

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**June 13, 1983**

**EVENING SESSION**

**SPECIAL ORDER**

**Bill No. 105 — An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service  
for the fiscal Year Ending on March 31, 1984 (continued)**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I had addressed some remarks to the House earlier. I'm aware of the fact that a number of members will want to enter the debate on both sides of the House. That was clear from the fact that people were addressing remarks on topics which they felt were relevant and I'm inclined to agree with them. Accordingly, I won't detain the house overly long. I simply want to summarize a few of the things that I have said and then take my seat.

I have not touched on some elements of this budget and largely items which are not covered by it. I have not talked about the absence of clear position of the government on the Crow rate, and I'm sure some of my colleagues will touch on that. I have touched upon the position of the government with respect to the operation of the mental health program. I have not touched on the strange conduct of the government in introducing legislation to cut down the funding for Wakamow Valley, Meewasin Valley, and Wascana Centre Authorities and I can only reiterate what I have said earlier on, that this was a breach of faith with the parties who negotiated those. It would be in order for the government to renegotiate them, but that it did not do. It simply imposed its will on the three authorities. There can really be no question about that since some of the spokespersons for the authorities have made that very clear. And I noted that the chairman of the Wascana Centre Authority had expressed his regret that the government chose to deal with the authority in that way and not sit down and discuss with the authority the financial problems which the government was having and reach an agreement on a reduced level of funding. That was not done. And I could have entered into a rather lengthy discussion about that and I trust other members may well wish to deal with that aspect of the budget and the funding which it contains.

I have not dealt with the more egregious efforts to promote members of the Conservative Party and people associated with the Conservative Party, deal with the many conflicts of interest situations, or as it appears to me, conflict of interest situations which have arisen in the last period of time since this government has taken office.

I won't deal at any great length with the many efforts of the government to privatize the more prosperous, more profitable portions of crown corporations. I simply advise the people of Saskatchewan that they should watch for developments in this area. One which I did not mention in my earlier remarks was the treatment, the likely treatment, of the salvage division, and whether or not ways will be found to remove that profitable part of SGI and turn it over to friends of the party opposite.

I have not dealt with some other aspects of the budget. One member opposite asks me whether I'm talking about patronage, and the answer is yes indeed. I'm talking about patronage because there's a great deal to say and it may well be that some of our colleagues would wish to deal with that. But I will just close my remarks by reminding members opposite once again, once again, of the overall structure of their budget, one

which shows that they simply are not able to manage their affairs. They have run up a massive deficit — two massive deficits — and a case can be made for deficits if someone explains that you are going to run a deficit. There is nothing strange about the financial picture of Saskatchewan, nothing new that wasn't known 15 months ago, that the government opposite said, 'in the face of the financial situation that Saskatchewan is undergoing.' 15 months ago, 'We can operate a government; we can balance budgets; we can cut taxes.' That's what they said. There can be no question that that's what they said. And now they are suggesting that something miraculous happened between March 1982 and May of 1982 which made all their promises, made all their promises no longer operative.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the key and underlying fact of this budget. It is a budget which reveals the fact that members opposite simply cannot manage the affairs of this province as they promised to manage them.

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

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — They promised to cut taxes and by and large they have cut taxes. They promised to balance budgets and they haven't done that. They promised not to cut vital social services and they have cut vital social services. And they have amassed deficits which are going to be around the neck of the people of Saskatchewan for many years. If they had gone to the people of Saskatchewan and said, 'Look, we are facing a recession. Our policy is to cut taxes and run deficits,' then the policy which they have put into place would be justifiable. But that they did not do, and nothing has happened in 15 months to change the economic picture in Saskatchewan.

We all knew that Canada was facing a recession; we all knew that Saskatchewan was fighting it off, and if it was their policy to run deficits in order to fight off the recession, they might at least have told the public that. But they didn't do it. They promised balanced budgets and tax cuts and no program cuts, and they promised that all this would come about because of their open for business policies. They have tried all this would come about because of their open for business policies. They have tried their open for business policies; they have failed over 15 months, and I predict that they will fail over the life of this budget. And I predict that they will have the deficit which they are predicting, and very possibly more. And I predict that they will not be able to perform as they promised — that is, to deliver programs with no substantial cuts and no budget deficits.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are there. We all know what members opposite promised, and what is even more important, the citizens of Saskatchewan know what members opposite promised. Members may well be able to say that the people are not concerned about a deficit and this is true for one year or two years, but they are certainly concerned about us going down the Trudeau trail of five, six, or seven deficits which has put the Government of Canada in a total financial bind. And there's not an informed citizen in Canada that doesn't know that the Government of Canada is in a financial bind, and doesn't know that it is in a financial bind because it adopted a policy of deficits when it could have avoided deficits.

Now those are the facts. Members opposite may scoff at that. They may think that nobody is going to blame them for two deficits, but it's not two that we are facing, but more than two. And I'll hazard yet a further prediction and that is that their next budget will have a deficit in it and that they will renege yet another promise of balancing their budget over their four-year term. I'll hazard that bet . . . that guess and I bet I will be right.

We have some takers over on the other side and I will see them at 10 o'clock to negotiate the terms, but right now I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of the House, that because of the reasons which I have already cited and because of many others which I could cite, and because of the basic fact that they have promised what they have not delivered, I will not be supporting this bill. I will be opposing the motion and I am sure that all hon. members who examine the facts should equally oppose the motion.

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

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, I intend to take a few moments tonight to remind the members of this House that the March budget allocated only \$79.8 million for agriculture, a drop of over 13 per cent from the previous year, and at the same time saying how much more they can be. And as I was listening to our leader wind up his remarks and talk about the promises and commitments they made, I thought of the answer to the question he was asking.

The Tories have some architects that they bring in to designing an election campaign. After the election campaign they don't follow that blueprint for some reason. The people of Saskatchewan expect the architect to see the finished building product, and that's not happening in Saskatchewan. The architects that designed a plan and said, 'Don't fill your car till after the election; save 40 cents a gallon,' weren't around to tell us that it wasn't even going to be 40 cents, let alone much less, and let alone nothing for the farmer. They said, 'There's \$350,000 for the farmers,' and all the farmers thought, 'Boy, that's going to be a real shot in the arm; \$350,000 to refinance my farm at 8 per cent will do wonders for my farm'. But what happened? Did the farmers get it? Did the farmers get it?

But then when you talk about some trucking industries and some trucking companies, in particular the multinational CP trucking and those people, they're not complaining about the gas tax. They're not complaining. The member for Morse knows that if he'd own a truck that travels 200,000 miles a year, he knows how much money he'd save doing custom trucking. But, he doesn't save that with his farm tractor, Mr. Speaker. He is paying exactly the same today as he paid before. He's not saving 1 cent, and the message was out there that we were going to have this big tax reduction. Nothing happened, Mr. Speaker. And in agriculture we see a 13 per cent drop from the previous year, in an industry which at least those on this side of the House consider to be the number one industry in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the multinational oil companies aren't complaining; the private potash companies aren't complaining; the CPR isn't complaining; NHL hockey teams aren't complaining; highly paid politically staff members aren't complaining, but the farmers are — the farmers are. My farmer friends are complaining, and they're saying, 'The cost-price squeeze is on, and we're feeling the pinch and we're wondering what should we do.' And I have people over on a daily basis that are discussing what is the situation for agriculture today.

We've got election promises. How come that farm purchase plan wasn't as colourful and as bright as your Minister of Agriculture said it was going to be? Why are people going to be the credit union and getting a loan in less than a week for 11 per cent than trying to go through the hassle of getting it from your program? That's not a farm

purchase plan and the members opposite know it isn't. It hasn't helped one person purchase a farm. It's an interest-reduction plan, and it's not what you told the people. The architects of your election promise failed to tell the people what it really was going to be.

Who else is benefiting from this 3 billion-plus dollars that we're having? Who else is benefiting? I think a good example of who's going to benefit under Tory administration was demonstrated to all the people of Canada over a long haul this past couple of weeks, Mr. Speaker. We were bombarded with television casts and broadcasts daily informing the people, and you know I was glad you got all that TV time because it lets the people know who is sponsoring, and who is supporting, and where the support comes from in your party.

And what happened to the ordinary Joe? What happened to the ordinary Joe? The Westerner that spoke for the average person, what happened to him at your convention? What happened to the ordinary Joe? I your wisdom you decided to elect a multimillionaire representative, somebody that represents the large corporations. They're the winners, And they're the winners in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — the multinationals oil companies, the interprovincial trucking firms, CPR. And those are the companies that tell your little Joe. 'Look buddy, you got to go. We need somebody that will support our interests.'

And that's exactly the same reasons we witnessed in this House, Mr. Speaker, when we were dealing with bills to create revolving funds. And when we talked about the family farm improvement branch, where did the member from Morse go, and where did the other farm members that are sitting in this House? Where were they when the vote was taken, Mr. Speaker? And we called for a standing vote. And how come the rural members ducked the vote to change . . . And all we were doing was changing the family farm improvement branch, the revolving fund aspect of it. Why did you decide to duck the vote? I'd really want to know why the members opposite . . . I see my friend sitting behind the rail there and I'm wondering why the member for Kelvington ducked that vote and why you decided not to stand up and vote for the demise of the family farm improvement branch. I'd really like to know why.

And do you think silence is the way to rule the Tory party? Here we've got 56 members; not too many of them are multinationals. And yet when it comes to supporting the family farm improvement branch that makes money available for putting in sewer and water — and farmers that haven't got sewer and water are small farmers; I would consider a farmer living in rural Saskatchewan that doesn't have sewer and water a small farmer. They would duck the vote and destroy that department that makes that money available instead of standing up and speaking for the small farmer like they promised in the election campaign.

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

**MR. ENGEL:** — I think it's time members opposite do more than just applaud when I say that they should support the family farmer. I suggest that they stand up and look in *Hansard* and see who ducked the vote when it came to voting for the family farm improvement branch. Why didn't you clap then? Why didn't you at least say a yea to it? Why didn't you say a yea like your party did? We said no to it. Your party said a yea and yet the farm members can applaud now, but they were afraid to say a yea to the demise of the family farm. They thought they could duck the vote.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you a quiet endorsement is the same as a verbal one. The people of Saskatchewan will know that these vocal ones are saying . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Speaker, where were the members when it came time to defend FarmStart? Here we had a program that made not only loans available to small farmers but give them a grant if they hung around for a while. Give them an encouragement — up to \$16,000 in grants. Where were you to defend the demise of that program? The members were quiet. The member for Shellbrook didn't say a word but the FarmStart program is demised. It's gone. It's down with the 13 per cent drop in the agriculture spending. Where were they when the land bank leases were to be defended? Where were you? You weren't very far around. They introduced a program they called the family farm purchase plan. It's not a farm purchase plan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Did you vote against it?

