

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 8, 1983**

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of the House a group of Girl Guides from the no. 1 company at the St. Mary's Anglican Church. I introduce them on behalf of my colleague, the member for Regina Centre, Mr. Shillington, who was not able to be here at this time. The group is eight or nine in number. They are accompanied by Sylvia Panchuk, who is one of the guide leaders. They propose to be with us during the question period and then to have a tour of the building. I look forward to an opportunity to meet with them at 10:30. I'm sure all hon. members will wish to join with me in welcoming them to the legislature.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**Funding for Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies**

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Social Services. I would like the minister to confirm or deny for me the statement that I have been hearing that the SAGSSA organization, or the Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies, have had their funding cut as of yesterday, from 108,000 last year to 13,000 this year.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the member's question, it is true that the funding mechanism to the association of SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies) has been changed. I would like to point out to this Assembly, and to the people of this province, that the funding that was set up out for SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies) was most unusual in that their membership did not pay one cent to belong to the organization. The organization received its total amount of dollars from the government. And I guess one of the questions that it brings to my mind is: who was it accountable to? The government? Or the membership that it supposedly represents, who has no financial responsibility to the association whatsoever?

The funding approach has been reorganized, and we believe that in the reorganization — and there is a phasing-out period of three months for the association — we have also recognized the funding of dollars to the member organizations to belong to SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies) if they choose to. And we will recognize it in that manner. Ultimately, it can only strengthen the relationship between the membership and between SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies), and that is the ultimate objective.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. On the night of the budget last week, the president of the SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies) organization was quoted as saying:

Most of the 200 non-governmental organizations in Saskatchewan received the bulk of their operating money from Social Services, community services branch, which has had the budget cut of at least \$809,000,' Kathy Wasmann said. 'These cuts have been camouflaged in the shifting of department moneys in the dismantling of Northern Saskatchewan and the creation of a new Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat,' Wasmann said.

Will the minister not admit that the reason this group is being cut, having their budget slashed, done away with, is because of the position they took in criticizing this government, and it is not a notice to all NGOs in the province that if you criticize this government, a week later you have your funding cut. Is that not true?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, the member's question really doesn't make any sense, particularly when he specifically relates to the president of SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies), who also operates a transition home. There's been no cut there. They are going to receive, in fact, a 7 per cent increase within the guide-lines. Now, how you can suggest for a moment that the changing the funding mechanism has to do with what the organization itself is saying just indicates to me how narrow your scope of thinking really is.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — You know, there's some advantages to being a new government. It gives you an opportunity to sit down and to look at what is there, to evaluate, to re-evaluate, and to determine where one is going in the future. And I suggest that had not been done too often in the last 11 years. The membership of SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies) — and I want to remind you that only approximately half of the membership that SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Service Agencies) claims to have, belong to Social Services. I don't know where the other 50 per cent come from, of those agencies, but they do not directly get funding from the Department of Social Services.

We have concluded that in order to have the accountability, and through that organization must work for it. But the membership must determine the role and the objectives, and they can only do that if there is some financial responsibility and accountability. It has nothing to do with whatever you have dreamt up.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Minister of Social Services. I think that she may convince her colleagues in this House that that is the case, but she'll have a much more difficult time convincing the non-governmental organizations that that is the reason why the group that has represented them to the government . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The member is stating his opinion but is not asking a question. This is question period and I would ask you to get directly to your question.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, in prefacing my question, I was replying to

opinions from the Minister of Social Services, and my question to her is whether or not the cutting of funding from \$108,000 to 13 is not an attack on a group who represented over a hundred NGOs in this province to obtain money from your department, and is it not true that you are attempting to do away with that lobby simply by cutting funding to the main group who has been lobbying you?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — No, Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. Is it true that the Regent Court Tenants' Association were given notice yesterday that their funding has been terminated completely?

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Yes, this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Perhaps the member from Quill Lake would like to answer the question. Mr. Speaker, it is true that there has been some modifications within the NGO sector and the funding within the Department of Social Services.

**An Hon. Member:** — Tory cuts. Tory cut-backs.

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — I swear you guys would have made better dressmakers than opposition — cut, cut.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — If you would be patient and wait for my reply to the budget debate today, you will find that along with Regent Court tenant, they've been asked to amalgamate, and the service taken over with another group that has had its funding doubled.

### **Mediation Diversion Program**

**Mr. Koskie:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General, the Minister of Justice, I believe, or some time in the future, and that's in respect to the slashing and the elimination of the mediation diversion program. In view of the fact that the program was completely discontinued, or at least the funding was, can the Attorney-General explain why his department referred 10 cases to the mediation diversion program on March 20, the day of the budget, when obviously the decision had already been made to eliminate the funds for the program?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well, I can simply indicate to the hon. member that because of the rather tight security on the budget, for obvious reasons, no departments knew exactly what final decisions were to be made until the time of the budget and, as a consequence, the announcement was made in the budget.

**Mr. Koskie:** — A supplementary question to the Attorney-General. As the Attorney-General will be aware, and the comments of the executive director of the John Howard mediation diversion program, that at the time that the announcement of the slash of the budget, the elimination of the budget, that there were 39 open cases on file in Regina, and just about equally the same number in Moose Jaw. Why wouldn't the Attorney-General at least allow this organization to have enough sufficient funding to deal with the cases that were already in progress, and will he consider that?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well, I would be prepared to take a look at it. I'm not so sure that the

problem is as severe as the hon. member indicates. I think that the mediation diversion program was an experimental program started approximately in 1976. At the time of the commencement of the mediation diversion project, there was ample evidence to show that the John Howard Society was advised that they would have to arrange their own funding to continue the project, and that reminder was given by the opposition, the former government. And, Mr. Speaker, in 1979, 1980, 1981, the reminders were given too. It was continued as an experimental project in two cities, Regina and Moose Jaw, and I think the hon. members opposite should be reminded, Mr. Speaker, that in fact, the previous government never took it out of the experimental stage because it had the same reservations that others did, including the federal government as to the cost-effectiveness of the program.

There seems little doubt that the cost of the program cost considerably more than going through the normal court process, that it was not cheaper, notwithstanding the allegations of the members opposite. I'm frankly a little bit surprised that with the evidence before the previous government, that it did not make the decision either to expand it province-wide at a much higher cost, or make the difficult decision to bell the cat. In fact, a responsible government would have done that, and a responsible government has done that, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Koskie:** — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I take it the Attorney-General has indicated that he made a review of the cost-effectiveness of the program. I would like to ask him whether he found that the cost-effectiveness of the mediation diversion program was more effective than sending people to jail, and the cost.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well, I'm a little reluctant, Mr. Speaker, to give a full lecture on the criminal law or criminal sentencing to the hon. member opposite. Some of us have had some legal experience and are somewhat familiar with the sentencing and, in fact, most, most first offenders of relatively minor offences which would be within the purview of the mediation diversion in fact receive what are called absolute discharges or conditional discharges under the court system and in fact didn't go to jail, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Some did.

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I suggest that in all likelihood they were not within the purview of the mediation diversion, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is showing a surprising lack of understanding of the criminal sentencing process.

**Mr. Koskie:** — A question, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer the Attorney-General to a release here, 'Jail Population at Record Levels.' It indicates that there are 18 per cent increase in the number of inmates in the provincial correctional centres at the end of January, compared to 1982. I would like to ask the Attorney-General: could he detail the program which he indicated that he was looking at that would, in fact, replace the John Howard type of program and reduce the number of inmates in our jails?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the member is articulating the opposition's policy about releasing inmates from the jails merely to reduce inmate population. I think that has some obvious inherent dangers, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not a

subscriber to the blanket release of prisoners as the hon. member is. There's no doubt the question of sentencing alternatives is one of ongoing review by the government, Mr. Speaker. There are many areas that have to be looked at.

One of the major increases, as a matter of fact, in the number of inmates in correctional centres result from drunk and impaired driving. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to address very seriously alternate penalties. Certainly the consideration of the white paper on The Vehicles Act is one area in that, and there's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to look at many other areas, and we will have to review that from time to time as the effectiveness of programs wanes.

Secondly, we have to address very seriously, and my officials have started to address for the first time, Mr. Speaker, alternative sentencing for the native population, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, under the existing system which we inherited from the previous government it has become a right of passage for many of our native youths to go to correctional centres. That is obviously not a desirable approach, nor do I suspect any members support a system that allows that to happen. The answers are not going to be easy. We are going to have to experiment, Mr. Speaker, for the first time we are addressing that problem. We don't have the answers yet. I suspect we will never have the final answers to the problems, Mr. Speaker, but at least we are addressing the very serious problem.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **First Ministers' Conference on Native Rights**

**Mr. Yew:** — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Attorney-General concerning last month's first minister's conference on native rights. At that conference your government, along with the governments of most of the provinces, agreed to introduce a resolution in the legislatures confirming the agreement reached by the provinces, the federal government and Canada's native leaders.

My question is, Mr. Speaker: when can we expect to see this important resolution introduced here in the Saskatchewan legislature?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I don't want to give a dissertation on the rules as to debating that during the formal budget debate. Mr. Speaker, I can leave that for others to brief the hon. member.

However, the commitment that I made publicly is that this very important resolution would be introduced, and I'm hopeful that it will be passed, certainly well within the deadline, which was the end of 1983. It is our full intention to do that, and we will introduce the resolution at a very appropriate time.

**Mr. Yew:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I assume that the aim of the government and the minister is to achieve unanimous approval for this important resolution prior to its introduction in the House. Because of that desire then, and because of the basic question of native rights that should go beyond partisan politics, would you agree to discuss the working of this important resolution with the opposition, in advance of its introduction in the House?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I would certainly be prepared to discuss it with the official opposition. I sympathize with what the hon. member said: that it should be a non-

partisan statement. I hope that the opposition would give the commitment as well that they will approach it on that basis and realize that constitutional change should be drafted within the framework of the intent of the change, and that it does not become a major policy statement or a general nebulous statement — that in fact we do make the constitutional changes agreed upon by the first ministers. If that framework exists from all parties, I'm more than pleased to discuss it prior to presentation to the Assembly.

### **Sale of Drag-Line by SPC**

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Some days ago, I raised with him the question of the sale of a drag-line to Manalta Coal Ltd. And asked him at that time whether or not to his knowledge the Saskatchewan Power Corporation or some other agency of the Government of Saskatchewan had guaranteed the debts of Manalta in connection with the purchase of the drag-line. The minister undertook to ascertain the information and I ask him today whether or not SPC or some other agency of the Government of Saskatchewan has guaranteed the debt of Manalta.

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I had been holding back. I did have the information, but I was awaiting the final result as far as the sale of the note, to be able to give you the whole answer. But however on the drag-line itself, the potash corporation . . . or the power corporation has backed the note along with a guarantee from the province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. The minister has told us that the Government of Saskatchewan and SPC has guaranteed Manalta's debt. Is this a general policy of guarantees, Mr. Minister, or is this guarantee available only to business associates of the government opposite?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Speaker, we did it so that we could obtain the lowest possible rate of interest and we have nothing to lose if they go into default. We will get everything back that we had done in the first place. And we have not given anything away except get a better rate for the note that we have . . . (inaudible) . . .

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the minister's opinion, but as to facts, is it not true that Manalta has bought a drag-line, has paid none of its own money, has borrowed the money from somebody else, and the Government of Saskatchewan has guaranteed the debt, so that Manalta has taken absolutely no risk in the purchase of a drag-line and the Government of Saskatchewan has taken all the risk?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Speaker, that is totally inaccurate. In the deal that we have made with Manalta, we are going to be saving \$500,000 a year in the amount of the coal that we're buying from them, and over a period of time that adds up to \$13 million that the people of the province will have saved.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the minister's opinions are interesting, but aren't these the facts: one, you sold a drag-line; two, that Manalta put up no money; three, Manalta borrowed the money; and four, you guaranteed Manalta's debt? Is that not true?

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Speaker, and number five, we have saved \$13 million.

