

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
June 13, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and to all members of the House, a group of students from Wascana School in the Elphinstone constituency in Regina. Wascana School, as many of you will know, is at the corner of Pasqua Street and Fourth Avenue, and these are a group of about 25 grade 8 students. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Dave Bouchard, who if I am right is no stranger to the political process. I know that all hon. members would want to join with me in welcoming the students, and may I say that I have many fond affections for Wascana School. Two of my children have attended Wascana, and I found it to be an excellent school.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure at this time to introduce to you and through you to the members of this House a group from the Wascana Hospital who are visiting with us today. They are a group of four people who are in level 4 at the Wascana Hospital, and they are sitting behind the rail. They are sitting there along with their four attendants, and their chaperon, Michael Piluk. This visit, I might mention, along with other planned excursions in the community, has been made possible by the hiring of university students this year. These are extra staff for the summer months.

I sincerely hope that your summer will be more exciting, made possible through excursions such as this, and that your visit to the legislature comes up to your expectations. I would mention to you at this time that I am pleased to meet at 3 o'clock with you for pictures, following which we will meet for refreshments, and I would ask the members of the legislature at this time to join with me in extending to these people a hearty welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

QUESTIONS

Mulroney Position on Pepin Plan

MR. ENGEL: — I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, it's a question that arises because of some comments that were made by the new leader or friends opposite decided to choose on the week-end. They're asking Canada to accept another Montreal millionaire lawyer. He's on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that Jean-Luc Pepin is going in the right direction with his plans to kill the Crow rate. My question is this, Mr. Speaker: Mr. Minister, do you plan on having any meetings with Brian Mulroney to educate him on the crow and on some other western issues so that he

won't be making any more silly statements such as 'The Pepin plan is a step in the right direction?'

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I will be having several meetings with the new leader of the Conservative Party and the next prime minister of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — And I would expect that they will be very fruitful meetings, because he's a very intelligent sort of a gentleman and he has a firm grasp, Mr. Speaker, of the issues facing Canadians right across Canada and any misunderstanding that he may have, which I doubt, about any western Canadian issue, he will pick up on very quickly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, he say: 'What about the Crow?' What notice that Michael Foot was over here last year taking campaign lessons from the members opposite, but I'm sure he must have been at some time in recent history, because the result in Britain is the same as it was here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I tend to agree with his Legislative Secretary who, on television the other night, the member for Rosthern said — and he was talking about Brian Mulroney — he said just won't help the Conservative Party in the West. And I think the word you use was 'bad vibes.' 'Bad vibes' is the way he put it. My question remains: is it now the position of the Conservative Government of Saskatchewan that the Pepin plan is a step in the right direction, as Mr. Mulroney said, or do you plan to encourage Mr. Mulroney to change his mind?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — You see, I don't just happen to subscribe to the suggestions that you put out that Mr. Mulroney has in fact taken a position any different from ours relative to the Crow question. And as it relates to any of the comments of anyone from this side of the House, Conservative don't need much help in the West, and I would suggest that with Mr. Mulroney or Mr. Clark or Mr. Gamble or Crosbie or any of them . . . As a matter of fact, we could split them all into five parties, and run five parties, and still beat you guys with your 16 per cent.

So, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, I don't anticipate a problem in the West with the new leader, and in fact, in the new government in Ottawa in a year or two down the road. I would expect seven less NDPs in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, the minister seems to be having trouble hearing. I wasn't asking him about should the Conservative Party get any seats in the West or not. My question was Mr. Mulroney's concern, and you don't seem to care what he says. I'm quoting from a June 2 *Leader-Post*:

Montreal businessman Brian Mulroney agrees the government is 'going in the right direction' . . . Mulroney says farmers are ready to pay for better transportation, and the thrust of the legislation 'seems to be progressively acceptable.'

That's your new leader's statements, and my question is: are you concerned about his

attitude about the crow rate, or is it because he's not in the House, he's not going to be the leader, or what is your no-show attitude on this one?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I can remember the hon. gentleman that used to sit in this very chair, Mr. Speaker, when he was saying, 'Where is the invisible Mr. Devine? Where is this invisible Mr. Devine? How are you ever going to get a guy elected that doesn't have a seat in the House? That was only a year and a half ago, Mr. Speaker. Well, we all have seen what's happened.

I guess I should maybe address the question. The gentleman that the hon. member is talking about and attributes certain quotes to is also quoted as saying, 'I know exactly how the Montreal folks would feel if all of a sudden their cab fares were raised by 500 per cent. They wouldn't tolerate it, and nor should the western farmers.' So, I believe what I hear from the horse's mouth and not what I read, necessarily, in the *Leader-Post*.

MR. ENGEL: — Just one other question, as far as the leader's attitude is concerned. Mulroney's adviser, Charles McMillan says:

The candidate believes that Crow benefits should be paid to the farmers directly. There's no evidence that just giving it to the railways will improve the system.

There's another statement about Mulroney's position on the railways, and my concern is: are you planning on actively doing a campaign, not only with your Tory colleagues in Ottawa, but with the new leader? These questions are very serious to the people of Saskatchewan. A bill is before the House, and I think we need some answers very shortly as to what the Tories' position is going to be.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I'm not sure that the members opposite know how a caucus functions or how the political process is carried out or how a party position is arrived at, but I'd just point out to you that if the adviser has said those things, I suppose that's fair. I would also point out that the man that nominated Mr. Mulroney for his candidacy for the leadership, Len Gustafson, there's been no more vocal spokesman for the no change in Crow position from any one in Saskatchewan — your MP, I think, and a good one he is. And I would suggest to you that when the political process reaches its natural conclusion, the party sets out its position and that's it. And I have every confidence that the Conservative Party will reflect the western make-up of that particular party.

Changes in Liquor Legislation

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Liquor Licensing Commission, and I am directing the minister's attention to a letter from the United Church of Canada, the Church in Society committee of the United Church of Canada, represented by a Mr. Merv Harrison. And the letter was addressed to the Hon. Mr. Devine with a copy to the minister, dealing with the upcoming liquor legislation. And I am giving this identification of the letter so that the minister will recall it to mind. And Mr. Harrison says, as the minister will recall, that he met with the minister, and I now quote from the letter:

We were told that the review committee was dealing with the item, that is changes in liquor legislation, and that their report would be complete in the early summer, that caucus would consider the report during the summer, and that legislative changes would be proposed in the fall session.

He goes on to say:

I see by my detailed notes of the conversation that Mr. Sandberg made no mention of Taylor Field.

Now I want to quote the relevant portion of the letter as follows:

We were clearly led to believe that any changes regarding sports events would not be dealt with until the fall session. We believe we were misled, and this is a matter of public trust and commitment at stake, and we respectfully request that the legislation be withdrawn.

In view of this very clear allegation that the members of the United Church delegation were misled, is the minister now prepared to withdraw the legislation and have it dealt with in the fall as he undertook to do to the representatives of the United Church?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I did indeed meet with the person that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to in Saskatoon, also one other person. They were not a delegation from the United Church of Canada. They did not lead me to understand that they were a delegation from the United Church of Canada, in any way, shape or form. I did not allude to them that we would not deal with this particular matter in this session in any way, shape, or form. But his allegation is not correct. What I did tell him was that we had a committee of caucus studying liquor legislation in the province of Saskatchewan; that their report would be coming forth sometime this summer or later this summer; and then our government would be dealing with that report and looking at a complete re-write of The Liquor Act and The Liquor Licensing Act. And that is indeed what we are doing.

As far as the present amendment to The Liquor Licensing Act that is before the House now, as I've said to the Leader of the Opposition before, it is a democratic vote that we are offering to the people of Regina through enabling legislation; a democratic vote through a referendum. What could be more fair than that? The people who are against this legislation can rally their forces if they wish. We've given them that opportunity. Nothing could be more fair than that, Mr. Speaker. I do indeed share the concerns that have been raised by the United Church and by others in this province in regards to the matter of beer at Taylor Field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I want to refer the minister to a particular phrase in this letter again, and I will quote:

We were clearly led to believe that any changes regarding sports events would not be dealt with until the fall session. We believe we were misled and there is a matter of public trust and commitment at stake.

Do you deny, sir, that you led Messrs. Harrison and the other members of the delegation to believe that there would not be any change in liquor legislation respecting sporting events?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny that I misled one Mr.

Harrison or a Ms. Dayle Norman, I believe it was, that was with him at that time. I categorically deny that I misled them at any time. I sat down with them. I was forthright with them. I explained what this government was doing in terms of liquor legislation, and at no time did I deny them any information that I had at my hand at that time.

I again reiterate, there is no fair way of dealing with this question than a democratic vote or a referendum of the people of Regina. If they're not for it, as I said, they can rally their forces and voice their opposition in that way.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer the minister to yet another comment in this letter:

I see by my detailed notes of the conversation that Mr. Sandberg advised us that there would be minor housekeeping changes and he specifically mentioned five items to be dealt with, but no mention of Taylor Field.

Do you sir, deny that you advised them of changes you proposed but did not mention any change in legislation with respect to serving liquor at sporting events?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Speaker, I did not take notes at that meeting I had with the two people. If they took notes they could have written anything down, but as I mentioned to the minister of the opposition, we spoke in general terms — we spoke in general terms of some changes that we were contemplating in liquor legislation in the province of Saskatchewan. Now whether or not beer at Taylor Field was included in that conversation I do not specifically recall. We may have discussed it, and we probably did discuss it, but I made no such promise, no such allusion to them that it would not be dealt with in this spring session.

And again, I repeat and reiterate, there is no fairer way to deal with the question than a democratic vote of the people of Regina, a referendum. If the people of Regina decide they do not want light beer in Taylor Field they can do so through their right to vote, if indeed the city of Regina does take it that far. That's up to the city of Regina.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, are you suggesting that the adoption of a policy of serving alcoholic beverages at major sporting events is a matter only for concern of the citizens of Regina and not for citizens elsewhere in Saskatchewan as represented by these particular members of the United Church who, I believe, are residents of Saskatoon?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Well, I answered that question several days ago when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked it. We could theoretically have the people from Vancouver who come in to visit Taylor Field included in that vote also, or the people from New York City, London, England, or wherever. You can't carry the vote to the ends of the earth. Taylor Field is under the jurisdiction of the city of Regina, Mr. Speaker. They are the people who should vote on this referendum.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it your position, sir, that a policy of this nature with respect to the serving of alcoholic beverages at major sporting events is not a policy of province-wide concern but only a policy that concerns the people who may live in the particular area where the sporting event takes place?

