from? Clearly, a misleading statement made to these students in the usual careless way that the members opposite seem to conduct themselves.

As a result of this meeting, I received calls from young people asking me about this, and I explained to them what the real facts were because these facts are documents. Mr. Speaker, these figures further reveal other things which should be of interest to this Assembly. The highest increase that the members opposite made was in 1975 where they increased 26 per cent, and the low was 1979 where 6.9 increase existed.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I took the liberty of applying the consumer price index calculation to the number which I reviewed, and the results revealed actual decreases in spending by the members opposite in two out of the eight fiscal years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the facts indicate that the Leader of the Opposition was not correct in his statements, and he further showed that his government had other more important things to do with the taxpayers' money; education was not a priority. They didn't have time to build the technical school, or the trade school, in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan. They talked about it for two elections, but they didn't have the time.

Mr. Speaker, at the same meeting with the student body of the university on the date mentioned, the provincial Liberal Leader, Ralph Goodale, indicated that the government should be actively pursuing technical training for high-technology jobs. He indicated that it would be a tragedy to have to import people while their home-grown people were left out. I agree with that, and I am sure that the students who met on that occasion were pleased to hear about our government's focus on technological training in the budget.

I think that the members opposite, the members opposite should caution themselves, because from here onward we're going to be watching; we're going to be watching

what they say to the press. And I would hope that the press follows the example which I have just enunciated and looks into some of these figures and facts that are being enunciated by the members opposite, because they're misleading to the people of Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatchewan deserve more, and deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, the educational system is going to be upgraded by our budget. There's no question about it. We are going to do more than arrange to have picketers surround the Legislative Buildings to prove a point. I looked with interest the other day when I saw several students picketing in front of the Legislative Buildings. And the Leader of the Opposition again seemed to be right there right on time to say a few words to the masses. I wasn't invited, and I'm not sure if any of our members were invited. I did recognize, however, that some of the, some of the people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that were carrying the picket signs, were from an organization associated with the NDP party. In fact, in fact, one of the, one of the picketers interestingly enough happened to be the son of a former defeated NDP member.

So there were these people getting all the headlines, getting all the media attention. And this little circus went on for some time, while our finance minister was announcing that we were making giant steps in the field of education for the young people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, enrolment increases, enrolment increases at the University of Saskatchewan are predicted to be somewhere in the 7.8 vicinity — 7.8 per cent. Our Minister of Education is monitoring this situation, and we're committed to increasing the standards of education. It's my belief, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that with adequate technical training facilities in the province of Saskatchewan, the pressure at the university level will be decreased. Our government is committed to a far-sighted strategy in this area which was lacking totally under the former administration.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest that this budget allows our educational system to begin to develop into that which is essential if we are to develop economically as a productive unit in the global market-place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I therefore support the motion, and oppose the amendment. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the budget debate on behalf of the good people of The Battlefords. Firstly, I'd like to congratulate the Minister of Finance for the creative and forward-looking attitude that he took in developing this budget which we're here to debate today.

Mr. Speaker, on the federal level, they have a tradition where the federal finance minister wears a new pair of shoes whenever he delivers the budget. When my colleague, Mr. Andrew, was appointed, appropriate garb for him might have been a pair of hip waders to wade through the corral of economic promises and garbage that he found in his search for the true provincial funding situation.

In November, when Mr. Andrew announced his mid-course correction, it was widely accepted around the province as a sound statement of the financial facts of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a document that looks toward the future, and is very unequivocal in the terms in which it does that. We have a statement

that says forcefully that the people of Saskatchewan come first and that Saskatchewan is moving forward with confidence and conviction, to take its rightful place as the leader in the world order, was the leader in the world order.

Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of speculation about the contents of the budget prior to its delivery. In the March 29th issue of the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, the Leader of the Opposition called for a number of measures to be included. He was looking for job creation and he got it. He was looking for the road to economic recovery and he was shown where it was. In fact, virtually all of the things that he'd called for to be included in his budget were there, and more. And that, Mr. Speaker, is because there's so much more that we're going to be and this budget is a first step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. gentleman of whom I speak will be retiring soon. With his great gift for prognostication, he may want to think of a retirement career as a clairvoyant. But if, but if he decides that that career doesn't pay very well, he may want to think of a career as a magician. Certainly the whole House was impressed on budget night with the masterful way that he dealt with a half a bundle of ten dollar bills. He piled them high and he stretched them long. We're no doubt going to, to be able to coin the phrase now that he was playing with the Blakeney bundle. And possibly he'll want to step out of his position now before his team-mates send him down the road for the Blakeney bungle of April 26th of last year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Morin:** — Mr. Speaker, getting down to the meat of the budget. In going through the estimates we see that the taxes, tax revenues are up. Now since our government didn't see the need to raise the level of taxation, one can only draw the logical conclusion that there are more people working. Personal incomes taxes are up by 16 per cent. Corporate income taxes are up by 9 per cent. And sales tax revenues is also up by 19 . . . by 9 per cent, I'm sorry. Well, the rates didn't go up. There's more money coming in. Obviously there's more confidence in the economy and more people working and higher salaries being earned. All these . . . (inaudible) . . . increase confidence in the economy. So the people of the province are doing well, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, receipts from 'government enterprises' in the heritage fund are down 12 per cent, which only serves to enforce the argument that we've been making in this House for 11 months: that if you leave the economy to the people, it will run well. Wherever you have the government to have its fingers in it, you have a problem.

What about expenditures, Mr. Speaker? Well, what is the government spending its money on? On page 9 of the estimates we see that Advanced Education and Manpower spending has increased 13 per cent; that Culture and Recreation spending is up 21 per cent; Education up 10 per cent. The Executive Council, and I found this quite interesting — the people that work for the Premier, down 47 per cent from the other administration. Health up 34 per cent. Ordinary Highway expenditure is up 26 per cent. Justice, something that society today is more and more interested in, up 46 per cent. And, of course, the department of northern Saskatchewan, which we wouldn't want to forget about, is the mere 28 per cent of its former strength.

Mr. Speaker, in The Battlefords, the expenditures with the Saskatchewan Hospital, which is a major employer in my riding, are up 9 per cent. The expenditures in the Department of Highways for The Battlefords region, which is also a major employer in my riding, are up 10 per cent in the personnel area and 13 per cent in other categories,

and total capital expenditures for the, for the riding of The Battlefords will be \$3.8 million this year, and that's a significant injection into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the province have heard the paradoxical argument that we've heard here today, that we hear all over the province — that we should have increased spending in all different categories and yet we should have reduced the price, the deficit of the budget. Well, they heard that and they judged it for what it was and they just didn't put any credibility in it, and that's, that's a credit to their sound common sense, and not much credit to the people that are making the argument.

The expenditures that are outlined in this budget, Mr. Speaker, are reasonable and consistent with needs and aspirations of the people of this province. We recognize that you can't get inflation under control by continually spending more tax dollars. In government . . . people of the province and people of the country are tired of hearing governments preach one thing and practise another. Last year we launched an, an economic recovery program which will make, help us to be part of the solution to inflation. We said that everyone should spend 1 per cent less than the inflation rate, and consequently the inflation rate must be drawn down. Well, this year in the delivery of this budget by the finance minister, we've come in with increased expenditures of 6.8 per cent, which is within the target guide-line. So it's leadership by example for the first time in this province's history that I can recall.

The deficit that we're faced with is largely the result of decreased revenue, and the major culprit in that area is the resource sector. In 1978 the spot market price for uranium was \$45 per pound American. It's currently in the neighbourhood of \$20 a pound American. Increased sales in uranium are helping somewhat to offset this reduction in revenue, and hopefully the price will come back and in the long run we'll, we'll be able to recover and have provincial revenues increase greatly.

Thanks to the efforts of the Minister of Labour in the potash area, Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has recently announced a major sale — 200 million tonnes, I believe he said. Yet for the past 10 or 11 months we've heard him criticized for his approach to potash marketing, and yet in the first three months of this year, we've sold more potash than that corporation sold last year entirely. And we've done that in the period of time when our traditional markets have been drying up, when our market in the United States has been hurt by government action in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to pass over potash too quickly because really the potash industry is one of the reasons that we're in the, the difficult financial straits that we're in. In 1980-81, this government, or this province, rather — it should have been this government, it would have been better handled — took in about \$280 million in potash revenue. This year, we're going to be lucky if we take in about 30 million. Now in 1980, the expenditures were set. Rather than behave like rational people, as you or I would, Mr. Speaker — save a little money when you had a windfall — every nickel was spent. The result is that we were locked into some long-term programs, and when revenues fell, naturally there is going to be a deficit position created there.

Finally, the other big culprit in the revenue drain in the oil industry, and certainly we're all aware of what's going on in the world scene with oil. Prices are falling. They've fallen. OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries), has restructured its bench-mark price from \$34 to \$29. They've cut back productive capacity to 17 million barrels per day. In spite of the actions taken by this government, which have increased all drilling by 49 per cent in the last year, and going higher and higher all the time, we're

facing a situation where last year we took in \$711 million; this year we're expected to take in \$539 million or a resulting shortfall of \$172 million.

The fall in revenue is somewhat of a concern, but it could be considerably worse. Through all this difficult times, when other areas are losing their market and laying people off, we've been successful in protecting our markets, in keeping our people employed, and if and when the economic recovery gathers a little momentum, the demand for oil, petroleum will go up. The price will correspondingly go up and our revenues will go up. In fact, we'll be in a stronger position than we've ever been in because we've maintained our markets, we've been aggressive, and we will be in a position, then, to build on those strengths and to expand our markets.

We produce about 165 million barrels, thousand barrels, I'm sorry, a day in this province, of oil, Mr. Speaker. And of that number about 115,000 are exported. Now, the Canadian price for crude oil, for old oil, is determined by averaging the three previous months costs of imported oil at Montreal — that's the price that we get paid in Canada. For the oil we export, which is far and away the major share of the oil that comes out of this province, we get the differential between the Canadian price and the American price, and there's an export tax on that. Our share of that tax is one-half. At the present time, that export tax has declined 89 per cent, and that has created a major drain on, on our revenues.