I'm not sure how Manalta is getting their money. All I know is that we, as a corporation, are getting a loan for \$45 million at the lowest possible rate, that we'll get paid back — we'll have it for a dollar after our time of the agreement. If the agreement goes into default we get the mines, we get the drag-line and everything back.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### Ministerial Staffs

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister of industry and commerce. And I have, Mr. Minister, a document, which I think is available to our cabinet ministers generally and to other people in the government, simply giving the name of ministers and their staffs about the government. It's dated March 21st and . . . I give, for example, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. Mr. McLeod's name is listed and his executive assistants and staff are listed as a Mr. Jerry White, EA; and a Mr. Dan Stephens, special assistant; Mr. Gordon Sonmore, executive assistant, DT and RR; Mr. Pat Jarrett, executive assistant, constituency.

I direct this question to the minister of industry and commerce, and his list reads as follows: Dorothy Sollosy, EA, communications; Margo Fries, EA, SGI and constituency; Ron Dedman, EA, CIC and SGI; H. Rick Parken, EA, Sedco and I&C; and Al Nicholson, special assistant, Canadian Pioneer Management. Would the minister advise me what Mr. Al Nicholson, special assistant for Canadian Pioneer Management does, and what is he paid?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — Mr. Speaker, it's not what he does, it's what he did. He's been terminated for some time, and he was on board early on a per diem when I needed him for certain functions.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Well known that the Lyon government had very close links with Great-West Life, and they used to exchange staff on a regular basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, please. I believe that the hon. member is on his feet to ask a question, and I don't believe that what the Lyon government is doing has any concern here in this House, and I would ask the member to stay with the subject here.

**Hon. Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister of industry and commerce. In view of the fact that the Manitoba government, the previous Manitoba government, adopted a practice of recruiting staff from the Great-West Life, are you now adopting a practice of recruiting staff from Pioneer Life, and exchanging staff and hiring their staff on a per diem basis?

**Hon. Mr. Rousseau:** — Mr. Speaker, we hope to have many ties with Saskatchewan business people. They are the backbone of this province — they and the farmers of this country — but, Mr. Speaker, to answer his question: Mr. Nicholson, as I said earlier, was on contract to me to assist my department in organization, and I make no apologies for that. He did an excellent job. He was there when I needed him for part-time. His contract has been terminated. I can't remember if you asked the terms of the contract. I don't have them in front of me, but I would hope that we could use many people from the business sector to assist this government where we might need them and use them on consultant basis or in contractual basis, because I believe that most of them, and many

of them are very competent people. And I would say that this government would make no apologies for that at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **MOTION**

### **Leaves of Absence for MLAs**

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I would move, by leave of the Legislative Assembly, seconded by the Minister of Health:

That leave of absences be granted to the hon. members from Athabasca, Redberry, Saskatoon Nutana from April 11th to April 15th, 1983, to attend on behalf of this Assembly the Second Commonwealth Conference of Delegated Legislative Committees.

Motion agreed to.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **SPECIAL ORDER**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

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

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

**Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, for 19 years the people of this province and of this country have suffered under the expansionist, under the interventionist policies of a Liberal government in Ottawa. And I was very pleased to hear yesterday that the results of the latest poll, national poll, indicate that 50 per cent of the people of Canada would choose a Progressive Conservative government in the future. And so I'm very happy to hear . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dirks:** — . . . I'm very happy to hear, Mr. Speaker, that the next budget which the people of Canada will have will be a Progressive Conservative budget, not a Trudeau Liberal budget.

And for the last 11 years, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province have suffered under the socialist, under the interventionist, under the big-government budgets of the socialists here in this province, the New Democratic Party. And so, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province, the people of Regina Rosemont, are asking me, and are asking all of us in this Assembly: are we going to suffer again with another expansionist, interventionist, socialist budget? And I am happy to tell the people of this province today that the budget that is before us is not a Liberal budget, it's not a socialist budget, it is a Progressive Conservative budget. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that this will be the



first of, undoubtedly, a long, unbroken line of Progressive Conservative budgets.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dirks:** — Mr. Speaker, the days of socialism in this province are fading into the distant past — a past better forgotten than remembered — but unfortunately the scars and the wounds of socialism remain with us today. And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what is this legacy of socialism that is still with us? The legacy of socialism, Mr. Speaker, is as follows: it's a legacy of a million children who had to turn their back on this province in search of jobs and in search of income, in search of a future somewhere else. That is the legacy of socialism. It is a legacy of an ever-growing government bureaucracy which was fuelled, Mr. Speaker, by the egomania of the socialist political masters whose guiding dictum for this province was, 'Bigger government is better government.'

The socialist legacy was 1 million acres of farmland turned over to the government, not turned over to the farmers of this province. The socialist legacy was an economic climate, Mr. Speaker, which dulled the spirit of entrepreneurship, which stifled private enterprise, which drove business away. That, Mr. Speaker, is a black legacy, a shameful legacy in my estimation, a harmful legacy, and I am happy that that legacy will not be repeated under this administration.

So bankrupt was the former administration, Mr. Speaker, that they did not even have the good common sense to put away some funds during those heady days in the 1970s when the economy was booming for the rainy days that have come upon the economic scene world-wide and here in Canada. No, Mr. Speaker, the socialist budgets of the past decade were a disgraceful litany of spending binge after spending binge. And I am happy, therefore, to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Progressive Conservative budget that we have in front of us is therefore a welcome sight. It is water in a dry land finally, Mr. Speaker. And if I might indulge us all, Mr. Speaker, in this springtime era that we have come into, this budget is a spring flower bursting with the blue and orange hues of Progressive Conservative idealism, of Progressive Conservative policies, and of Progressive Conservative action.

Consider with me, Mr. Speaker, if you will, what it is that sets this budget apart from the budgets of the past 10 or 11 years. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative budget demonstrates that this government, the government of Grant Devine, not only speaks about fiscal prudence, not only talks about the wise expenditure of tax dollars, not only talks about running a tight, lean ship, about controlling the growth of government — we not only talk, Mr. Speaker, but we deliver, we take action, and not the kind of action of the former administration. And I want to tell the people of this province and the people of this Assembly, under the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Regina Elphinstone, the Government of Saskatchewan grew from 18,647 civil servants in 1971 to 29,860 civil servants in 1982 — from 18,000 to 30,000 civil servants in 10 years. That Mr. Speaker, is an increase of sixty-six and two-thirds per cent in 10 years. In 10 years our government, in the province of Saskatchewan, grew by 66 per cent? Did we increase from approximately one million to one, million, six hundred thousand in the last 10 years? We did not, Mr. Speaker; we certainly did not.

Well, why then, did this socialist government increase the size of the civil service by approximately 12,000? I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because the former government and the members of the opposition today are convinced that more government, that

bigger government, that larger government is the solution to all of society's ills: more crown corporations, more control, more regulation, more intervention, more direction.

It is, of course, a sad delusion, a dream world, shattered of course, on April 26th, 1982, and we would naturally expect that that is what would happen. It would be shattered, for the people of this province had the good common sense to realize that the Liberal government in Ottawa, and the former NDP government here in this province, when they provided big government for this province, they did not provide good government, for more government and bigger government and larger government does not ipso facto produce good government for the people of this province. And I suspect that if you were to conduct a census of all of the residents of Saskatchewan, they would raise their voices in one unanimous cry that would roll across the plains and valleys of this fair province and reach into this building and into this Assembly and cry to each one of us — enough is enough, stop the growth of government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that we have done. That we have done. The size of the civil service here in Saskatchewan now stands at 28,310 positions. That is a reduction, Mr. Speaker, of 1,550 from the number of positions under the NDP administration, a reduction of 5 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and I want to stress that the quality of service in Saskatchewan has not been reduced one iota with the reduction of the size of government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It has been increased. Consider, if you will, some statistics from the Department of Health.

In the last year the prescription drug plan: a 9 per cent increase in prescription claims processed per employee in 1982-83 over 1981-82, and a further 10 per cent increase in efficiency is projected for the next year; a 5 per cent increase in claims processed per employee in the medial care insurance commission, and a 7.4 per cent, million saving due to a more thorough assessment processing in reviewing claims. And I could list many more examples of increased productivity.

Mr. Speaker, what about the overall growth in government expenditures? Does this budget reveal an increase on the order of 16 per cent which is what the NDP administration in Manitoba has just brought down? Does it indicate an increase in the order of, say, 12 per cent, or 10 per cent, or perhaps just 8 per cent? No, Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of increase in government spending here in Saskatchewan in 1983-84 is in the order of less than 7 per cent. Mr. Speaker, it took a Progressive Conservative government to get spending under control in this province.

And I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker. I want the people of this province to understand this very clearly. A socialist government, an NDP government, a government led by the Leader of the Opposition, or any other self-appointed messiah who's waiting in the wings, will never, ever, be able to bring government spending under control. These are the hard cold facts about the NDP party in Saskatchewan. And we shouldn't be surprised by this revelation. Call them what you want: the old CCF; call it democratic socialism; the NDP — it's all the same. Big government is their panacea. But unfortunately, more often than not, big government and the ever-escalating costs of big government are not a panacea. They are, rather, a menace, a millstone about the neck of society. Take a look at what has happened in France. The socialist government there has so destroyed the economic climate in France, that today the people of France cannot travel outside of their own country and take more than a few hundred dollars with them.

Look at the NDP in Manitoba. Their spending increased in the order of 16 per cent, their

deficit in the order of almost \$600 million. Big government is indeed the sad legacy of the NDP in Saskatchewan.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, with the dawning of the Devine years here in Saskatchewan, with the advent of the Progressive Conservative government, this malignancy of big government has finally been arrested.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, is an example of what the Progressive Conservative government will do. It is an example of a government that cares about the economic dreams of people, which attempts to shelter them from the economic calamities that they may experience; a budget which attempts to assist their level of disposable income, which provides effective health care, which provides them with the opportunities for further education in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP, in their fanatical drive to regain power, are fond of attempting to paint the Progressive Conservative Party as a bunch of fanatic, uncaring, right-wing ideologues whose mania for free enterprise blinds them to the real needs of people. I'm sure the member for Regina Centre would love to caricature the Devine government as a crowd of hot-headed capitalists who rape the resources of the land, and who sell out to the multinationals, who discriminate against minorities, and who ignore the downtrodden, all in the name of their sacred password: profit.

Well, Mr. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Member from Regina Centre, you know and I know that that kind of trick just doesn't work. For you see, an uncaring government doesn't provide mortgage assistance to people when they really need it. But come to think of it, I don't ever recall the NDP coming to the aid of 30,000 Saskatchewan residents hard hit by high interest rates.

**An Hon. Member:** — 39,000.

**Mr. Dirks:** — 39,000, pardon me. And an uncaring government doesn't lower the taxes for its citizens so that they can have more disposable income. But come to think of it, I don't ever recall the NDP doing away with the gas tax when they were in power and had the opportunity to do so. In fact, they increased the gas tax.

And an uncaring government doesn't provide low-interest loans to young farmers to start family farms. But come to think of it, I don't recall the NDP ever helping hundreds and hundreds of farmers to buy their own family farm.

And an uncaring government doesn't canvass the province to ascertain the water needs of Saskatchewan's communities, and doesn't establish a crown corporation to help meet the water needs of such communities. But come to think of it, I don't recall the NDP ever talking too much about the water needs of the communities of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, an uncaring government doesn't increase the overall Health budget, the Education budget, the Social Service budget by 10 per cent; it doesn't increase the spaces in technical schools by 60 per cent; it doesn't provide a \$2.7 million opportunity for youth summer employment. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that this new Progressive Conservative government has done all of these things, and it has done more, in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1982, and not that long ago in P.A.-Duck Lake, the people of Saskatchewan indicated very clearly that they did not, and they do not, buy the myth

that this Progressive Conservative government is uncaring, heartless, cruel, as the opposition would suggest. And I'm not surprised that they haven't bought this myth, because the policies and programs of this government have indeed been a resounding success. Now, the members of the opposition can call it what they want; call it Reaganomics; call it Devine-omics; call it even Dirks-omics, if you want to. Call it what you will; it will make no difference. The fact of the matter is this is a Progressive Conservative budget, a budget which demonstrates fiscal prudence, which attempts as much as possible to shield those citizens that need help from the ravages of unfortunate economic or social conditions. It's a budget which chooses to deficit finance instead of placing onerous tax burdens on the people of Saskatchewan. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to be able to support this budget, to speak against the amendment, and to urge all hon. members to do the same. Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to enter into the budget debate today. I would not be totally honest if I did not add it is also with some disbelief and some regret: disbelief and regret in the misleading criticisms from the opposition, and that leads to regret.