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Let me remind the Leader of the Opposition that in other

jurisdictions in Canada there weren't any referendums at all. I think we've been ultimately fair with the people of Saskatchewan in referring it in this manner through a referendum. Manitoba, for example: in Winnipeg it was simply a by-law by the city of Winnipeg that instituted the serving of light beer in the Winnipeg stadium.

I reiterate again that it most directly affects the people of Regina. The greatest percentage . . . I don't have the exact percentage of people who attend games at Taylor Field are from the city of Regina. I may quote from a recent poll back in 1981, if I can find it here, conducted and published by the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*. Well, I don't have it here in front of me but it was approximately 65 per cent to 70 per cent and more percentage of the people in Saskatchewan said that they favoured the sale of light beer at Taylor Field.

Saskatchewan Women's Institute Funding

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. As the minister will know that it was your government's initial decision to abandon and do away with the women's division within the Department of Labour, and only after considerable representation made on behalf of women, and the strong opposition, you have decided to incorporate a women's division in the Advanced Education. We still do not know the content of the development of that division, but I would like to ask the minister: is it a standard policy that this government will, in fact, attack all women's divisions in this province? Because I have been advised, Mr. Minister, that the Saskatchewan Women's Institute, an organization that was founded in 1911, which received funding from your government in the past, has been denied any funds at the present time. Will you, in fact, indicate whether you will be funding the Saskatchewan Women's Institute?

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, I was very fortunate to be able to get the gist of the questioning from the hon. member from Quill Lakes, because it seems that when he started to talk about women, there was considerable excitement rampant in this House. However, in this particular instance, if the last part of your statement was your question, then I would ask . . . In view of the fact that it's handled through the Department of Agriculture, I would ask to defer the question to the Minister of Agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to deal with this question as a matter of fact because we met with the women's institute on more than one occasion during the last year. And as a result of the meetings that we had with the women's institute . . . And it was pointed out to us that it was the first time in history that they'd ever met with such an open government and receptive government. And during the course of our discussions, Mr. Speaker, we agreed to provide funding to the women's institute through the Department of Agriculture, matching dollar for dollar up to a maximum of \$10,000, to which they were very receptive, Mr. Speaker, and in fact have acknowledged our contribution and are very appreciative about it. So I guess the simple answer is, Mr. Speaker, we gave them a week or 10 days to research their questions for question period and they just blew another one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that someone has to make this minister look good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Occasionally what I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to in fact give him a lead so that he can in fact answer a question. I would like to ask the minister, in view of the fact that there has been a definite policy of providing the Saskatchewan Women's Institute with continuing ongoing funding, what I'm asking you: have you now established that it is only going to be funded on an ad hoc basis, on the basis of the whims of the government, or are you going to cut back as you have with the international funding?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I don't understand the question, Mr. Speaker, because from zero to \$10,000 is not really a cut-back, number one, Mr. Speaker. And number two, it is a matter of policy with this government that \$10,000 on an annual basis will be granted, dollar for dollar matching, to the women's institute and we haven't . . . I clearly admit that the \$10,000 was fairly arbitrary. We just plucked it out and said, yes, we'll help you to the extent of \$10,000 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . They got zero before, my friends. They got zero before.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the members to spend a little time and get your researchers out again and go through it one more time, and find out just how much money they were receiving from the Department of Agriculture or the government, and come back and we'll go through this exercise again. But as a matter of policy, they will receive \$10,000, matched dollar for dollar. And that's not carved in stone. It may in fact be increased in a later year. We'll see what unfolds as the calendar rolls on.

Financial Position of PCS

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. The minister knows that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan did not do well financially in the last two quarters of 1982, and he knows that notwithstanding changes in the manner of calculating depreciation so as to reduce the charge by some \$13 million he only managed to show a profit of less than \$1 million for the year 1982. Does the minister deny that a quarterly financial report prepared for himself and for the board by staff of PCS indicates that PCS lost \$11 million in the first quarter of 1983?

HON. MR. MCLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the exact figure but the first quarter did show a loss in 1983. Now I don't know if you're talking the calendar year or the fertilizer year, but it is a loss at this position, at this point in time. But I'd like to remind the member opposite, also at this point in time, that we are considerably ahead of last year and the calendar year, both domestically and in the export market.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. I'm sure the minister is ahead in something, certainly in the deficit. But we're talking about the earnings and I'm asking the minister: are you saying that the earnings picture for the first quarter of 1983 is higher than the earnings picture for the first quarter of 1982?

HON. MR. MCLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't have those figures in front of me. We are projecting, if we stay on the budget that we had planned this year, is that there will be a loss in 1983. But at this point in time, we are ahead of our budget. It's being reduced each month. And we all know that the whole world market area in potash is in a mess and I can reiterate that because I did attend the conference and the whole world is in

that same position. But we are starting to climb back up out of it. And we have done a job in Vienna; the Premier has done it in Brazil, where we are selling potash there again which we haven't seen done in the last couple of years to any extent, or last year at least. And it's starting to come back. And we are confident that the potash market will turn around slowly, but at least starting to turn around.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 106 — An Act respecting Planning and Development in Urban, Rural and Northern Municipalities

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move first reading of a bill respecting planning and development in urban, rural and northern municipalities.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few opening comments with regard to the second and third reading of this particular piece of legislation. It really is . . . We all know what it is: the final to the budget that was delivered in this House some 60-odd days ago. I think what we have seen of the reaction to that budget across this province and across this country has indeed been very, very favourable. And I defy anybody to say anything different. If the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, get into their constant harangue about this, I'll suggest that they are reading the population of Saskatchewan the same way they did today that they did April 26 last year.

Mr. Speaker, what did we see from the NDP? What did we see from the NDP following the budget? The Leader of the Opposition stands up and starts haranguing about the deficit. He did that for one day — one day, I believe. And then they huddled back in their little caucus and says, 'Hey, we're not winning on this deficit thing. This is not the policy of the NDP. It's not the policy of the NDP from one end of the country to the other end of the country.' So then they had to move off in the other direction; said, 'No, you're cutting too many programs.' And of course, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, some programs had to be pared down, but very few important programs were cut.

Now that budget, Mr. Speaker, concentrated primarily on one thing, and the one thing that we believe right now that we must concentrate on, and that is creating jobs. And I would just like to read the numbers that came out, the numbers that came out from Statistics Canada this Friday — this past Friday — the numbers that came out with regard to job creation, the number of unemployed across this country and in the province of Saskatchewan. The number of people actually employed in May of 1982 versus the number of people actually employed in May of 1983, increased 11,000 people. The number of jobs increased, April when the budget came down, to May, one month later — 23,000 jobs created in that period of one month following the budget. 23,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — While we cannot take credit for all those jobs with regard to the budget, I think it is fair to say that some of those jobs did come as a result of efforts that we brought in with regard to the budget . . . Efforts made by the Minister of Continuing Education to hire many of the students across this country, across this province; efforts made by the Minister of Small Business and Tourism to hire people under the small business program; efforts made by the capital spending of government to hire people. Mr. Speaker, the job was done in the budget and the job was done properly in the budget. But it went further than that, Mr. Speaker. It also put dollars into training people. And they know our training programs have to increase — and we put dollars into that.

And we put restraint measures on. And the members opposite were against the restrained measures that we put on. But I believe the population of Saskatchewan supports that type of attitude.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, in a rather general way to make a few comments to the members opposite. The members opposite — and we saw it demonstrated once again today in the question period — the members opposite have not yet, even after a year — 13 months — have not yet come to the realization of looking internally at themselves for once; of looking internally at themselves for one and just seeing where they are going, and asking themselves in their small group of eight, 'How are we doing as a group? How are we doing and why did we get there?'

You're still of the view over there that there was some freak of nature that somehow you are only eight when you were 44 less than, or a little more than a year ago — that you're only eight now. 'Some freak of nature that the Tories hired some fast-talking advertising campaign and somehow we lost the election. It wasn't anything we did. It was just something magical.' And you haven't yet come to the realization of looking internally and looking at yourselves. And therein lies, I think, the big dilemma that many of the people opposite — the members opposite — in fact find themselves in.

I believe that the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan is going down the same road as the Labour Party in Great Britain. And I say this in a very, very sincere way to the members opposite. The members opposite are allowing their party, allowing the NDP Party of Saskatchewan, to be taken over more and more and more each year by organized labour. And that's where you people are going; that's exactly where those people are going, Mr. Speaker. It used to be a broad base party. Not any more, not any more. Your party is moving in the same direction as the Labour Party in Great Britain, and you are going to move and pay the price for that.

As the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in question period, the most recent Gallup poll puts the New Democratic Party of Canada at 16 per cent. That has got to be the lowest that they have fallen in the polls since 1958-1963 — down at the bottom. You have made no progress; you have made no progress as a party. You have made no progress as a party, and I say where the NDP party in this province is going, Mr. Speaker, is they're going to the leadership of the trade union movement, and they're going to move further and further left on the political scale. And that's what I see coming. That's what I see coming, and the members of that party are going to be moving that way.

And I suggest the Leader of the Opposition, he will make a gallant effort to hole the line and not let that happen the way perhaps many in the party think it should. And that's

what you're seeing now, and I suggest that he is not going to be able to stop that from happening. He's not going to see that from happening. He's not going to see that from happening, and I'll tell you why. In many ways the Leader of the Opposition — and I say this in a very meaningful way — has made a contribution to this province, as he made a contribution to this country, and I think everyone agrees to that. He's made a contribution but, like any party that has made that move and now finds itself fallen from the graces, very often the leader of that party always wants to hold on, never wants to let it go, wants to maintain the control. And one of the weaknesses, I suppose, one of the weaknesses that we saw, can be that fading away as well.

What do the NDP stand for, Mr. Speaker, with regard to a budget? How do they stand to correct the economy? And this is the dilemma and the problem you've never come to grips with, because here's your theory, here's your theory as to what we should do, both provincially and at the national level.