Mr. Speaker, the, again dealing with oil, if the former government, when it signed the national energy agreement with Ottawa, had recognized that they were trading an international commodity, in an international market, they might never have agreed to the energy program, which virtually decimated the oil industry in this province and in western Canada in fact, and we wouldn't then face the problems we have today because our revenues would have been up in the past, and we would have been able to ride over the rough spots. But, of course, they didn't do that, and the sector which used to contribute one dollar in every four to the provincial treasury is now substantially hurt because of that.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that we discussed today addressed the future. It creates 19,000 jobs to alleviate the hardship faced by Saskatchewan citizens due to the recession that we've just come through. It addressed the problem of inflation with a reasonable attitude and a plan for return to economic stability. It deals with education and re-education so that the people of our province will be able to gear themselves up for the jobs of the future, and enjoy some job security in a very turbulent and changing job market.

It does all these things without increasing the burden on the taxpayers of this province. If we were, if we were to have, have eliminated our deficit, it would have cost each man, woman and child in this province \$320. Now I haven't gone to the trouble of calculating what that would have been per taxpayer, but I would suggest it's probably about \$2,000 per taxpayer. And that would have been the NDP's solution, Mr. Speaker. They would have taxed you to death; they would have driven people away, as we saw them drive away the young people out of this province; they'd have driven business into bankruptcy and seen the people drive away.

Now, what we chose to do instead was to make an investment in the future. No different than, than when you or I go out to, to purchase a car, to do anything else. You deficit now based on the strength of your future earnings. What we're doing is making an investment in the province with this budget. It's an investment in the strength of our

people, in the courage and the spirit of our people and, and there's no doubt in my mind or in the mind of my colleagues that, that this investment will pay off and pay handsomely.

Mr. Speaker, it should go without saying that I will be opposing the amendment and supporting the budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, fellow members of the opposite side, Her Majesty's loyal opposition, an earlier count tonight indicated there were two or three or them. Right now they're down to two.

I would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance on one of the province's most positive budgets tabled in this House in 12 years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — The last Liberal budget couldn't have impressed too many people, the NDP won the election. Their last budget didn't impress anybody; they're down to eight members in this House.

I have a document with me this evening which was the budget speech tabled in this House on March 22, 1982 — an election budget speech designed by that government to buy an election in this province. We came out with a positive platform designed for the people of Saskatchewan and we got elected as a government. We didn't have to depend on the rhetoric of an election budget designed for that purpose and that purpose only.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Job creation was one of the major platforms of the finance minister's budget of last Thursday. I would just like to repeat where job creation was in their budget of March 22. 'Public investment,' it says, 'of \$1.9 billion will create 18,000 jobs.' I would like to let the people of Saskatchewan know that 18,000 jobs divided into \$1.9 billion works out to approximately \$105,000 per job. Now, I realize they had a lot of overpaid help, and some of their, some of their administration that they carried over into our administration, but I didn't realize they were planning to pay the help \$105,000 per job in this province.

In Blakeney's . . . The hon. member from Elphinstone, in his redress to the budget, he pointed fingers at us and he said that we were cutting and slashing the programs that they designed in this province. We were not cutting and slashing the programs that they designed. This government has taken a new direction in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we will continue, through innovation and programs designed for people, to get away from the old programs the NDP designed to hoodwink the people in this, in this province.

This budget, and I'm sure the members opposite have all read this budget — they studied it carefully prior to the last election — indicates that we would have approximately \$1.14 billion in revenues to spend on programs, as they outline in this budget, to spend on current programs and investment. Their target fell a little short. The exact numbers that the target fell short off this budget were approximately \$207

million. That \$207 million they've targeted for investment. There was talk before the election in 1982 that that investment would concentrate on possibly the CPR, and other areas, so that they could gain some control, and the word control is very, very conducive to their philosophy, so they could gain some control over the railroad picture with the Canadian Pacific Railroad. Fortunately, they weren't elected; that money was not spent in that area, and it's presently being invested in programs designed for people.

One of the programs recently initiated is our Build-A-Home Saskatchewan program. Again, a comparison does present itself versus the program that they announced for housing in 19, in 1982. We expect that approximately 3,000 new housing starts will result from our program, at a cost to the provincial taxpayer, Deputy Speaker, of less than \$10 million. Again, outlined in their own budget speech of March, 1982, they say, 'The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation will construct 1,850 new homes, and 2,050 low and moderate income rental units at an approximately cost of \$200 million plus.' Now I think if we do our arithmetic, we've saved in the neighbourhood of \$190 million as a government to, in fact, initiate the same number of jobs, and initiate the same number of housing units in this province through private initiatives of home-owners in Regina, in Saskatoon, in Bienfait, in Carrot River, and yes, Mr. Speaker, also in Kuroki.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — When we were elected in April of 1982, we were approximately number eight in health in this country. And we were fast, we were fast . . . Our position was dropping quickly. Since our election, with an additional input of revenue through this budget of approximately \$70 million, I think we can expect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to become at least number three or maybe number four.

In our first year we've moved four places with response to health care in Saskatchewan. A very commendable . . . And I think we can be proud as government members that the health care in this province is improving, and once again we have the interests of people, not simply the interests of administrations and government head-hunters such as the two or three I see across the floor whose primary interest was in their own self-justification and not in the health care of the people of this province. They carried the big lie to the people in 1978 that suggested that we, if we were elected as a government, would remove health care and would not offer the, the health care that the province had a reputation of carrying to the people. This health care was developed in an administration long before they became government — an administration that was interested in health care and was interested in people in this province. Since 1971 that's disintegrated to number eight in the country. And I can promise the opposition, and I can promise you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we will, before this administration finishes a four-year term, we will be knocking on the door of number one in health care in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — In Regina, which is my own area . . . I feel that it's important that we let the people in Regina know that there's also something in the budget with respect to health care designated for the city in the, in the, in the way of capital expenditures. We are, we are continuing the programs that . . . the capital programs of hospital expansion in the city. We are also expending \$700,000 for cardiac care in the Plains Health Centre. Now, in the last two or three years the needs of that particular, that

particular facility have been somewhat short-changed by the former government. We are seeing to it that the patients that require that help, that help — and it's required immediately when it's required — will get that help. As a result of this program, we will at least rise to the level presently available in the cities in Alberta and will definitely exceed the levels arrived at in many other provinces in this country. That is in the direction of being number one in health care in this country and definitely, possibly in North America.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinsson:** — I have heard the NDP opposition in this debate suggest that new plans, new plans . . . And I heard the member earlier suggest that . . . I can appreciate they are a little confused about new plans. There weren't any for 11 years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think the onus is on that, on the opposition after 11 years of experience in government maybe to suggest some constructive plans. We're a new government, we listen. We're listening to the people in this province, and we may even listen to the NDP if they can come up with something constructive. It hasn't presented itself in this debate. I don't expect it to present itself in this debate, but if it does, I can promise the member who was up earlier and invited me north on a fishing trip that if he does come up with something constructive, we will listen to it as a government, and he will be the first to know about it.

Tax policy was touched in the budget speech — and I want them to listen closely — tax policy was touched.

Earlier, we discussed a budget that they tabled in March of last year, and one of the highlights of this budget, and I have them all checked off . . . They've got about, oh, six or seven highlights here — 18,000 jobs at \$105,000 a job. But one of their highlights, on the backs of the children of this province, was simply to eliminate sales tax on children's clothing and footwear. Now why, in 11 years of government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why was that not addressed before the 1982 election? Why did they suddenly have to remove a tax that they had imposed and agreed with for 11 years, moments before an election campaign?

They were again trying to mislead the people of Saskatchewan. They'd successfully done it in two campaigns. Fortunately, the people of this province weren't misled in the 1982 campaign.

In the budget speech, we announced tax concessions for small business in this province which will, in fact, put people to work. It also gives the, the owner of a small business in this province the additional cash flow that he is required to have to run his own business.

I have heard not one single positive response from any member of the opposition who has stood and spoke on that program. Are they not interested in small business? I think in 11 years they've proved they aren't interested in small business, and the small business in this, businessman in this province went to the polls on the 27th of April and he let them know how he felt. And, as a result, we feel a program such as our program, designed for small business in Regina and Saskatoon and Maple Creek and Moose Jaw and all centres in this province, is designed specifically to get the cash flow moving and get the people back to work.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Sveinson:** — They so ably presented a rosy picture in 1981 which included . . . And this is a, this is a very complex little document, as you can see. It included, as they mention, an 8 per cent increase in Saskatchewan's gross national, gross provincial product. Now, it was mentioned earlier in the, the debate today that oil, during their administration, went from \$2 a barrel to in excess of \$32 a barrel. Anybody could have run the province. It could have run by itself, and it did. And it did.

In many instances, businessmen were being driven out of this province. The level of optimism in this province had fallen to an all-time low. At least in the '30s people were still optimistic and they were hearing from an optimistic Conservative government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — In this recession, I haven't heard a note of optimism from the members opposite since I've been elected, and I think they should, in fact, apologize to the people of this province for responding to positive programs that are designed to help the people, such as our mortgage interest reduction plan.

They also, in this little document, outlined in their last budget a program that was going to cost \$20 million to help mortgage owners in Saskatchewan — home-owners with mortgages. Our program . . . We approached the whole thing universally. It didn't matter what you earned, you were entitled to some mortgage assistance. Our entire program, Mr. Deputy Speaker, cost approximately what the program they introduced in March of 1982 would have cost, would have cost. They promised to spend the money, and they would have spent it. We touched everybody, and we didn't spend any more money. At least, if we did, it was only a few dollars more, and that's in the first year. And we helped everyone in this province who was a mortgage holder, and they were suffering.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — The mortgage holder was suffering. Interest rates had doubled. What did the NDP do? They said, they told the wives in the families, 'Go out and get a second job. Go out and get a second job. You don't have to sit home and look after the kids any longer. Go out and get the second job.' Earlier in the debate today, they were talking about women's rights. Women's rights. Again, in this budget document, they do not mention women anywhere. All they've done is told them to go out and get the second job so they can afford to pay for the programs and the taxes that that government across the way, when they were in power, gave us as the people in this province to look forward to.