This is also the first time that I have had a chance to publicly welcome and congratulate the member from P.A.-Duck Lake. Today, I take that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister of Finance, the member for Kindersley. His ability to accept some of the past, to recognize the problems of the present, and to plan for the future, are all indicated in that budget. Perhaps the many statements that have been made through the various outlets of the media have said it best, and I would like to take some time, and I know some of them have been stated, but they probably deserve restating.

One had said:

In drafting his first full-fledged budget, the finance minister appears to have come up with a rational blueprint for the province's economy.

Another one went on to say, 'The emphasis on job creation is essential and welcome.'

Another one, an economist from the University of Regina, said:

Overall, it is a sensible budget. There are certain things that are interesting in this budget. One is the emphasis on the economic development. Another one is in the way which they have used the heritage fund. That is the thing that impresses me about this. I would rather suspect if it had been an NDP budget, that heritage fund would have been kept with the crown corporations, used to promote their activity, and here we are seeing the heritage fund being used for other kinds of capital projects, to support research and development and to support expansion of agriculture and the assistance in agriculture.

Another one said of this government in the budget:

In the area of health and social services, the government has demonstrated it

is capable of taking a moderate approach. There is a very substantial increase in the amount of funds being allocated to education, but at the same time, given the employment situation, given the fact that the highest rate of unemployment is amongst our young people, who don't have any skills at all, the education element in the budget makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Speaker, those perhaps say it all. For the majority of people in my constituency, the budget is a fair one. Our constituency is city boundaries only, but we do not live in isolation of the rural areas that surround us. The recognition of agriculture in the budget is welcomed in Swift Current. We are a trading centre for the South-west, and the nine-point job creation program gives us optimism for our future. It is also welcoming news to the business community of Swift Current.

We also welcome, Mr. Speaker, the news of expansion of our technical training system. Many of our young residents in the past have been forced into leaving our province and going west when seeking post-secondary training. The future indeed does look bright for us.

Mr. Speaker, today, in keeping with the tradition, the majority of my remarks will be on the Department of Social Services. But before I address in that particular area, I would like to briefly comment on one aspect of the government reorganization, and as it relates to my department.

Now before stating the positive side of this move, let me first deal with the criticisms that have been put forth by the former minister of social services, the member from Shaunavon. The first criticism that he had to say was:

This move reflects very poorly on the minister and the department. They can't handle it. It shows a lack of confidence in the minister.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to this Assembly that the attack on the personality and the attack on the civil servants and their function, as opposed to the issue, is cheap, petty and the crassest of politics, that the member for Shaunavon has lowered himself to and cannot take the time to sit in the House and hear it.

These comments, Mr. Speaker, reveal a basic insecurity, and I must admit, if I had less than 50 per cent of the vote out of his constituency that he has, I too might be insecure.

There is also more than a hint of arrogance on his part. Perhaps that is why these changes, as necessary and as obvious as they were, were not made while he was minister of social services. The desire to protect one's own territory took precedence over efficiency and the needs of the people.

Our Premier has clearly outlined the objectives of the reorganization, and I am confident these objectives will be realized. There will be improved productivity and overall effectiveness. There will be greater accountability and better public access, and it will take time, but planning for long-term, permanent solutions is this government's goal which was quick-fix band-aid approach. The need for better co-ordination and joint planning by hospitals, nursing homes and community-based programs such as home care was a long-standing one. The urgency of this need intensified in the face of an expanding elderly population and growing pressures on the public.

Mr. Speaker, over the year in the many meetings with boards from level 3, level 4, users of the home care districts, it became obvious as to the level of frustration that those in the community were feeling when it came to dealing with the health issues for the elderly. Their main concern was: how can we better a system that is so large, so immense and so costly, so that the direct service becomes much easier for the person to have access to? That was their main concern.

The bottom line on the transfer of corrections, Mr. Speaker, is that it makes sense to consolidate under one department all the resources required to discharge our province's responsibilities in the justice field. Having corrections in Social Services separated the custodial function from the rest of the justice service delivery system. The result was fragmentation and a disjointed approach to the administration of justice.

Some criticism by the Leader of the Opposition has been raised on corrections going out of Social Services. His concern has been the rehabilitation function will be lost and the community-based programs will be no more. Mr. Speaker, I suggest today that that is totally unfounded. There is only one other province now in the whole of Canada and one territory that has corrections under social services. And yet all the other provinces that have a department of justice or an attorney-general, have the rehabilitative in the community-based programs.

I am told as to some of the history of corrections in Social Services that they have more or less had their bags since 1973, when it was suggested that perhaps there was a better way of doing things. I can only speculate and make some assumptions as to why it didn't happen. Perhaps the minister of social services at that time was more concerned with the quantity of employees and the quantity of dollars as opposed to the quality of the minister himself.

I also have the suspicion that perhaps the attorney-general at that time, because corrections at the best of times is never a popular program, did not want to have the unpopular aspect of any department. Mr. Speaker, we have a minister responsible for the Department of Justice that is willing to accept the unpopular and to make them work.

I have to admit it is not without some regret that I see these programs leave my department, mainly for the reason of the associations that I have been able to make over this past year, with the home care association, with the individual boards themselves, the members that make up those boards and of course with the nursing home, the level 3 and with SASH (Saskatchewan Association of Special-Care Homes), the association that represents the nursing homes.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced the people of this province will be the winners in the long run, and that should be every government's primary goal. If it isn't, they don't deserve to be in government. I am confident that the Minister of Health recognizes the social aspect of long-term care, and what's more, Mr. Speaker, they will find him a person who listens and that is somewhat different than what was with the past administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to having some extra time to spend on some very important program areas in the department which have been badly neglected in the past, such as: social assistance, services to the handicapped, and our community grants program. The former government's approach was to allow Social Services to

develop every which way with little attention paid to factors which should always be considered when the public funds are involved. In order to avoid the difficult task of setting priorities, and the even more difficult one of evaluation, decisions were often made on the basis of political expediency. A change in government, Mr. Speaker, signals a reassessment of priorities and directions, and we have not shirked that responsibility but rather have faced the issues squarely and honestly. The task is an onerous one and it has been complicated by the need for economic restraint. In the final analysis, however, we produced a budget which ensures the continuation of essential programs and services. A solid foundation has also been laid upon which to build a social service system which will be more effective, more accountable, and hopefully more responsive to changing social and economic conditions.

Mr. Speaker, my department's '83-84 budget will provide for the maintenance and strengthening of direct, preventive, and essential services. Our objective is to achieve a balance between the need to preserve and strengthen the safety net aspect of our programs with the limited resources available. The economic realities which dictate that funding for all public programs is restricted and in hard times is reconciled against the need to protect services which are essential to the well-being of individuals and communities.

Support to low-income families under the family income plan will be increased by 7 per cent effective April 1. Provision has also been made for a 7 per cent increase in funds to the foster parent program. Services to the handicapped will be maintained and improved. Our budget provides an increase of 6.5 per cent in moneys available to the sheltered workshop and activity centres, but an overall increase, Mr. Speaker, a 16.4 per cent. New activity centre spaces will be added in those areas of the province where the greatest need exists. In addition, Mr. Speaker, Cosmopolitan Activity Centre in Saskatoon, which acts as the provincial resource centre for mentally handicapped persons, will receive the last half of this government's \$400,000 commitment to their relocation and renovation project.

Mr. Speaker, the early childhood intervention programs will receive an 8.3 per cent increase. This increase will also recognize the greater travel costs that are associated with rural families, as compared to the urbans.

Funding for the supportive living projects will rise by 7 per cent. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing urgency to address the needs of mentally handicapped adults, in terms of residential resources and especially employment opportunities. Our budget will allow for a limited expansion of residential facilities. Kindersley will receive a group home this year and Saskatoon will be expanded in co-operation with Sask Housing.

In the coming year, Mr. Speaker, my department's employment support program will receive a new mandate. This mandate will include a greater emphasis on employment opportunities for people who face severe employment barriers, such as the mentally handicapped. We intend to establish clear terms for a partnership between government and the non-governmental organizations delivering these services. We will also explore ways to expand and enhance the opportunities for the private sector involvement. In consultation with the Saskatchewan Association for the Mentally Retarded, it is agreed that integration into the mainstream of life is a goal that, for far too long, has been put on the back burner.

One of the major goals of the newly mandated program will be to reduce the

dependency of handicapped and other disadvantaged persons on social assistance. We anticipate that the savings in human dignity, personal independency and productive capability will be among the foremost benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this year the Saskatchewan Paraplegic Association and the Voice of the Handicapped will continue to receive government support: \$65,000 to the Saskatchewan Paraplegic Association and approximately 81,000 to the Voice of the Handicapped in '83-84. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, special funds have also been set aside for pilot projects aimed at increasing employment opportunities for physically disabled persons. I will be initiating discussion with the Voice and with the Saskatchewan Paraplegic Association on this matter in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, our budget includes \$171.5 million for social assistance. This represents 21.1 per cent increase over last year. Mr. Speaker, in being realistic, we would have preferred a 21 decrease, but we are just that; we are realistic. There is nothing hidden in this budget.

Also included in this year's budget are funds for a 6.5 per cent increase in the pre-added allowance for social assistance recipients. This increased allowance, which covers food and clothing, recognizes the effects of inflation on these costs.

Mr. Speaker, given the rising welfare caseloads, my department will strengthen its auditing capacity in the social assistance program. By expanding the program's audit capabilities, we will be in a better position to verify applications before payment is made, as opposed to after payment is made.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the rising welfare caseloads have placed severe pressure on my department's overall budget. Social assistance provides for the most basic minimum necessities of life, and there is no question that these needs must be met. From the government's point of view, however, it represents, to a large degree, a very uncontrollable expenditure. We cannot refuse anyone whose eligibility is established.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that welfare costs impact significantly on our ability to respond to needs in other areas. The department is addressing a dependency on social assistance for both a short-term and a long-term perspective. In the short term, our 1983-84 budget demonstrates an ongoing commitment to job creation, with an \$8 million fund under the provincial JOBS program. Combined with the 2.5 million provided to the employment support program, we expect to create between 2,300 and 3,000 new jobs.

Recognizing that many of the problems faced by social assistance clients are not linked exclusively to the tight job market, I had initiated a comprehensive review of the plan in December 1 of 1982. Mr. Speaker, the review will be completed by June of this year, and steps will be taken to improve the plans, overall administration, and alternatives will be considered to reduce the undue dependency.

Mr. Speaker, when one takes a look at the data that has been collected in the various briefs to date, it is absolutely amazing, the system and the bureaucratic system that has been created over the many years. We took a very brief look at the forms that an applicant in going to a regional office would have to fill out. And what we found was there was absolutely no consistency from region to region. We also found that there is 400 to 500 different kinds of forms. We also, when we looked at them, Mr. Speaker,



found that 50 per cent of the workers' time was spent on paperwork, and it was routine and repetitive — nothing on the rehabilitation end. Those are some of the issues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we will be trying to address.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services cannot provide directly all the social services needed in this province over the years. And nor would we want to, because the social fabric, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is made up of the local community from the grass roots up. Over the years, a partnership is developed for the provision of services to people who are disadvantaged, or may face crises situations. This partnership involves the department on one hand and the community-based agencies on the other, and to a very large degree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a very large component of volunteers.

This government is pleased to acknowledge its obligation to share in the delivery of these essential services. Unfortunately, the terms of this joint responsibility were never clearly spelled out in the past, and services were often developed in a haphazard manner. This made for considerable uncertainty on both sides, government on one hand, not always sure of what it was funding and why. I don't think the past government ever asked why it was funding many of them. Community agencies, on the other hand, were very unsure of their funding source and possible support for any new initiatives. While the consequences of this approach, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many have been tolerable for the previous government, it is not to this one.