**MR. ENGEL:** — I've never ducked a vote in my life, Mr. Member from Kelvington, and I don't intend to, I'll stand up, and if I don't believe in something, I'll vote against it. I'll vote against it, but where are you? Where's the member for Kelvington? You've got \$3.5 billion for your friends and for the oil companies and for the CPR and for the multinational truckers, but you've got a 13 per cent cut for farmers. You've got a cut for farmers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the friends that they so desperately try and support . . . I have a photostatic copy here of the 1982 annual report of their best friend, and they're really, truly, your members opposite, your loved ones, the Canadian Pacific Ltd., Canadian Pacific Ltd.'s annual report. Net income from CP Rail in 1982 was \$117.9 million. CP Air lost money, CP ships lost money, CP trucks — they made 1.5 million because the gas tax cut in Saskatchewan, so they didn't do too bad, but all the rest — total net income of the entire conglomerate, Mr. Speaker, was only 188.3 million, and 177.9 million of that was made from CP Rail. And here are the members opposite saying that their new leader says that Mr. Pepin's legislation's on the right track, it's going in the right direction, I read from in the question period today.

I'm wondering what the members opposite are going to tell their new leader and how many times they're going to regret, and why the Minister of Finance is going to regret, for not supporting the ordinary Joe, the ordinary farmer, the ordinary . . . Why not support the ordinary fellow? Why support SP Ltd. consolidated assets? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Why not support the ordinary one?

Mr. Speaker, the 117 million isn't a true picture of CP's net income, or net earnings. That's not a true picture. You look at page 4 on your financial report: consolidated assets of the company amounted to seventeen thousand, two hundred and seventy-three million dollars on December 31, 1982 — up from eleven thousand, two million at the end of '79 — a six billion, two hundred and seventy-one million dollar increase in net assets by this good friend of your party's. Can you say that number again so that . . . (inaudible) . . . Twice the budget that we're talking about today was the increase in net assets of CP Consolidated assets of the company amounted to seventeen thousand, two million at the end of '79. That's a tremendous increase in assets. This company has done very

well, Mr. Speaker.

I have some notes here from an address that was given down in Mossbank by a leading reporter right here in Saskatchewan. He did a fantastic job but . . . He was developing this theory why we shouldn't be supporting the Pepin plan and when he talked about the railways and the railways' position in there:

Will the railway make that kind of money? (He asked.) One estimate has their gross income for grain jumping from 1 billion a year to 2 billion a year under the Pepin plan, with the current loss of only about 300 million would seem to leave fair room for profits. Furthermore, freight rates are expected to increase at least five times or more over the course of the next 10 years so railway revenues could be expected to do the same. If they keep costs in line and deduct investments there should be ample room to add both to assets and profits.

We don't need a Pepin plan is the argument he's making> But when he talks about who really runs CP Ltd., and who are the majority shareholders, and when he talks about people like Ted Turner and Brian Mulroney and some of the other fellows that are involved, and whose companies are directly involved with CP Rail, it makes me shudder.

Because there isn't much of a choice, Mr. Speaker. If we're going to go from one Montreal lawyer to another Montreal lawyer I don't think the people of western Canada are going to benefit an awful lot. I don't think they're going to benefit very much, and I'm sure that the CP isn't going to do very much complaining, and I'm sure that Mr. Mulroney's position will be stable as long as he wants it because he's going to be supporting the people that like the kind of programs that are in place right here in Saskatchewan, programs that . . . To create this \$3 billion fund — where's the money coming from, Mr. Speaker?

And this is the part that concerns me very much and this is the main aspect of what I don't like about Tory financing. Where are you going to get the money from? In Agriculture, programs were introduced to sell crown land, programs were introduced to sell lease land, programs were introduced to sell park land. Any kind of land is for sale in Saskatchewan today — anything just to sell a little land and get our mud-hooks some money. Sell the land; sell off the assets just to pay for some election promises that the architects of the Tory election machine created and got you on the hook, and so you're selling off Saskatchewan's heritage to pay for this.

I argued in this House with the Minister of Agriculture for a long time during Agriculture estimates. If you're going to sell Crown land, and you're selling parcels of land or isolated parcels here and there, a section or two sections or even three sections. I don't mind that. But when you're going to cut into those large tracts of land in the southern part of my constituency, and when you're putting up that kind of land for sale that your forefathers . . . Your political party inherited when they were in the power last time in Saskatchewan, and in spite of the bad government they had, that the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't look at them for 50 years. At least they didn't sell off the Crown land that they were entrusted with. The federal government entrusted this province with the management of that land and leave that part of Saskatchewan as is.

I don't like to see that land being sold just to pay your debts. Your debts are terrible. A 500-plus million dollar deficit is going to be very hard to pay back. It's going to take a lot

of good management. It's going to take some social reform and some programs that are going to nationalize some private companies that are fleecing the people of Saskatchewan, that are going to make money again for the people of Saskatchewan, but it's going to be a long, uphill climb to repay that kind of deficit . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right.

And that's what the people of Saskatchewan are telling me. How are we going to pay back that debt? How are we ever going to get out of debt? And you're just spending and spending and spending and in no concern — no concern with deficits — and that spending is going to the friends who are in the private sector, those open for business philosophy. They're the ones that you bend over backwards to serve, to pay off your friends and to pay off your patronage. And, Mr. Speaker, there is so much in this budget that I can't support. I want to wind up by saying that I feel it's time that the people of Saskatchewan realized what the government's intentions are and they realize what's happening.

The government opposite has repeated over and over again that its . . . one of its major budgetary priorities is agriculture and the economy and the improvement of the rural way of life in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, that's not happening. When it came down to the crunch, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite refused to put their money where their mouths are.

And I've mentioned the programs that have been eliminated. And the serious one — and I've held up ads in this House before — that the minister of rural affairs has indicated during his election promises, and they were going to implement a farm fuel rebate program. I'm not asking for as much as the large truckers are getting. I don't think I need \$15,000 for my tractor as a rebate, like a truck that makes 200,000 miles a year is getting in Saskatchewan. But I think that 25 or 30 cents a gallon, 32 cents like Alberta's got, or 28 or 29 cents like Manitoba has, would really be appreciated by farmers. I think farmers expected that. They expected more from you. They thought they were getting it. They're not getting it. Yet this government, rather than assist the Saskatchewan farmer, gives its concessions to their friends in the oil companies.

Another major concern in the budget was the disappearance of the Saskatchewan Grain Car corporation vote — \$9 million spent last year to indicate that we were keeping the grain cars rolling on behalf of the Saskatchewan farmers. This year that has dropped to \$200,000. The Minister of Finance tried to assure me that was just an entry. They don't need that kind of money. It's just a budgetary entry. That's not the case, Mr. Speaker. That's not the case . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I'm not sure. The minister of . . . The member for (he's not a minister yet; I wish he were minister of agriculture) but the member for Weyburn asks the question about why the grain car corporation hasn't got the \$9 million in its books. I'm not sure why they're not doing that. I'm not sure why they don't actually show. I think they've got some ulterior motive. I think they've got some ulterior motive for the grain car corporation and as I indicated earlier, their friends in the CPR are likely calling the shots and saying, 'No more money charged to the grain car corporation.'

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has indicated to this province that he's unable to convince his counterparts that the Crow rate should remain. He's failed to convince the Alberta Tory government to implement the same kind of motion we had here in Saskatchewan. And as I get to the last point and talk about the Crow rate and the effect the Crow rate is going to have on Saskatchewan, and how little money this province has

put . . . they said, 'We're going to go to the wall for the farmers of Saskatchewan. We're even going to tax the treasury to fight the Crow rate.' I looked at those Crow ads that you did right across Canada. Show me an ad and show me a word in there where you said you're going to maintain the Crow rate. You spent some money advertising against the Pepin plan. But never did they reveal that they're going to leave the Crow rate in statute. And I think your colours are starting to show when Mulroney stands and says, 'Pepin is on the right track.' And the minister isn't willing to talk to him and to encourage him. And he'll do about as good a job with him as he did with the Alberta government, which is nothing. I predict here and now that they'll also be unable to convince a new federal leader, who is on the record as saying that the federal government is going in the right direction and that farmers are prepared to pay more for better transportation. I think the Tory plan is clear. You're kind of hoping the Liberals destroy the Crow rate so you won't have to do it if you think you're going to form the next government. But I am afraid the Tories have just blown their chances because the people of western Canada are going to find out where you really stand on the Crow rate with the statements your new leader has made.

The March budget provided no programs to buttress the agricultural sector at the time when the realized net farm income was down by more than 20 per cent. All economic indications reveal that even with the normal crop this year, farm income will be the lowest it's been since 1972, Mr. Speaker, and that's serious news. That's serious. And what is the Tory response to the plight of Saskatchewan's farmers? It's been disgusting. A slash in the budgets by 19 and 20 per cent. Programs have been eliminated. This is the Tory pride that makes Saskatchewan number one.

Another disappointed in the March budget was the paltry increase for rural local government — an increase of only 4.5 per cent. Why didn't you go inflation minus one like you said you were going to do? You leave the farmers on their own.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the matters which are discussed are few, but the examples are this government is insensitive to the people of rural Saskatchewan. It's insensitive to the ordinary Joe. The irresponsible action by the Tories, under the guise of a budget, are not the actions of a government should recognize as its responsibility to rural Saskatchewan.

The backbone of the Saskatchewan economy is agriculture. The government has obviously refused to recognize this. The budget introduced last March does nothing to help farmers in rural Saskatchewan. It is for that reason and others already mentioned, that I cannot support this bill.

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

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise and take part in this debate over Bill No. 105, Mr. Speaker.

This is one of the most important bills presented by the government at this session, the bill to give effect to the government's bad news budget of two and a half a months ago. While that budget, Mr. Speaker, the budget now to be passed with this bill was a bad news budget for all of northern Saskatchewan and for all residents of this province, Mr. Speaker, it was particularly bad news for the northern administration district.

Last spring, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party misled the people of this province,



claiming that they had a new vision of the North. They claimed that they had a new vision for northern Saskatchewan, and I will get into more detail on that aspect, Mr. Speaker, as time progresses.

A new vision of the people of northern Saskatchewan they promised, but that promise was hollow, Mr. Speaker, and it was empty; it was hollow and it was empty. The people of Saskatchewan were misled, Mr. Speaker, and now for the last year the Conservative Party in office has betrayed that very promise. They have betrayed this province and they have betrayed the people of northern Saskatchewan, instead of the new vision for the North which was promised, like what they had said. And what we have seen, the total . . . Number one, the total failure of the open for business policy to the issues facing the North and a glaring double standard — a glaring double standard. One set of rules and practices for the ordinary people of northern Saskatchewan, and a very different set of rules of the big corporate friends of the Conservative Party. A double standard.

However, Mr. Speaker, nowhere was the Tories' betrayal, the Tories' failed open for business approach and the Tories' double standard more evident than in its budget, this last budget presented here in this legislature, the budget now to be given effect by this bill, the appropriations bill. Budgetary policies which totally ignored the real developmental needs of people in isolated communities such as northern Saskatchewan.

In order to have a clear understanding of the impact of these policies on the North, Mr. Speaker, one must have at least some sympathetic understanding of the North itself — the isolation, the remoteness, the different cultures and different way of life that we have in the northern areas, its communities and its people, and their issues. And yet this northern issues and northern problems. No compassion, no understanding, totally unaware of its past and even its potential, totally unaware of the great positive development strides made under the former NDP government.