And that is a shame. That is a shame. I'll tell you, if there's one consensus in this House, it's that they should hang their heads in shame.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Earlier today, it was mentioned that one of our members, one of our hon. members, one of our very hard-working hon. members, went to Bulgaria to expand a trade program. I was talking to him. I asked him, 'Did you kiss the earth when you got back to Regina?' He said, 'Yes, I did. Yes, I did.' And you know, he is not an exception. How many people who have travelled to the Eastern bloc — and I don't know what their philosophy might be — come back to this province or this country, get off the airplane,

get down on their knees and kiss the earth? I think even members opposite would. Murray, I think that you might do that.

You know, the sad litany of this whole story is that I've talked to people who have taken off in Regina and landed in Edmonton, before the election, and done the same thing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Now they're doing it in Saskatchewan. The people who we drove out, who the politicians in this province drove to the line and forced them out of Saskatchewan are returning. And when they get off the plane, if you see people on their knees kissing the ground, they're just coming back here to work because we offer them programs that are designed for people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — They're not designed for governments. We're trying to usurp some of this power of government so people can in fact live a life in this province with some dignity. The government takes that away from you. Their philosophy is to take it away from them. Leave them no dignity, and we can do what we want. Well, that's not what we're doing. And I apologize to those people in the province who may, on occasion, because of a change in direction, may be eliminated from our work-force. But I can promise them this: that we will offer them an opportunity to get into another area and go back to work before they have to get on the plane and kiss the ground in Edmonton.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I'm just listening to some of the feedback from across the House, and I'm finding it somewhat inerv . . . inervating . . . inver . . . Inervating?

**An Hon. Member:** — Enervating.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — No, it's not the right word. Enervating means you actually have a nerve. I don't think they have nerves over on that side of the House.

Another industry that I believe has been dealt a fatal blow, almost, from the private sector, is the mining industry. Now I know the members opposite are experts in mining now. They took over an industry in 1975 and they offered mining companies a sweet little deal, and with the taxpayers' dollars they took over an industry, but not only a potash industry, they also eliminated a hard-rock industry. They eliminated a placer industry. The people in the mining industry in this Canada, we want them back in Saskatchewan. They are not yet coming back. They haven't got the confidence that they need to come back into this province. But I was just reading today, in fact, that in the next quarter in that industry, in the mining industry, and I'm including all mining, all mining endeavours in that statement, they're expecting a 38 per cent increase in employment in that industry in the next quarter. We don't share in that because of the opposition and the government that they led. We do not share in that because they did not give these people the opportunity to participate in our mining industry.

Would you, Deputy Speaker, if the government came in and took half your farming operation, would you be pleased about it? Would you go out and tell your friends you have a friendly government? They want to get friendly or they want half my operation. Invite them in, they take half of it, they legislate it so they can have it. Would you stay in

the province and farm if you could get out? Well, they left.

And earlier today, I heard one of the members talk about the shaft, and I'm just trying to think of the song. But I'll tell you, the mining industry . . . If we had two or three more shafts in northern Saskatchewan, we wouldn't have an unemployment problem in this province, we'd have people working. That industry is just trying, is just trying to struggle back up to where it was five years ago. It's going to be there. It's cyclical. But it won't be there in Saskatchewan because these people in that industry who are looking after their money and other people's money who are shareholders in their endeavours, have looked at Saskatchewan and said, 'No, we've been burnt there, we're not going to be burnt there again.' And I, I see the member opposite with his back to me reading the newspaper. He was with that operation. He knows what I'm talking about. He should have his head bowed in that newspaper. And you know I see he's reading the mining page. It's interesting.

All I'm trying to say is that we have done our best, and I, I say we as a government, and I am saying them as the former government, they did their best to drive anybody with any initiative, with any capital, with any ambition, with any optimism, they have driven them out of this province, and some of those people have not yet come back.

Now we're talking about . . . Earlier in the presentation, I was talking about the, the runaway kissers. The runaway kissers, the runaway kissers have not entered the mine. The mining industry has not sent in any runaway kissers yet. You folks across this House, as government you put the kiss of death on the mining industry. And I know, Lawrence, that as the member for Cumberland, you can't be proud of a government that done that. You can't be. That government that did that left your jobless you were talking about a few minuets ago. You've got a 90 per cent unemployment problem in your, in your constituency. Where is all the mining opportunity in this province? Where is all the mining industry? Where should it be? It should be in your constituency, Lawrence. How can you get up and blame us for programs that don't work, when your government initiated them? Answer that.

We have a North in this province that's the most beautiful in this country, that's the most beautiful in this country and the most bountiful. And it does present opportunity. But you can't just have the government solving all your problems, Lawrence. You can't do that. Sometimes you have to have people solving their own problems. And I appreciate your initiative. I appreciate the member's initiative for suggesting an economic platform. You know, we agree with that, and we may even listen to some of it. But I'm asking the member: how can he live in the opposition when he knows that they, they initiated it all? How can you do that and keep your head up? Your member opposite, your member from Quill Lakes is hiding his head. He's hiding in the newspaper. Now he's on 'Sports.'

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — You know . . . And I just want to outline, before I give up my position on the floor, I want to outline, I want to outline to this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how we can be missiled, missiled by the ex-government. I've got to take a drink of this Saskatchewan water, this Regina water. And that's one way they missiled us. They did nothing for us. I want to read from *Hansard*, the Hon. Mr. Blakeney's redress to this budget speech. And I want to read verbatim so I don't make any mistakes. Lawrence, you listen carefully because as of . . . the mining sector is in your constituency. It says,

quote . . . I might be on the wrong page but I'll find it:

They are going to remove the ceiling which says they can only take 80 per cent into revenue.

And for those who don't understand that, they're talking about the heritage fund. Well, the heritage fund is all talk and I will get into that later.

They're going to remove . . . and take 80 per cent into revenue and are going to take 100 per cent into ordinary revenue. And that will mean, (Mr. Deputy Speaker), that there will be nothing out of that fast depleting resource for the generation to come.

Well, the fast depleting resource he's talking about, we see just a little above this, is potash. I made some inquiries and I'll tell you how fast potash is depleting. At current production we have over a thousand years of known reserves. Now that's what they told us about medicare, that it was going to, that it was going to go downhill. Now they're telling us we've got a fast depleting resource. You know, that's what, that's what creates depressions. That doesn't answer the problem. Tell us the truth. That's what they want to hear. That's why they threw you out, because they could never get the truth.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Well, I think Mr., the Hon. Mr. Blakeney should stand up and maybe correct that mistake he made.

**An Hon. Member:** — He's not here.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — He's not here this evening. He's possibly . . . I, I don't know where he'd be. But I saw him stomp out earlier.

But those things are something that, as a government, we are going to address. And our budget speech addresses many of these problems. It's also mentioned in that speech you cannot, you can't solve all problems immediately. It takes time. It takes time and a little bit of patience. And the people of Saskatchewan are showing that patience. They're member from P.A.-Duck Lake, he's patient. That's what you call patience. They're willing to wait, because they saw 11 years of what can happen when your side of the House is in government. They saw, they've seen 40 years of it. We've lot our children, Lawrence. I, I hate to single you out. You've got 90 per cent employment because maybe they haven't left. You know, if our, if my, if my family and, and families of this government side of the House and friends and neighbours had all stayed, can you imagine with your kind of philosophy where we would be as far as unemployment is concerned? We could lead the western world in unemployment quite easily.

I prefer to talk, talk in terms of employment. This province employs more people on a ratio basis than any other province in the country today — 93 per cent or somewhere in that range — 93 per cent. Now, that's a commendable, that's a very commendable . . . I don't, I don't, I don't know how an opposition member can get up and point his finger like this, and say we're doing something wrong. Now you answer me. I can't figure it out, and neither can the people out in the street. They're, they're baffled. As long as we're in power, I could say we want to make sure they're baffled, but that's not what we're going to do. We're going to include them in the secrets. That's the difference in governments. That's a lot of the difference in philosophy between this side of the House and that side

of the House. It's government by inclusion, not government by exclusion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — And I can just say that with respect to a lot of the feedback I get out of my constituency . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — You won't be around next time.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I hear the member from Quill Lakes suggest I won't be around next time. You know, like I've been trying to, I've been trying to demonstrate to the opposition that occasionally a finger, a finger of optimism is necessary. They can't even find a thimble of opposition. They can't even find a thimble of opposition, of, of optimism. And they can't find much of a thimble of opposition either. But I don't want to get into that. I think I've said enough — I think I've said enough . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I see them, for the first time in the last couple of weeks, lean back and say, 'You know, maybe he's right.'

**An Hon. Member:** — I believe you.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Lawrence, I can see that you are almost convinced and I'm not inviting them to cross the floor — we don't have room. Half of our government is on their side right now. For those folks in the province, for those folks in the province who aren't familiar with the set-up in the House, even though it's televised out to Saskatchewan, they don't some of them aren't aware of it. We have so many members in here, we have to send a lot of them over on the other side of the House. You could be watching the Leader of the Opposition and you could see the Legislative Assistant to the, or the Minister of Finance. And it's an honest mistake . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and he says, 'Thank you for that.' Maybe it's not an honest mistake. I didn't mean that the way he understood it, I can promise you that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — I'm just going to excuse myself and I think maybe in closing, I'd like to touch on one area that is the difference between success and failure in any venture.

**An Hon. Member:** — Optimism.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — It's not only optimism, but it's the willingness to go into areas that are maybe new, and it's something that the opposition are not familiar with as a government. And we are going to expend \$50 million in the private sector on research and development, \$50 million. You know, one innovation, I don't care whether it's a John Deere tractor or whether it's a Morris cultivator, or whether it's a . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — NDP mousetrap.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Somebody suggested an NDP mousetrap. I don't think it would employ many people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . But, they got caught in it as the member opposite suggested. But, one innovation, one innovation, one innovation coming out of the mind of one individual can result in employment that would include everyone in the city of Regina. Everyone, everyone in the city of Regina . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I've just been invited to cross the floor. You know I've, I've offered, I've offered to go into their caucus and bring them up a little bit — I said I'd do it. Until now

they turned me down flat, but I accept that. I'm going fishing with the member from Cumberland; I'm going to talk with the member from Quill Lake — he wants to take me shooting.