Last April this government promised to place greater emphasis on accountability. Just as the more stringent accountability standards are expected within government, so are non-government agencies which receive the public funds expected to increase their accountability both in terms of quantity and the quality of services provided. Mr. Speaker, we also made a commitment in looking at public funds to try and ensure that those who needed it the most were going to receive it.

An important component in all of this is the need for agencies to work together to identify ways to ensure that all of the resources available in any one community are utilized and co-ordinated to the greatest extent possible. There is no doubt that most services can be more effectively and efficiently provided at the local level. Nor is there any question that community-based agencies are in a better position to identify and meet many of these needs than is the government. The changes being made are intended to strengthen the community service grant program, as well as to rationalize it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 5.3 million has been allocated in 1983-84 for grants to community agencies. This is in addition to the 5.4 million for groups providing services to the handicapped. Agencies providing the direct preventive and essential services will receive an average increase of 7 per cent, and some of this will be included in transition houses for women and children, the crises services including the sexual assault centre, the preventive services such as the Big Sisters and the Big Brothers association. The family workers program will also see a 7 per cent increase, the youth programs operated by the John Howard Society, and also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the family service bureaus. Our budget, Mr. Speaker, also includes approximately half-a-million dollars for agencies providing trustee services for low-income families, including social assistance recipients.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the high teen-age birth rate in Saskatchewan continues to be of a serious concern, not only to us as a government but to the people in general. This matter is taking on a new dimension because of the increasing number of single teen-

age mothers, approximately 85 per cent, who are choosing to keep their children. In recognition of the special problems and the needs of these young, single-parent families, my department will expand in 1983-84 its teen parent program.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, under this program, which has been in operation on a pilot-project basis in Saskatoon and Regina since 1981, workers made weekly home visits to the young mothers. In addition to helping mothers develop their parenting skills, counselling and a variety of support service related to education, employment and family relations were also provided. Our evaluation of these pilot projects suggests that tangible benefits are to be gained from this service. For example, in terms of education, 50 per cent of the project mothers were continuing with their education at the time of evaluation, compared to 20 per cent of the non-project group.

The interesting thing on the expansion, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is an important change in the way that the service is going to be delivered. Presently, all services are provided directly by government staff. The new program will see the development through long-established community agencies. In this way, the professional resources and the valuable community grass root contact which these agencies possess will be utilized in the delivery of this important service. The scope of the program will also be expanded to include children from birth to three years of age. Presently, the services were restricted under one year of age.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the major concerns of government has been the increasing numbers of single parents, mostly female, that are on social assistance, and while I recognize that there are no single, easy answers, the problem is severe enough that some new initiatives must be taken.

This year we have taken the initiative to look at a program that has been in the Regina community for some time. It is the Contemporary Women's Program, and their funding will be doubled this year. This agency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has an outstanding track record of commitment and success in dealing with single women. Fifty per cent of the women that have taken this program have either gone on to further their education or have moved into the work force. Mr. Speaker, we look forward to see the development of more spaces within that particular program.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the allegations of decreased funding for day care have been stated in this House by members on the opposite side all too often, and they are completely unfounded. The member from Shaunavon talks about a 43 per cent cut in one media, and then in the other media he talks about a 46 per cent cut. The other day I heard the figure, 30 per cent cut.

Comparisons between the 1982-83 budget with the 1983-84 budget are complicated, I admit, by the inclusion of the '83-84 of funds previously allocated under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even when these adjustments are made for the DNS funds, there is an increase of approximately 4.5 per cent in day care funding for 1983-84.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — All that despite the current 10 to 20 per cent vacancy rate in day care centres. We have provided for limited expansion of both centre spaces and family day care homes. But, given the trends towards vacancies, we intend to be very careful in terms of where those new spaces would be located.

My department, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will continue to play a role in meeting the needs of seniors in this province. The senior citizen activity centre program, which includes

centres, will be maintained. Our budget also includes funds for the expansion of the Seniors Assisting Seniors program which presently serves 12 communities on a pilot project basis. This program is being evaluated, and the expansion funds are available pending the outcome of the evaluation.

Mr. Speaker, this year we will be looking at some changes on the Senior Citizens' Provincial Council mandate, with a view to strengthening their advisory function and their grass roots connection. The possibilities of such changes have been discussed with the council, and further discussions will be taking place.

Changes within my department are also being considered which will complement the changes being made to the council's mandate, and I am confident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the overall result will be an improved capacity to deal with senior issues.

We are also committed, both financially and morally, to the support of the Senior Action Now group, and also the Senior Citizens Association of Saskatchewan, which represents a membership of approximately 22,000 people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, has stated why he will not support this budget, and he used a quotation that said:

The moral task of a government is how it treats those who are at the dawn of life — the children; and those who are at the twilight of life — the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life — the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, I find it absolutely insidious, and unbelievable, that the Leader of the Opposition actually believes what he said. He will not support it for those reasons. He firmly believes that while his government was in power, it was the only one that could ever pass a moral test.

Now, I will agree, that the perception was left that, indeed, there was the holier-than-thou ring around the head, when it came to social policy and programs. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I emphasize the word, 'perception.' The perception was there that they looked after the children, the elderly, the women, the sick, and the handicapped. The perception; more like masterful deception. Somebody else said they were masters at smoke and mirrors, not the reality, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Let us look at some home truths on the home front. For example, let's look at the elderly and the sick. Three years preceding this government coming into power, over a three-year period of time, \$1.8 million was allocated for nursing home beds, over a three-year period. The population was getting older, living longer, becoming frailer. The need was there. There was no doubt about that.

In August 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government allocated \$6 million to nursing home beds, in August of 1982. Seven months later, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Health, announced another 4 million into nursing home beds plus, Mr. Deputy Speaker, another 2 million to recognize the very special needs of the very frail, level 4, senior citizen.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — What is the most interesting point in the whole matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the perception. The lack of information that never went to the

public, and let's use . . . For example, in 1978, the letter from the government that was sent — a moratorium on nursing home beds. Tell me about the moral responsibility to the elderly, and the sick, when you put a moratorium on the number of beds.

One year in office, we have a minister in charge of Sask Housing who has presented a new concept of enriched housing for our senior citizens, not creating another bureaucracy to do it, but by utilizing the programs and the services that are already in place. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a Minister of Health who has listened to the senior citizens of this province, and has brought in the beginning of foot care program for those people. Mr. Speaker, we have tried to strengthen the direct service element in this budget to those people that need it most. It doesn't pass the moral test? My question is: whose morals? Morals that dictate — no encouragement, no optimism, only negative comments, doom and gloom. No optimism for people to assert their rights and accept their responsibility. I sat in this House the other day and I listened to the Leader of the Opposition tell me that women need protecting. He still doesn't understand. I don't want protection; just train me in how to protect myself. That's all I ask for.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mrs. Smith:** — Mr. Speaker, the comments from a person — no morals on accountability when dealing with big government. His moral is a big government is the keeper to control at will the needy, the sick and the handicapped. His morals — that at campaign time to harass the old in the nursing homes. I went through it at campaign time. Families phoning and saying, 'Can't something be done? They are scaring my mother, or my father, to death.' I thought that would only happen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a general election. Then we went through a by-election in P.A.-Duck Lake. The same thing. They were in the nursing homes in Prince Albert threatening the elderly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this budget does pass the test on the economic side, the health side, and the education, and above all, it passes the moral test when it comes to the needy, the handicapped, the sick, the children and the elderly. And it is with that, Mr. Speaker, that I will be supporting the motion and the budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is indeed an honour and a pleasure for me today to participate in this budget debate, representing my constituency of Yorkton, in which is situated the best little city in Saskatchewan, which is the city of Yorkton. Yorkton lies in the parkland area, an area that was blessed with some of the finest farmland in this province, and this in turn has given our area an exceptional agricultural base, along with an industrial base which is anchored by two of the largest farm equipment manufacturing companies in the province and, for that matter, in western Canada. We also have a potash industry in the immediate area, which has made us one of the most prosperous areas in this province. And I'm also very proud, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of our constituents, a hard-working group of various ethnic backgrounds, who decided in essence that times were tough, but they kept a stiff upper lip and barrelled ahead in spite of the devastating frost that we experienced last August in that part of the province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague, the member from Kindersley, the Minister of Finance, for his common-sense budget that he presented to the people

of Saskatchewan a week or so ago, a budget that brought relief to the hearts of the population of this province because they no doubt had a feeling that they would be hit with more tax increases, a practice that they had been accustomed to over the last 11 years of NDP rule.

The fact that this government is extremely concerned about the job creation was indicated by his nine-point program which will have tremendous impact on reducing the number of people that are unemployed. We are completely aware of the hardships generated by the lack of work, and can readily sympathize with those who are forced into this undesirable situation. On the other hand though, we can be very, very thankful that our unemployment rate, seasonally adjusted, is at 7.6 per cent and not at the 11.7 per cent or the 14.8 per cent or the 14.9 per cent that the provinces of Ontario, British Columbia and Quebec respectively are faced with. Who would ever believe that these industrialized provinces could be in poorer shape than good old Saskatchewan which is now in the hands of a common-sense government?

On road tax cuts and financial assistance with regards to home-owners has assisted greatly in reducing the cost of living for the people of Saskatchewan, and no doubt was a benefit to those who found themselves unemployed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to speak basically on the three departments that I am responsible for, namely: the Department of Labour, minister in charge of potash corporation, and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. But first of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to give my first impression of my first year in government, especially concerning the effectiveness of the NDP opposition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, never in my born days have I seen such a pessimistic, negative group as our opposition members. The performance reminds me of the bleeding-heart sop opera: tune in again tomorrow, ladies and gentlemen at 2 p.m. for the next episode of 'Bleeding Hearts,' produced, directed and performed by the remains of a former NDP government. It seems to me that they enjoy misery and are suggesting that we all should share in that misery together.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to remind the members opposite that the populace on April 26th, 1982, indicated in no uncertain terms that they had had enough of big government. They wanted it off their backs. They wanted government out of the pocket-books. And they wanted to be individuals again with the opportunity to build and be aggressive, to attain their goals without burdensome government interference. And if they didn't get the message on April 26th, they should have got it on February 21st with the results of the Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election. And I would like, at this time, as I have not had the opportunity, to congratulate Sid Dutchak on his resounding victory. And I know he will contribute much to this Assembly, his constituents and the Progressive Conservative Government of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McLaren:** — We are now in the process of reorganizing the Department of Labour under the able direction of my acting deputy minister, Mr. Peter Grady, who has an extremely relevant background in law, labour relations, business and public service. What we are aiming to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to establish the department as a more streamlined and efficient administrative entity and also to make the department's programs operate in a more effective and balanced fashion. Accordingly, the policy of the Department of Labour must be aimed towards the creation of an environment

which will stimulate business activity as well as towards the protection of the working person. And that is precisely what the department is attempting to do in the spirit of the Saskatchewan: Open for business theme which I am confident will create significant opportunities for new growth and added employment. The statistics show us that we are on the right track.

Needless to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a major thrust in my department is in the area of labour relations. There is a growing public conviction in this country that we can no longer afford the harmful and wasteful consequences of work stoppages and poor labour relations. We have learned that the economy can function smoothly only if our full potential is attained. We literally cannot afford to stop producing and risk losing our markets to our competitors.

I have said this before and I think it bears repeating here: I believe that the key to the kind of labour relations system which most people want calls for a renewed commitment to the principle of labour-management co-operation. The role of government is to make sure we are operating under an even-handed legislative framework which enables both business and labour to achieve their goals, goals which, in a very fundamental sense, are always complementary and very often the same.

There is no doubt that we have reached a stage where we can and must work together to reduce industrial unrest and adapt our collective bargaining system to the new demands of the current age of technology. The labour relations experts in my department understand all this quite clearly. And under the leadership of my director of labour relations, Mr. Garth Leask, who has a solid background and reputation in labour-management relations, they have been given the mandate to pursue the objective of equity and balance in the most practical of terms.