Number one, pay more money to the public sector employees. That was Dave Barrett's great election promise in British Columbia, but it's consistent with NDP policy. Don't control salaries at 6 per cent or 7 per cent or 5 per cent. Don't be responsible, like any other government has to be, or any other business has to be. No, make it 13 per cent or 14 per cent, and when the salary accounts for over 50 per cent of the entire budget — over 50 per cent of the entire budget of this province — in excess of 1.5 billion of the \$3 billion budget, their view, Mr. Speaker, is increase those salaries 15 per cent. Don't control those. Don't control those; spend more.

Then, you say, here's how we will create jobs. Here's how you have to create jobs. spend two or three hundred million dollars more on roads. Because for every million dollars you spend, you're going to create what? A few hundred more jobs? And keep doing that, that theory they live by. That's the theory that the Leader of the Opposition lives by: to spend more and more and more money. And the people of this province and the people of this country no longer believe that; and they no longer believe that because it doesn't make any sense economically. And the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, in his heart of hearts knows that as well. That's easy. There's no problem to fix more money. Ed Broadbent's view . . . Ed Broadbent's view, if you wanted to reduce unemployment across this entire country — to reduce it by what? 3 per cent in the unemployment rolls — we would have to increase the federal budget, the national debt — the national deficit — by three or four times over what it is now. That's a \$100 billion deficit. That's the type of logic the NDP stands for. And that's the irony of the Leader of the Opposition on budget night, as he stood with his roll of \$10 bills, talking about the way that you should not have a deficit.

And that comes to what I was saying about the trade union movement will take over your party. The trade union movement, of course, stands for: 'Don't worry about a deficit no matter what size it is. Just deficit, deficit, deficit, and create jobs.'

I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition will stand in his place and defend the position of organized labour with regard to deficits. They are the key part of his party. And ask him how they square that. But their advice to the government: 'Don't worry about a deficit. Deficits don't matter. Just keep pouring it up as long as you have higher salaries and more government spending.'

So I say to the members opposite, in your wrap-up speeches, let's see you come to grips for once in the last year and a half. Let's see you come to grips, within yourselves, on the balance between government spending and the deficit position, because you've never done it yet. You've come to that realization.

The Leader of the Opposition . . . (inaudible) . . . because I know what he's going to say: 'Well, here's where your money went, boys. You give it all to the oil industry. You gave all your money away to the oil industry, to your friends. You give all your money away to potash, and therefore, there's why you've got a deficit problem.' Nobody believes that either. Nobody believes that either.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say the budget of the province of Saskatchewan was well received. It was seen as responsible. The jobs are being created. We simply look at the numbers. The credit rating of the province of Saskatchewan is in a safe position according to the rating agencies in New York. We are seen as controlling costs of government, the only province across this entire nation to hold government spending below the rate of inflation. We have done, I believe, an admirable job in putting the budget together. I believe it's well received, and I suggest that, judging from the number of questions advanced either in question period or during estimates, the NDP themselves know that there wasn't very much to shoot at. Mr. Speaker, with that, I move second reading and third reading of the appropriation bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I want to address some remarks to the Chamber on the bill before us, and I want, first, to take some opportunity to respond to the remarks of the Minister of Finance who has just taken his seat.

I wonder if you were as struck as I was by the fact that the Minister of Finance wished to spend his time not talking about his budget, but about the New Democratic Party in Canada, about the Labour Party in Britain, about the internal affairs of the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. He certainly talked about all of those issues, but he did not say very much about his budget. He did say a little bit about our response to his budget, but next to nothing about the budgetary framework in which he was operating, or why he felt that the thrusts which were outlined in his budget speech, and included in figures in his estimates, were the right direction or the right thrust for Saskatchewan.

I can understand, if I had brought in a budget like that, why I would want to talk about anything else but the budget. I would understand why I would want to talk about other parties, and since he has opened up that subject I will avail myself of that opportunity in a moment of two, but right now I want to reply to some of the statements which he has made. He has talked about the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, and who may or may not take over the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan, and what the people may expect if the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan is allowed to exercise governmental authority in this province. He acts as if everybody has lost their memory. He acts as if nobody's memory goes back beyond April of 1982. He acts as if there are not people in this province who lived in the province during the 1970s. They don't need to speculate about what the NDP will do. They don't need to listen to the member for Kindersley outline, spin his theories about what dire things would happen if the NDP were in government. The NDP has been in government. And if members opposite can't remember back that far, quite a few citizens of Saskatchewan can. They know what the policies of the NDP are. They know whether or not the NDP granted huge increases, or proper increases. They know whether the NDP could finance the programs they

launched, and they know that the NDP was able to do that — able to do it for 11 successful years without a deficit.

And they know, also, that the government opposite is not able to do that. They know that the government opposite is not able to finance the programs they put forward. There can be no denying that. I'm sure it's not the stated policy of the government opposite to run deficits of the kind that they have, and again represented by this budget. It is their sheer incompetence at being unable to launch programs and finance them. They are good at promising, and no one can deny them that. They are good at whipping up programs which would be nice if we could finance them, but they are not very good at financing the programs which they launch. And they are not good at financing the programs which they launch, not because they spend too much money — because they collect too little money. And the member for Kindersley is entirely right that I will point out that they collect too little money from the resource companies, and that per barrel of oil produced we're going to collect this year. That may be doubted, but per dollar value of oil produced we're going to collect much less money next year than we collected two years ago because this government opposite has decided that they are not going to take the same number of cents per dollar for the people of Saskatchewan. They have decided that they are going to give to some of that money back to the oil companies.

Now there's no use this minister denying that. The figures are there in his budget and came out in the estimates, making abundantly clear that for every dollar of value of Saskatchewan oil produced in 1983 and 1984 we are going to take fewer cents for the people of Saskatchewan than we did in 1980 and 1981. Now that's a hard fact, and it's particularly hard for the people of Saskatchewan in the years to come because they're going to pay for it with interest compounded. I hope that no one is going to deny that. I hope that they admit that and then argue that it's a good idea or a bad idea. I hope they will argue — they won't try to deny the facts but they will try to justify their conduct — because then we will have the debate on a proper footing, on agreed facts, and then a dispute as to the appropriate policy.

The member for Kindersley, the Minister of Finance, said some nice things about me as Leader of the Opposition. I thank him for that, but I wish to advise him that I am still alive and well and I am not dead either physically or politically. I will solicit obituaries, or someone will on my behalf, at a later time. Meanwhile I want to tell him a few things about what I think is wrong with his administration, and I will not say very much that is flattering about the Minister of Finance.

He suggests that parties like ours have no policy for dealing with recessions. Parties like ours have the only policies which have been effective around the world. I invite hon. members to look at the countries which have done best in dealing with the recessions, have done best in terms of maintaining full employment and having the least level of inflation. And those are not the free enterprise countries. They're not the United States, and they're not the other free enterprise governments. You're hard pressed to find them around the world now, but certainly United States and Britain are two, and certainly they have done among the worst, among the worst in sustaining new employment and in controlling inflation.

And the countries that have done the best have been the countries with moderate democratic socialist governments — like West Germany, like Sweden, like Holland. Those are the countries that have done best — if by best you mean maintaining full

employment in a free, low-inflation society. And no one can assert that those countries have maintained full employment. But when compared with Britain, at 13 or 14 per cent unemployment, it is indeed full employment. And when compared with the United States, where they have levels of unemployment in the double digit range, it is indeed full employment. And it is indeed a record which cannot be matched by Margaret Thatcher with all her determination to act, and her equal determination to act oblivious of all the economic facts. And this is what has happened throughout the world.

The minister suggests that we cannot spend our way out of a recession. We equally cannot restrain our way out of a recession. You can ask your father or grandfather how much success Herbert Hoover had with that little approach — or R.B. Bennett had with that little approach. That was the last time we had in this province a Conservative government, federally, and a Conservative government, provincially, were days which no one in this province wishes to recall. So that we, I think, know that we cannot mindlessly spend our way out of a recession. That must be conceded. No one suggests that the mere spending of money will solve our problems. It may create employment, but it will also run the real risks of creating inflation, and in order to deal with that we would have then to have another bout of high interest rates.

But that need not be. Countries can operate their economies in a way which has a much higher level of employment and without sustained inflation. You can do it by having an incomes policy. You can do it by having some sense of a social contract where government and business and people representing working people sit down and decide how we are going to sustain a better level of governmental activity.

No it's not easy in a country like Canada, which has an open economy — an open economy where we have many trade links and financial links with the United States, and accordingly where our economy will be inevitably affected by the policies of the United States government.

No one suggests that it's easy, but if we are willing to face some of the possible alternatives which may include an incomes policy, which will in effect restrain prices and, very possibly, wages for higher-income people, which will possibly — and only possibly — involve some controls over the movement of currency . . . If we are prepared to do that, as so many other countries in the world have done, we could do very much better in Canada at creating fuller employment in a free, low-inflation society.

And I suggest that the hon. members opposite have not addressed this. They have not tried to figure out how they think they can get a better level of unemployment in a low-inflation society. They have not done that because their only answer is to leave it to the private sector, and they don't even believe that. They don't even believe that. They believe it until the economy gets into a downward spiral, and then they call for governmental action — governmental action to shore up companies which cannot be allowed to go to the wall.

And I've not heard members opposite really attack the financial assistance provided to Ford or Massey-Ferguson or Dome or some of the other recipients of the largesse of the federal government. You and I and all of us might have some misgivings about that, but fundamentally we know that no government federally can sit back and watch major employers go down the chute because of particular financial constraints if their commercial activities can be salvaged.

And that's the decisions made. I don't agree with all the decisions made by the federal government, and I don't suggest that these should be confined, those are getting the largesse should be confined to major corporations, but I do say that a government must be prepared to intervene. The federal government was, and I commend them for it, even though I object to some of the particular measures they chose.

So that is the sort of economic policy our party would like to pursue federally, not a matter of spending our way mindlessly out of a recession, but not either applying restraint in a mindless way which will only create more unemployment and start the downward spiral. The members opposite are busy attempting to say that society is divided into trade union people and farmers and business men. In a sense of course it is, but in another sense they're very, very dependant on each other.