But it's a serious matter, and the people of Saskatchewan, we take it seriously. We aren't as committed to a philosophy, we aren't as committed to a philosophy or an ideology. We're willing to listen, and if direction dictates it, we're willing to move, very movable.

They wanted our farmland; they wanted our businesses; they wanted our mines; they wanted our homes; and they chased the kids out of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — Now is that a compassionate government? Who can stand up in this House and suggest that we, we are the ones that aren't compassionate, we don't offer compassion to the people of Saskatchewan?

I'll tell you this: that on, on the freehold ownership of land, that is the basis of all freedom. The basis of all freedom, the basis of all freedom is the freehold ownership of land. That's the basis of the freedom to live, eat, to do whatever you bloody well have to in order to bring, in order to bring the grub to the table, and those are . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . those guys understand. I don't want to get too high, or too, too far above them, or it will shoot right over them, and I see one member leaving now.

Our, our grandparents, our grandparents nurtured, nurtured the ownership of land, they nurtured the ownership, and our grandchild expect the ownership of land . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — . . . and that was being denied by the government opposite. And they took them en masse in the farming community and they threw them out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not support the amendment, I think that's clear. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do support the motion, and I am almost embarrassed that the opposition, after virtually driving a wreck . . . a wrecking truck through the economy of this province, has the guile to come in with an amendment like they did, after we as a government have offered so much to the people in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinson:** — With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to . . . I would like to thank the one member of opposition who I have decided is probably the most intent member on that side of the House — he's always listening, he never says much . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And I think that said it all — he may be looking for a little bite in that leadership race.

**An Hon. Member:** — I think he's got it.

**Mr. Sveinson:** — And he might have it; he might not want it, but he might have it. He might win by acclamation.

But I would like to say that I . . . I in support of our motion, I believe, as I stated earlier, that it is probably the most compassionate budget we have seen in this province in 12

years, that answers the need of people in this province who have decided that they want to stay here, and they want to work and they want to make our economy work and they want to support this government and make it work. And they're coming back to do that, and they're coming back to do that; they're kissing the ground to do that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Sveinsson:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to thank the House for the patience they've had during this presentation. Thank you very much.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's again a pleasure to enter into the budget debate. It's a bit disappointing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when members rise in the House now to debate issues before the Assembly, that we have almost no audience whatsoever, other than our own members . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hear one lonely voice holler, 'I'm here', and that was the member for Pelly. I think it should be, should be noted which member that was. The member for Pelly is certainly in his seat. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, given that . . . Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker, given the fact that we have very little in the way of an audience in the opposition, and given the fact, Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker, that the volume of the last speaker, the hon. member for Regina North West, who gave a very good speech, although at a slightly, although at a slightly larger tone than I intend to give mine, and considering, again, the fact that I suppose I'm only speaking to those wonderful people out there in TV land, that I would ask them that maybe if they wouldn't mind turning up their sets now or they may think they're watching silent movies.

None the less, there's certainly a few comments that I want to make. I would like to start out, naturally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by congratulating our Minister of Finance. Our Minister of Finance has brought in a, a very good budget — a budget that I would say, in my mind, is a very imaginative budget. It certainly is full of ideas and opportunities for the '80s. I feel that it, it holds out to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many, many of the dreams and the basis that people in this province have built this province with. And they're, again, back to that basis and it's been brought to them and brought around and history has repeated itself. The Minister of Finance has given us a budget that again Saskatchewan can hold up their heads and be proud to be Saskatchewan people, and go ahead and build again on this great foundation and their dreams that they have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in all matters in life, whether it be government or any other walk of life, the greatest, I believe the greatest aspect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that anyone can have is a matter of trust. Do people trust you? And this is a very important aspect of politics. If people trust and respect politicians, then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they most definitely will have a tendency to understand more clearly and have confidence and faith in the direction that you're setting out as a government.

Now I want to take a few moments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to outline why the people of Saskatchewan have a right and a responsibility to trust this government under the leadership of Premier Grant Devine. I want to refer all members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a, to a publication, *Business Review*, in which it has the picture of the Premier on the front page, and it has 'Premier Devine Addresses Chamber Outlook Conference.' Taking a look at what the Premier had to say at that conference:

Saskatchewan taxpayers can expect to see a new role for the provincial government, with government working as a partner in the economy with business, instead of as the boss. 'We will work towards a sustained and healthy expansion of the private wealth-creating sector of our economy,' says newly-elected Premier Grant Devine, speaking at the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce's Business Outlook Conference, May 5th in Saskatoon. 'With government acting as a partner with the economy, not as the controller, not as the owner, and not as the paymaster. But as a sensible partner for the people of Saskatchewan, we've worked to build better and more prosperous lives for ourselves and for our children.'

Another highlight, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Premier's address at that chamber of commerce meeting was, and I quote:

'In recent years,' he explained, 'the competition has been to see which crown corporation or government agency could use up the most taxpayer dollars available to serve its own bureaucratic ends. There is no better example than Saskatchewan, where under the previous NDP government tax money was used for projects ranging from setting up crown corporations to buying the farmland. We want to see resources used so that we can facilitate the ownership of farms, homes and businesses by the people, not by the government. There is a considerable difference between helping people own the farm and ownership of the farm by government.'

Another quote that I thought was, was very appropriate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was that he had stated in this speech that 'In Saskatchewan one of the biggest factors causing inflation is the provincial government raising prices. Rather than controlling people,' the Premier explains, 'it's our intention to control costs. Controlling costs fights inflation and it also gives us the competitive edge.'

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take the time to provide some of these quotes, and there are others, and I, I just took some time today and marked a few of them out in, in yellow. And what this proves to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that, that the things that the Premier had stated in that address have been put in place by this new government, and in particular by our Minister of Finance in his budget. And let's take a look at some of those things that, that have come through:

The provincial government intends to alter the taxing system for the oil industry to bring the fields back into active production. While not privy to all of the background information on the national energy program negotiations prior to the final deal being struck, Devine does have one observation of the program: 'On the surface it appears as though one government after another said, 'More for me,' giving no thought to how they were killing the proverbial geese that were laying the golden tax eggs.'

On that issue alone, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very clear that our government, under the leadership of Mr. Grant Devine, our Premier, has acted, and in particular in the south-eastern part of the province which is a part of the province which I represent, where prior to the election the oil fields were only operating at approximately 36 to 38 per cent capacity. Now through the new oil structuring tax that we have placed as a new government, we now have those oil fields operating at 100 per cent capacity and that's new revenue for the people of Saskatchewan. He also stated, and I quote again:



That three or four years ago the mega-energy projects were seen as a central vehicle for the future. Now the entire subject of energy is a national disgrace and an international embarrassment.

And the third area that he identified is where government should be active is in working to identify opportunities for economic development and job creation:

To translate those opportunities into real jobs where it makes sense, we will invest public money in new enterprises, but only where it makes sense. The government would like to see a rural natural gas distribution system, which in addition to meaning low cost fuel and low operating costs, will generate employment to build the system and orders for steel and other products.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's common knowledge now we have a 10-year plan for natural gas distribution in the province of Saskatchewan.

Finally, and I quote again from the Premier's remarks in the speech:

There's a big role for government in health, education, social services, and environment, and there should be. It's a natural. We belong there. Money will be spent there, but not in buying farms. 'Saskatchewan,' Devine says, 'is Open for Business.'

What our Premier had stated at that time was prior to the introduction of the budget by our Minister of Finance, the Hon. Bob Andrew. The issues that he was identifying as being absolutely paramount and crucial to the people of Saskatchewan were identified there, and are in place now as a result of that budget.

And that brings me back, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to my opening theme, and that was trust. Do the people trust the politicians? Do the people trust Grant Devine? And do the people trust our Minister of Finance? Mr. Deputy Speaker, obviously they have good reason to trust our Premier, because he stated what he was going to do, and he has had his influence as Premier, understandably, and that direction and that new course has been put forth by our Minister of Finance in the budget.

So, Mr., Mr. Deputy Speaker, how the opposition can be so negative and get up in this House and condemn a budget that reflects the honesty, integrity, and the trust of the Premier of Saskatchewan and the members of his cabinet is absolutely beyond me, when it's been verified and proved right in the tripe that I've just given you.

Now let's compare that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us compare that with the supposed honesty and integrity that we are hearing from the Leader of the Opposition, the former premier. And we will understand, and understand very clearly, why he is not the Premier, and why he is now the Leader of the Opposition. We will also understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why their numbers are of only eight.

If we take a look, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the transcript in our *Hansard* from the Leader of the Opposition's comments which he spoke here in the legislature in his address to the budget . . . And again, I've taken the time to just mark it out in yellow, the comments that I thought were relevant, or non-relevant I should say, and let me quote. What does the Leader of the Opposition say? He says:

Traditionally, budget speeches are a time for the Minister of Finance to blow the budget, the government's horn, to resort to rhetorical flourishes in describing the government's spending plans for the coming year, and often the facts and figures in the documents fail to justify the record, and that's common enough. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, the budget documents not only fail to justify the budget speech rhetoric, the rhetoric in fact seems designed to hide the true impact of the budget documents.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my comments on that particular paragraph are these: that it may well have been the position of the previous administration, the previous minister of finance, to stand in the Assembly (and it certainly was as I sat in opposition and listened to him), blow the government's horn, brag about all the things that they had done with the people's own money. Those were the comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he was making. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are a different government with a different philosophy. And we don't believe in standing here as members, either whether we're finance ministers or members of cabinet, and blowing the government's horn, when, in fact, what we're really doing is just trying to tell the people what we're doing with their tax dollars.