The focus of the labour relations branch will be changing from one of simple, reactive service to one of new pro-active programming, designed to resolve potential labour-management disputes before they assume major proportions, or direct specifically towards improving the labour-management relationship. The staff will be using a variety of proven conciliation, mediation and arbitration techniques which will further these ends. At the same time, the labour relations board will be striving to ensure that the provisions of The Trade Union Act are applied in an effective manner, with sound, reasoned and modern policies, under the chairmanship of Dennis Ball, an experienced and respected labour lawyer.

Another important program involved in the departmental reorganization is labour standards. It has been a priority to establish the program within a separate labour standards division, rather than to continue to combine it with the apprenticeship program. We have been told by employees, by unions and employers alike, that it was a mistake five years ago to merge the apprenticeship and labour standards functions. And these functions of standards and apprenticeship are not compatible in either principle or practice.

The merger has created many operational difficulties: a decline in the level of service, poor public relations and low staff morale. The apprenticeship program has now been transferred to the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower, paving the way for the establishment of a new and separate labour standards division in the Department of Labour. And I am confident, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this step will solve the problems which have developed, and will allow us to administer the labour standards program in a fair, reasonable and effective way.

The occupational health and safety branch is also being reorganized to provide through action now lacking, increase efficiencies, and to correct confused reporting relationships. We are working towards the achievement . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . You see the results, Mr. Member. We are working towards the achievement of a more equitable labour-management perspective in the administration of occupational health and safety programs.

We want to establish a communications thrust with business, under which the Department of Labour would provide as a service to industry the knowledge required to implement effective occupational health and safety programs.

In addition, we are about to reorganize the occupational health council. In the past, the occupational health council was an effective, unused and otherwise dormant body. We propose to equip the occupational council to play a more useful role in advising the government in occupational health matters. The reorganization will recognize the separate identity to the safety services division to acknowledge the importance of gas, electrical, elevator, fire and boiler safety, and we are also working on uniform building standards to ensure that the disabled persons have reasonable access and the use of buildings and facilities throughout this province.

I want you to know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that careful attention is also being paid to the other programs of the Department of Labour. The emerging issue relating to employee pensions has multi-billion-dollar implications for government. Therefore, the pensions branch will be given the mandate to undertake a program of pension policy analysis and development. Our research division is developing a streamlined information program which will provide a rational and credible labour relations data base for use during negotiations by management, labour, conciliators and arbitrators. The program will also serve the information needs of employers as well as investors who require a knowledge of wage structures and working conditions in the province.

Finally, we have beefed up the workers' advocate office to full strength, significantly reducing the backlog of case files, and are considering specific measures and changes which will better serve the clients' needs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are some of our plans for the Department of Labour in the coming year, and this has been a short and sketchy outline of our intentions, but I think it has been complete enough to point up the common theme. All the policies we intend to introduce will emphasize a suitable degree of balance between the interests of employees and the interests of employers. In taking this course we are not only being fair to both groups, but are maximizing the chances of creating a favourable labour environment in which to implement our proposals to develop the Saskatchewan economy. And in this way, the attainment of the government's economic objectives will lead to new life and prosperity for employees, for employers, and for every citizen in this province.

I also will expect to be placing before this Assembly some changes and amendments to The Trade Union Act, which will help both the employees to work in a more harmonious fashion with our employers. And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise this Assembly that we are operating our department on an open-door concept, and I am pleased to say that employees, union leaders, and employers have accepted this policy.

I would like to speak briefly on the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And it is very

interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the present government assumed responsibility for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the inventories in the system were at 1.1 million tonnes, which is very close to the maximum possible inventory. Our storage facilities were full to their maximum, as well as ore stockpiled on the ground.

Obviously, the former government was not watching the international or domestic market trends, otherwise reductions in production would have been made. Because of the decision made by the former government, our government was faced with the very difficult decision to cut production, and therefore lay-offs had to take place. And as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, it is most important for international corporations, whether they are public or private, to be totally up to date on market trends as they affect our industry. And I am sure that it was only coincidental, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that an election was forthcoming. However, this did seem to cloud the thinking of the former government.

I am pleased to report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government has taken positive steps to ensure that better marketing procedures are used by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. And these steps include: the moving of the United States sales office from Atlanta, Georgia to Chicago, Illinois, which is right in the middle of our market area, the creation of employee sales incentive programs, rather than salaries. A salesman could sit in his office, draw his salary, and not sell one ounce of potash, in the previous system. The reorganization of the entire sales force also took place. And I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that because of the positive action that we have taken in the domestic market with our sales force and aggressive selling by Canpotex, our offshore market agency, our sales increased in both areas. Our offshore markets are up 14.9 per cent, and our domestic sales are up 28.4 per cent for the same period in 1982. And we believe that much of this can be contributed to our new and aggressive sales campaign.

The Leader of the Opposition has indicated recently that our increase in offshore sales is attributable to arrangements made while PCS International was in place. In the one year that I have been responsible for PCS, I have not seen any firm orders that were generated by PCS International, and I challenge the hon. member to provide me with the copies of the so-called contracts or orders.

As indicated in the recent throne speech, research and development — 38 per cent ahead of last year, same period . . . (inaudible) . . . Fifteen per cent ahead of Canpotex in the offshore over last year. As indicated, research and development will be a priority over the next several years. Many Saskatchewan people fail to realize that one of our most aggressive industries in this respect has been the mining industry, and more specifically, the potash industry.

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is a leader in research into new process mining and product technology, and this is reflected in the fact that PCS is also one of the top 10 research and development investors in the Canadian mineral sector. Research and development expenditures to date have concentrated on improving mining and processing techniques which are needed to ensure that the operating costs are kept at a minimum. A minimal operational cost is our main competitive advantage, and we must ensure we never lose this competitive edge.

Continued work on research and development and improved technology is especially important because the advantages we enjoy as a low-cost producer are often more



than offset by the transportation disadvantages we encounter as a land-locked producer. Potash is a low-value commodity, and Saskatchewan producers are land-locked and dependent on Canadian railroads to move product 2,500 kilometres to the U.S. Midwest and 1,850 kilometres out to Vancouver. Typically, about 40 per cent of the delivered price of potash from North America is represented by transportation costs. This percentage is even greater offshore, and we are only beginning to see the effects of U.S. rail deregulation for more flexible freight rates for both PCS and its competitors can be expected.

The combination unit train and barge shipments put into effect in 1982 has enhanced our ability to compete with European and Israeli material coming up from Mississippi River from New Orleans at very competitive prices. And at the same time, our offshore marketing agency, Canpotex, is continuing to work with Saskatchewan producers in providing more competitive freight packages to major offshore customers. A recent example of these efforts is illustrated by the fact that Canpotex recently loaded the largest single potash shipment ever sent offshore, destined for China, with 68,000 tonnes of potash on it.

It is clear that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the industry will need to support Canpotex in ensuring that their facilities in Vancouver are capable of handling larger and larger tonnages on a regular basis.

PCS also recognizes that a sound market development program will be needed to ensure markets for expansions now under way. And this will be most important, of course, in developing these offshore markets where the need for potash is not well accepted. We have therefore pursued initiatives in markets such as China and the fruits of these efforts can be seen through the development of a new Canada-China agronomic development program. This program will be jointly funded by the Saskatchewan potash industry through Canpotex, the Saskatchewan government and the federal government. This is the first of many initiatives we hope to see the industry undertake in support of market development offshore.

And in conclusion, let me say that we are confident that PCS can play a dynamic role as a member of the Saskatchewan potash industry and that there is room for a balanced private-public sector approach to this industry. We remain committed, however, to the belief that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the private sector can co-operate to the advantage of Saskatchewan. And I make specific reference here to offshore markets, market development and research and development initiatives.

And while research will always remain competitive, areas such as mine safety which are of concern to the entire industry can be improved through shared technology. For this reason we have supported the concept of establishing a potash industry institute here in Saskatchewan which would act as a funding mechanism to the industry for carrying out such research and for funding market development initiatives which will be of benefit to the entire industry.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to discuss briefly also the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. In July of 1982 the corporation forecast a year-end deficit of \$37.4 million. A very concentrated effort was made to reduce controllable operating expenses within the corporation and to critically examine capital programs. These efforts, together with a reduction in interest rates and the strengthening of the Canadian dollar were successful in bringing about a very substantial reduction in the

year-end deficit.

A hiring freeze, implemented in May 1982, has enabled SPC to reduce manpower in excess of 200 employees through attrition. Recently the corporation has announced an early retirement incentive program targeted at staff 55 years of age and over with at least 20 years of service. This program will enable SPC to further reduce their staff and costs while at the same time providing advancement opportunities for younger, skilled employees in whom the corporation has a considerable investment in training and development.

Generation expansion to meet the future needs of the province and to assure a secure supply to meet the future needs of the province, and to ensure a secure supply of electricity is being met through major project developments at Coronach and at Nipawin. At Coronach, a second 300 megawatt unit is nearing completion and is expected to be in commercial service by July 15, 1983. At Nipawin, the hydroelectric project which will add 252 megawatts of electrical capacity to the SPC system by 1986, is now under construction at a projected cost of \$600 million, and this project will make a significant contribution to the provincial economy through direct employment, and will also contribute to the manufacturing, supply, and service sectors of our economy. On-site labour is expected to peak this year in excess of 1,000 employees.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has initiated a comprehensive natural gas distribution program, and in 1982 the program brought service to 2,736 residential customers in 30 communities and 79 farms. This year the corporation has committed \$340 million to install natural gas service to farms and rural communities in accessible areas throughout the province. The program will begin immediately, and will take approximately seven to 10 years to complete.

During 1983 the natural gas service will be extended to 23 communities and approximately 2,000 farm customers at a cost of \$37 million, and this program will also make a major contribution to the economic well-being of this province and create between 300 and 400 jobs per year for the next seven to 10 years. The development of a fifth underground natural gas storage cavern has been undertaken here at Regina, and the cavern is expected to be completed in 1984 and will add 28.2 million cubic metres of usable gas storage to the system.

In preparing to meet the challenges of the future, President E.B. Campbell recently announced a major reorganization in the senior management of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The new organization reduces the number of positions reporting directly to the president from 13 to 5. This will improve the effectiveness of the senior executive group, and will help the corporation to achieve its major goal of increased efficiency and productivity so that a secure and reliable supply of gas and electricity is delivered to customers at the lowest possible cost. The corporation is also looking to modern technology to improve the efficiency of its operations. Construction of a new system control centre here at Regina began in 1982, and this \$22.5 million project will control the provincial electrical and natural gas systems and provide computerized dispatch and monitoring.

In closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt the budget presented by our Minister of Finance is zeroing in on job creation, and I'm pleased that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the potash corporation is doing its part in providing jobs.

Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what could be achieved in job creation if the hundreds of millions of dollars that were used to purchase potash mines and farmland, which did not create one extra job, was now sitting in our heritage fund?

Needless to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be opposing the amendment and will be supporting the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Young:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, with pleasure I rise to speak on behalf of the good people of Saskatoon Eastview. I'd like to congratulate the Minister of Labour on his very fine speech, and I'd like to certainly congratulate the Minister of Finance on his very honest, straightforward, and responsible budget.

I think that it is of some note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that on this budget, unlike many budgets in the past, there were no budget leaks. The thing got through without any major leaks. I think that's very, very important. Any leaks that did come out, Mr. Speaker, were shown to be erroneous, in the nature of speculation. I am wondering, at this time, how the Ombudsman feels about the budget and what sort of a reaction he has to his increased monetary sum that he will be obtaining.

**An Hon. Member:** — We haven't heard anything.

**Mr. Young:** — Not a thing out of him, eh? Well, my goodness, it's strange. But certainly that goes to show you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the very tight office that our Minister of Finance is running.

I'm very pleased to see the first kick at a full budget come down with an increased spending in health, social services, and the skilled-training area of education, and job creation. Certainly I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we might be able to recoin the slogan, 'Don't let them take it away.' You'll recall that that's the one that the NDP used as a scare tactic for the old and the sick in effort to unfairly hold hostage some of their vote. Certainly I think that 'Don't let them take it away' could now very well apply to the type of administration that we are coming forward with.