They may laugh, Mr. Speaker, they may laugh and sneer at those developmental steps which represented a solid and positive leadership and partnership between the people of the South, the people of the North and a sensitive New Democratic government. They may sneer and they may jeer and they may heckle. However, the reality still exists and people in the northern administration district still feel and understand the sensitive approach the former administration had on people in the remote northern areas. The new schools, the additional classrooms, the expanded educational programs, and programs to get northern teachers in northern schools — those type of programs were developed and implemented, and they were given high priority. Training, education and local government, and economic development were given very high priority in the northern administration district.

The expanded health care programs and facilities, including a new hospital plan for the community of La Ronge, those were approved. Those were scheduled to begin. Now where is that new hospital? Where is that new health facility, Mr. Speaker? There isn't nothing mentioned in this budget or in the former budget.

The hundreds and hundreds of miles of improved transportation facilities, roads to break down the barriers of geographical and social isolation — they were improved under the former administration. Rapid and significant expansions . . . (inaudible) . . . represented an effective local government. They were improved. Prior to 1971 we had

no local advisory councils. We only had seven local community authorities and three incorporated centres. Today we have 24 local advisory councils, nine local community authorities, and three incorporated centres; and as well, we have locally elected school boards throughout the northern administration district. And all members will know, Mr. Speaker, that these accomplishments of northern people and with northern people were made possible in the past purely because the previous government's commitment to positive budgetary policies and for positive northern development to benefit people living in isolated communities.

Now, however, we see a different approach by this Tory government, Mr. Speaker, a betrayal of the North, an abandonment of the North, and a negative budgetary approach to the needs of communities throughout the northern administration district.

The evidence for this is found throughout the Tory budget, Mr. Speaker, which is to be given effect by this bill that is presented before us today. Let us just take a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. Has the government proceeded with the planned new hospital, as I've mentioned before, for La Ronge — for that whole region that covers Stanley Mission, Weyakwin, Brabant, Southend, Pinehouse, many other communities throughout that region? This hospital, this new health facility, was so direly needed by the people of that region, but did it ever proved to be a success through this Tory budget presented? No, it was cut back. It was cancelled. And that is reality wit the Tory government.

Has the government provided for any increase at all in funds for northern community utilities and northern community capital projects? Again, no. The Tories, again, have slashed budgets so direly needed to create employment and community improvements. Again, they have slashed those direly needed services and programs, Mr. Speaker. They have again cut those budgets back.

Has the government provided, in the money being voted by this bill, any increases in funds for northern economic development? Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to say no. In fact those funds have been cut by 17 per cent. Again they have been cut by 17 per cent.

I have here a memo drafted by the minister in charge of the northern administration district where he promised local self-government, where he promised a comprehensive economic developmental strategy, a self-sufficient economic development strategy. I ask the minister: where is that strategy? Where is that promise? And again, the members opposite can only shrug their shoulders and try to misunderstand what I'm talking about.

They have to shrug their shoulders because they have no economic development plan. They have no economic development strategy for the benefit of people living in those isolated communities. That is again another example, another prime example of their double-standard policy with respect to their whole philosophy and with respect to their budget that is being proposed to us in this legislature tonight.

I go back again and look at the unemployment statistics in the remote areas throughout northern Saskatchewan. I just take one community as an example. In May of 1982, and as compared to 1983 of May, under this administration, there has been an increase of 37 per cent unemployment in La Ronge. And you look at the more remote isolated communities, and the lowest and very minimum unemployment rating in those areas is 85 per cent. Now who, I ask the Assembly, this Legislative Assembly, is looking after the

health and welfare and those very social, cultural and economic problems of the northern communities? No one, I cannot see anyone that has dedicated himself, or committed himself to go out into these remote northern communities and try to improve the living standards of those people.

Has the government even attempted to maintain the previous levels, the necessary expenditures for maintaining and improving northern roads? No, I looked at the record of the former administrations, and I'll just go down to several items listed under this record. And I have to agree with my colleague from Shaunavon; it was an impressive list. Because, in northern, remote Saskatchewan, we had somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1,300 low-income subsidized housing, home-ownership houses built for people in northern Saskatchewan. And again, we had 14 water and sewer built for people in northern Saskatchewan. And again, we had 14 water and sewer systems installed or expanded, and also electricity provided to 17 remote northern communities. We had 12 new airfields built, and also additional airports constructed through the former Department of Highways, through the former administration.

We had major expansion of community access roads built through DNS, and upgraded through the department of northern highways. We also had \$42 million worth of construction for schools, for first-time schools, and education facilities to eight remote northern communities.

Extension of Sask Tel communications — that was a tremendous help for many of the remote isolated communities — 24 to 97 per cent of population with access to television and communication. Funding again, for 18 community halls and arenas. Eighteen communities received access to new community-oriented programs. Funding again, for fire halls, municipal offices, fire trucks, too many to count and too many to provide statistics in terms of the way the former administration had committed itself. And if you get down to economic development in the northern areas, and I state this for the record, there were \$15 million in low-interest loans provided to local entrepreneurs, local Northerners who wanted to better their way of life. And again, compounded with that \$15 million provided in low-interest loans, there was \$6 million in grants provided to northern communities and Northerners. I challenge this administration to better that accomplishment.

And to go on and talk about social development, we had health and medical staff chiselled from the former administration of the pre-70s. Community health worker programs were implemented in nine communities, and they have expanded, and they have improved the way of life in many of those remote communities. There were six dental clinics constructed and Northerners trained as dental assistants. Now, that is a very important program. And then again we had two new community health centres very important program. And then again we had two new community health centres built in Sandy Bay and in Pinehouse, services that weren't there by former administrations and certainly not there by this administration. And then again, I can go on and talk about the northern teacher's training program, and here I commend the Minister of Education. At least he made an effort to visit those northern areas and to improve and approve and recommend for approval the NORTEP (Northern Teacher Education Program) training program. There were, under the former administration, three community colleges built, and that is a tremendous improvement in terms of training and education facilities for people in the remote northern areas. And then we have some very needed services such as the food transportation subsidy program; 16 have some very needed services such as the food transportation subsidy program; 16 day care centres were built and people in those communities have tried to improve and tried to expand on those facilities. However, we are certainly on the verge of questioning where those projects are going, and where those programs are going, and what the government's policy is towards those social, cultural, and economic

improvements that were there prior to this budget that is being debated in front of us tonight.

This, then, Mr. Speaker, has been the record of the Conservative government, the Conservatives' approach to the people of northern Saskatchewan: betrayal of promises made, cut-backs of badly needed programs and services. A double standard, Mr. Speaker — tax breaks for the Tories' big corporate friends in the oil business and the banking business and the insurance business and the real estate business, and programs cuts for the people that direly need the encouragement, the support, from their administration in this province. This Tory government, Mr. Speaker, likes to pretend that its economic policies, its open for business approach and philosophy is designed to provide economic activity and economic benefits for the North. They pretend, of course, that their mining policies are designed to just that. But this is not so, Mr. Speaker. This is not so.

If we look at for a moment, if we look at the surfaces lease agreement signed by the Tories at Rabbit Lake and if we compare this agreement to those signed for Cluff Lake and Key Lake, we find the truth, Mr. Speaker. And the truth, Mr. Speaker, is once more bad news for the residents of northern Saskatchewan, for the residents of my constituency, bad news for the people of the North. In this new lease agreement, Mr. Speaker, there are no northern native residents be hired and be trained and be given preferences. No. what we have once again, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the open for business approach, an example of the double standard practised by the members opposite: profits for the multinational resource companies and no significant benefits of northern people. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that the residents of northern Saskatchewan and the people of the entire province have now come to realize that the budget which is being implemented by this bill, the appropriation bill, has been nothing but bad news for the ordinary people of our province. And in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this bill. Thank you very much.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to get into this debate, a debate on an appropriation bill, a \$3 billion bill for the province of Saskatchewan, and one could wonder what those \$3 billion are going to provide for the people of Saskatchewan. When you look at the budget that we had before us this year, Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to find what the benefits are going to be. We have a \$3 billion budget, and we have over a \$500 million deficit — shame. That, Speaker, is what this government has provided the people of Saskatchewan for the past year that they have been in office.

What have they provided to local government, local governments within the towns, villages, the cities. They have told the local governments that they are going to have to do with less. They will have to somehow find ways of generating that revenue that they will require from within their own communities. They will only be providing a certain amount of funds and they have to stay within the inflation guide-lines that they have set. That, Mr. Speaker, is what they've been telling the people of Saskatchewan. They have been saying that to the RMs. Every RM in Saskatchewan has been expecting at least the inflation guide-lines that this government has talked about. Did they get their 7 or 8 per cent, Mr. Speaker? No, they did not. All that they did get when it finally came own to the crunch was about 4.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That's what the RMs of Saskatchewan received. That is what they received and they had to therefore go to the citizens of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of

rural Saskatchewan, to get money that they would need to continue the services that they have been providing. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan received from this government.

And they talk about a \$3 billion budget, a large budget, and true it is. The only problem is, that money did not go to the areas that it should have. They did not provide the kind of services, the kind of assistance, that the people expected this government to provide. That, Mr. Speaker, was the disappointment that was created by this government, the disappointment that the people of Saskatchewan did not expect. The people of Saskatchewan expected a lot more, because if you listened to a lot of the campaign promises of a little over a year ago, one would have thought that every government, every local government in Saskatchewan, every taxpayer and every farmer, every individual in Saskatchewan was going to somehow benefit tremendously if the Conservatives ever became the government in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they did become the Government of Saskatchewan. The only problem is now they forgot the promises that they made to the people who elected them. That was the one problem, Mr. Speaker. They made the promises and they did get elected, but they did not keep those promises. And, Mr. Speaker, that was the one disappointment that the people have, and I would suggest as the years go by, the one disappointment that the people have, and I would suggest as the years go by, the one year and the two years and the three years, that the people will find many more disappointments from this government. They will find that this government does not intend to keep many of those promises. They may, in the last year of their office, come up with some good little programs and come up with some goodies to try and fool the people once again, but, Mr. Speaker, the electorate of Saskatchewan is an intelligent and very informed electorate and they will not be deceived twice in a row.

What has this government provided for agriculture? Well, Mr. Speaker, agriculture, according to this government, and definitely according to the members on this side, is the number one industry in Saskatchewan. And this government agrees to that. But that is about all they do. They just agree that agriculture is number one. And what did they provide for agriculture? They provide about a \$79.8 million budget — a cut of some 13 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That is what they have provided for the number one industry of Saskatchewan.

What have they done with some of the programs that were being provided for rural Saskatchewan, to the farmers of Saskatchewan? Well, they decided that they would do away with some of those. They got rid of land bank — land bank which assisted many young farmers to get on the land. And a lot of those farmers are still there farming today. And they're only there because they had an agreement, a contract, that could not be broken. And those farmers are still farming, and I hope that this government will not find a way to get these farmers off that land. I hope that they allow these farmers to continue farming. Land bank was a good program that got many young farmers on the land — many young farmers that cannot afford to buy that land. They did not have the finances to continue farming, they have to do it under a program that will not cost them \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$300,000, because that would put many of these in financial difficulty; it would put these young farmers in financial difficulty to the point where they would not be able to remain on that land for more than a year or two. So the land bank program was a beneficial program, Mr. Speaker.