So, certainly we have taken a, a new course, and a change in direction in that respect. The Leader of the Opposition refers to it as a tradition. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe it's a tradition that we have broken, and it was long since overdue.

Some other comments: he says, 'Savage cuts in services and deficit budgeting,' and then he says, 'and that's why I say this government has misled the people of Saskatchewan.' Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's very obvious that it was the Leader of the Opposition, the former premier, that misled the people of Saskatchewan. He misled them on a daily basis. He misled them into thinking that his family of crown corporations was in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan when in fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was only in the interests of the government. Certainly, certainly the government of the day was getting richer and the people were getting poorer. As governments of the day, as the government of the day took the taxpayers' dollars to build monuments unto themselves, great wondrous buildings that I think it could be fair to say were architecturally unsound — maybe pretty from the outside, but unsound — and using past NDP members' names to name the buildings. Monuments unto themselves. Well, I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it says something in the *Bible* about people who build monuments unto themselves and whether they worship the true God or their own monuments.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again the Leader of the Opposition, and I would like to quote again, says:

Given the government's policies, these expenses are regrettable but necessary. The government's spending in other areas is not too high. No. What's wrong with this government, and what's wrong with this budget is not that they're spending too much; what's wrong is that the income is too low.

Now if I could just stop there. Earlier, he had indicated that the people were now paying the price for these very expensive election campaign promises of the Tory party, now the Tory government. That what he had said, and now he's indicating that it's not that we're spending too much, but that revenues are too low. So when we do something like adjusting the royalty structure for the oil companies to get the revenue up, so we broaden the tax base, then he criticizes us for doing that, and says that, in fact, we're not

making moneys available through programs and grants for the people of Saskatchewan, but rather we're financing the multinational oil companies, our supposed buddies.

Now again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is the one that is misleading this Assembly, and he not only . . . You know, it's not the matter of my saying he's misleading the Assembly; it's proven by his own words that he is the one that is misleading the Assembly. These are his words that I quote, the Leader of the Opposition's words that I quote . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know I hear a member speaking behind me suggesting that maybe there should be a point of order on some of these matters. And maybe that's a good point. Maybe we ought to start and just be, be very careful to listen to what they say, and maybe we will start moving a few points of order in the House as it respects what the members of the opposition are saying as it relates to misleading the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, I'm not going to go into any detail, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about all the facts and figures that he tries to outline in terms of the dollars that were coming in or being lost in oil revenue. I just say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the facts are there — it's in black and white, or I should say it's now in yellow since I marked it in — certainly very clear to anyone who cares to read the *Hansards* that the Leader of the Opposition was in fact misleading the House by his own words.

What does he, what else does he go on to say? He says that health is not promoted, that health is demoted. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to leave that topic for just a moment and come back to it, but I just want to flag that issue because health is a very important issue to the people of Saskatchewan, and how the Department of Health is administering its responsibilities as a government. So I'll come back to that.

What else does the Leader of the Opposition have to say when he's replying to the budget speech? He says:

What does this government offer to deal with the rising costs that farmers face? Mr. Speaker, the increase in costs for farm diesel fuel since this government came to office are 23 per cent. 23 per cent! As the price of Saskatchewan oil has gone up twice since the government came to office, the costs of farm diesel has gone down, gone, rather, up and this government has taken no action. There's money for the oil companies, money for CP Transport, but no money to help farmers with the cost of fuel. (Then) that's not true in Alberta, where the government has a farm fuel distribution allowance which rebates farmers 31.8 cents a gallon . . .

Now, here we have the Leader of the Opposition talking about an Alberta program that rebates the farmers on their fuel costs. Now, how he could, you know, I don't know how he could bring himself to make that observation again in this Assembly, unless, of course, he wasn't here when I spoke earlier in this Assembly on the throne speech debate, when I outlined very clearly that not only once did the NDP in government remove the farm cost reduction program, which was a farm cost reduction program aimed at rebating farm fuel costs to farmers, not only once, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but twice. Once by the minister of agriculture who represented the riding of Saltcoats, and then later, by the minister of agriculture who at that time represented the riding of Last Mountain-Touchwood.

And then we have the Leader of the Opposition, that same party, now not in government but in opposition, indicating that they feel that we should impose, or bring into place, as a government, a farm cost reduction program to offset the costs of fuel for farmers. Now how he can say that when it was their government that removed it, not once, but twice, is absolutely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems obvious again that the Leader of the Opposition has been misleading the people of Saskatchewan. Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm rather tired of their rhetoric about how, about how there's subsidies and assistance for CP Rail, and those kinds of corporations, the multinational corporations.

They never talk about how the taxpayers of Canada have to subsidize Air Canada. They never talk about the subsidy that the taxpayers of this country have to pay out for Canadian national Railways. Only they talk about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the multinational oil companies and the private oil companies, the CP Rail. Whenever you hear them debate the, the Crow rate, the transportation issue, in this legislature, you never hear them talk about how CNR is, is out of line. It's always CPR, not CNR.

And then they, and then they talk about diesel fuel costs. Well, you know, I didn't hear them applaud all that much when our Minister of Finance increased the diesel fuel costs for the railroads. I didn't hear them applaud that. It's likely that the . . . They are likely the closest buddies of multinationals than we are, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I can tell you that, to the best of my knowledge, there was no money coming into my constituency from any multinationals.

Besides that, as it relates to multinationals, I would challenge any one of the eight members in opposition to, to try and spend a week and not deal at one time with a multinational. Likely by the end of the week you'd be starving to death.

None the less, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to go on and just quote again from some of the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition. And this is a very interesting subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a very interesting subject to me. He talks about . . . And let, let me just quote again. What does, what does the Leader of, of the Opposition say about women? He says: 'Now, who else needs protection in our society, Mr. Deputy Speaker?' Notwithstanding the fact that the NDP in opposition need protection. Certainly they do. I can remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it was we on that side of the House, and we were the ones that needed protection. About the only protection, as the saying used to go at that time, were the game laws in the province.

At any rate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, here's what he goes on further to say:

. . . well, women in the work-force. All the statistics show that women are paid less than men, even when they do the same kind of work. We in our party believe that people should be paid for the work they do, and should have the chance to do any job if they can qualify. Whether they're male or female shouldn't make any difference. And we all know that that isn't true, Mr. Speaker, in our society. One of the main jobs of the women's division is to help give a better break to women in the work-force. But the budget ends all that, and the Premier has made clear that there will be no women's division in the new department of advanced education. The entire women's division has been abolished — axed completely, axed completely by this compassionate government. Another group of people who should be getting protection

from this government and aren't.

All right, now what has he said there, Mr. Deputy Speaker? He said there that women are paid less than men. Well he should know as well as any other member in this House. We could take the Minister of Social Services as example. Now that's a, that's a woman, and she's paid more than I am and I'm a man. Now I wonder why he didn't allude to that particular fact. What I'm saying that for, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is because I'm trying to tell him that in Saskatchewan women have an equal opportunity if they're prepared to move out and acquire those equal opportunities. Our Minister of Social Services is a good example of that.

I'll grant you that over the years there has been a lot of areas where there were some inequalities, and it was difficult to compete on an equal basis with men, but those things have been changing over the years. In fact, in some areas, they've changed so far that it might be fair to say that some day we'll have a men's liberation group. None the less we may be a little ways away from that.

I want to remind the Leader of the Opposition, and the, the two members that, that are here tonight to hear my comments, to take this message back. And the member for, the member for Cumberland would be the best member, I suspect. I see him smiling over there and listening to a few of my comments. When I was in opposition, I was the critic for the status of women. It wasn't in the women's division of the Department of Labour at that time. I was the critic for the status of women, and those women had one of the most effective lobbies ever at the legislature of any organization, male or female. And they had a very unique system, a very unique system. They had a great big score-board at the front of the legislature, and they rated every MLA. Now, I'm telling you, if you, if you weren't in your office and weren't able to meet your, your group of women that came in to see you, you were in big trouble because you know what you were rated on the score-board, a big zero.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm very pleased to say that as a Progressive Conservative member of the legislature, in opposition, I was at that time rated number three out of 61 members of this legislature. Number three.

Now how the Leader of the Opposition can say that we on this side of the House do not understand the issues of women, and make charges, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we're, we're stripping the rights of women through the reorganization of government is very misleading again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Very misleading, because what we have done, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in our reorganization and in our funding priorities in government, is to make available in a very fair way opportunities for women in government. And we thought, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were doing something that was honourable, was right, that was good for the female segment of our society. And it will be, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But we got condemned in this legislature by the Leader of the Opposition — condemned for that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I think that's very unfair. And again I say that's very misleading, because I for one believe there are many, many opportunities for women and I believe that the greatest opportunity for them is, is now in Saskatchewan. The greatest opportunity in Canada is here in Saskatchewan.

Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to touch on another issue and that is the issue of unemployment. In this country unemployment is the number one concern of Canadians — number one. And out of all of the words that the Leader of the Opposition spoke, that is but one paragraph where he addresses himself to the question of unemployment. And yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and yet, what do we hear in this House

during question period? Questions about unemployment. And, 'What are you doing about a job creation program?' Criticisms of the Minister of Social Services respecting the joint program between the federal government and the provincial government and job creation. Criticizing. And yet in his own speech, he allocates one small paragraph out of all of his rhetoric to the question of unemployment.

I was going to, to enter that quote into the, into the record as well this evening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I, I don't feel that it's, it's really, it's really worth it. He, he really never said anything in that particular paragraph. I even read it a couple of times trying to find out what he did say and, and he indicated absolutely nothing.

So I'm going to close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the comments of, of the Leader of the Opposition. But I want, and I want very clearly, the people of this province and the members of this Assembly to understand that the Leader of the Opposition, and I would suspect that he represents the other seven members in opposition, has misled this legislature and is deliberately trying to mislead the people of Saskatchewan — deliberately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that they can in some way regain power and sit on this side of the House. And Mr. Deputy Speaker, it tells me they have not learned one thing, not one thing, because they played politics with the people's lives in this province for years when they were on this side of the House in government and they are continuing to do that now in opposition. And I'm glad they are because it's going to keep them there for the next 20 years.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's take a look at a few very, very positive matters that have been brought to this Assembly through this budget by this government. I want to touch first on a reorganization. It was very understandable that, after our taking office, it was necessary to reorganize the government, to restructure it and redesign and redefine its, its philosophy and its principles and where it was going — to where it was going to take, ultimately the people of this province. Because the people of this province on April the 26th voted for a change. And when they voted for that change, they didn't just vote for a new face of members but rather a new direction for the province of Saskatchewan.