I think that — although my speech, due to the time constraints, has to be somewhat short — it's very much in order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make some comments with respect to the total negativism that has been coming for the eight members on the other side of the House. Certainly if you look for a moment, I think one of the very important issues that I would like to deal with in the short time I have is the Crow issue.

The member from Quill Lakes really upsets me with the way he attempts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to warp our position on the Crow. We have always had a constant position on that subject matter. The farmer cannot afford to pay a nickel more for the improvement in our rail system. Our House unanimously passed a resolution. And the member, if he keeps continuing with his false rhetoric on the subject matter, I cannot see how he can perform in this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, under that constant sort of betrayal of the truth. I don't think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the member from Quill Lakes can last much longer on that line. Motor mouth, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Back to the Crow. I asked the three members opposite — I presume that the other five of them are air-fared out to British Columbia to do a little campaigning. But for the three of them left, I'd like to point out to them that the reason that we have Mr. Pepin . . . The

reason that we have little Mr. Pepin coming out here to the West to tell us what we're going to do with our rail system is because of the members opposite, and because of their colleagues and what they've done for western Canada.

I think, in their very small heart of hearts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they know full well that if we had Mr. Don Mazankowski, the member of parliament from Vegreville, as our Minister of Transport, we would not have any problem with the Crow — if we had that man. They know it in their little hearts of hearts, and they know why we have little Mr. Pepin coming out here — because of them and their colleagues and the NDP motion which got rid of a western sympathetic government, of a government with a western Minister of Transport to be replaced with Pepin, Chretien, a mafia from down east, your bed partners.

The member from Shaunavon . . . I put it to you that your relationship with the Liberals is incestuous. It's incestuous. You're not strange bedfellows. The Liberals, you've taught them now, are just the NDP in slow motion . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member from Shaunavon, as I understand it, will be the next speaker, and I'd appreciate him commenting on his feet with respect to the subject matter I've just dealt with.

I think, getting on to the member in Shaunavon, he's got a few problems. Lorne Nystrom was here at the back rail yesterday, kicking off, I presume, his leadership campaign for the member from Elphinstone's seat. Mr. Lingenfelter kind of feels that he is the heir apparent. But for the member from Shaunavon, in the land of the blind it's been said that the one-eyed man is king. I think that the one-eyed man is Mr. Nystrom. And I don't think you, sir, are the heir apparent to the throne. But keep trying; it's fund to watch.

The clock is getting me. I have prepared here, Mr. Speaker, 10 more pages of speech. But under the circumstances — we have to vote at 12:30 — I think that it's fair to let the member from Shaunavon have a few negative words. And I look forward to more negativism from the member from Shaunavon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — Mr. Speaker, it's with a bit of anticipation that I rise to take part in the budget debate today. I have waited through a week of Tory back-slapping and revelry in a budget that I have a great deal of difficulty in recognizing what they are talking about. Because, this being my sixth budget in this House, I a little difficulty in understanding how that many people can applaud the worst budget that I have seen in this House, and talk about is greatness at a time when budget cuts are rampant, where programs are being slashed. And outside of this House there is very little cheering about the budget of 1983-84 in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to refer first of all to the budget and its impact in my area of the world, that being south-west Saskatchewan. And I want to relate to the members of the Assembly the disappointment that is down there in terms of the lack of highway construction, not only in my constituency, but throughout the south-west, where the Red Coat Trail the member from Weyburn mentions, where their advice that certain sections of highway be built was not recognized in the budget speech, but instead, political roads were built, not on the advice of the Red Coat Trail Association, but rather on the advice of the member from Weyburn. And I suppose that he will need

all the help that he can muster in winning in the next election. So, politically, it's not a bad move. Because having been in Weyburn a number of times, I realize that he will need a good number of roads built in that constituency in attempting to maintain it after the next election.

There are other areas in south-west Saskatchewan which are equally hard hit. I think the ranchers at Val Marie and Killdeer are interested and saddened to know that the grasslands park is one step and one year further from fruition at this time because of the lack of funding by the minister in charge of tourism, who did not see in his power to get the money from the finance minister to go ahead with the surveys and the seismic work for gas and oil, which had to go ahead on that piece of property before the federal government and the provincial government can establish the grasslands park.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of the grasslands park, the federal government has made it well known that they have a large chunk of money to spend in Saskatchewan which would improve the state of affairs, create many, many jobs in south-west Saskatchewan, if the provincial government would go ahead and do the kind of exploration that they have an agreement and a commitment that they are to do. But instead we see backpedalling by the minister and by this government to the point that this program is now in jeopardy. Not only is the program in jeopardy, but the ranchers, the 40 or 50 who are affected, are left in limbo, and they too are not happy with this government's performance today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's not that they are adamant — they are still willing, I suppose you could say, to give this government a chance. But they're beginning to wonder more and more how a government after 11 months can be apparently old and tired as this government has become in that short of time. But I think if you look at the economic problems that they have created and are now facing, it's not hard to understand why in fact they're becoming tired and old very, very quickly.

There's other areas that the farmers are disappointed in — the fact that the budget of the Minister of Agriculture was cut a good deal, the fact that that did not include a farm fuel rebate program. There is no massive irrigation program which had been promised at the time of the last election, and all they see is a mortgage interest rebate program for people who are able to get loans from the farm credit corporation. And they would have liked to think that it's a farm purchase program, but I can guarantee them that the farmers know it isn't a farm purchase program, but it's an interest rebate program that the loans are given out, not by the provincial government but by the federal government. And what the Tories are attempting to do here is take credit for probably the only positive Liberal program that has come out of Ottawa. And I say that when they are tying their fate on Liberal programs it can tell you how bankrupt of ideas this government really is.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were, to say the least, disappointed in the budget. I think disappointed, first of all, because of the large deficit, the fact that we now owe over \$500 million in one year, but also the fact that we have services cut, and I think that's the more important issue. Had the budget been balanced, I think this government could have got the groups and people to accept the fact that their budgets had to be restrained. But social service groups in particular are saying, 'Had the budget been balanced, we may have understood how our budget is being slashed.' What they're saying is, 'Because there is a large deficit we had anticipated that our funding would remain intact.' And I think that makes very logical sense to most people. It probably won't for the members opposite, but you would think in running a large

deficit, Mr. Speaker, that the funding for very basic groups would have been maintained.

And this following the Trudeau government down the deficit path is a very, very interesting story. This year alone, if we want to add up the number of what the people of Saskatchewan are being asked to pay in terms of a debt by the federal and provincial government, if you do a little calculating you'll find that the federal government borrowed over 30 billions of dollars on behalf of the people of Canada or about \$1,500 per person here in Saskatchewan. Add that on to the 500 per person that was borrowed by the Devine government, and you'll find that each individual person owes 2,000 more dollars today than they did last April 26th. For a family of five that adds up to a total bill of \$10,000 in one year. I think what the people of Saskatchewan are saying is not whether we can get rid of this government after four years — I think they have accepted that — but whether we can afford the bill of \$40,000 per family that will be built up by the time four years rolls around.

Mr. Speaker, the members talk about gloom and doom. But, I think, if they watch the Liberal government in Ottawa there's a fair bit of doom and gloom about that government as well, and very appropriately so. And I'm warning the members, if they continue to follow the Trudeau trail, if they attempt to follow the Trudeau trail of deficits, what I'm pointing out is that they too will have a great deal of doom and gloom to live with as they are turfed out after their first year in office, similar to what happened in 1934 after a short stint in government then. And it took the people 50 years to forget about that. In fact, a full generation had to go by, where they weren't anyone who could remember it before they were allowed the privilege of entering this building and forming the government. It's been a long, long time. But, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting how history does repeat itself. We are seeing again today the results of a right-wing radical government here in Saskatchewan. I listed a number of cut-backs in question period today, and I'll have more to say about that.

The Minister of Finance finds this whole debate very interesting, and I suppose he should. He has a little bit of explaining to do in the fact that we not only have a very large deficit, there's no money. That's a very interesting problem for the Minister of Finance to attempt to explain to the farmers of Saskatchewan then, when they want a fuel rebate program. How is it that you run a large deficit at a time of restraint, and at the same time you have no money for anyone?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not that there's no money for anyone. There is money in the budget for certain individuals. There's money for oil companies. There's massive cuts in taxes to oil companies which will amount to about \$150 million, not in one year, but this year, next year, and the year after. And at that point it will come to an end, Mr. Speaker, because the people of the province will reject that policy of cutting taxes to the rich and charging it up to the poor. It's a policy that will be rejected at the first opportunity that the people of this province have to reject the Tory philosophy that you take from the poor and give to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that I would like to say in the area of health. And I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the minister at the very, very fancy footwork which he did in raising the budget of Health significantly but decreasing services to people. And I think that it's not hard for the people of the province to understand and it will not take them a great deal of time to find out that the increase in the budget of Health came not from an increase from the Minister of Finance, but came

from what I am now calling the weak Minister of Social Services, because when he was refused by the Minister of Finance any funding he looked over his shoulder to the Minister of Social Services and said, 'There's a bit of money there. I'll raise my budget by taking programs out of another department.' And that's exactly what he did. By moving home care and nursing homes from Social Services, he took money from another department and called it his own and says, 'Now we are number one in health.'

Well, this kind of a cynical attitude by this government will not be accepted by the people of the province. And it will not be accepted by the people who have children in the dental care program who are seeing cut-backs in that program in terms of the four-year-olds, who are seeing a halt to the expansion, by the 17-year-olds not being included in that plan — the fact that many adolescents are being encouraged to go to the private sector dentists and each time they are encouraged to go there it saves the good old Minister of Health some money and he will go on encouraging them until finally he can say, 'There's not enough people using this program and we should do it in.' I believe that's happening already, and you need only look at the staff in the dental plan to find out that people already are being removed from that program. And I believe the number is in the area of 23 less staff in the dental plan program this year as to what it was last year.

And so we see the undermining of a very basic and a very fundamental program in the province of Saskatchewan, one which was brought in by an NDP government — the first one in North America — and I think that the first Conservative government in 50 years has made up their mind to get rid of it.

Mr. Speaker, an area which is very dear to the hearts of all Saskatchewan residents . . . I say that, still giving the government a chance, because I think that in the back of their minds they have a thought that they would like to do exactly what the Alberta government has done in the area of deterrent fees. Mr. Speaker, we saw last week the Government of Alberta introduce the most regressive taxation structure on the health care that we have seen in the country in the past 10 years. What it is, is a deterrent fee of \$20 per day in a public ward, and \$20 increasing to other numbers as you get into semi-private and private facilities in the hospitals. I think this government is watching very closely. They're digging away at the roots of medicare by cutting back in psych services, dental plan, but in the back of their mind they really want to go after the big deterrent fee. And Alberta is taking the risk for the other Tory provinces, because they think that their position is so secure there that they can run a little experiment in Alberta to see whether or not they get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if the federal government is not strong enough to delay this and put it off, or if there is a Tory government elected next year federally, you will see deterrent fees in every province, if it's allowed to take place in Alberta the way they are proposing at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I can see that we have hit a little bit of a soft spot with the Conservative government and old Liberals in the House who have seen the result of deterrent fees in the past, in 1971 when a government was defeated on the fact that it had introduced deterrent fees in this province. And I predict and I give a warning to this government that if it follows its Conservative cousin's position in Alberta, if it does follow the steps taken by the Conservative government in Alberta, that it too will face the same results as the previous government, that being the Ross Thatcher government, being turfed out for that particular reason.

I think there is another area of cynicism by the Minister of Health which I would like to comment on, and that's the fact that, at a time when he is increasing the budget in some areas — I laud him for that, the fact that there is more money going into cancer — but his explanation in the House was a little curious when he said the reason that money was going into cancer treatment was because it was popular in Saskatchewan. I don't mind the government putting more money into cancer treatment; I think it's an excellent idea. But the reasoning behind the fact that more money is going to cancer and less to psych services, I believe because they did a poll and found out that cancer in fact was more popular, and they thought they could get away with cutting psych services, is not acceptable in a province which believes that medicare and equality for all people. And I think that that little line will come back to haunt this government when you're talking about the popularity of certain health programs and deciding your spending priority, not on the needs of the people, but on an opinion poll done by a firm in Toronto, and therefore putting more money into cancer and acting like heroes about it.