The family farm improvement branch — another program that was cancelled by this

government — and that was another program that many of the farmers felt was a very good program, and one that I see no reason why this government would decide to do away with it. It allowed the farmers of Saskatchewan to receive some of the same benefits as do urban residents, where they could provide or put in waterworks on their farms. It allowed them to purchase equipment at a reasonable cost, purchase the pumping equipment, the septic tanks, at a reasonable cost.

And what has this government done? They decided to do away with that program — do away with FFIB even though it was self-sustaining; it made a little bit of a profit; it did not cost the taxpayer of this province any money. It made a profit off the equipment, the material that it sold to the farmer. And that, Mr. Speaker, was a program that did not cost the taxpayer any money. The farmers did not ask for the taxpayers to subsidize that program, but they asked for a reasonable price on the material that they required. But this government decided that they would do away with the FFIB and give everything to the private sector. Regardless of what the benefits were to many, many people in the province, they decided that they would do away with many of the programs and give it to the private sector. And nobody disagrees with letting the private sector handle much of the business, be it in plumbing, in any other area, but, Mr. Speaker, when you do away with a program that is there to assist one sector in society, and this was the farmers in particular . . . There was no reason to scrap that program and give it over to the private sector when the private sector already had a good portion of that business. But this government in their blind faith to the private sector, decides that they would scrap some of these programs.

FarmStart grants — another program that many farmers have used. Many farmers today that are in the livestock business, in the hog industry, are in it because of FarmStart grants. And that is another program, Mr. Speaker, where it allowed young farmers to get on the land, to be able to get into the production of hogs or cattle, or to get into the dairy business. And it provided the funding for these young farmers to get into that industry. And today, this government is saying that that is no longer required, that if they have not got the finances, then they shouldn't be in a business, that this government will no longer assist them to get into whatever type of production that they way want to get into.

And that, Mr. Speaker, I say is unfortunate. It's unfortunate that this government has taken that stand and it's very unfortunate for the farmers of Saskatchewan, the people in rural Saskatchewan, that are looking forward to a little bit of assistance, not looking forward to receiving something for nothing, because any grants that they get or any assistance that they get — a majority of those were loans provided at a little lower interest rate, and it allowed these young farmers to get started. And they are looking for that kind of assistance — a little bit of help — much the same as what is being given to some of the large corporations. In fact, it is only a small part of what is being given to the large corporations, Mr. Speaker.

But yet it seems to that this government decides that out of that \$3 billion that they have in their budget, they would cut out all the smaller individuals, the smaller industries, and the smaller businessmen, and I consider a farmer a businessman. He is businessman who produces food and this government has decided that this is the group that they will not be assisting in any way at all, and they have cut virtually every program that was there to assist the farmers of Saskatchewan. And not only did they hurt farmers by cutting away some of the programs that were there to assist them, but they have gone even further and hurt the farmer along with every resident of Saskatchewan, every individual, be it a private home, an industry . . . They have hurt them by some of the

increases that they are putting into place for our utilities.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think is one of the most unfortunate things that has hit everyone in this province in 1983. They are looking at huge rate increases, be it SGI, Sask Tel, Sask Transportation, SPC — every utility, Mr. Speaker, that everyone uses or transportation that people use that was a crown corporation, this government had decided to boost the rates, not in 5 or 7 per cent as they had been providing for the rural municipalities when they were giving them money, but they are boosting them by 17 or 20 per cent or 40 per cent.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of increases that they are indicating that the people of Saskatchewan are going to have to accept. They have to accept huge increases for what they require, for what they will be using. And yet when the people of Saskatchewan asked this government for a little bit of assistance that wasn't costing the taxpayer any money, they said no, they won't do that there. But when it comes to charging for utilities or for insurance, they are going to raise those increases as high as they can possibly raise them and raise them to the point where on some of them the public will not be able to afford.

And we can look at what it's going to do with natural gas, Mr. Speaker. And this government was bragging in the beginning of 1982 when they first got elected about what they were going to do to provide natural gas for rural Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, they started providing natural gas for some of rural Saskatchewan. But how long will rural Saskatchewan be able to afford to purchase that natural gas from this government? If the increases continue to rise the way it is suggested now, Mr. Speaker, then I would say that this government may as well discontinue the expansion of natural gas to farmers in rural Saskatchewan because I am sure that many of those farmers will not be able to afford that natural gas. That is the situation that is developing in this province, Mr. Speaker. That is what the people of Saskatchewan are facing today. And that is what the people of Saskatchewan did not expect from this -government because that is not what they were saying when they got elected.

We'll look at what's being provided in highways, and it's unfortunate that the minister of pot-holes is not here tonight, Mr. Speaker. But when you look and drive down some of the roads in Saskatchewan, and just after a year . . . It's unfortunate that he is truly becoming the minister of pot-holes, because many of these highways are breaking up so fast, Mr. Speaker, that the maintenance crews cannot keep up to repairing them. the maintenance crews have some difficulties in repairing the condition, the pot-holes on these roads. The condition that some of these roads will be in within one or two years, Mr. Speaker, will be to a point where they will no longer be able to be repaired. And what will happen then is that we will be going back to what the situation was a number of years ago, the years when the Liberals tried the same type of programs — the same type of policy that the Conservatives are trying today.

Cuts in highways, cuts in just about every program that there is designed for people and let everything deteriorate to a point where it is almost intolerable and that is when this government will not be in power any more, Mr. Speaker. When it gets to the point where they continue to allow the highways, to allow agriculture, to allow rural municipalities to go down and down, Mr. Speaker, that is when the people of Saskatchewan will react and they will say that we did not elect government to allow this province to fall apart. But we would like to see a government in place that will continue to provide programs, to provide good highways, and to run a good

government and a good province, Mr. Speaker.

We still have a good province, and we can only hope that it will remain that way, but the way it's going now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's questionable if this province will be able to survive the four years. It is becoming questionable whether we will be able to say that in four years time there is going to be much to salvage in Saskatchewan when you look at some of the deficits that have been created within the crown corporations. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think as my colleague said, is shameful. Because every crown corporation has been managing to make a small amount of profit and has always managed to provide a service to the people at the lowest cost possible — at the lowest cost possible, Mr. Speaker.

When this same group, the Conservative Party, was in opposition, we have been criticized then that the rates for Sask Power, Sask Tel, or for insurance in SGI, were much too high, that they should be lower. Well, Mr. Speaker, we see what has happened now. The rates were reasonable at that time, and the corporations did make some profit. And today we see every corporation . . . Sask Tel — what happened to Sask Tel? Well, Mr. Speaker, this year they made a profit of about 7.8 million in 1982, compared to about 24 million in 1981. That, Mr. Speaker, shows what is happening to Sask Tel.

We can go to SPC, Mr. Speaker. They had a deficit of some \$3.5 million, Mr. Speaker, compared to a loss in '81 of about \$323,000. That's quite a difference, Mr. Speaker, quite a difference.

Sedco (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) recorded a loss of some \$9 million in '82, Mr. Speaker. And in '81 they had a profit of 3 million. Sask Transportation Company — a loss of \$2 million in '82; in 1981 a loss of only \$300,000. Sask Transportation Company was being run to provide a service — a transportation service for the people of Saskatchewan — at as close to a break even point as possible. And when you look at only a \$300,000 loss in '81, one would have to agree that it was being run at as close to a break even point as possible.

And it was providing a good service. In '82 we see a \$2 million loss, and what is happening to the service? What is happening to the service in Saskatchewan with Sask Transportation? Well, Mr. Speaker, we see buses being cut. We see fares going up. That, Mr. Speaker, is what has happened to STC. Every crown corporation in Saskatchewan is being . . . Mr. Speaker, I notice the minister of pot-holes came back in, and I found it a bit amusing because it's unfortunate that I'd just finished with him. But I'm sure I'll be able to get back to him again, before I complete my speech.

But on the crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, we see that CIC in total, and that's of all the crown corporations in Saskatchewan — has lost something like \$126 million, Mr. Speaker — \$126 million compared to 1981 where we had a profit of 116 million. That, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening in Saskatchewan today, just after a year of Conservative government. That is what is happening in Saskatchewan today. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the Tories think of the crown corporations and of the services that have been provided to Saskatchewan people. That, Mr. Speaker, is what they think.

I would say, that's not what they necessarily think of crown corporations, but I would have to say that that is the consideration that they have for Saskatchewan people. Because they would not, they would not allow the corporations to get into that situation and into that financial situation, if they were concerned about what they were providing



to rural Saskatchewan, if they were concerned about the kind of service that they were providing to urban Saskatchewan, and to all people of Saskatchewan. But if they were concerned about Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, they would see to it that every crown corporation was run efficiently and run to provide the service that it was meant to provide. But that is not what has been happening, Mr. Speaker. That is not what has been happening at all, and it is becoming a disappointment to the people of Saskatchewan because that is not what they expected.

We see Social Services, and when you look in areas of Social Services, although some of it was given to Health just to make the department of Health look like it was number one, the way the election campaign has promised — that we will be making Saskatchewan Health number one, mainly in spending, but not necessarily in providing service. So what do they do in order to bring up the expenditures of Health? Bring in programs from Social Services. But what is left with Social Services, Mr. Speaker? What kind of funding has this government provided? It appears that the Minister of Finance and his colleagues felt that we do not have to put that much emphasis on Social Services.

They have been making cuts, particularly for the handicapped, the disabled. They have been cutting small amounts, and when you go to the hearing impaired, a small \$7,000 amount, Mr. Speaker. They could not find \$7,000 to continue the kind of programming that was being provided for them in the past. That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of cuts that we have been seeing — small cuts here, and small cuts there, mainly in areas and to people that cannot defend themselves. That is what this government has been doing, Mr. Speaker.

They have done that to the hearing impaired. They have done that to psych services, and as I've said, in areas where the people cannot defend themselves, cannot fight for themselves. That is where they have been making the cuts. They have not been making cuts for the oil companies. No, they increased the royalties there because those people have the power and the ability to make the argument for themselves, and for those are the people that receive the benefits from this government — a minority, just few people that get that, a few large corporations. It's not the majority of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

We see unemployment in Saskatchewan that has gone up and up just about every month and has continued to go up every month since this government has been in power. We see many young people without jobs. Young people out of university that had hoped they would have a real job really have nothing to look forward to. There are no jobs available. All there is is unemployment. That, Mr. Speaker, is what we see in Saskatchewan. And maybe the most disappointing area is the area of Yorkton, where the Minister of Labour comes from. We see an increase there of about 77 per cent in unemployment. And that, Mr. Speaker, should be a disgrace for the Minister of Labour, where his own constituency and the city that he lives in has about the highest unemployment in the province.