I recall being in Saskatoon a while ago, and was chatting about a businessman there, a small businessman, and the discussion came around to whether or not the city of Saskatoon should apply vigorous restraints on the wages being paid by the city to its employees. And this merchant was quoted as saying: 'Well, I can understand why the city would want to watch its pennies when it's paying its employees, but I know that the smaller those pay-cheques are, the less my till is going to ring; the smaller those pay-cheques are, the less my cash register is going to ring.'

And that is a pretty obvious point, but one sometimes not fully appreciated. Restraint is always very popular, but not any cut in the purchasing power of the citizens, because cuts in the purchasing power of the citizens impacts, and impacts very heavily, on businessmen, particularly small businessmen. Nobody wishes to explain how you can restrain wages without cutting purchasing power, and they don't explain it because it's totally unexplainable. Agreed, nobody should simply raise wages, particularly if other sectors of the economy are not enjoying some increase. But at the time of restraint the move ought to be in the direction of raising wages and incomes for the less fortunate and restraining them for the well-to-do and we can, at one and the same time, bring about greater equity in our society and apply some restraints to people who can well afford to sustain any loss of purchasing power which might flow from that.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Kindersley fails to understand the economic policies which are advocated by parties such as ours. It may well be that it will be some time, federally, before we will have an opportunity to show to Canadians what can be done. It may well be — who knows? In places like Australia and New Zealand, left-of-centre governments do very well. I'm sure members opposite who are fond of quoting the results of the British general elections will not want to quote the results of the Australian general election, when the right-of-centre parties did not do well at all. So there is, I think, nothing to be drawn from any suggestions that we see a uniform right-wing mood across the world. That is simply not the case, since left-of-centre parties have prevailed in many countries recently, including Australia and Spain and Portugal and France, and right-of-centre parties have prevailed in other countries. And the end of the ... (inaudible interjections) ...

Members opposite are scoffing but I invite them to look at what has happened in Canada under the right-of-centre friends in Ottawa — their right-of-centre friends at Ottawa who have seen, in the last 15 or 20 years, the position of Canada decline from about second or third in per capita income to down to ninth, tenth, or eleventh. And I would invite hon. members to look at the countries which have superseded us and ask what kind of government they have, and ask whether any one of the countries which

has superseded us has the kind of government which they are advocating. Is any one of them ruled by a party of the kind that they advocate we should have in Canada? Whether it's Norway or Sweden or Denmark or West Germany or France, indeed, all of those countries which have moved forward have had governments which believe in a substantial measure of government involvement in the economy, sometimes under alleged right-wing banners and sometimes under alleged left-wing banners.

But some of the Europe's right-wing parties would look left wing compared with members opposite, and I think that is because they have learned the hard lessons. They have decided that government in this day and age must be a partnership between employers, employees, and governments representing the general public, and they have made it work. And we could make it work in Canada if we would lay aside a great deal of the ideological trappings which we can hear from the people like Mr. Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher and decide that we were going to enter into a kind of partnership government wherein we could have, and I say, close to full employment in a free society with low levels of inflation . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

Members opposite are busy saying that left-wing governments were not chosen in Britain and they are right. They are right. They will have noted that the Conservative Party lost vote and the two left-of-centre parties gained votes. They are right there. And it is equally true that the two left-of-centre parties split the vote and they didn't come up with as many seats, but that hardly indicates any massive support for the Conservative cause, which declined, and any massive rejection of the left-of-centre cause, which increased . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Members opposite wish to deny the fact that the Social Democrat-Liberal alliance is left of centre. I could tell you that no one of the members, and no one of the members sitting on the government side of the House would feel at all comfortable sitting beside Roy Jenkins, or Shirley Williams, or some of the other leaders of the alliance, or Mr. Steel either.

Mr. Speaker, I think that those are hard facts, and it is also a hard fact, and I hope no one will deny it, that Mrs. Thatcher's party lost votes. Mrs. Thatcher's party lost votes. However, that is hardly relevant to our affairs, hardly relevant to our affairs. I mention that simply because the member for Kindersley mentioned it.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to some other matters. And I wonder, before I turn to some remarks I have on the budget, I want to beg the indulgence of the House to make a couple of comments of a general nature, and a very, very different nature, Mr. Speaker. We will have an opportunity to pay tribute to the outgoing Lieutenant-Governor, the Hon. C. Irwin McIntosh, but this is likely the last general debate of this session. When we next convene I suspect we will have a new Lieutenant-Governor.

Accordingly, I want to take the opportunity to say a few words about His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, and about his contribution to this province. I will not take this occasion to recount his contribution to the province prior to his assuming the office of Lieutenant-Governor, save only to say that he had a distinguished career as a publisher, and as a citizen of North Battleford and of the province, having been on many province-wide bodies. He comes from a family which has made a significant contribution. His father was a member of parliament and served with distinction his area of the province in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

Mr. McIntosh assumed the position of Lieutenant-Governor at a time when it was

perceived by the federal government and by others that a Lieutenant-Governor who would emphasize the broadly-based nature of Canada, who would emphasize the need for Canadian unity, was particularly important. It will be recalled that the Parti Quebecois was elected in 1976, and many people in Canada became concerned — some became alarmed — about the likely continuation of Canada as a single state. And it was necessary at that time to emphasize some of the things which bind us together in this country. Sometimes we don't do much of that. We're not very enthusiastic patriots in the demonstration of our patriotism, but that should not be interpreted to mean that we are not patriotic and we do not have strong feelings for Canada.

Well, on occasion arose during the late 1970s and early 1980s when some of those feelings that we have needed to be articulated. And surrounding the office of the monarch and the office of the Lieutenant-Governor in our province, surrounding that there was an opportunity to articulate some of these beliefs that we have as Canadians and as proud citizens of Saskatchewan, but as a province of Canada. Mr. McIntosh, His Honour, did that with great, great distinction. He travelled this province backward and forward. He went across Canada on a number of occasions. He acted as a focal point, a rallying point for all of those who see in our democratic parliamentary form of government a great bulwark of liberty, and a great element which binds together, not only as Canadians, but as members of a world-wide commonwealth.

I want to tender my appreciation to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and to Mrs. McIntosh. During the course of my period as premier I had many close associations with them. They have continued on a different basis since I have become Leader of the Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and I will describe it that way when I speak in this context. I can say that he always conducted himself with the utmost propriety in terms of dealing with what he was fond of calling 'my government,' particularly when we were putting forward programs and proposals with which I suspect he did not have full sympathy as a person. It was a great pleasure to deal with him.

I recall on the occasion of our electoral defeat I had an opportunity to send a letter to him tendering my resignation, and in a formal way giving him my advice, in a formal sense, to call upon the member for Estevan to form a government. I think that these traditions of our parliamentary system are worth preserving. The office of the Lieutenant-Governor is one which, on occasion, in our system can be absolutely crucial in resolving difficulties which may arise. If such an occasion had happened, I would have had total confidence in His Honour Mr. McIntosh to resolve it with firmness and fairness, and I want now, on behalf of my colleagues, to indicate our appreciation to him for his service in that high post.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to beg the indulgence of the House to raise another sad event in our province recently. And that is the death of the Most Reverend Michael O'Neill, formerly Roman Catholic archbishop of Regina.

Some of us came to know Archbishop O'Neill, or Father Mike, or what other names one might give to him, very well. He was a man with a very, very warm personality. He had a distinguished career of service to the people of Saskatchewan in World War I and particularly in world War II, when he rose to the rank of colonel and was senior Canadian Roman Catholic chaplain overseas for a period, having responsibility for more than 100 Roman Catholic chaplains in the services. When he returned to Saskatchewan he was active in much of the church, became a monsignor, I believe, in about 1948, and later was consecrated a bishop, and then Roman Catholic archbishop of the Regina diocese, in which position he served until about 10 years ago.

Those who knew him found him to be a person who was able to command respect well beyond the confines of the Roman Catholic community in Saskatchewan, or in Canada, and the tributes which have been paid to him by Archbishop Peers, the Anglican archbishop of Qu'Appelle, and other church leaders and by lay leaders indicate the esteem in which he was held and the affection with which he was regarded by a very, very wide circle of friends. I know many of us will have the opportunity to attend the funeral, but I wish to put on the record of the House a tribute to him, and a grateful statement of thanks for his contribution to the life of this province and of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with the appropriation act, and as the Minister of Finance has indicated, the appropriation act is in effect the placing in statute form of the estimates with which we have dealt at length.

And I think it's useful for us to consider just what the direction of this budget is and what it tells us about the government opposite — its priorities and the direction in which it wishes to take this province. It's useful to take stock of the impact of more than a year of Progressive Conservative government. We want to ask ourselves about the performance of this government and particularly the performance of this government in the light of the promises made by the government, something more than a year ago, when it contested the general election.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 55th sitting day of the second legislature under a new Conservative government. We've now seen two successive budgets: the first last November, and this second one, which are in effect now debating, on March 29th. After more than 13 months in office, no one can deny that it is largely the policies and the programs and the priorities of the Conservative government which shape the direction in which this province is going.

The Minister of Finance tried valiantly to suggest that the proper subject for debate was the New Democratic Party and why it lost the election, but I think the people of Saskatchewan will want to talk about the new government and why it is doing so badly in the management of the affairs of Saskatchewan.

I want to make this point for the benefit of the government members who I know will be entering this debate. They have certainly been free with their comments during the course of the remarks that had been made by the two speakers today, and I know they will not wish their opportunity of contributing to the debate. And I hope they will, because we want to know where they stand. I think that they are displaying, as the member for Kindersley, the Minister of Finance, displayed, a certain tendency to look back, to look behind them. I can understand that. If I had been a Conservative just coming back for a Conservative convention in Ottawa, I would have it firmly embedded in my mind that I ought to look behind me, I ought to keep my back to the wall, and I ought not to allow myself ever to be in a position where I did not know who was behind me. And I am sure that Mr. Clark, whether he would particularly join with my comments, must share this sentiment, he must share that sentiment.