That's a little bit of a deception and shows the insensitivity of this government towards the real people in this province. And that will be the case that we will take to the people in psych services, those people who are facing tough times, that in trying to run a popularity contest with the cheer-leading and the flag-waving that goes on by this group, eventually, Mr. Speaker, eventually will get them into nothing but hot water, and at the time of the next election, they will be facing the consequences of that kind of action.

And there are other areas of cut-backs besides psych services. We see health promotion and health education; I'll say that funding for rural hospitals is not adequate to meet the needs. I've had meetings with a number of hospital boards who are telling me they are facing the reality, the stark reality, of cutting staff at their next board meeting as a result of the funding in hospitals not being increased to the level that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with the Kincaid Hospital Board who will be asking for a meeting with the Minister of Health in the very near future to see if they can get emergency funding so that they do not have to lay off one staff, and I will be assisting them in getting the meeting set up so that we can see whether or not the doors of that hospital can, in fact, be kept open. Because here again I'll go back to the era from 1964 to '71 under another right-wing government when the doors of many, many hospitals were closed with the same kind of attempt of the government to shift the responsibility of closing hospitals from themselves to the local hospital boards.

But here again you're underestimating the will and the strength of the hospital boards in this province. You're also underestimating the importance of a good healthy medicare system in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the other area which I mentioned earlier was in the area of psych services, and, by this government's own studies which they have done, they admit that there is a crisis in the psych services in the province. And I quote from an article which appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* quoting from a report of their own hospital's facilities planning committee in which they say, describing this phase of psychiatric services as near crisis. 'The committee recommends the increase in the number of city-wide psych beds to 75 from 55 in the establishment of an in-patient psych unit at St. Paul's to complement those of the other two hospitals.'



And, Mr. Speaker, I think that the fact that their own people are telling them of this dire need in the area of psych services, and the complete ignoring the statement and going with what their opinion polls say is a more popular area, show that this government does not listen to the people of the province, and does not even listen to the people who may commission to do studies for them.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a very, very difficult thing for those people who are in the area of psych services to deal with, because they know full well that if they go to bat for those people, funding will be only cut more because this is what has happened to other groups who have commented on and said that the budget was not good. You don't do that if you get funding from this provincial government. You keep your mouth shut, and I guess you wait till the next election.

But I say that at the next election, they will speak very loudly, the same as the people of and province of Manitoba spoke. There was not a great deal of outcry from the groups during the term of office of Sterling Lyon because they knew they couldn't get away with it. But at the time of the election they will let you know that they don't appreciate cuts in their budgets. They don't appreciate about 1,000 or 1,500 people being laid off out of the government in one year, and I think that at the time of the next election, these people who are quiet now will be very loud in rejecting this right-wing Conservative government.

Mr. Speaker, in transferring the home care program and the nursing home care to the Department of Health, while the minister is saying what a great increase this is in his budget, he did not mention that nursing home construction announced this year is \$2.4 million less than the budget that was announced in the Department of Social Services last year. There has been a decrease from \$6.4 million in the budget of Social Services for nursing home construction last year to 4 million this year in the Department of Health.

When shuffling numbers from one department to another, you may be able to get rid of that sort of thing with your back-benchers who apparently don't read the estimate book, but for the nursing homes in the province who are waiting and waiting patiently for nursing home construction, whether it's in Whitewood, or whether it's a 144-bed in Saskatoon, I think that they will know that the budget has been cut, and they will let you know over the next few months that they're not very happy with the budget that you have announced for construction of nursing homes.

I think the cut of \$2.4 million in construction will mean that the waiting lists which have grown a great deal since last April 26th will continue to grow, and those people will let you know in the very near future that the pioneers of this province deserve to be treated a great deal better, and that simply moving them from Social Services to Health is not really the test, but whether the people in the nursing homes get better service for less cost will mean whether or not that little program is working.

And I say that the increase of nursing home rates from 390 to 417 in last year's budget did not impress many people, and the predicted increase this July will not be approved by the residents whether or not they're in Social Services or whether they're in Health.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn now for a few moments to the Department of Social Services, a department which is very close to all of us in the opposition. Many of the people who are served in this department are the forgotten people of the province since

April 26th. Mr. Speaker, they are forgotten because the cut which have occurred in the area of senior citizens' programming should be commented on. The Saskatchewan income Plan, which allowed for a payment of \$25 to single seniors and 45 to couples, has been cut, not increased in this budget. The home repair program, which allowed for the improvement of seniors' homes, has been cut as well. And, at a time when welfare rates are sky-rocketing in this province, the numbers of people on welfare, as well as the total number, the assistance, public assistance, to the aged has been decreased. Those people who are most deserving of the assistance has been cut back in this province as of the budget last week.

I'm not sure what it is that the pioneers of the province have done to make the Tories angry at them, but apparently it's something because there are very few people who are bearing the brunt of this type of a budget as the seniors are doing at the present time. And I think that what they're attempting to do is take advantage, as is typical of right-wing government s, of those people who are least able to fend for themselves. They believe that the senior citizens are not able to come out and lobby for their position, whether it's over nursing rate increases or whether it's Saskatchewan Income Plan, but here again they will be surprised at the power of the ballot at the time of the next election.

There's no shelter allowance for senior citizens, even though they're being asked to pay increases like 19 per cent for telephones. There's no promised free telephones. Many of the seniors believed the Tories at the time of the last election, and I say that they will not believe them again when promises like that are made that they'll get free telephones immediately after the election. They may get them two months before the next election, but here again that kind of cynicism by a government doesn't tend to get you a lot of votes at the ballot box.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of social workers, I would like to just take a few moments to outline for the Assembly and for the people of the province the fact that a large number of social workers and people who work in that area are being cut back by this government. I think the total is in the area of 40 social workers or staff who work in the regional offices and in the northern administration. And, Mr. Speaker, this at a time when we are at record numbers of people on welfare, record numbers of child abuse, record numbers of spouse battery, and I say that it's simply impossible to expect the number of social workers in this province to be cut by 40 and still maintain the operation.

I predict that, as a result of these kind of cut-backs, we will see an ever-increasing number of a type of child abuse cases which came to light in Alberta at the time when the Tory government there attempted to cut back in very basic social services. And they could take a leaf out of the book of Bob Bogle who had to face the music of that kind of cut-back in social services — the numbers of child abuse cases which came to light as a result of it. And I say here that the war that was being waged on child abuse, in the province prior to April 26th has been given up by this government, and we will be laying the responsibility for that kind of increase in child abuse, and the fact that it goes untended to by social workers, at the feet of the Minister of Social Services and the chairman of the board, the Premier of this province.

I think that over the next months we will make a conscious effort, because the government and the ministers are not doing it, to become the people who defend those children who are in those homes and now have no social worker who is looking after their best interests at a time when parents and families are facing an ever-increasing

strain because of the policies and the inaction of this government in creating employment.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of non-governmental organizations, I outlined for a few moments this morning, during question period, certain cuts which were occurring in the area of the non-governmental organizations. Mr. Speaker, these groups have been built up over the last 20, 30, and 40 years, where groups, community groups, have gotten together to meet the need of the people in their community groups, have good idea. It was a good use of volunteers, that these people would help in transition houses, or help in Regent Court park — places like that, where the assistance was given to the poor and those who were in need of help from time to time. We felt that these groups, with a local board and a hired executive director and maybe two or three secretarial staff, using many, many volunteers, deserved seed money from the provincial government. But what we are seeing at this time is not only staff being cut back in the department in taking care of the needs of those people, but also the non-governmental people, staff and also budgets being cut back significantly.

Mr. Speaker, I think this double whammy for the people who are facing trying times will be well noted by the press, and by the people of the province and ever-increasing numbers of people who are facing the brunt of these kind of cut-backs. And I'll mention a few. There was Regent Court which has lost its funding; the fair tax deal; By Ourselves. The very group that is the umbrella group for all the NGOs, SANGSSA, it was announced yesterday had a budget cut from \$108,000 to \$13,000, and this after the members of the board have written to the Premier, have talked to various individuals about their funding and telling them how important it is. And I have here a letter to the Premier addressed to the Hon. Grant Devine from Rev. Bob Gay, the secretary of SANGSSA, Bob Gay who is the Regina chaplain, United Church downtown chaplain, and I would like to read this into the record. And my colleague from Regina Centre mentions that he is the downtown chaplain for all the churches in the city, and it says:

The Regina region of SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Government al Social Service Agencies) formally protests the discontinuation of programs such as By Ourselves, the mediation diversion program of the John Howard Society, and the loans program of the welfare rights centre.

This was written two days before the funding was cut to his organization.

Furthermore, we demand that any non-governmental programs that have been cut back or eliminated by this budget to given full 90-days funding in which to appeal the decision that has been made. Your response would be appreciated. Sincerely, Reverend Bob Gay.

Well, his response was the fact that his group, it was announced yesterday, are no longer getting funding. When I make the case that you don't speak out against this government, here is a minister in Regina who is being told: 'You don't speak out against the Devine government.' And I lay this on the table as proof of that page — that you don't speak out. There is complete intolerance of such groups in this province and I say that it is completely intolerable that groups like this are being treated in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I have a large number of other points that I would like to make, but I would just like to say in conclusion that in the areas that I am critic for — and I don't have time to go into Agriculture — there's a whole other story to be told in many other areas — that northern Saskatchewan is in a state of affairs that needs to be taken care of in the

very near future, if we are not to face total collapse and the possibility of violence in the North.

But, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to quote to these people who believe that profits should come before people, that profits are the essence of government, a quote from the Catholic bishops from their recent paper 'The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops — Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis.' And from that I would like to quote the following:

This option calls for economic policies which realize that the needs of the poor have priority over the wants of the rich; that the rights of the workers are more important than the maximization of profits; that the participation of marginalized groups takes precedence over the preservation of a system which excludes them.

And in closing I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I really would like this government to take a look at its misguided policies of taking from the poor and giving to the rich, and attempt to get back to some sort of an equitable system, where those at the top, whether they be oil companies or insurance companies, pay their share, so that the people at the bottom can live a life of dignity and respect.

Thank you.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — It's my duty to inform the members that the hon. member is about to exercise his right to close debate, and thereafter all members will be precluded from speaking. If any member wishes to speak, let him do so now.

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Mr. Speaker, I had a nice 20-minute speech prepared that I was going to deliver, but I think I will go back and respond a bit to the member from Shaunavon.

First of all, what we have here, Mr. Speaker, and what was promoted here, was going to be the first truly Tory budget in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, let's ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, just exactly what that means, and I think we go back, Mr. Speaker, prior to the election of 1982 to approach some of the things that the member from Shaunavon referred to.

The number one thing that has, I suppose, dominated Saskatchewan politics since I can remember is the NDP line, 'Only the NDP can look after medicare.' You will recall the 1978 election, Mr. Speaker, the 1978 election. 'Don't let them take it away. Don't let them take it away.' . . . (inaudible) . . .

The entire campaign of the NDP back in '78. And I remember, Mr. Speaker, I remember so well, Mr. Speaker, going to the doors, going to the doors in the town of Kindersley . . . And this is the meaning to them of medicare and the politics of medicare. I knocked on the door of an old gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and he's crying. He's crying in 1978 election campaign, because, he's concerned that there's going to be a change of government and medicare will be taken away from him. Taken away from him, Mr. Speaker. And there you see, Mr. Speaker, the real meaning of the party opposite. The real meaning of the party opposite, Mr. Speaker. They're not concerned about

medicare. What they're concerned about is poisoning the minds of those old people concerning and scaring those old people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this government has been in power for one year, and no medicare has been taken away, Mr. Speaker. Medicare has been making stronger . . . Medicare is stronger now than it has ever been in the province of Saskatchewan, and will continue to be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The second great story, Mr. Speaker, was in the 1982 election campaign. This was the next line by the members opposite, all eight of them now: 'They're going to take away the crown corporations. They're going to sell power corporation to Calgary Power, and they're going to sell Sask Tel to Ma Bell, and they're going to sell the potash corporation.' This was their tactic. Now the people, Mr. Speaker, in the 1978 election, of course, they didn't look at it that way. They came, including many people that used to support the NDP . . . They came to us with this line. 'Well, we think we're going to vote for you guys this time. You've got some good ideas, and those people are getting old. I'm getting tired of the NDP. Can you give . . . I've only got one thing on my mind. You have to give me the assurance. Are you going to sell Sask Power and Sask Tel and the potash corporation?'