And that, Mr. Speaker, has happened over the past year. And one can only wonder what is going to happen in the next three years: what is going to happen to Saskatchewan; what is the outlook going to be; what prospect is there for young people in Saskatchewan in 1984, in 1985 and onward? I think that is something that many of the young people are thinking about, Mr. Speaker, because today they cannot find a job. And it is a concern to them — it is a concern to them because only a year ago this government has said that if they ever get into power that we would have total prosperity

in Saskatchewan. There would be jobs; there would be economic prosperity, and they would be calling for all the people that had left Saskatchewan. They would be calling for all the children to come back to Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many of them came back. But if they did they came back to go on welfare or to go on unemployment insurance for as long as it'll last, because there are no jobs here and there is nothing to come back to in Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, is what they are being faced with. It was merely a lot of rhetoric on behalf of the government as to how prosperous everything was going to be, and what they were going to do, and how many people they could bring back, because the actual facts are that there is no money, no work — no work in Saskatchewan, no money for these young people in Saskatchewan at all.

We will not see these people coming back; we will not see the young people that had left to look for work elsewhere coming back to find a job here. If anything, we will see more of them . . . Every young student that's out of university today and does not have a job is going to have to leave Saskatchewan to try and find one. That is the situation that they are faced with today, and, Mr. Speaker, a situation that they will probably be faced with next year and the year after. So it has to be a concern to every student, to every individual of this province, and it should be a concern to this government.

We have seen bankruptcies on the increase. There has been something like a 90 per cent increase in bankruptcies, Mr. Speaker, and all this after only one year in power; one year in power, and we see bankruptcies at an all-time high. We have seen closures of businesses and lay-offs. All that has happened within that one year, Mr. Speaker, and one would wonder why that has been happening in this past year. Why would so many businesses be going out of business? Why would they not be able to continue to operate their business, especially when they were being told that if they become the government, that Saskatchewan is open for business, and anybody that wanted to come into Saskatchewan to open up a business would find prosperity here and it would be open for them? Well, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that Saskatchewan is open for business. But if you want to survive in business in Saskatchewan, it seems that you won't be able to do it merely with the open for business slogan, because we have come on hard economic times in Saskatchewan in the past year and we do not see new businesses opening up; but what we see is businesses closing down. Day after day, more and more of them are closing down. That, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening in Saskatchewan.

And that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, should not be happening in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan could be a prosperous province. It could be one that could be providing many benefits to the people. It could be allowing businesses to remain open. But that has not been happening. And why is it not happening? I think it's merely because of the inability of this government to address the problems that are out there and to provide the assistance where it's required. This is the one thing that this government has not done, Mr. Speaker.

They were supposed to cut down the costs of government. They continually said that they would bring down the cost of government and one of the members across says they did. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true, they have fired a lot of people. There are a lot of people on unemployment, but that doesn't necessarily cut down the cost of government because it brings up the cost of the taxpayer; it puts these people on welfare and it costs the taxpayer.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — A lot of money, a lot of money.

**MR. LUSNEY:** — yes, it costs the taxpayer a lot of money to keep these people on welfare because they no longer have a job. They're paying them not to work, when these same people could have been working; they could have been productive, and many of them want to work and continue to look for work daily. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the people of this province want — they want work. They want this government to help them find work. They want a means of making a living; they do not want to go on welfare.

But this government found that it is more important to worry about the oil companies and to try and make it appear as though somehow they're cutting back or cutting down the cost of government, but when you look at the list of employees that this government has, and the cost of those employees, well. Mr. Speaker, I don't think they're saving the taxpayer any money. In fact, I think what they're doing is probably costing the taxpayer a lot more money when you take everything into account. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government is really doing, in actual fact. They say one thing, but what is actually happening is something different, and that will only continue for a short while because, as I mentioned before, the people of Saskatchewan are intelligent. They are politically aware and they will soon realize what is happening. They will soon realize that this government is saying one thing and doing another, and when that happens I think this government could expect some reaction from the people, and that will come, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would only like to say that every individual in Saskatchewan today has been giving this government an opportunity to right the things that have gone wrong over the past year. They have been waiting, but they are getting a little disappointed. They're getting a little discouraged and it won't be long, Mr. Speaker, that you will have problems in Saskatchewan as you have in many other provinces, where people will not just sit back quietly and accept the kind of difficulties that are being imposed on them by this government. But they will react to that and it will be unfortunate when they do react, because I feel that there is no need for that, that there is a way that this government could provide the opportunities in this province.

We have a good province, a province with resources, and a province with the manpower and the ability to provide many benefits to the people of Saskatchewan, but unless this government takes control of what is happening and forgets about the policy of open for business where no benefits accrue, then, Mr. Speaker, this government will wind up in a lot of problems along with the people of Saskatchewan. Unless they take that stand and unless they decide to right the things that have gone wrong or that they created in the past year, we will continue to be in a recession in Saskatchewan and we will continue to have a lot of financial problems, a lot of difficulties in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would only say that I feel this government has gone the wrong direction. They have gone in the wrong direction, and they are continuing to go in that direction, and it will be their defeat. That will be their defeat and in four years time I can only say that the people of Saskatchewan will once again have a government that will not only provide some economic stability in Saskatchewan, but will allow the individuals, the business people of this province to prosper once again as they have over the past 10 years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I was waiting, Mr. Speaker, hoping that members opposite might want to make some of their contributions from their feet. I suppose members opposite are either so burnt out after their week-end of frivolity in Ottawa or so totally lacking in any enthusiasm for their own record, they simply will not get into this debate.

The question of the appropriations makes me thing back over the last year. I think there was no question last year, last spring, but what the public of Saskatchewan felt frustrated — frustrated not with an administration but with events which they felt were taking control of their lives in a way they didn't like. They felt concerned about mortgage rates. They felt concerned about inflation. They felt a certain frustration that the events seemed to be out of control.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the public do not feel frustrated so much as cheated. They voted for a party which promised them they could be so much more, which seemed to herald a new day — easy solutions; pat answers. What they got was no solutions, a very considerable exaggeration of the problems, an administration that has not been so poorly run since the '30s, a deficit of unheard-of proportions, undreamed-of proportions and a sharp cut-back in services ... (inaudible interjection) ... Well, I wonder if the member is going to give us this speech on leafy spurge from his feet or if he is going to repeat these pearls of wisdom from his chair? ... (inaudible interjection) ... It was; it got front page coverage in the *Leader-Post*. I'm sure in the *Weyburn Review* it did as well.

What this budget did, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in addition to giving the member an opportunity to make a speech on leafy spurge, what this budget did was to avoid any — to avoid any — of the major problems. It said a great deal about job creation and has done very little. The results so far, with respect to unemployment, must disappoint even members opposite. I just noted in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday an article, 'May jobless rate eases to 12.4 per cent.' What we learn is that Saskatchewan lags many provinces which we've hitherto led ... (inaudible interjection) ... I am telling the member from Weyburn, if he cares to give me the opportunity, who is leading the recovery, and it certainly isn't Saskatchewan with its much vaunted 'open for business.' I'm going to get back to 'open for business' in a moment. Suffice it to say, if it had just been perfectly ineffective the public might have counted their blessings. That silly bit of sloganeering has in fact exacerbated Saskatchewan's economic problems. It has exacerbated the problems because it has diverted attention away from some things that could have worked and could have brought relief to Saskatchewan people to some ideas which are totally bankrupt of any usefulness. The article is entitled: 'May jobless rate eases to 12.4 per cent.'

And it states the rate of declines in various provinces. It states that the rate declined nine-tenths of a point in Newfoundland; one-tenth of 1 per cent in New Brunswick; two-tenths of 1 per cent in Quebec; two-tenths of 1 per cent in Ontario; and the rate of unemployment declined by one one-tenth of 1 per cent in Saskatchewan.

In terms of economic recovery, we are now being led by such hitherto robust economies as Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Quebec, and even Ontario. Virtually the only provinces with whom we can make favourable comparisons are the Maritimes — Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, etc. Our rate of recovery is not something to be proud of. We are being led in our rate of recovery by many provinces who don't have a

fraction of the resources that we do. The suggestion that Newfoundland and New Brunswick should lead us in the recovery should give even this government pause for some consideration.

Members opposite have spent some time tiltilating themselves with figures about the number of new jobs created.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What was that word again?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Tiltilate, tiltilate. I'll spell it for the member from Weyburn. It hasn't anything to do with leafy spurge. In terms of unemployed, Mr. Speaker, there were . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — We're waiting for you to spell it Ned.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — T-i-l-t-i-l-a-t-e, tiltilate.

In terms of numbers, there were 80,000 more unemployed in May, 1983 than in May, 1982 — 8,000 more unemployed. Over the 10-year period from 1972 to '83, the average annual rate in the change of unemployed was about 1,400. Last year, with the benefit of this genius, with the benefit of the genius of members opposite, 1,400 became 8,000. Moreover, the attached operational data from each of the 11 unemployment centres — and I'm going to get back to that — shows there were 26,000 more unemployed persons seeking work at those unemployment centres in May '83 than in May '82 — an 80 per cent increase. If that doesn't give some members opposite cause to consider whether or not the open for business philosophy is the runaway success they'd like to think it is, I really don't think, Mr. Speaker, know what will give them cause to consider it.

I heard the Minister of Finance the other day saying that Saskatchewan's unemployment problems were caused by people rushing in to take advantage of this new-found prosperity. To listen to the Minister of Finance, you couldn't stand within 50 miles of the border without getting trampled by the onrush of people into the province. I say to the Minister of Finance: there is no great net in-migration. It's going down; went way down. They've heard about what happens when Tories take over. It used to be the case, Mr. Minister of Finance, there used to be a significant in-migration. It declined very sharply with the benefit of your administration's . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, silence may be golden for the member from Weyburn, because that's all we have heard from him. You must believe that yourself.

In 1979 there were 3,319 people came into Saskatchewan. In 1980 it ballooned up to 4,284. In 1982, 3,416; last year, down to 2,900 — lower than it has been since the early '70s when the former administration go this province and got its economy back up on its feet.

People in Alberta have also heard about the wonderful miracles you people have created in this province. In 1979, when this province had a strong economy, given the proper leadership, 1,157 people came into this province from Alberta. In 1980 that increased to 1,304 people. In 1982 there were 1,088. This year, when one might have thought they might have flocked to this right-wing haven, the number plummeted to 744. The unemployment in this province is not created by in-migration.

Mention has been made in this debate of two of the central features of this Conservative

government's policies, two central features which have become apparent from their policies and the results of those policies. These two essential features are now widely recognized by Saskatchewan people as direct consequences of this government's general, negative approach to government, which was so clearly illustrated in the budget and in the appropriation act, which enacts the budget and the estimates.

Those two features of the Conservative government's policies are the total failure of the open for business sloganeering and their arrogant double standards. The total failure of this government's open for business approach would be laughable if it weren't for projects that didn't result in so many individual tragedies. And the failure of the open for business philosophy is complete. One would have thought in one year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in one year some bind bit of luck would have resulted in some fortuitous development in this province.

But we have a water-slide. Where's the water-slide, the water-slide which was announced by the minister of industry and commerce . . . The water-slide announced by the minister of industry and commerce in a most unusual act, of announcing a project the government had nothing to do with . . . Announced by the minister of industry and commerce — later fell to pieces. And that, I think, is the single sole success of the open for business philosophy, and the success was somewhat fleeting. Even for the member from industry and commerce, all of whose successes have been somewhat fleeting, this must have been embarrassing. This must have been embarrassing.