Members opposite suggest that all that good things that exist in Saskatchewan today came about somehow because of what has happened since April of 1982, and all the bad things that are in Saskatchewan today are because of the terrible circumstances which existed in April 1982 and have not yet been overcome. That is the perfectly standard method of debate, and it is an understandable method of debate for the first

three months of four months of the new government, but unfortunately for them the public are now saying, 'You are in office. You Progressive conservatives must answer for what you do and what you do not do. And it is your policies, and your programs, and your priorities which are shaping this province, and you must take responsibility — must take the credit for them, but you must take the blame for them as well.'

We have the spectacle, Mr. Speaker, of this government advancing program policies which it would be very, very difficult to defend. They are, for example, freezing the minimum for two years. They have elected to freeze the minimum wage for two years, and then in a great flow of, shall say we say, lack of candour they are advertising in their bulletins that Saskatchewan has the highest minimum wage in Canada. I have here a constituency report by one of the MLAs and, sure enough, he's got it in there: 'Saskatchewan has the highest minimum wage in Canada.' All I can say is, no thanks to him. No thanks to him, because he has sat in his seat in this legislature and not said one word in support of a higher minimum wage. And I suspect he has sat in the Conservative caucus and not raised his voice against the decisions of this government to freeze minimum wages for two years.

Here's a government which has cancelled scheduled increases in minimum wages last July, and then this January, and then this July, and tell us that they are going to continue the freeze for two years and it's part of the budget which they have put forward. Here is a government which argues that the minimum wage is far too high and accordingly ought to be frozen for two years. Here is a government which has inherited the highest minimum wage in Canada and has been doing everything in its power to see if somehow they couldn't lower it. They've even been flirting with the idea of a differential minimum wage — a differential wage which would allow them to pay even less, even less, than the minimum wage which is now being paid. And notwithstanding the fact that their approach to the minimum wage has been one of saying, 'It is too high; we inherited it, but we can't lower it; I'm sorry, Mr. Chamber of Commerce, we can't lower the minimum wage,' this doesn't stop them from advertising in their bulletins that we have the highest minimum wage in Canada.

So my first message in this debate to the Conservative members is this: you really have to decide whether you want it both ways. You are going to have to take responsibility for what you do as a government and you are going to have to decide whether what you inherited was good or bad. And if you inherited what you say is a bad situation, then would you have the common decency not to advertise in your bulletins that the situation which you inherited puts us way in front in Canada, and shouldn't we all be proud of the Conservative government which has done this. And that the position you're taking and it has no credibility.

The spending plan which we have which is outlined in Bill 105 is the Conservative government's spending plan, totally. This budget can't be blamed on anyone else. It is their responsibility — their full responsibility — for what is good and for what is bad. They can't look to the past any longer. They've had 14 or 15 months to clean up what they say were the problems. Most of them have got a great deal worse, and I'm sure the public would be very, very happy to have some of the old problems and not some of the new problems ... (inaudible interjection) ...

One of the members opposite has asked for an example, and I will give him an example because I just saw the minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan come in. how the public would like to have those old problems of the potash corporation: what to do

with a profit of \$141 million in the last NDP year, what to do with a profit of \$160 million in the second-last NDP year. How would we like to have those problems instead of wrestling with trying to alibi the fact in 1983 the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is going to lost money? It's going to lost money in the first time in its history. That's one of the old problems that the people of Saskatchewan would like to have and not the new problem bought on by the government opposite.

Members are asking to me, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of this House, that there was a great stockpile of potash. They know that's not true. They know that's not true. If they will consult the records, they will know that the productive capacity of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is approximately 39 per cent of the total provincial capacity. And they will know that the inventory by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was approximately 38 or 39 per cent of the inventory of all the potash in Saskatchewan. And if in fact there was a great heap of inventory of potash when their government took office, then every other potash company in Saskatchewan — all private sector companies — would have an equal heap of potash. Members opposite may not believe this, but I invite them to look at the figures. The figures came out very, very clearly in the crown corporations committee and if any of them doubts it please to refer to the figures which are there on the record which we examined in some detail in the crown corporations committee. There is no question whatever that the inventory of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was more than everybody would have liked it to be; obviously, because sales were dipping a bit, but the situation was the same with respect to every potash company in Saskatchewan, private or public, and there is no justification for the canard, the story, the fable that somehow the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's current problems are because of any large inventory left to them.

The current problems arise because the government opposite is unwilling to sell potash and unwilling to take all the steps necessary to sell potash. They shut themselves out of the opportunity to sell potash in Brazil and potash in China and bound themselves to the rules of Canpotex, which they are now acknowledging will not sell potash, and they are confiding themselves to pleading with Canpotex to change the rules. They wouldn't have had to plead at all. They would have been able to make the rules and sell the potash had they been willing to cross their private enterprise friends. But that they were not willing to do. And as a result, as a result in this budget, we see a sharp reduction in the money that's going to come into the heritage fund from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and from all the potash companies. And this is what we are seeing because of the policies being followed by that government, and this is what is being paid for by the citizens of Saskatchewan.

And speaking of the potash corporation, I'm sure we're all interested in noting that \$50 million in this budget is coming from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan because they are drawing down accumulated profits — accumulated in the bad old days of the NDP — in order that they can pay for programs which they cannot finance because they have given away so much revenue to their private enterprise friends in the oil industry. And if anyone doubts this, I am sure that he's going to stand on his feet and deny, deny that there is money coming from the potash corporation from accumulated surplus and not from earnings, not from earnings because there are not going to be many earnings while those people run the potash corporation that way. So we are drawing down money accumulated in the good old days of 1979 and 1980 and 1981 and we are giving away money to the oil companies. And again I say, of every hundred dollars of oil produced in this province in 1984, far fewer of those dollars will find their way to the provincial treasury was in the case of let us say, 1981, because of the policies being pursued by that government.

It's time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the members opposite decided that they were going to take responsibility for their policies, and when members on this side of the House point out that their policies are failing it's not good enough for them to say we are preaching doom and gloom. They better understand that the people of Saskatchewan, while they don't want to hear pessimism for the sake of pessimism they certainly want to hear realism because they are very realistic people. They don't believe that you can create any measure of prosperity simply by hype and optimism.

Citizens of Saskatoon know something about hype and optimism, and there's nothing wrong with hype and optimism so long as it's followed up with solid work. But when it isn't followed up with solid work, there is failure, there are blighted expectations, there are people who are looking forward to something happening when it's not going to happen. I'm assumed, as I'm sure we all were, to note the constituency report of the member for Regina North East who was taken in by the fact that he believed that you didn't need any solid work and solid planning, and as a result he was misled, as many other people in Saskatchewan was misled into thinking that you can accomplish things by sheer optimism. And I am sure he would have been one of those who would have said, who would have said if people had asked questions, that they merely spreading doom and gloom. He prefers optimism.

He not only prefers optimism but he prefers to put it in print, and he says the Government of Saskatchewan is proud to have played a major role enabling a Saskatchewan group to attain an NHL hockey franchise. The economic benefits to Saskatoon and Saskatchewan will be tremendous and will create many, many new jobs. Well, of course we like optimism and I know that I suppose even yet if someone suggests that we might look at this again that we'll be accused of spreading doom and gloom. But I wonder if it isn't useful for all the people of Saskatchewan to be a little less full of unbridled optimism about the wonderful things that are going to happen just because some member on the other side indicates that it might happen.

No, I don't think that's going to wash any more. I think that the allegation of doom and gloom is now rather clearly discredited since some of the more optimistic predictions, whether it be hockey teams or water-slides, do not seem to be coming to Saskatchewan very fast ... (inaudible interjection) ... Members opposite are saying, 'Who started the water-slide?' I don't know who started the water-slide, but I know who issued the press release assuring us that there was going to be a water-slide. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know the Minister of Industry and Trade, who said that he expected the water-slide to be with us this year. And I will ask the people of Saskatchewan, towards the end of this summer, whether or not it was doom and gloom to at least suggest that this might not come quite so rapidly or whether it wasn't hard realism of the kind which Saskatchewan people expect from their public figures.

I think the time is rapidly passing when alibis can be offered for all the failures of the government opposite. It is your spending plan; you've had well over a year to get things going; nobody is expecting you have to have your full program under way in a year, but I think you can no longer blame what happened in 1979 or 1980, all of which you knew when you assumed office and when you made the promises; you can no longer trot out those alibis to justify the failure which is becoming the mark of your government.

We've had an interesting, interesting array of alibis ... (inaudible interjection) ... The

members opposite say that I should talk about the oil industry and I will take advantage of that a little later, but right now I want to talk about balanced budgets. And I want to talk about the member for Kindersley and the Minister of Finance saying: yes, yes we promised balanced budgets. True, we introduced two budgets and they're two big deficit budgets, but that's not our fault. We have to blame somebody else. It was perhaps the NDP who didn't leave us enough money — it was only \$140 million in hard cash. Or perhaps it was the recession — that great recession which has somehow just come into Saskatchewan, according to the members opposite, in March or April of 1982. The western economy has been in recession for a number of years. It wasn't in 1982 or '83 that Massey-Ferguson and those people were in trouble and getting bailed out. It was earlier than that, because there was a recession elsewhere before the government opposite took its place on the treasury benches.

And yet they're still trying to blame their failures on this new phenomenon of the recession. It won't work; it won't wash. People know that there was a recession before they took office, and they know that the government that preceded them grappled more effectively with that recession than they are grappling with that recession.

Then they say: yes, I know, those Crown corporations, our situation is desperate but somehow it's not our fault. True, that in the last NDP year they made \$115 million; and true, in our first year we lost \$126 billion — and that after some pretty imaginative and creative accounting. In fact the turn-around would be more than \$250 million — the loss, drop from 1981 to 1982. But they will say, 'Well, of course, that's not our fault. You know, there's been a recession,' as if there wasn't a recession before. No, in fairness, the recession has hit some corporations harder in 1982 than in 1981. But for some it shouldn't have been a factor at all. For some it shouldn't have been a factor at all. For corporations like the SGI — it does far better during recessions. SGI is not a corporation which has trouble during recessions but uniformly makes money during recessions, and we all know the reasons for that: because when incomes are short people drive fewer miles; and when they drive fewer miles they get into fewer accidents. They pay the same premiums but for fewer miles, and the insurance companies, virtually all of the, are doing better. But they're not bothered by that. They say the recession's here; or the recession cost us money in potash and it didn't cost us money in SGI; but somehow the recession is the reason for all of these troubles.