Of course the answer is obvious, Mr. Speaker. And one year later we still have Sask Power stronger than it was before, with a tremendous program of rural gas. We still have Sask Tel. We still have the potash corporation going, and, Mr. Speaker, can you believe it? We have a new water crown corporation. We have a new water crown corporation. There goes the second myth, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Now we come to the third myth — the biggest one of all. This was the great NDP campaign, Mr. Speaker. And here was this one. I call this one the 'mythical messiah,' and here's how it went: if we get rid of Mr. Blakeney, if the province loses Mr. Blakeney, in six short months it will be ruined. Ruined, Mr. Speaker. Ruined, Mr. Speaker. The man is indispensable, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, one year later the province has done very well without Mr. Blakeney as the premier of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — And we heard, Mr. Speaker, that he was the great statesman. Well, where is the great statesman now, Mr. Speaker? Where's the great statesman, Mr. Speaker, now? The great statesman has fallen from the great pedestal down to being an opposition leader. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, an opposition leader with a squint, that has to squint to see the flicker of light at the end of the tunnel, because there's nothing there for them, Mr. Speaker. . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — . . . The mythical messiah, Mr. Speaker, is gone from

Saskatchewan politics.

The fourth thing, Mr. Speaker: the members opposite were always great at saying this, 'Well, we like business, we like business. Yes, we're pro-business, us NDPers.' But every time you talk about business, what comes to their minds — Shell, Hudson's Bay, all these other companies? They forget that there's 65,000 small businesses in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And they don't even know what a business is, Mr. speaker. They trap everybody. Everybody that runs a store or a good manufacturing plant or anything else, they want to lump them in with the multinational corporations, because they don't understand what business is. That's the problem with the NDP.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — And the member from Shaunavon is saying you need to look at the opinion polls. Well, when you look, Mr. Speaker, at what happened in Manitoba last week, you don't need an opinion poll. You don't need an opinion poll to attract tourism and to attract business and to be friendly with the rest of the world. You don't need an opinion poll, Mr. Speaker, for members of a government, cabinet ministers of a government, to participate in the burning of an American flag — Mr. Speaker, the burning of an American flag. And that's consistent with the people across there, Mr. Speaker, as to their views as to the way the world should turn — burn the American flag. Mr. Speaker, I think it is disgusting; I think it is disgusting as a Canadian. And I can assure you that we might have ideological differences with Bulgaria, Cuba or the Soviet Union, but it would be a dark day in this province when we burn those flags.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Now, I would like to briefly come back to the fabrications with regard to the NDP's amendment to this budget, Mr. Speaker. The opposition expressed their shock and dismay, Mr. Speaker, shock and dismay about the deficit. The opposition, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, has become schizophrenic. They've become schizophrenic, Mr. Speaker. They continue to say, on the one hand, 'Don't have a deficit, boys; that's bad news.' On the other hand, 'Don't make expenditure cuts, don't make these slashes and dirty massive cuts,' and things that we're doing. They want it both ways, Mr. Speaker. They want it both ways. I can tell the Assembly that I don't like deficits either. Nobody over here likes to see a deficit, but sometimes you have to have them, Mr. Speaker. That's the reality of the world. When revenues are going down there's still demand for expenditures. Mr. Speaker, sometimes you have to have that deficit. And you have to have the deficit, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to bring in new programs.

Without the deficit, Mr. Speaker . . . We could have eliminated it, but in doing so we could have also eliminated the nine-point job creation program. We would have had to eliminate the massive undertaking on skills training. We would have had to not be able to change the heritage fund. We would not be able to stimulate the business sector. We would not have been able to make the moves in health, social services, and education. Sure, we could have come in with a balanced budget, but that's what we would have had to give up, Mr. Speaker. Our belief is that was wrong.

Now let me go back, Mr. Speaker, to talk about the consistency of the Leader of the Opposition, the great messiah of the NDP. Mr. Speaker, let me quote for you for a minute from *Hansard*. This is from Ottawa, from parliament. And it was February 17th, 1983 — that's this year. A guy by the name of Mr. Riis, NDP member. Here's what he had

to say:

A deficit per se is not necessarily a disaster. Every businessman knows it's sound business practice to borrow money and invest in order to get a return.

That's Mr. Riis.

And here's a statement of a Saskatchewan member of parliament, Mr. Hovdebo from Prince Albert. Mr. Speaker, this statement was in the Parliament of Canada, March 28th, 1983, one day before the Saskatchewan budget. And what does it say, Mr. Speaker? Here's quoting from Mr. Hovdebo:

There are times when deficits have a value. Right now, deficit spending is a good idea; it's going to create jobs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, here's another quote from one Max Saltsman, who used to be an NDP member of parliament:

This is not a budget that we, if we had have been government, would have brought down. We have reservations about the size of the deficit. We think it should have been larger. More stimulation should have been . . . (inaudible) . . .

Not smaller, the word 'larger'! Well, Mr. Speaker, there's where you see. You've got two ideas. Either the Leader of the Opposition is out of touch with his party — out of touch with his party — otherwise they're absolutely taking both sides of the fence on it, Mr. Speaker.

This budget shows, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else, the hook they have over there — the hook they have over there. While their leader says, 'You can't have a deficit — balanced budget, tight-fisted,' the rest of them say, 'Spend, spend, spend, spend, spend more money.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan, I believe, think this is a responsible and meaningful budget; a budget that makes sense out of a tight financial situation, Mr. Speaker; a budget that uses a little bit of common sense, Mr. Speaker; and a budget that helps point us, Mr. Speaker, in a new direction and a bright future for the province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — The third point in the amendment, Mr. Speaker, the NDP say, 'Well, resource give-away has created the deficit.' You know, this has got to be the most feeble of all of their approaches, Mr. Speaker, the same one they always take — same one they always take, Mr. Speaker. They know they're caught they know they're caught with an illogical argument. You can't have it both ways. So they seek to patch that over with Polyfilla, Mr. Speaker. They get some stuff, and they're going to cover this all over to make it good. So here's what they say they're going to do. Well, it's because — you know, it's a typical line — it's because the new government has got a massive give-away to all their buddies in the multinational crown corporations and the dirty, rotten Americans, and all this stuff. These rotten American corporations come in here and just

into our pockets and took all the money out, and that's why we have a deficit. That's their third argument, Mr. Speaker.

Well, let's look at it, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the potash. The potash, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, is operating the same as it did before with the previous government. And who signed the agreements, Mr. Speaker, who signed the agreements, who designed the agreements, who put them in place? And we haven't changed a comma in that, Mr. Speaker. We haven't changed a comma in that.

Then they blame the give-away to the oil companies. Now you give it away to all your friends in the oil industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier in his address last Tuesday threw away that argument, and I think the media in the same point of view have said they didn't buy it either.

But, Mr. Speaker, for years the NDP government have taxed the oil industry to the point where it was better for them to see an oil industry shut down, close down, not producing — that was their policy of how to keep the oil industry going.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since we have taken office, we have seen a recovery in production of oil. We have seen development in drilling. And that, Mr. Speaker, means jobs in Saskatchewan, not jobs in the province of Alberta.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — And that means, Mr. Speaker, strong land sales. Strong land sales, Mr. Speaker, increasing three-fold from the time we took office. And that means people coming to the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, to do business here, to create jobs here, to create revenue here, and to create this into a better province.

But what would the NDP have had, Mr. Speaker? Well, here's their economic policy on oil. Here's what they would like to see happen to the oil industry, Mr. Speaker. They would like to see idle jack pumps right across the province, idle jack pumps and service rigs, Mr. Speaker, being scrapped up for scrap metal and put into something else. That's their policy on the oil industry, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan did not buy that.

Then they say, Mr. Speaker, well we better throw something in for jobs because the Leader of the Opposition got the same headline as we got in the budget, but he got his the day before. He wanted to see more jobs created — that's exactly what he got. Since then we haven't heard a peep out of him, with regard to the whole thing, not a peep, Mr. Speaker. So point number four, they got to throw that one in — well, didn't create enough jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have done better in creating jobs in the province of Saskatchewan than any other province in this country.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — Then point number four. They've got to get into the problem with regard to the cost-price squeeze that farmers face, and everybody recognize the cost-price squeeze, Mr. Speaker. And they say, what are you doing about it? Well, some of us members that have been in this House for more than a year now can recall the NDP



proposals and policies with regard to helping the farmer.

Here's what they did, Mr. Speaker. Every year just prior to going into an election, out they come with a farm fuel rebate. Farm fuel rebate, Mr. Speaker. 'Oh, boy, look what we're doing for you. This, this, this, and this.' They got back in. What did they do, Mr. Speaker? They cut it off. Some kind of policy, Mr. Speaker. Some kind of a concern.

Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, when we take the price of gasoline off in the province of Saskatchewan we're not about to bring it back in a year later, I'll tell you that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — They indicated, Mr. Speaker, the savage cuts — the savage cuts that we're doing, Mr. Speaker. Well, I wonder where the savage cuts are, Mr. Speaker. I wonder where the savage cuts are in this budget. And if that's what they got left to . . . The day after the budget, the best they could do was raise a question about some small organization that didn't get 7 per cent funding and got 3 per cent cut. Savage cuts, Mr. Speaker. Unbelievable.

Again, the NDP wouldn't have touched anything, Mr. Speaker. They wouldn't have touched anything, Mr. Speaker. Everything that was there should never have been touched, never evaluated. Just leave it in place, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the boys over there, the boys over there, Mr. Speaker, are living in a dream world, living in a dream world, Mr. Speaker. They wouldn't want to have any deficit. They don't want to have any savage cuts. They don't want to have any oil revenue changes. Know what they want, Mr. Speaker? Know what they want, Mr. Speaker? They want magic, Mr. Speaker. Magic is what they want. That's what it's down to, Mr. Speaker. What they really want is magic.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, thankfully, the people of Saskatchewan performed magic last April 26, 1982, and eliminated . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Andrew:** — And that magic, Mr. Speaker, was a disappearing act for a political party that had lost touch and itself had become a comedy, Mr. Speaker — itself had become a comedy.

And I say in closing, Mr. Speaker, to the members opposite: Wake up boys; get into the world; there's so much more that you could be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 7**

Blakeney  
Thompson  
Lingenfelter

Koskie  
Lusney

Shillington  
Yew

**NAYS — 40**

Muller	Smith (Swift Current)	Gerich
Birkbeck	Boutin	Domotor
Andrew	Weiman	Maxwell
Lane	Sauder	Embury
Rousseau	Petersen	Dirks
Pickering	Glauser	Hepworth
Hardy	Meagher	Myers
McLeod	Schmidt	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Johnson
Klein	Hopfner	Baker
Katzman	Martens	Dutchak
Currie	Rybchuk	Folk
Duncan	Young	Morin
Schoenhals		

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

**YEAS — 40**

Muller	Smith (Swift Current)	Gerich
Birkbeck	Boutin	Domotor
Andrew	Weiman	Maxwell
Lane	Sauder	Embury
Rousseau	Petersen	Dirks
Pickering	Glauser	Hepworth
Hardy	Meagher	Myers
McLeod	Schmidt	Zazelenchuk
McLaren	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Johnson
Klein	Hopfner	Baker
Katzman	Martens	Dutchak
Currie	Rybchuk	Folk
Duncan	Young	Morin
Schoenhals		

**NAYS — 7**

Blakeney	Koskie	Shillington
Thompson	Lusney	Yew
Lingenfelter		

**COMMITTEE OF FINANCE**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE**

**AGRICULTURE**

**Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 1**

**Item 1**

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 12:58 p.m.