The tragic aftermath of their negative, do-nothing, 'let foreign investors handle it' approach to job creation, and the problem of unemployment in Saskatchewan — the tragic aftermath are those individual people: a striking example of how the failure of open for business sloganeering has produced a double standard in our society.

It's funny thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't hear near as much about open for business as we used to. We don't hear the cheer-leaders opposite trumpeting this — trumpeting this new-found key, the golden prosperity.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Do you want us to be closed for business?

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, I'm suggesting it is closed for business. That has been the result of your government's administration is that you might have as well built a brick wall around this province for all the investment that's come in . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the members aren't talking it down any too soon. I say to you that the Berlin Wall, the Berlin Wall wasn't half as effective in chasing people out as this administration — not half as effective as this administration. You people really ought to let the eastern European governments in on your secret, because they've missed it. They haven't been anywhere near as effective in keeping people out as you people have been.

Funny, we don't hear anything more about the open for business. I noted with some interest that the open for business slogan did not appear in the budget speech. Interesting. Last year we heard nothing else but this new-found genius, this new-found cure-all — the antithesis of virtually every success story in this province. I look at the member from Yorkton who was once associated with one, and may still be — the Morris Rod-Weeder Company. That company is typical of Saskatchewan success stories. They have not come in from outside. Some exceptions, but they are rare. Almost all the Saskatchewan success stories have started out as small Saskatchewan businesses and got larger. And the whole approach of this government is open for . . . There are any

number of them; there are any number of them. The member from Quill Lakes has a riding that is full of such success stories, none as prominent as Morris Rod-Weeder, none as prominent as Morris Rod-Weeder but some of them very profitable. The member from Shaunavon has quite a number of them. there are quite a number of Saskatchewan success stories, but they started in Saskatchewan small, and they grew. They were attracted to this province. The prosperity which this province used to enjoy under a saner administration was not born out of attracting foreign investors in. That has not worked for this government. It did not work for the last right-wing administration which this province had the indignity to suffer under.

The open for business philosophy is not new. Indeed, the slogan isn't new. That was the philosophy of Ross Thatcher, of that ill-fated government, and it was every bit as unsuccessful for him. Ross Thatcher repeated the experience of the member for Regina South, industry and commerce, of announcing a project only to have it fall flat.

Some day, before you utterly bankrupt this province, I hope members opposite come to understand the history of this province and the history of business in this province, and the success stories, the success stories have started here. The success stories have started here. They've started here small and they have grown. That is true of them all, virtually them all — everything from the Morris Rod-Weeder Company to the Pioneer Trust. But, you know, I may have been successful in moving the immovable. I may have actually got a government member inspired to get into this debate. And if I have, then I have truly turned water into wine. I have truly turned water into wine if I have inspired a government member to take part in the debate.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Take it in writing, Ned. Take it in writing.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, no I will not take it in writing. I want to hear the member from Regina North illustrate all those Saskatchewan success stories which started in Detroit or Ontario or Europe.

Saskatchewan success stories started here in this province. That's true of the Morris Rod-Weeder Company; that's true of Pioneer Trust; it's true of most others. They started small in this province and grew ... (inaudible interjections) ... Potash mines got started under a government with a very different complexion than this one. They started under a CCF government which gave active aid and encouragement to them. It did not go out of their way to discourage them.

Instead of the success which we would ... (inaudible) ... Instead of the success which ... I'm amused at how I've got members woken up. I don't know what I did, whether I'm standing on the cord of the microphone is screeching in your ears, but I've got the members opposite woken up. And that's truly a feat; that's truly a feat.

Instead of the rich prosperity which open for business was supposed to introduce and supposed to turn this province into sort of a 1920s style Detroit, with black factories belching smoke at every street corner, instead what has happened is that this philosophy has been an utter and complete bust — not a single solitary success story in over a year. That is a failure as complete as any that I know of. Even Ross Thatcher, who embarrassed himself for the same reason — because he was swimming against the tide of this province's history — even Ross Thatcher would look like a runaway success compared with this government.

There are many tests which we could apply to the open for business, but let's just apply

the test by which we can judge it best — its performance. Let's take the simple test of bankruptcies. When we do find that in the first 12 months of this government's term that bankruptcies were down with this new-found prosperity? A lot of people wish that were the case. Did they go up 10 per cent? A lot of people wish that were the case. Bankruptcies with this administration, supposedly pro-business, in office — bankruptcies went up by 90 per cent. By 90 per cent. So by that simple test, they fail and fail rather grandly. Or investment; new productive investment in a Saskatchewan economy — and when we apply the simple test, we find that in their first year in office, because of their misguided policies, there was an absolute decline of 7 per cent in total economic investment in Saskatchewan — absolute decline of 7 per cent in total economic investment in Saskatchewan. I say to member opposite, without a word of a lie, you have to go back to the period of the last Conservative administration from 1929 to 1934 to get a period with as bleak a record as that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's what many people are calling this, is a depression as well. Many people are calling this a depression as well. For the first time it's been over 10 years since there was a decline at all, and that was a fraction of yours. After a decade of positive economic policies . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I didn't get the chance to go to Ottawa and look around the world . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I was not in Africa last week. I was not in Africa last week. I feel as if I'm in the jungle this week, but I was not in Africa last week.

After a decade of positive economic policies which produced an increase in investment every year, we now have the open for business approach failing the acid test — the level of investment.

Government members say we are only being negative, only preaching doom and gloom. They ask us to apply a reasonable test. There's only one that I ever hear them use — it's housing. It's housing — that's the one test that I ever hear you use — h-o-u-s-i-n-g, housing . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it's not like titlating at all. Houses are rarely titlating.

But let's apply the simple test of housing. Housing has nothing to do with open for business since it is almost entirely an indigenous industry. But let us at least look at housing starts, and look at the figures published by the Minister of Finance, and by the Premier's own department of government, the Executive Council. We see that in the last five years of the NDP administration — in the last five years of the NDP administration was an average of 9,300 new housing starts each year. And if you want even higher figures, you may go back to the first six years of the NDP administration where the housing starts were even more startling — ran around 12,000 a year. But let's take the last period, the most comparable period — 9,300 new housing starts each year. What miracles do we find that members opposite have managed to work? Obviously no miracles in 1982. There weren't 9,300 new housing starts. There were fewer than 7,000 new housing starts, far fewer than the average in the previous five years. The open for business in Saskatchewan, the open for business approach, has failed yet another test.

The ultimate test, the fundamental test with the Tories' open for business policies, will lie in jobs. that is the test that is most meaningful to my constituents and to yours — jobs for Saskatchewan people and, particularly for young people.

Now I now the members opposite will spend an endless amount of time talking about the promises they made in the budget and not the performance. Let's talk jobs. I am



going to talk about your performance; you will talk about your promises, and the two are very, very, very different. I know that Conservative members opposite will want to talk about their performances. They'll want to talk about the promises made by the Minister of Economic Development as he set off on his European vacation last fall, not about the jobs which have resulted from the trip.

The minister of industry and commerce set off to Europe last fall with the typical skill and wisdom exhibited by this government to sell potash, wheat, and coal. Potash, steel, and coal was what the minister of industry and commerce set off to sell in Europe. If Europe has anything in abundance, it is coal, potash, and steel. It came as no surprise to members of this side of the House when he came back without having sold any potash, coal, or steel in Europe. It's a wonder he didn't make a side trip to Kansas to see if he couldn't sell some wheat as well, but I suppose time did not allow that. It couldn't have been good sense that kept him out of Kansas.

Not a single, solitary job came out of that boondoggle — not a single, solitary job. To be fair to the minister of industry and commerce, he has been every bit as successful with his European trip as the Premier has with his open for business philosophy and conference. So I suppose we should credit him with that, keeping pace with the Premier.

No doubt members opposite will . . . once members opposite cease telling us and cease outlining the successes of the minister of industry and commerce's European trip, they'll then want to get on to the student summer employment program, another program that people cannot stop singing your praises. It is far too little; it is far too late; it should have been called 'missed' Opportunities 1983. I doubt that they will want to talk about the 18,000 Saskatchewan young people who are out of work and actively seeking work right now. — 18,000. Government members opposite will no doubt want to talk about their version of the statistics; they will try to pretend that our unprecedented high employment is due to the influx of workers from other parts of Canada.

I pointed out earlier to the Minister of Finance that that is not the case. In the first few months . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That has to be some of the most imaginative use of statistics to suggest that because the number of agriculture workers has gone up, the amount of useful employment has gone up. They have gone home to the farm, because of the dismal failure of this government's economic programs. There simply is no point in them staying in the urban areas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I would invite the member from Weyburn to get up and speak from his feet. He's making a sterling contribution from his chair. I would hope he would take the opportunity to get up and speak from his feet.

Perhaps the most telling figures of all, perhaps the most damning evidence of how open for business policies have totally failed is from the 11 Canada employment centres all over Saskatchewan, where in May 1983, some 60,000 unemployed people, Saskatchewan workers, were actively seeking work — 60,000. That is an increase of 80 per cent — an 80 per cent increase. I invite the members opposite — some might have a passing interest; one might have a passing interest — in checking with the Canada Employment Centre in Estevan where there are more unemployed people than last year, with 17 per cent fewer jobs posted. I sincerely hope we are enlightened by the benefits of the member from North Battleford, who I don't see right at the moment,

explaining why the open for business policy was such a runaway success in North Battleford, with an increase of 33 per cent in the number of unemployed people in North Battleford in the last 12 months. No doubt the Minister of labour is chomping at the bit, dying to get into this debate, dying to tell us how government policies, how the burgeoning success of the open for business philosophy resulted in a 77 per cent increase in the number of unemployed persons in the city of Weyburn. It is perhaps symbolic — perhaps symbolic — that the largest increase was in the riding of the Minister of Labour . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . In Yorkton, that's right, because that member has perhaps made . . . that department should have made a much, much larger contribution to the solution to this problem than it has. But I'm going to get on to his department in a moment.

Perhaps we'll hear from the member from Prince Albert from his feet for a change, who can explain to us why the Conservative policies resulted in a 67 per cent increase in unemployment in the city of Prince Albert in the last 12 months — a 67 per cent increase in the number of unemployed people. What happened to the number of jobs? It went down 21 per cent. The job postings went down 21 per cent.

I recall campaigning . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I can hardly wait. I can hardly wait to hear the supplications of the member from Regina North on jobs. Maybe we'll get lucky enough to be treated to comments from one of the members from Regina who can explain to us and to this Assembly why his government's failed policies have meant plant closures, lay-offs, bankruptcies on a scale which is unprecedented since the Great Depression, why, in his government's first year, there has been a 66 per cent increase in the number of unemployed men and women in Regina seeking work at the Canada Employment Centre. It's a good thing you had the member from Yorkton to compare yourself with, or you would have walked off with the booby prize. A 60 per cent increase at a time when there were 27 per cent fewer jobs.

Who knows, we may even inspire one of the members from Saskatoon, some of whom do seem to need some help, some of whom do seem to need some help. You might hug an unemployed hockey player. You might just hug anyone who's unemployed in Saskatoon. You're not going to have to go very far, I say to the member, because there are a large number of them in Saskatoon to hug — a large number of unemployed in Saskatoon to hug. Perhaps that Conservative member can tell me why Tory policies in that city have resulted in an increase of more than 5,500 — 5,500 in the number of unemployed in just one year?