When the Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election brought in yet one more Conservative member to this House, it confirmed that that initial thrust, when we set out on a new direction . . . It confirmed that that initial thrust was correct, that we were on the right track. And we'll listen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and not just through by-elections, but we listen through joint committees and hearings all around the province to understand fully what the people of this province want and where they want us to, to work with them and the direction they want us to take them as a new government. And that, that new reorganization of government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is going to do a number of things. It will improve government productivity, and heaven only knows that was necessary. It will improve the government's overall effectiveness, efficiency and economy by coordinating similar programs. Secondly, it will consolidate related functions under single departments to ensure greater accountability — a very important issue, accountability falling back again on my initial theme of trust. In order to have the trust of the people, you must account to the people. So our reorganization will accomplish that; it will allow for better accountability by this government to the people and it will improve public access to government by simplifying communication and reducing confusion. Those are the kinds of things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that are necessary. Those are the kinds of things that were, that were at the, at the basis of a new election.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said I wanted to get around to health in my closing remarks, and I want to commend our Minister of Health. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he has taken the

Department of Health and he has reorganized as well the direction that they are about to take. A number of initiatives, and what are they? And I can flip through them very quickly. Maybe the, maybe the Leader of the Opposition, maybe the NDP opposition members should take note. You know it's . . . You have access to this as well as I do, as any member in this House does. It simply comes out of information services and you can find someone to read it for you. I'm sure you could.

Now let's take a look at it: 'New positions announced for Saskatchewan hospitals. The 1983-84 Health budget will create more than 180 new positions in Saskatchewan hospitals at a cost of \$5 million, health minister Graham Taylor announced today.' Now that sounds like a pretty good one to me. Now what was wrong with that? Was that a good health program? Are you opposed to that? Do you want to vote against that too, maybe? What else? 'Funding advance for paediatric intensive care unit. The provincial government is providing \$650,000.' The member for Quill Lakes is babbling; he missed that. I better run that by him again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. 'The provincial government is providing \$650,000 in its '83-84 budget for the establishment of a paediatric intensive care unit at University Hospital in Saskatoon, health minister Graham Taylor announced today.' Now do you oppose that? What else does he say? Again, I remind the members, maybe the member for Cumberland, these are available from information services. You can get them too, you, you know you can; there's no problem. You can read these and it's good stuff and you should read it. 'Increased funding for open-heart surgery. The provincial government is providing more than \$700,000 in its '83-84 budget to expand open-heart surgery at the Plains Hospital Centre in Regina, health minister Graham Taylor announced today.' That sounds good to me, too. Another good one — are you against that?

Now those are some of the matters that I, I came across just in a few news releases, as it relates to the Department of Health. What else? The health minister was able to work with his colleagues, and I'm sure he must've stressed the importance of the Health Department, and I'm sure his colleagues were co-operative in understanding the need to expend moneys in the Department of Health, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's very important to identify very clearly what that cost is. What is that cost to the people of Saskatchewan? Well first of all, if you take the Health Department alone, it runs approximately, and the Minister of Health sitting close to me would correct me I am sure if I were wrong, it's somewhere in the neighbourhood of 30 per cent of the total budget for the province of Saskatchewan — 30 per cent. And what does that break down to in a per capita? \$1,000 per man, woman and child in the province of Saskatchewan, \$1,000 per man, woman and child that this government, this Minister of Health has committed to the people of Saskatchewan for the health care of those very citizens. Are you opposed to that? I would challenge the member for Cumberland to vote against that one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Health was able to gain a 9.6 per cent increase - \$70 million, in fact - \$70 million, and these were during bad economic times. He was still able to eke out \$70 million — a 9.6 per cent increase. And you people can still stand there and criticize the Minister of health and this government for not dedicating enough funds to health care.

Well, I tell the member for Cumberland, you don't know where it's all at. You don't even understand government. And I can appreciate that, because you just got elected. I didn't understand it either when I came in here. If you want to learn it real quick, I challenge you: cross the floor and we'll teach you in about a day.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance was able to approach his whole emphasis in terms of government financing in essentially two basic ways — twofold — essential services and community programs. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that ties into the direction the Minister of Health was able to take as well, because that's what he is able to accomplish with the funding that he has in his department — essential services and community programs. And those are the kinds of things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that our Minister of health is able to emphasize in his allocation of the budget for the Department of Health.

But let's take a look at a few more things, very quickly, in winding down on this, on this budget debate in terms of my own remarks at least, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

\$17 million to the Saskatchewan Cancer Foundation - \$17 million, and \$10 million for a new cancer clinic. Are the members opposed to that? I mentioned the 700,000 for expansion of cardiac services in Regina. Also, a half a million dollars allocated for small hospitals. What else, Mr. Deputy Speaker? \$2.7 million for a children's rehabilitation centre in Saskatoon, in co-operation with the Kinsmen Foundation. That's very significant, as I read it, as I read it into the record. \$2.7 million for children's rehabilitation centre in co-operation with the Kinsmen Foundation. That tracks right back, Mr. Deputy Speaker — tracks right back to where I started. Our Premier, *Business Review*, speaking of a new direction, setting it out. Where are we going? Where are we taking the people of this province? Working together, not only for the people of Saskatchewan, but with the people of Saskatchewan. That has flowed right through into the budget, and you see it there with \$2.7 million and it's in co-operation with the Kinsmen Foundation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$4 million for the construction and renovation projects in special-care homes. The total since taking office - \$11 million for special-care homes. Now how does that stack up? You know, to use some of the member for Quill Lakes' expressions, how does that square? He used that terminology. How does that square with the previous administration? And I'll tell you how it squares: it is 50 per cent more than the previous administration was able to accomplish in seven years. Now I tell you — seven years! So in other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are able to accomplish, through the Minister of Health and his department, just in special-care homes alone, as much in 11 months as they could do in seven years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — I hear a member say, 'Shame on you.' Now I don't know whether that means all of the, all of them over there, or just the Yew from Cumberland. But none the less, either way it is shame on you. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to close on this comment. The only member that got a little bit rangy-tang over there was the member for Cumberland, and he was making awful threatening remarks. He was threatening members to go up north. I means, heavens, I mean, you know, we want to go up there. It's a beautiful country up north. And I want to tell you something about the, your own province, about the own part of this province that you should know. My good heavens, you live up there. I don't live up there. I'm a southerner; I live down south. Okay? You should understand that.



Now, I'm going to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and through you, I'm going to tell the member from Cumberland, that if you really cared about the people you represent, you would want to have them, as the Minister of Social Services said today in reply to a question in the question period, part of the mainstream of society. Do you want to isolate them and have them quarantined up north in some hinterland that you refer to it as? I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I tell the member for Cumberland, I see the people you represent as being equals — equal with the people that I represent in southeastern Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Birkbeck:** — And I, and, and, through your, your debate it, in the House, if I could call it that, through your debate, which one, unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was not really a debate, what you had was a speech that was prepared for you by some more of your NDP hacks in the back, that never did understand politics up front, but their back-room politics. And I don't know why an hon. member like you, and you were honourable when you came in, you . . . but you have let them, by preparing a speech for you, put you into a very bad situation, because what you had to say in here tonight is on the record. It's on the record of the *Hansard*. And I say that it's very unfortunate, Mr. Member, that you have let them drag you into that pit. Because, you know, they're going down. And they're going down fast. And it's just like being near the Titanic when it was going down.

Now, Mr., Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to tell you that the people in northern Saskatchewan do want to be part of the mainstream. And I've just outlined the commitment our Minister of Health has made to the people of Saskatchewan. And when he means the people, the people of Saskatchewan, when he says the people of Saskatchewan, he's talking about the people that you represent as well — people of northern Saskatchewan and not just in southern Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are some of my comments that I have to make respecting the, the member for Cumberland.

Now, finally, in conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we felt, and I, and I certainly feel, as, as maybe one would draw from my comments, that we have an excellent budget — an excellent budget that reflects the, the direction of this government. And what do we, what do we have from the opposition? Now I see the member for Pelly, you know, giving us the old down sign. Well I challenge you, and I'll pass this challenge out to the member for Cumberland as well, since you challenged our Premier. I challenge you. If you're so confident about how solid you are in your riding, you resign and we'll have a by-election up there. All right? And you too, the member for Pelly, you resign and we'll have a by-election in your riding. Now, you know, there's no point in me resigning, because you couldn't find a candidate to run against me.

Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have an amendment before the House, and I believe it's very important the people of Saskatchewan should know what this amendment is that was introduced by the opposition members.

The amendment reads, and it was moved by the hon. member for Regina Centre, and it was unfortunately seconded by the member for Cumberland. And that was too bad, because he seconded that motion and I don't believe he even read it. I don't believe he even read it. What does it say? It says that all the words after the word 'That' be deleted

and that the following substituted therefor:

This Assembly express its shock and dismay with the budget because: (1) it contains the largest deficit in the 78-history of the province, \$317 million . . .

Now then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the NDP members in opposition would like us to do, so that they could get into power, would be to lay heavy taxation on the backs of the people of Saskatchewan.

What we're doing rather, through a restructuring, as I said earlier, of the oil royalty, is to create revenue through the multinationals, which I suspect are their friends, and that way not have to tax the people of Saskatchewan. And we haven't. In that budget, you can't identify areas where in fact the tax has increased.