Not so, Mr. Speaker, and the public are no longer going to believe that. You have promised a level of performance of the crown corporations which you are not delivering. I looked at SGI, for example, and I noted the fact that they asked for a 6 or 7 per cent increase and the public utilities review commission felt that that was excessive — 6.7 per cent was the requested application before the public utilities review commission. And that was turned down and 3 per cent was allowed. And so far as I am aware the public utilities review commission is assuming that the deductible will not be changed.

See what these people were trying to do, Mr. Speaker. They were trying to raise the deductible, which is worth 15 or 20 per cent, and add 6.7 per cent, and the public utilities review commission is saying that's way, way out of line. Perhaps 3 per cent and not 25 per cent is a better figure. And that is what they are going to be permitted to . . . So one wonders, Mr. Speaker, what can be said about a government which hopes to manage crown corporations successfully, wishes to put on huge increases and is denied these increases as not at all necessary.

What we are looking for as an opposition, and what the public are looking for, is for the

government to move beyond this period of alibis and to stand up in this Assembly and defend their spending priorities, defend their deficit, defend what they are doing in the face of what I think is substantial evidence of mismanagement. And that, of course, is what this debate is supposed to be all about.

Members opposite are supposed to be proud of their budget and to tell us why they're proud of that budget, and we're about to find out how many of them are proud of their budget. We're about to find out how many of them want to stand up and say, 'This is a good budget, and I am proud of what it does for my department. I am willing to meet the criticisms which you have been levying and tell you why this is good, good for Social Services, and good for Urban Affairs, and good for Culture and Recreation, and good for Highways, and good for Labour.' I would expect that they will say why it's good for Saskatoon, and good for Regina, and good for Prince Albert. And we are going to find out whether many of them will have much to say about what a good budget this is or what a bad budget this is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on some of the elements in this budget. The budget is a budget of about \$3 billion — \$3 billion the government opposite is going to spend. And what we're debating is whether or not we should vote to permit them to spend this \$3 billion. When you're asking whether or not the \$3 billion is well spent, you really ask: is the spending plan set out in this bill and in this budget fair and just? If sacrifices are called for, are the sacrifices evenly distributed? If goodies are to be included, are the benefits evenly distributed? Or, alternatively, are they going to the people who need them and not going to the people who don't need them? Those are pretty fair questions to ask about any budget. And these are the basic questions we should be addressing during the course of this debate. I can assure you that we on this side of the House propose to direct a good number of questions during this debate to those issues. Are the spending cuts fair — are they hitting the people who should be hit? Where extra benefits are offered, are they going to the people who need it or are they going to people who don't need it?

Now let me state our position, and I suspect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will already be aware of it, but I want to state it clearly so that there can be no question. We oppose the spending plan outlined by the Conservative government's March 29 budget and which is included in this Bill 105. We oppose the spending priorities set out in the budget. We say that the Conservative government's \$3 billion spending plan is not reasonably fair, is not reasonably just. That's our position, and throughout the course of this debate my colleagues and I will try to tell you why we think it is not fair, it is not just, and that the budget does not do the job that ought to be done for the people of Saskatchewan.

Now I want to touch on a few themes. I want to illustrate a couple of them. I will try to not only state general principles, but try to pin-point some examples so that members opposite and members of the public who may be interested will know what we are talking about, not only in general, but specifically.

Mr. Speaker, I've studied the spending plan contained in the budget in some detail. Each time I review the plan I'm struck by three or four themes that run through it. Let me take a moment to review some of these. First, there's almost a total reliance upon the private sector, almost a total reliance on the private sector to pull Saskatchewan out of the current recession. There seems to be a touching but blind faith in their open for business proposals and somehow this is going to answer our problems.

Now I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose making this province open for

business. I was not aware that it was closed for business, and indeed any look at the figures will make clear the business people didn't know it was closed for business. They invested far more money in 1981 than they did in 1982, and I suspect when the figures for 1983 were in, if we correct for value of the dollar, the inflationary difference in the dollar, 1983 is going to be a poor year for investment as well. I can say with absolute confidence that the average increase in investment since the Conservatives came to office, and for the next year, will be a good deal less than the average increase in the NDP years. So, if this province wasn't open for business, the businessmen didn't know it because they were investing rapidly, investing heavily, and creating jobs — creating jobs in a far greater rate than the open for business philosophy of members opposite has created jobs.

The second theme is that this Conservative spending plan displays a remarkable facility for double standards — double standards which I think any fair-minded person wouldn't accept. And finally, this budget indicates that the government continues to believe that because it has a large majority it does not need to consider the requirements and the rights of minorities, be they minorities or economic minorities or social minorities.

So these three themes: the over-reliance on open for business; the decision to withdraw the government from the economy effectively; the application of double standards, so that some in society are asked to bear heavy burdens and some are asked to bear no burdens at all; and finally, the decision by the government that its large majority gives it the right to trample upon the rights of minorities in our province, be they political, social or economic minorities.

Touching first on the reliance on the private sector, I was struck by a piece of mail which arrived just today, I believe, from the Department of the Environment, which talks about a little magazine or leaflet called 'Snoop':

For the past three years, Saskatchewan Environment has distributed 'Snoop' free of charge to interested division 1 teachers. It's been a pleasant and rewarding experience for us with over 3,500 Saskatchewan educators receiving copies each month.

Then it goes on to say that times are tough. The Minister of Finance has cut off our money. It's phrased somewhat differently. It says:

In order for the department to focus its limited resources on the development of new programs for other age groups, (never mind about division 1 children — what do they know about the environment?), particularly ... The 1983-84 edition of 'Snoop' will not be sent out free of charge. It will be sold.

And it will be sold, not by the Government of Saskatchewan, but by something called L. A. Weigl Educational Associates. And the enclosed brochure says ... Here it is: 'if you want this valuable periodical ... (inaudible interjection) ... That's right, you can get it for \$22.50. Three thousand five hundred Saskatchewan educators are called upon to put up \$22.50.

Let me just give you a few of the facts which are said to be true about this little

magazine. 'My students really enjoy 'Snoop' and have asked if they were able to get them in July and August too.' The answer is no, not if they're grades 1, 2 and 3 and they don't have any money. 'Keep up the good work. It had really opened the children's eyes to the joy of nature. Thank you.' So they keep up the good work by saying this is no longer a matter of public education to the private sector. 'I think 'Snoop' was an excellent package of materials. Children and teachers alike enjoy the activities and it is presented in a very meaningful format. Thanks so much.' I'm sure they'll be very, very grateful for the fact that this little project has been turned over to the private sector.

Now I don't suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this stands in the same category as the decisions by the minister in charge of SGI to turn over huge areas of that corporation to the private sector; the decision to have licences issued by private sector people over the objections of many hundreds of people in cities like Swift Current; the decision not yet denied, at least by the minister, that the claims service centres may not continue to be operated by SGI but may be turned over to private adjusters; the increasing number of comments that there's going to be a withdrawal by the government from insurance of collision claims so that we will have public liability coverage but not collision coverage, and with all the consequences of that, it will be a great project for the lawyers. I will tell you that. Wherever there is compulsory public liability coverage, but no compulsory collision coverage, there is a great range of litigation. I would venture to think two or three times as much automobile accident litigation in any province where that exists per thousand vehicles as there is in Saskatchewan. So it'll certainly be a bonanza for the lawyers, but just what it will do for the people of Saskatchewan has yet to be explained.

And I could go on, Mr. Speaker, at length to discuss why I feel there has been an over-reliance on the private sector and why the government opposite seems determined to make the decision that the open for business private sector approach is the only one that can work. Again, Mr. Speaker, I want it understood — and I don't need to say this, because 11 years of government, when the private sector prospered as never before in this province is proof enough — that our party believes in a vigorous private sector. But our party believes that the private sector is kept more vigorous by an active role for government providing services that the public needs.

I wouldn't need to go beyond the Highways budget, which is included in the bill we have before us, to illustrate that. If members opposite feel that the decision to cut back on highway construction, to cut back substantially on the number of miles that can be built, or the number of cubic yards or cubic metres of dirt that can be moved, is a decision which is likely to help the private sector, then I think they ought to consult with the members of the private sector who find that they do not have available to them the contracts which they used to have in the bad old days. The bad old days, so called by the members opposite, when the NDP believed — and as we still believe — that we must have a road program which builds some roads each year, which is directed partly at main arterial roads, but partly at class 4 and class 5 highways which are being allowed to deteriorate in this province. I don't think anyone can drive over some of our less travelled highways, and I think of Highway No. 13 which is a pretty well travelled highway, which I had the opportunity . . . I don't know whether I should re-phrase that, but I was called upon to drive over that road in the last four weeks, and I found sections of it in very, very bad repair and sections of it which were scheduled to be rebuilt not being rebuilt.

And so I don't think it's good enough, and the public won't think it's good enough, to put up some Red Coat Trail signs along 13 and decide that that represents a total

discharging of the government's obligations to the people who use that highway and no money needs to be spent on the work of the continued upgrading of that trans-provincial highway. I know a little bit is being done down in the constituency of the member for Souris-Cannington, a little bit of Highway 13 down there which was thought to be a priority. But leaving that aside, the staged construction of that highway — not in one year or two, but over several years — should be proceeded with, and is not being proceeded with, and is not being proceeded with because members opposite believe that the government ought to effectively withdraw from the economy.

I now want to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of double standards. One of the most striking things about the government's approach to many of the issues which must face them as a government is what I think is their lack of fairness. So much of what your Conservative government says and does positively reeks of a double standard. Dozens of examples could be given. I've already referred to the minimum wage, the fact that members opposite say that we are in a time of recession and therefore we cannot raise the minimum wage. We must freeze it for two years for people at the very bottom of the scale, but we should not freeze incomes for other people at the top of the scale. Just think of that for a moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

If we must bear sacrifice because there is a recession, should we not try to distribute those sacrifices so that those who are at the bottom of the economic heap are asked to bear no more than their share and those at the top of the economic heap are asked to bear their full share? But that isn't the approach of the members opposite. Approximately 60,000 people in this province work at the minimum wage or have their wage changed when the minimum wage changes — and most of these 60,000 are women. And I want again to say that the persons opposite can say that they have some concern for these problems which women face in this economy, but the concern would be better shown if they would take steps to see that women in the workplace are getting some increases in salary as prices increase at the grocery check-out counter and prices increase when children's clothes are bought.