If the open for business had succeeded with anything like the way it was promised, if they had increased in anything like the fashion which was promised at the time the much-heralded open for business philosophy came out, I wonder if we would have had the number of jobs posted. That's what open for business, a complete misunderstanding . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, I can, I can. They're in *Hansard*, and if the member can read, you might find them in *Hansard* tomorrow . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I should be nice. I should be nice. We should be nice to people from Saskatoon.

The pattern is the same throughout the province. It is the same in Weyburn; it is the same in Swift Current; it is the same in La Ronge . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Far worse in La Ronge. The member from Athabasca is quite right. It is far, far worse in La Ronge than in any of the centres that I have mentioned — thousands more Saskatchewan men and women seeking work; thousands fewer jobs posted. And that is

the acid test of Tory policies, policies which were contained in the misguided and negative budget that lies behind bill 105 now be fore us.

By that test, open for business has been a comedy of errors, but it's also been a tragedy of errors — a tragedy for the 60,000 for whom there is no work, the men and women who have been stripped of their pride, many of whom for the first time in their lives are going on to, are facing the prospect of going onto welfare, people who never thought there was any possibility of them being on welfare. Some of them are on welfare, and many thousands more face that prospect.

For the young people — tragedies for the young people, young people who should be full of optimism, who should believe that life owes them the best and will give them the best if only they offer up the very best. What do you see written across the face of young people? I'll tell you, because I see them in my office, I see them in there every day. I see young people coming into that office with their job resumes, wanting to know if we can hire anybody. The job situation is so desperate, they simply go door to door hoping that somehow or other, by some miracle, someone will want their willing hands and their willing mind.

It's a tragedy for the women of this province, who are the first to be unemployed. Women in this province, as elsewhere, have a far higher rate of unemployment. Their rate of unemployment takes longer to go down. They're the first off and the last back on again. By the definition of jobs, open for business has been a tragic failure.

I know we'll hear them brag about the summer employment program which might have been aptly styled 'missed' Opportunities '83. Will they have the courage to stand before this Assembly and admit that it has been their policies, their budget, their double standard, which has produced a 38 per cent increase in the number of Saskatchewan young people now unemployed? Will a single member of the government caucus have the courage to admit that? A 38 per cent increase in the number of unemployed young people since last May; there are now 18,000 young people out of work.

Last spring during the highly misleading campaign conducted by members opposite they said, 'We'll be open for business.' But ballots may hurt you, and they will, when the next election comes along. They will the next time. You will find a different mood out there. Members opposite said, 'There is so much more we can be.' Those young people who trekked into my office, hoping some miracle will occur, and they'll be able to find a job, missed the essence of the phrase, 'There's so much more we can be.' They do not quite understand how the economic climate which this right-wing government aided and abetted, aided by right wing governments elsewhere I must admit, which the right-wing economics of our time have brought upon us . . . They miss the essence of how there is so much more they can be and why they are so much more this year than they were last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . E-s-s-e-n-c-e . . . Why they are so much more this year, when they don't have a job, than they were last year when jobs were easy to come by.

I can give you a personal illustration of what difference a year can make. In late 1981 I advertised in the *Leader-Post* for a legal stenographer. I got one application. I hired the person. That person left after a year later. I advertised, with the assistance of this administration and this administration was of very considerable assistance in finding a new secretary, because I can tell you that when I advertised when you people were in office, I didn't get . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I did not get one application; I got a

dozen at least, of which six were crack secretaries.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Crack secretaries.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Crack secretaries. That's right. I want to thank members of this administration for making my job in finding staff so much easier. As for anyone who is hiring, you can understand how there is so much more we can be. The reality is that this province is facing the worst unemployment among young people since the '30s — since your administration was last in office.

Let's take time to review the statistics on unemployment before we allow you people into the debate. Let us just use some facts. Before members opposite start to question the source, let me tell you it's the monthly report compiled by their own Department of Labour. The Tory wrecking crew hasn't got around to that operation yet; it's still functioning. By youth unemployment ... stats Saskatchewan ... By youth unemployment, I am referring those 15- to 24-year-old age groups.

Let's look at the number of young people employed in our province between January and May of last year, in 1982. In January of last year, there were 11,000 people between the ages of 15 and 24 looking for work. That was January — 11. February was 13,000. March, it was 12,000. April, 15,000. Over the four-month period, average unemployment level of 12,250 young people. That was last year under our government. We said those numbers were too high. And we introduced in that budget, one of the biggest job creation programs in the history of this province to bring those numbers down ... (inaudible interjections) ... To their everlasting regret. And so along came the Conservatives, the Conservatives who told young people there is so much more we can be.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And so much less we are today.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — The member from Cumberland is quite right. They are so much less today. The Conservatives who promised jobs for all young people lived elsewhere and wanted to move back to Saskatchewan — symbol of the campaign was the now Premier waving people back. Fortunately they have had more good sense than that. They are not coming back in the numbers since the election, in anywhere near like the numbers they did under the former administration. I gave you those figures earlier.

What's been the result of this Conservative government's economic policies? Has the youth unemployment problem disappeared? Has it even been reduced? Unfortunately, just the opposite is true. It has shot up like a rocket. Let us just review the sorry record in this area over the last five months. The number of people between the ages of 15 and 24 who were unemployed in January of this year, the number of people between the ages of 15 and 24 who were unemployed was 19,000, compared to 11,000 in January of last year. In February, the number of young people who were unemployed was 18,000. You may compare that to 13,000 a year ago. In March, youth unemployment hit 20,000 young people. Compare that to 12,000 a year ago. In summary, during the first five months of 1983, the average number of young people who were listed as unemployed in our province was 18,800. That's up from an average of 12,400 last year. That's a jump of 50 per cent in the rate of youth unemployment. That is up by 50 per cent. Those are the facts right out of the government's own mouth, right out of their own publication, Youth unemployment is up sharply from a year ago.

I refer government members to a document called 'Labour Force Statistics.' It would

make a good reading for the members opposite before you deliver your next open for business speech. If members have any integrity, they might find the next open for business speech much more difficult to give. The member from Weyburn might find an absolute run on his leafy spurge speeches by members trying to find something to talk about. It would make good reading, and I recommend it to members opposite. It's published under the authority of the Premier.

I recommend members get a hold of the report for April. In it, you'll find that the unemployment rate among young people in Saskatchewan last month was nearly 16 per cent. That ought to ring alarm bells in members opposite. So much for the promise to bring home the children. So much for the beckoning arm welcoming them with jobs and unprecedented prosperity and opportunity.

Now I can hear the government members taking part in this debate with their caucus office canned speeches that come out of a Xerox machine. I can already hear what they're saying. You're all the same. You're all the same. All you do is mix up the pages. You guys got some research staff which have it easy — the same speech, just mix the pages up. Everybody gives the same speech, just in a different order. The slogans are all the same. The slogans are all the same: 'You guys are just preaching gloom and doom.' And every one of you said it the last occasion you got into this debate, which was in March.

We were told that we haven't got the Saskatchewan spirit. Well, I've got news for Conservative members. When I see those young people coming through my office, they haven't got the Saskatchewan spirit either. And they share some of the gloom and doom because they are the victims of your sloganeering, the victims of your misguided policies, of your ill-conceived programs, and of your positively dishonest election campaign.

The 60,000 people who are looking for work in this province have some trouble with your claims for prosperity. The 18,000 young people in the province have trouble getting excited about the open for business program. It doesn't mean that much to them.

So members of my party are not alone in having difficulty working up a point of enthusiasm for the open for business philosophy. We are not preaching gloom and doom. We are asking this administration to face up to reality. Look at what you have done, look at the misery and tragedies which you have caused, and admit there's a problem with which you should be dealing.

But the Conservative government can't simply admit there's a problem and then deal with it. First, because they are so caught up in their own shallow boosterism, they are virtually the only victims of their own propaganda. Virtually the only victims of the open for business propaganda is the members opposite. They stubbornly persist in their blind faith in outside foreign rescuers, preferring to be saved by outside investment, preferring a negative, do-nothing approach to exercising some positive economic leadership — the type of economic leadership which took this province in 1971. From a Cinderella province we're the wealthiest provinces in the country — and a path by which you people are going, except you're going in reverse. And I shudder to think that you might have one more than one term in office, because you might reach, you might reach the sorry state that Ross Thatcher left this province in.

I want to make some brief mention . . . It's a great speech. I want to make some brief mention of the very high cost of these unemployment figures. We can calculate the financial and economic costs, but the social costs are higher still. Not just in lost jobs and lost income, but in lost skills, in lost opportunities, and what I think is most tragic, particularly among young people — lost hope. These are the devastating social impacts being visited on our young people, on working families all across this province as a result of the ill-conceived programs and lack of them of this administration. This is the price of Toryism in Saskatchewan. This is the price of Tory failures.

I want to deal for a moment, if I might, with the Department of Labour. I want to invite the Minister of Labour to get into this debate. Tell me what he thinks the function of the Department of Labour is; it has changed. My, what a difference a year can make. I saw a document produced . . . The member from Regina North wants to get into it . . . You will have the opportunity you want. The debate doesn't finish until tomorrow afternoon. And we will be waiting with bated breath. I'm going to have trouble . . . I'm told it's tomorrow evening. I'm going to have trouble sleeping. But I am nevertheless going to finish my comments and then I will wait with eager anticipation for the contribution from the member for Regina North.

But there was a time, Mr. Minister — this will come as a shocking surprise to you — but there was a time when the function of the Department of Labour was to protect and advance the interests of working people. That at one point in time was a function of the Department of Labour. My, what a difference a year has made. It now appears that the function of the Department of Labour is to advance the interests of the business community and to protect the business community against the workers.

I'm going to refer in a moment, to a startling document called 'Background Notes to the Proposed Trade Union Amendments. 'But if you read this document, when you got finished you asked yourself, Mr. Deputy Speaker: what function does that department think it's serving? It would be twofold: to protect the business community from membership in trade unions and to protect the members from the trade unions. There is no suggestion that the members of the trade unions, the membership, needs any protection from the business community. That comment is not in this document. It is entirely outside the purview of this department to ever believe or suggest that its function is to advance the interests of working people.

Well, I want to run over just a few of the ways that your department has sought to advance the interests of working people. None of the things I am going to mention have done anything to advance the interests of working people. All of the things you have done, Mr. Minister, have been done solely with a view to advancing the interests of the business community. And I say, Mr. Minister, that is not your responsibility. Notwithstanding your background, notwithstanding your obvious attachment and feel for the business community. I say to you that your role as Minister of labour is to advance the interests of working people.

We were promised, but have not seen, any amendments to The Labour Standards Act. We don't know what amendments were considered . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yeah, I'll just bet you will. We don't know what amendments were considered. We can only pray to God that we'll never see them, because we will know that they will not advance the interests of working people. Any changes to The Labour Standards Act will be changes that will be made at the behest of the business community.