The Leader of the Opposition alluded to some tax that, that the taxation was great. Well it was, because there's people making more money in the province of Saskatchewan. People are coming back to Saskatchewan, and we know that; it was identified earlier today. It's been common knowledge that since 1936 we've lost a million people, and that's based on the premise that since 1936 the nation's population has more than doubled. And this province with a live birth rate which is higher than the national average, so they couldn't say that it wasn't because we were productive, we were productive in that area as well, we only had a million people. So by that understanding only, we lost a million people, and we lost them all over the, all over this country. And now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're coming back, they're getting jobs here, and they're taxable and understandable, understandably, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the total taxation has gone up.

It says second, 'coupled with the deficit of 1982-83, the Government of Saskatchewan is now more than half a billion dollars in the red.' Now, that again, is misleading. Coupled with the deficit that we introduced earlier, in the 1982-83 budget — well, you don't couple the two. I don't know what understanding that is of a budget. Again, I say, the hon. members don't understand they budget, they don't understand what they're debating in the House. Because the deficit in fact is 317 million. You can't couple the two, otherwise you could couple the last 20 or 40 or 50 years and average them all out. So that doesn't make any sense.

He says that thirdly, that these 'record deficits are not the result of government efforts to create jobs, but rather the result of government give-aways to big oil companies, American-based private potash companies, and interprovincial truckers such as CP Transport.' Again he's talking about CP Transport, nothing about anything else. And 'it offers a totally inadequate job-creation response at a time when unemployment is at its highest level in Saskatchewan since the Great Depression.' Well, I say they would know about the Great Depression because I feel that they're still in the Great Depression, the Great Depression for those members in opposition.

'It contains no assistance for Saskatchewan farmers to deal with their worsening cost-price squeeze.' I identified that as well that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have done absolutely nothing. They're hypocritical in their call for us to introduce a farm cost reduction program; as I said earlier, two of their ministers removed it. So, it's hypocritical and it's misleading to the people of Saskatchewan, to indicate that, if they were government, they'd do something. They were government for 11 years and did nothing.

Six and seven. Number six says, 'it contains no economic development plans for people of northern Saskatchewan.' Again, isolating Northerners from the rest of this province, isolating them as if they were some separate entity . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And that's what I say. A member says, 'You're one of us, Lawrence.' I agree with that. The member for Cumberland is one of us. I see you as an equal, as I see all other members in this House as equals.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the seventh and the last point is, 'it contains savage cuts in needed government services for thousands of Saskatchewan people.' And that's an expression that was introduced in the House by the Leader of the Opposition. Savage. Now he used the word savage because he hoped that the media would catch that little cliché and unfortunately they did, and they used that word to headline one of the articles.

Now that's the amendment. And not only has the Leader of the Opposition's remarks in the House been very misleading — I have proven that this evening — I have outlined, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the very positive approach this government has taken, the fine job our Minister of Finance is doing, the fine job our Minister of Health is doing in his budget and his Department of Health. And again, in the amendments introduced for the NDP members of the opposition, they're still living in that, that doom and gloom land of negativism. And there's the amendment, and again, as I've gone through the amendment, I've pointed out how it in itself is misleading. It's not factual. It does not represent truly what the budget introduced by the Minister of Finance is meant to represent.

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's understandable that I would be opposing such an amendment and supporting the main motion in this budget. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** — Before the member from Arm River takes his place I would just like to remind the House that you are supposed to, by rule 319, refer to members by their constituency and not by their name.

**Mr. Muirhead:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I take great pride and pleasure to rise in my place to support and commend the Minister of Finance and our government on the presentation and content of the proposed budget for the year '83-84.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems very strange to me that the Leader of the Opposition should condemn this budget because for the first time in many years a minister of finance has saw fit to tell the people of Saskatchewan the real facts about our financial finances. What I'm saying is, Mr. Speaker, that for many years the Leader of the Opposition and his expert advisers, known, commonly known as the Murray Wallace corporation, have been telling the public, on the future of Saskatchewan finances, we're and would be in the black for many years due, due to their master-minding a crown corporation, etc.

I'm sure that the public will recall the long-running expensive media promotion of the family of crown corporations. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would appear that the Wallaces and Dombowskys, etc., did not anticipate that just maybe the world economy would not stay buoyant forever, and just possibly they didn't care, because it's quite evident that with all their wisdom they failed to advise the ex-premier that they in their socialist

fantasy had not made allowance for the down periods, which any astute businessman knows were bound to happen.

The great advisers, and apparently now the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, were on a high that they thought would never end. Under all circumstances they thought the shuffling of accounts and numbers would always satisfy the public and their power trip would never end. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, oil revenues went down, potash revenues went down, and the NDP went down, leaving in its wake a financial situation that we soon found out was very serious.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the finances of this province were as spectacular as the NDP claimed they were during the '82 campaign, we as a new government would have no difficulty whatsoever. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the purpose of the NDP expensive advertising campaigns in respect to our financial buoyancy in the 1970s and early '80s was to set up a smoke-screen to keep the public unaware of the true facts.

I recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many times when we were in the opposition, we took special effort to try to obtain information as to the financial situation of crown corporations other than those such as telephone and power. And time after time the stock answer we got was: the information we were requesting would not be in the public interest, or it would be detrimental to our competitive position. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the information we were seeking certainly would have been of interest to the public. And now we are a government that believes the public should know exactly where they stand in respect to their finances.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, everyone I am sure is aware that government has only two main sources of revenue, which are taxation and revenue from resources such as oil and potash. I'm sure it should be clear to the Leader of the Opposition, as it is to me, that in a time of world-wide recession, sales of resource materials are down, thus lower revenue. He should also be aware that when the mainstay of our Saskatchewan economy, which is agriculture, finds the products they produce are at an all-time high surplus and sales values are down, the revenue of this province and indeed all of Canada suffers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in short, what I am saying is that the production of agriculture is healthy but sales are a low level in respect to value received for crops and agriculture products produced.

The facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are clear: that the position of the economy is not buoyant. The solution to this world-wide problem is not too clear. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is also clear that the previous government, who in, in a position to know when the downturn in our Saskatchewan economy and financial position was on the downturn, did not take steps to advise the public or make changes in their socialist financial planning to get off the state-controlled financial spending. Thus, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our Minister of Finance and our government were faced with two alternatives — increase general taxation or a deficit budget.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the majority of economists (I would point out that when I say majority of economists, I only include those that are not of any high political profile, such as Dr. Kelly) agree that in financial recession deficit budgeting is not the wrong approach to take. I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you were to ask the taxpayers of Saskatchewan whether they wanted general increased taxation or a deficit budget at

this time, the majority would opt for a deficit budget, and express their faith in this province, in this government, that the deficit will, will be removed in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, recently there was a great uproar by the members of the opposition opposite, which I'll admit was probably due to their unreliable spies, that our government was going to cut financing to the Office of the Ombudsman. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the estimates for 1983-84 indicate that the Ombudsman office will receive \$51,580 more than last year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also note that under the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs we have a grant of \$86,450 for commercial cemeteries, companies in default. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only reason we are paying for cemeteries in default is because the Leader of the Opposition created and gave birth to the cemetery problem back many years ago when he was a civil servant for the CCF regime and then he failed to correct the problem when he became an elected member of the government. The time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he gave birth to the cemetery fiasco was in 1952-53.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the ex-premier gets up and decides to criticize and accuse our government in respect to expenditures or the lack of them, he should first of all recall his past mistakes and political errors. He should remember that when he adds up all of the past and the ongoing cost that his poor judgement or political endeavours have to date cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan just for cemeteries in default, he and the taxpayers will realize the hundreds of thousands of dollars that could have been used to increase budgets for many government agencies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that the majority of the members of this House are now saying, 'What is Muirhead talking about?' When I speak of cemeteries, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the Leader of the Opposition is quite aware of what I speak, and I am sure that there are many people in Weyburn, Moosomin, Moose Jaw, Yorkton, North Battleford and elsewhere who know about the cemetery fiasco created by his friends and himself, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the preceding only to point out that, although they represent small amounts of expenditures, they're ghosts of the socialist past which must, from time to time, be brought to their attention to remind them that in their closets hang many skeletons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my sympathy goes out to the Hon. Allan Blakeney, Leader of the Opposition. I will give him credit that we, he was an honourable premier, well-respected by nearly all of Saskatchewan citizens for his 11-year reign. Mr. Deputy Speaker, why I have sympathy for the Leader of the Opposition is on account of him making the biggest political mistake of his career in March, 1982. He knew the party was in serious trouble, going down month by month, week by week, so he was forced to call an election. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he did not have the political sense that Tommy Douglas had. Douglas was smart enough to know that when his party was falling, he turned the party over to Woodrow Lloyd and let him take the party down to defeat. Thus, Tommy Douglas moved on to greener pastures in the federal scene.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Allan Blakeney will always regret his mistake because he went down a loser, and there will be no federal scene for Allan Blakeney. I said a moment ago how well Allan Blakeney was respected as an individual when he was premier. That is one thing, but I think we should talk for a moment on the real reason that Allan

Blakeney's government fell.

Being a respected man and his philosophy are two different things. Allan Blakeney is considered by many, many people across Canada as being far to the left to red socialism as possible. His philosophy, Mr. Speaker, believed in state ownership. He believed private enterprise was a complete 'no.' He did everything in his power in the 11 years as premier to teach people a life of socialism of the worst kind. The people who followed him and trusted him were taught to depend on government instead of themselves as an individual. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Allan Blakeney followed in the same path as Tommy Douglas, and that was government ownership wherever possible.

The Douglas government built box factories, shoe factories, rolling mills, etc., etc. Most of Douglas's government own ventures went broke, but private enterprise business survived in Saskatchewan. The Douglas government also created seven crown corporations. In the great Mossbank debate, which many people will remember, between Ross Thatcher and Tommy Douglas, Thatcher proved this is where government could hide corruption. The people of Saskatchewan in 1964 said they had enough of socialism, so elected Ross Thatcher's Liberals to power.