Many of these women — these women who work on minimum wage or close to it — are the heads of single-parent families. They're out there in the work-force trying to support themselves and sometimes a child or two on 4.25 an hour. And they were looking forward to a little bit of relief because it's a tough struggle, and they are being told that there's going to be no relief for two years. Do you know how much that works out to — 4.25 an hour — if you work a full 40-hour work? Well, it works out to \$8,840 a year. Put yourself in the position of a single parent getting \$8,840 a year plus some small amounts through family allowances — not very much money.

Statistics Canada publishes their idea of what the poverty line is in Canada, and there are different definitions of the poverty line, but StatsCan figure says that a family of three living in a city the size of Regina or Saskatoon needs to earn \$14,908 to be above the poverty line. Even that's not a whole lot of money, but it's a great deal more; it's a great deal more than will be the yield from 4.25 an hour plus any small benefits which may come from the federal government — a great deal more than that. And yet the members opposite say that this person is not entitled to any of the largesse which is being distributed in this \$3 billion budget — \$3 billion, but none of it for anybody on minimum wage.

I'd like you to think about that for a moment. If you deny someone on minimum wage an increase of 25 cents an hour three times you are denying them an increase in pay of about \$1,500 a year. If you assume only a modest inflation factor you are decreasing

the purchasing power of this person by \$2,000 a year. Add it up. It's a sorry story. It's a sorry story of what you're doing with respect to the people at the lowest end of the scale. But what are you doing for people higher up the scale? Well, you know and I know that we as MLAs voted ourselves 6.5 per cent increase. You rejected any suggestion that that increase ought to be delayed until the minimum wage was increased. And that's a double standard.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that people who work for the government at high salaries received a 6 per cent increase retroactive to April 1; senior public servants, political advisers got very, very substantial increases. And what was the justification for this, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We were told by the Premier that it was because of increased productivity. On May 10th of this year at page 1994 of *Hansard*, the Premier defended his increases and he told this Assembly in these words. This is what he said:

... if you can correlate productivity increases with wage increases it isn't inflationary ... if we feel that the productivity is there, and particularly if there's no other way to provide that incentive ... then that's how you do it: with salary increases.

Now I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if anybody believes that. I wonder if anybody believes that there's no other way to provide an incentive to someone who's getting \$85,000 a year than to offer him a salary increase. I can think of another incentive for a number of those employees. Threaten to withdraw the 85,000 and I think you would see quite a bit of activity, because some of them would have the greatest difficulty getting positions which would net them more in the private sector.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we pressed the Premier at that time to tell us what he meant by increased productivity, the increased productivity that justified the taxpayers of this province reaching into their pockets and handing \$3,000 a year to somebody who's already making \$75,000 or \$80,000. And he's been unable to do that. Certainly the performance of this economy during the last year has not merited any productivity increase from his economic advisers. The performance of this government in many other areas has not justified any productivity increase in other areas of government. Nonetheless they went ahead with their political advisers and with senior deputies to offer them an increase of over \$3,000. That's just another example of the double standard.

Mr. Speaker, another element became clear in the double standards of this government when we noted that for people who are working in hospitals and nursing homes, the government pressed — pressed — their employers to limit increases to 6 per cent or 7 per cent. Some of these people making perhaps \$1,800 a month, they were to get a 6 per cent increase or a 7 per cent increase.

And yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the same time the same government was hiring, on contract, political friends at daily figures of \$410 a day, and hiring them day after day and week after week — not a one-day effort, but five days a week for four and one-third weeks a year — \$410 a day for the Premier's personal staff; \$51.25 a hour, if you assume an 8-hour day. And if that isn't a double standard, Mr. Speaker, one would be hard-pressed to find one.

Here's a government which preaches restraint and which has systematically — systematically — expanded the staffs of ministerial offices, systematically expanded the number of people who are getting very large sums of money in this government.

Indeed there are more than 500 people who now get \$50,000 a year or more from this government. And if that is restraint, I don't think the people of Saskatchewan will understand it as such. This is a glaring double standard — glaring in the minds of all the citizens of Saskatchewan.

We have the example of another senior officer of the government getting approximately \$70,000 a year, and he is getting a shelter allowance of \$600 a month. And when we pressed the government whether they had any money for a shelter allowance for senior citizens, not all senior citizens but just the lowest paid senior citizens, they said, 'No.' They said, 'No, they did not have any money for a shelter allowance.' Please understand, Mr. Speaker, that this was to be a shelter allowance for those senior citizens who need it most, who perhaps don't own their own home, who do not live in senior citizens' accommodation which is subsidized, but who have to go out there and rent in the market-place to get a roof over their head. And for this relatively smaller group, we had proposed a shelter allowance. The amounts of money would be relatively small compared with the \$3 billion which the government is spending on many other programs, but they said, 'No. No money for shelter allowance for those senior citizens.'

Lots of money at \$410 a day for some of their friends; \$69,500 plus a \$600 a month shelter allowance for others of their employees; but no money for senior citizens' shelter allowance. That certainly is a glaring example of a double standard.

Mr. Speaker, the examples don't stop there. I think of the voluntary agencies who have been cut back, consistently cut back. I think of the cuts in the social aid, cuts in Saskatchewan assistance, cuts in the clothing and household allowances. In all these cases these have been defended on the grounds that it's part of the restraint program. But restraint didn't run to the office of the Premier who increased his staff by 20 per cent in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, once again Saskatchewan people can be persuaded to accept restraint. They will not be persuaded to accept restraint for the people on low incomes and no restraint for people on high incomes. And they will not, Mr. Speaker, be persuaded that the government is acting fairly when they say that income increases, that wage increases for telephone workers or for hospital workers, or for highway workers, should be limited to, say, 7 per cent, but increases in telephone bills or power bills or natural gas bills can increase 15 or 20 per cent. They are not persuaded that that's fair. They're not persuaded that that is a reasonable distribution of the so-called restraint that the government is calling for. They're not persuaded that there's any element of fairness and equity in the conduct of a government which acts that way.

People of Saskatchewan are beginning to question these double standards, and so they should. They are beginning to realize that the economic policies of the government opposite do not promise economic prosperity for all, rather they promise economic advantage for a relatively few. And this advantage for the relatively few will be gained at the expense of the majority. People of Saskatchewan again are prepared to pay the price of getting our economy moving again. They'll even do that even if they don't have confidence in the policies of the members opposite to get the economy rolling again. What they will not willingly tolerate are policies which are grossly unfair to those at the bottom end of the scale.

It has been said on another occasion that no place on earth are the good things of life more evenly distributed than they are in Saskatchewan. I doubt whether that is true, but

it used to be true of Saskatchewan in relation to North America. You could say that no place on earth are the good things of life . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, you could say that no place on earth are the good things of North America distributed more fairly than in Saskatchewan — no place in North America was that true, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That is less and less true today.

Members opposite are suggesting that what we advocated was the redistribution of poverty. May I say that during the 1970s the Saskatchewan position in relation to the other provinces of Canada steadily improved. Saskatchewan people had incomes which were steadily approaching the Canadian average, and in some years surpassing the Canadian average. This was a far cry from previous years. And I say to members opposite: unless they change their policies, while we may be currently in a reasonably favourable position because of economic difficulties in other provinces, if and when their economies revive as is now predicted, we will be left behind again because the members opposite have no proposals for strengthening the Saskatchewan economy in any fundamental way.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on some other aspects of this. I spoke of the \$3 billion budget. I spoke of the fact that in spite of that being a very, very large sum of money, it was not finding its way to the people who needed it most. And you only have to look at the very long list of groups who will not be helped — some of whom will have their money cut off for the first time in many years — to know that, notwithstanding this very large sum of money that is being spent, many of the most deserving in our province will not be getting it.

Think of our children's dentistry program. We had a program that provided dental care for four-year-olds — provided care for four-year olds because there was a belief, and is a belief, that if you can get children to get their teeth fixed early, you will start them on the road to lifelong dental health. The government opposite, notwithstanding the fact that they're spending \$3 billion, cancelled the money for dental care for four-year-olds and went back on what is clearly a desirable social policy — a social policy which had kept Saskatchewan in the very forefront in providing health services to our citizens.

I think of legal aid. Now here's a program which was designed to provide money for people who are at the bottom end of the economic ladder. They are getting legal services which it's thought other people can afford on their own. It is far from a generous program. It provides what must only be thought of as a relative minimum standard of legal care for people who are charged with criminal offences or who have significant civil law problems. And when I say a 'minimum standard' it's not because of any lack of ability or lack of diligence on the part of the legal aid clinic lawyers — far from it. As a matter of fact, over the years these people have developed a great deal of expertise and this is being generally recognized. It is that they have heavy case-loads. They cannot do the enormous amount of work which might be done for an affluent client who wished his lawyer to pull out all the stops in seeing if he could get a dismissal of a charge of, let's say, 0.08.

Yet this government has decided that they're going to further cut back on the money for the legal aid clinics. They have decided that one of the fundamental aspects of that program is to be withdrawn really on a permanent basis. And they're putting it in legislation. And I want to make this point because it is key to what we think of when we are trying to grapple with the minimum standards which ought to be offered to all of the people of our province.

We have someone who is charged, let us say, with robbery with violence. And they want to make the point that everybody that's charged with robbery with violence isn't guilty of robbery with violence. If this were so we wouldn't need courts. And that's a very serious offence, carrying with it, I believe, a possible sentence of life imprisonment.

The theory of the legal aid plan when it was set up was that people charged with those very serious offences would have some choice as to what lawyer defended them. Now there have been problems over the years. Sometimes there had to be some restraint. But by and large, over most of the time that the legal aid has been operating, a person who was charged with robbery with violence would have been able to select a lawyer from the private sector, from the ordinary bar. This government not only proposes to deny that right because of money restraints but they propose to enshrine that denial in legislation. I'll have an opportunity to expand on this when the bill is before the House. And I won't press this further in terms of the policy. But I do say that it is a bad decision with respect to spending when we decide that we are going to save a small number of dollars out of \$3 billion, by restricting and restricting substantially, the right of people charged with very, very serious offences to be represented by a lawyer of their choice. We would think if this were applied to someone with means that it would be a shocking denial of natural justice. And it may well be that the charter of rights will have something to say about this; the courts will have something to say about this because of the charter of rights. We will see about that.