Minimum wage — I suppose the freezing of the minimum wage was done to protect and advance the interests of working people. I suppose that's your view, Mr. Minister, of how you advance their interests. Of course, it is not. The only justification I have heard you and your colleagues make is that Saskatchewan's minimum wage is the highest in Canada; that is going to discourage investment if it isn't brought into line, and therefore the minimum wage must be frozen until it's as reprehensible and as low and as abominable as everybody else's. and that's your justification for freezing the minimum wage.

That's a strange way, Mr. Minister, to advance the interests of working people. I would suggest to you that that's doing just the opposite. That's sacrificing the interests of working people on the altar of a blindly pro-business philosophy.

I suppose, Mr. Minister, when you gutted occupational health and safety, that was done to advance the interests of working people. I suppose that was done to advance the interests of working people, because so what if they lost a hand; they've got one left. But the important thing is that we get government off the backs of the business community. If you have any other justification for downgrading, degrading occupational health and safety in the manner you have, Mr. Minister, I would like to hear it.

I suggest once again, Mr. Minister, that changes to occupational health and safety weren't done to advance the interests of working people. The interests of working people were sacrificed to your savage pro-business philosophy.

The abolition of the women's division — this will go down as one of the most bizarre episodes in this government's administration. This will go down as one of your most bizarre failures. A leaked cabinet document indicated that you were considering abolishing the women's division. That raised a storm of protests. Notwithstanding the storm of protest, it was done anyway. And then members opposite pretended to be surprised when women's groups throughout the province protested. The Minister of Finance was to find out that they weren't all a bunch of NDP women. They may have labelled them that publicly, but some like Dolores Honour took exception to that. The truth of the matter was not that they are a bunch of NDP women; the truth of the matter is that that women's division was serving a valued function, a needed function, and had served it very well.

I said earlier that the rate of unemployment among women is considerably higher than it is among men. They're the first to be laid off, the last to be hired. The average salary is a fraction of what men's salary is. They occupy by far the largest number of those on minimum wage. Notwithstanding those stark facts and notwithstanding the stubborn nature of the problem, it was felt by this government that no special effort need to be made on behalf of women — no special effort need to be made. The philosophy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . he doesn't need the sermon; it's you guys that need it, and I'm glad to see you're staying.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — We wouldn't miss this for the world.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — No, you wouldn't miss this for the world. But the idea behind the concept of women's division was a special division which targeted women and sought to advance their interests in the government and in the economy as a whole. And that division won national recognition for the quality of its work. Notwithstanding all of that, it was abolished. We don't know in what form it has been resurrected, and only time will

tell. Only time will tell how far you people were forced to backtrack. Certainly the minister has no clear idea of what the function is.

Pensions. Pensions — the staff in the pensions division was cut in half, and the funding in that department was treated equally. And I suppose, Mr. Minister, that was done to advance the interests of working people. Working people have a problem that others do not — farmers, businessmen who enjoy larger estates do not. by and large, working people do not manage to save large amounts of money, and they depend on their pensions to keep them in old age. For working people, pensions are very, very important in a way that they are not to self-employed people, in a way that they are not to farmers and others who accumulate capital during their lifetimes.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — The minister likes women. He's married to one.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Yes, I forgot. I forgot, that's his claim to understanding it. He didn't marry a donkey or a giraffe, he married a women. So he's all for them.

Back to pensions. Back to pensions, Mr. Minister. Pensions have been something that ought to embarrass this nation. We ought to be embarrassed by the fact that fewer than one-third of our population actually get a pension. That ought to embarrass us. The level of pensions whereby almost half of those who retire do so and live in poverty — that ought to embarrass us. They're not easy problems. I suppose when you cut pensions, Mr. Minister, you did that to advance the interests of working people who need them more than any other group.

You're not alone, Mr. Minister, in declaring war on the poor and the needy. The Minister of Social Services set some sort of a high water mark in that regard. What we see is not just nitting and picking. What we see by the Minister of Social Services is a whole-scale attack on those who are on welfare. It began by transferring most of the non-welfare functions to some other department. Thus, we saw home care and nursing homes, senior citizens, go to Health. We saw corrections go to Justice — I am addressing my comments to the member and not to the media — Corrections was transferred to Justice. Employment support was reduced. Even senior citizens' benefits were reduced. Grants to non-government organizations were cut or reduced — and I'm going to get to non-government organizations in a moment. What happened in that department was that the amount spent on welfare has, of course, bloated.

It has, I think, in the minds of the public, identified that department even more so than in the past, as being a department which caters solely to those on welfare. Given the deplorable state of public opinion about those on welfare, given the deplorable state of public opinion about those on welfare, I predict we will see a diminution of the assistance available to people on welfare. We will see the amount of their assistance decrease. We've already seen it start. Indeed, we've already seen it start.

Well, I'll tell you how it started. I think it was mid-April that the minister announced the tightening of regulations so that those recipients who had just come on and who were employable, would not receive clothing and household allowances for the first three months. There is absolutely no logic to such a savage move — absolutely no logic to that. That is simply an attack on the poor — an attack on those who cannot defend themselves because they are misunderstood by the public. And I predict we will see a good deal more of that, and I predict that the transfer of other functions from the Department of Social Services was done intentionally so as to create a department



which does little else.

The non-government organizations — there are a few chapters in this government's log book that are as sorry as the treatment on non-government organizations ... (inaudible interjection) ... I have great difficulty answering that question. The non-government organizations — and the amounts of money were infinitesimally small, infinitesimally small — the blind getting \$7,000. Similar amounts. In the scheme of a government that spends \$3 billion, \$7,000 is not a significant sum of money to take it away from those who need it as much as the blind do.

By Ourselves, a group with a laudable goal of assisting those who had mental health problems ... (inaudible interjection) ... I'm not reading it ... those who have mental health problems. An agency with the goal of helping those with mental health problems help themselves, an agency which sought to assist people with mental health problems in getting a hold of themselves, with lifting themselves up by their bootstraps, and it achieved a good deal of success. Certainly those who ought to know, those with mental health problems, thought it was an excellent agency, and it's gone.

The Regent Court tenants' association, another group who sought to work with tenants, must be among the lowest income people in the city — chucked. Chopped. Again, an attack on the poor. An attack on the poor. Community switchboard, a board which received, I'm sure, thousands of calls a day — I'm sure that the vast majority of people in Regina have used it at one time or another — cut. It is not clear why. It may be an extension of this government's political vendetta, which doesn't seem to know any bounds; it may be simply a misguided notion of thrift. Whatever it is, for the dollars that you're cutting, the hardship is immense. If you want to describe a hardship factor, you maximize the hardship per dollar saved when you cut the funds from the non-government organizations. Indeed, the areas for this government cut was all in people programs.

I want to run down, for the benefit of members opposite, a list of where staff was cut, and it was done in the areas which delivered services to people: Health, dental health plan, person-years eliminated — 22.6; psychiatric services — 12.5; Saskatchewan hospital, Weyburn, North Battleford and Yorkton — 23; SAIL — two people cut; MCIC, SHSP, drug plan — 25 people cut. Notwithstanding the obvious temptation, I will not comment, as I did the other night, on the member's comments. Continuing care — 8 people cut. And that's what was cut from the Department of Health. Listen to the list: dental plan; psychiatric services; Saskatchewan hospital, Weyburn, North Battleford, Yorkton; SAIL; MCIC; SHSP; drug plan; and continuing care. If the member is so moved by my comments, please join us.

Social Services, income security administration cut 18.5 people; regional operations — 21 people; child care cut eight person-years; Valley View, mentally ill, mentally handicapped — cut 10.5 people; northern administration cut 18.9. Look at the cuts in Social Services: income security administration; regional operations; child care; Valley View Centre; and of course, the northern administration.

Education also had its share of cuts — again the children — 13 superintendents, 4 person-years in consultative services, and 4 person-years in management information.

Of course, there's always one more lamb they're prepared to sacrifice, and that's the environment. A healthy environment is not of course germane or necessary for an open

for business philosophy. Can't quite tailor the ducks and the geese and the wild flowers into the open for business philosophy. It doesn't quite fit somehow or other. So we saw the administration cut . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm only getting started, you guys; I'll be at least an hour tomorrow.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You'd better get back to it then.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — I am; I am. Administration cut 16.8 persons. Mines pollution control cut 4.9 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll have a good deal to say about the trade union legislation. Labour — of course, there's Labour; I've gone through Labour; there are eight subsections in Labour. Two will remain static; all the rest were cut. Consumer and Commercial Affairs — policy planning and research — 5 cut in policy planning and research; 7 cut in occupational health . . . Sorry, 7 cut in the provincial mediation board. Now, there's a likely group to cut — the provincial mediation board. It serves those who are having financial difficulties — by definition, the poor. That's a good group to cut — 5 persons. Notwithstanding the startling increase in the number of bankruptcies by 90 per cent, notwithstanding what one would have thought would have been an increased need at the provincial mediation board, 5 person-years were cut.

Urban Affairs — community planning services cut 10.3 per cent; municipal management was cut 4. The most striking feature however was, I think, not the cuts, but the most striking feature was the deficit. Notwithstanding the nature of the cuts, which I have detailed, very few programs for people were left unscathed. Notwithstanding that, the most striking feature was the size of the deficit — \$220 million last November; a scant 5 months later, \$317 million, for a total of \$537 million.

It was not, as my colleague from Regina-Elphinstone said, a stimulative deficit. If it had have been that, I think we would have been less strident in our criticism. It was not stimulative at all. What it was was a give-away for those who are least likely — who are least likely — to use it.

Gas tax — you lost 120 million in the gas tax. You could have retained the vast majority of that if you had simply removed the tax on private vehicles and left it on everything else. You gave away the majority of the gas tax to truckers, a good deal of them interprovincial. Oil export tax, a tax which brought in \$200 million in the last year of our administration, reduced to almost nothing and the vast majority of that came about because you decreased the royalties and accomplished nothing. So you gave away another 200 million.

Potash — you did your level best to give away the markets and largely succeeded. The Minister of Labour hasn't failed everything he's done; if I'm not mistaken, he's chairman of the potash corporation. He hasn't failed at everything he's done; he set out to give away the markets for the potash corporation and largely succeeded. He largely succeeded . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't think that was done out of frustration at all. One hundred twenty million dollars in the last year of our administration; what you people got was a loss, and a loss that was understated, was understated by a very considerable degree . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You're right, you're right; I thought so, I thought so.

That's 400 million; you gave away \$66 million in interest payments. That's over \$500 million in those four items alone, and I suggest those items did not create 100 jobs all told. What the deficit signifies is more than just mismanagement; what it signifies is

that you have transferred the burden of taxation to working people.

You are in the process of transferring the burden of taxation from the commercial and corporate sector to working people. And the transfer is very startling. It is happening very quickly. You do away with the gas tax, the vast majority of which is paid by commercial concerns. You give the potash away to the private companies. You give the potash markets away to the private companies. The vast majority of the taxes from here on in are going to be paid by working people, by those who can least afford it.

The next topic that we're going to get into, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was political firings. The subject is of such immense breadth, that I think there's little point in getting into it at 30 seconds to 10 o'clock. So with your permission, I'll call it 10 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 p.m.