In 1971, by people's choice, decided to give socialism a try once again. In the Blakeney campaign, the NDP promised a moderate government, a little bit to the right of the previous Douglas regime, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that what happened in the 1970s? No, that is not what happened. They did the opposite or what they promised, of what they promised. Things happened very quickly. Seven crown corporations grew to approximately 25 — I believe it's 27, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is where we had to fight them for information for eight years in opposition. For four of those years, I was in opposition. Any matter of important information, or of an embarrassing nature, they would always use their old line: 'The information we are requesting would not be in the public interest; it would be detrimental to our competitive position.' These things were only one small item, Mr. Speaker. This was the beginning of the NDP arrogance that led them to their downfall on April 26, 1982.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, state ownership was the big move. They decided to own the farmland, turn this country into the same situation as what was happening in Europe. Day by day, they were turning Saskatchewan farms into government-operated farms. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's compare why the Douglas government fell to why the Blakeney government fell. People in Saskatchewan turned on Douglas because of small government industries, small, such as box factories, shoe factories, woollen mills, etc. Very small, but they turned on them. But, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why did the people of Saskatchewan turn on Allan Blakeney's philosophy? Because he tried to control the production of our whole province. The Blakeney administration took over the potash mines, farms through the land bank program, the oil industry, even controlled the uranium industry and even tried to control the shopping centres in Regina. Controlled the housing industry and even tried to control the civil service, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a result of all this, Allan Blakeney lost all his control on April 26th.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, people want less government. When I grew up on a Saskatchewan farm with my father and mother, I knew or cared little about government. They had no control over my family. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, people in North America are controlled by too much government in their lives. Our goal, Mr. Deputy Speaker, must be to move to less government in our life, and to get back to the old philosophy of each and every person thinking and working for themselves. Mr. Deputy Speaker, people all

over our country are waiting for a hand-out from their fellow man. This may take decades to turn this around, but we must begin the turn-around now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall that in a review of the expenditures for the previous fiscal year, the opposition members had a lot to say about expenditures related to the Executive Council. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is time the facts in relation to the NDP's first year in office compared to the last year of the Thatcher government in respect to the Executive Council should be placed on record. The date used for the Thatcher regime is May 4, 1971. And the date used for the NDP under the Hon. Mr. Blakeney is of course May 4, 1972 — one year later. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Executive Council Premier's Office as of May 4, 1971, under the Hon. Ross Thatcher had a total staff of eight persons. With your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will read them. It's only eight, so it won't take long.

Executive Council, Premier's Office. (Mr. Deputy Speaker, you can see this is an old document. It came out of the Premier's office not too many years ago, maybe 10. So he has people that like to send material over to our side. We thank him very much.) Personnel: M.A.D. (I want you to listen very carefully. This man had three positions.) Cabinet Secretary, Clerk of the Executive Council, executive assistant. Total salary of \$8,650.

D.H. . . . special assistant, \$7,622.

K.J. . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Your name is coming. K.J. Sunquist, special assistant, \$7,341.70; Muriel DeCruyenaere, secretary to the premier, \$6,768; Marlene Middleton, clerk-secretary, \$4,512; Marlene Lerat, clerk-steno 2, \$4,512; Donna Kwinlaug, \$3,756; Jean Barnard, clerk, \$3,756.

The total salary, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of Ross Thatcher's Executive Council was \$46,919.

Now, when I go on to compare, I want you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the members of this legislature to keep in mind the figure \$47,000. Mind you, many of the staff of eight filled more than one position. Remember those figures I read and the names; they filled more than one position. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the total salaries of the Executive Council, Premier's Office — remember \$47,000. And remember this is based on 1971 dollars.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we now will look at the holier-than-thou Blakeney Executive Council, Premier's Office personnel and salaries as of May 4, 1972. First, we find . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now I see the member from Quill Lakes is starting to get nervous now. He's getting very nervous, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And he's got a reason to be nervous. First, we find that in addition to the usual Executive Council, Premier's Office staff, which by the way has grown from eight persons under Thatcher to 17 persons under Blakeney, we now find in 1972, also, Mr. Speaker, also, a planning and research branch of the Executive Council, with a staff of 12 persons, for a total of 29 persons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here comes the real . . . (inaudible) . . . The total salaries of the Executive Council, Premier's Office, as of May 4, 1972 was not \$47,000. It was \$307,316. And they have the . . . (inaudible) . . . to stand over there this last few months and say what we've been doing is too much spending. Now what is the proportion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and members of this legislature, if we figure out

46,000 to a jump of the Executive Council of \$396,000; 307,000, sorry.

Now, I think it's only fair, seeing that I read off the names of the Thatcher Executive Council, that we read off a few of the Executive Council, Premier's Office. First, J.F. Kinzel, clerk of the Executive Council. Now, how many of us know J.F. Kinzel? Total salary of \$17,000. Clare V. Powell, \$10,812; G.A. Wilson, cabinet secretary, \$14,500. Now let's do some comparison here. These first three names that I've mentioned come to \$43,000, and those three positions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, took place of the one position under Ross Thatcher of \$8,652. One man, de Rosenroll did all three positions, and he replaced them with three of 43,000. So, I don't think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we should be hearing from those people opposite about the extravagance of our government.

Let's reminisce a little more. Let's, let's reminisce a little more. D.G. McMillan, special assistant to the premier, 8,000. I'll go through these fairly quickly. Brian H. Coulter, special assistant to the premier, 10,500. Oh, oh! We won't jump this one, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker. M.J. Koskie, crown solicitor 3 to the Executive Council, \$18,888 — the highest-priced hack in the whole government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member from, the, this gentleman, Mr. M.J. Koskie, which I think you people know who he is, received just exactly half of what the entire Executive Council salary under, under Ross Thatcher was.

Ian P. Phillips, special assistant to the premier, 8,800-and some dollars; Graham Barker, 10,000; Graham Forstad, research officer, 7,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You sure did. K.J. Carriere, 6,000; Florence Wilkie, secretary to the premier, 8,000; Keith Kasick, \$6,450. I'm giving you some approximate on these, Mr. Speaker, to get through this quicker. Myrtle D. Harrop, V. Ann Gardiner, both getting 6,450; Doreen Dwernychuk, 5,448; Margaret Heinrich, clerk-steno 4, 5,724. That name will ring a bell out in Davidson. Jean C. Barnard, \$4,248.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to mention this name, Jean C. Barnard, because that is the only name that appeared under Ross Thatcher. So, therefore, everyone in the Executive Council were fired, except Jean Barnard — everyone — slashed, fired. The holier-than-thou, Mr. Deputy Speaker, fired them all because there's only one name that appears in the Executive Council under Ross, under the past premier — only one name, Jean Barnard. And I didn't, Mr. Deputy Speaker, notice M.J. Koskie up under Executive Council before, either.

Then they added another department, planning and research branch of the Executive Council. Hubert Prefontaine, \$25,000. Now, you people remember a couple of weeks ago I mentioned the name Prefontaine. He was the man who wrote the letter to Smishek and Romanow and Tchorzewski about the water; he's the man that had all the recommendations. We, we had tabled some information about him here a couple of weeks ago.

Saddlemeyer, secretary advisor, \$18,000; Dr. Gartner, \$21,000; Gene Darychuk, 15,000; David Abbey, \$7,000; Richard Hill, \$13,000; John McNeil, 9,000; Edward J. Reed, 10,000; Sylvia Ruth Baker, 7,000. A little note at the bottom — that's a total of \$307,000. Now they have a note on the bottom here. 'Note: estimate for 1973 indicates the planning and research branch will spend \$267,980 and employ 14 more persons.' So they're jumping from 152 to 267 from '72 to '73. It would be very interesting, wouldn't it . . . Mr., Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to table this one here and



send one copy over to M.J. Koskie right now, please, the member from Quill Lakes. Then he can look and read for himself. Just table this one, and this one over to Mr. . . . the member from Quill Lakes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have one more piece of information that I want to quickly go through. This is very interesting. I won't spend too much time on it. But it shows in 1971 that there was a total of 18,647 civil servants in the province of Saskatchewan. It shows in 1982 there's 28,805. The increase each year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, starts out with 874 and it keeps working down to 10,158. The figure I want to bring to you is what these 10,158 people cost the province of Saskatchewan. But, before I do so, I want to make it very clear that I am not condemning any civil servant that this happens to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll finish the story, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I'm ready.

What I'm saying Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any civil servant that I'm mentioning here, it is not their fault that the past government created a civil service of 10,000-some more people. What they should have done, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those 10,000 people is gave them a job with productivity, because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Allan Blakeney in the '71 election said that Ross Thatcher had too many civil servants — too many. So why did he create 10,158 more? He thought, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by creating this civil service it would keep him in power forever. But it didn't work, they turned him out to pasture.

The total salaries for the month of December in 1982 for these people, the extra 10,158 people, come out to \$108,426,953. If you times that by 12, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you come up with \$1.3 billion. Now that is exactly what this past government has spent for those 10,158 people. That would take care of our deficit budgets for the next three year s- \$1.3 billion. Now they're going to say to me, 'Well it wasn't wasted because we created a job.'

I want to take you to a conversation that I had with the past minister of agriculture, the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy, in the cafeteria, where he stated to me, where he stated to me that if you have five people that need a job . . . you need a job for five people and you can take five more off welfare, create that job, you've done a good thing. All you've done is taught 10 people not how to work. And I'm sure the people of Saskatchewan will agree.

What that past government needed to have done, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was to find a job that would give productivity to the province of Saskatchewan. It's sure easy to see, Mr. Speaker, why the member for Quill Lakes just about wasn't here at all.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to have one more remark. I just want to make a comment of the dollars and cents that this budget allocated to my constituency of Arm River - \$3,978,400. I'm only going to make mention of one which I was very glad to see. Under Social Services — construction of residential care facilities, 12 new beds plus renovations at Outlook.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in closing, my last comment is this: that this world is in a very tenuous situation. We're in a troubled, troubled times. The economy is low. I just want to state that I agree with President Reagan, in a statement that he said some three weeks ago, that our answers to all these problems are in the Scriptures, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that's why I'm proud to be in this government serving under the Premier Grant Devine, who stated that God is first, the family second, and politics third. It is a pleasure to serve under Premier Grant Devine.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will not be supporting the amendment and it will be a pleasure supporting the budget. Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — I move this House do now adjourn.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:57 p.m.