But members opposite seem perfectly willing to vote for a budget which restricts the money going to the legal aid plan, and with it restricts the opportunities of citizens at the bottom end of the economic scale to have the same sort of representation or anything like the same sort of representation which someone with means would have. And I think that's deplorable. I think it's another indication of the double standards which permeate this budget and the thinking of the members opposite.

And when we think of the . . . I mentioned some of the social service agencies, but it's useful, I think, to mention a few of them so you get the idea of where they're saving their money and where restraint is cracking down. I'll tell you it's not cracking down on the \$410 a day employees, but it's cracking down on the \$7,000 grant for the deaf organization, the \$22,000 grant for the Regina Native Community Awareness Society. The crack-down on the withdrawal of perhaps \$100,000 from the community switchboard operations in Regina and Saskatoon won't be more than a net of \$100,000 in savings once they have transferred services that they can't possibly cut to other agencies and paid for them through other government programs. A little program to provide low-income loans — loans for low-income people to help them over a particularly rocky period in their life — \$14,500: slash that. A self-help group for the mentally ill to operate a little drop-in centre, and there are many of those out in the community now — many of them are lonely people who wish a little place to go to outside of their homes where they may be living — \$30,000: slash that. These are just a few of the funding cuts which came with the March 29 budget — \$3 billion being spent, and cuts in some of the most trivial amounts that provide services to people who need it most.

On a larger scale, we have seen cuts in psychiatric services; we've seen cuts in the Department of the Environment; we've seen cuts in occupational health and safety programs; we've seen cuts in rent control and rent review; we've seen cuts in the Saskatchewan hearing-aid plan. These are our programs which members opposite have decided can be slashed. . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Members opposite want to talk about the farm purchase program, and I know they will when they enter the debate, and I hope they will because I . . . but I want to talk about the mentally ill, and I want to talk about people who are getting help from the hearing-aid plan, and I know members opposite don't want to do that. I want to talk about the school programs, and I'm getting contacted by a good number of people who believe that the grants, increases in school grants, were pretty thin, causing school closures in a number of places, and the Minister of Education will be very familiar with this because he's been contacted by many groups but they're made harder and harder by the fact that members opposite cannot find money for these programs because they are anxious to spend money on other programs, and they're anxious to cut all royalties, and they're anxious to cut the costs of using our highways by interprovincial truckers. And they've done all those.

And people like CP Express have saved certainly more than \$1 million, and that \$1 million would pay for many, many of the services to the deaf and to the hard of hearing and to the mentally ill, and pay for increased rather than decreased occupational health and safety programs. But this is what we're talking about the priorities of this government.

It doesn't take long to find out who the big winners are in this budget. And I think it's useful to mention some of these: 66 million extra in interest, 66 million extra to the banks and to the bond dealers and to the bond holders — and that's a lot of money. That would go a long, long way to meeting many, many demands for services which the people in this province feel are justified and ought to be met by this government.

Certainly the senior political advisers of this government have done well. The senior political advisers and senior public servants, that more than 500 people who got \$3,000 a year or more, they did pretty well. This number started out with an income of \$50,000 or more and were given an increase of \$3,000 or more by this government, so that we know who've done pretty well.

I won't pursue this any further, Mr. Speaker, save only to say that the government daily reveals its priorities. When I mention these \$410 a day or \$350 a day, it is sometimes said that I am mixing apples and oranges, and that people are really part-time people, and they're not paid for every day's work. But I want to remind the House that one of the people who was paid on a contract is the Premier's chief of staff, Mr. Tkachuk, and he's on a personal contract, and he's on a personal contract of \$350 a day. And I hope no one is saying that that's not a full-time job and that he doesn't work every day and that he doesn't get this \$350 for every day he works, because members know that that isn't true, and they know that when they say no to a mental health group, 'No, you can't have your \$30,000 grant,' they know that that money is going to Mr. Tkachuk. They know that this money is going to people like that. They know that of this over 500, if they had decided that just 10 of them wouldn't have got that \$3,000, there would be \$30,000 for the mentally ill. They would know that. But nothing daunted, they decide that they're going to pay all of this extra money and cut back on the services to many of the most deserving groups in our society.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I cannot give you the full details of some of these service contracts. And I cannot give you the full details of some of these service contracts because I've not been able to get the full details of some of these service contracts. And that displays another little characteristic of this government, and that is

its unwillingness to share with the public of Saskatchewan some of the more lucrative arrangements that they have made with its friends. And that is pretty important because the public have a right to know, and have a right to know what the arrangements are for anybody who gets \$410 a day, or \$350 a day.

They have a right to know something else. They have the right to know the arrangements between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Manalta Coal. And if anyone has disclosed those to the public in Saskatchewan, I have missed it, Mr. Speaker, we are not now talking about small sums of money. We're talking about \$45 million — talking about \$45 million. We're talking about a government which sold a drag-line to Manalta Coal for \$45 million. We are talking about a government which took back promissory notes from Manalta. We're talking about a government which in order to get any money, since the promissory notes were not negotiable in the ordinary course of events, applied a government guarantee to those notes, and the presumably sold them in order to get money.

Here we have a government which parts with title to a drag-line; which takes back notes which are not the same as cash; which in order to get cash has to apply the government guarantee so that if the notes are not paid we will have parted with our drag-line and we will have no money because we'll have to pay back the \$45 million we got. We have a government which enters into contracts. I don't know whether I've had them all, and the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was certainly not very forthcoming, since it's just approximately a month ago that I asked him for some information, and I'm certainly not going to get it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I haven't got it yet. And we have an agreement which talks about this government taking some security on this drag-line.

What would you say, Mr. Speaker, if someone said they were going to take security on a drag-line and you asked for a copy of the security, and one month later you couldn't get it, and you went down to the registration offices and tried to find out what the security was, and you found out that this security wasn't registered anywhere? What would you think of a government which parted with \$45 million of your assets, which wasn't able to get any either cash or negotiable securities in payment therefore which had to apply a government guarantee in order to get their money, and which, while the agreements apparently talk about security, reveal absolutely no indication of whether the security is to be taken and what's to happen to it? And I think that these are very, very proper questions — questions to which we're getting no answers.

If the government opposite has taken any security on the drag-line, I believe that the public of Saskatchewan are entitled to know what the deal was. This is not any small matter — \$45 million. There is already evidence of the fact that Manalta does not wish to have much of its affairs revealed, and members will recall the reports in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* back in March wherein it was indicated that the Ontario Securities Commission had been approached to provide an examination so that the Manalta promissory notes could be sold without providing any information to the public through the ordinary requirements of the Ontario Securities Commission. And that seems to be the way it went.

The reason for the government guarantee was partly to make the note saleable and partly so that Manalta Coal and Mannix would not have to reveal any of their business affairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, these people owe the government \$45 million. They owe Saskatchewan Power \$45 million. If the Government of Saskatchewan had not applied a guarantee but had attempted to sell those notes to the public, the securities

commissions would have insisted that information be made available. And I suspect that the securities commissions would have been right.

When somebody owes the Government and people of Saskatchewan \$45 million the public is entitled to know something about the company. And yet we have not information filed with the securities commission of which I am aware. I don't know whether any security has been taken, but I have been unable to find any record of any security registered in Saskatchewan. The chattel that was sold, Mr. Speaker, in ordinary course of events would be to register that security in Saskatchewan to give the people some protection for this \$45 million asset which they sold, but I can't find it. I can't find it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one might have thought that that was doing enough for Manalta, would have thought that you were doing quite a bit for them by selling them a \$45 million drag-line, not asking for cash but taking their notes and then very kindly applying your own guarantee to the notes so that Manalta would not have to disclose any of its business interests. That seems to me to be enough. But that's not all, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has entered into an agreement with Manalta Coal or with one of the subsidiaries for Manalta or Mannix, one of the associated companies, to buy coal for them for a very extended period of time. We will want to know how much, but as I recall the minister verbally indicating that it was a period of approximately 27 years.

So you see the situation, Mr. Speaker. We had a drag-line, owned by the people of Saskatchewan, bought and paid for. We sell it to Manalta, without them, putting up a dime; they give us promissory notes. The notes aren't saleable, so we guarantee them, and they sell them. The only way we can get paid for our drag-line is to guarantee the purchase price. And then we say to Manalta, 'Just run that through your mind, Mr. Speaker. When we see the Saskatchewan Power Corporation needing large sums out of this budget, we will know — we will know why — if they conduct their business affairs in this way.

Just reduce it to a more personal level. Suppose I had an office block, and my name is Manalta, and I say to you . . . Put it the other way perhaps even easier. Suppose the power corporation had an office block and they say to Manalta, 'We will sell you this block for \$1 million, but we don't want any cash. Just give us some notes; and I know that we can't sell the notes, but we'll put a guarantee on them and then we'll be able to sell them. And then, in order that you will be able to pay the notes, we will rent the building from you for 27 years.' And that's exactly the deal. It was owned by the power corporation — the drag-line. It is not now owned by the power corporation. They haven't got a dime from Manalta. The only money they got is raised by dint of the government guarantee and they could have raised any amount with that anyway. And they've entered into a long-term deal with Manalta in order to buy coal. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the arrangement made.

I have no doubt, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, arguments will be advanced, with the allegation that there will be tax savings. Mr. Speaker, any tax savings for Manalta are about 30 cents on the dollar, a little more than 30 cents on the dollar I would say, paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. When we assist any company that operates in Saskatchewan to save money by saving corporate taxes we are assisting them to take

money out of our pockets.

And I think that those facts should be known. I want to give the minister notice that we will certainly be trying to find out more of the facts. We have tried in the question period in the House. We have tried by letter. We will continue to pursue this because we think that facts like that should be known to the public — we should know what this government is doing in its business arrangements with its business friends.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one or two other points. Some of my colleagues will be dealing later with aspects, in more detail, concerning the health and welfare provisions in this budget, which we think we particularly inadequate in most areas . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm indebted to members opposite for their many helpful comments, but I'm going to address a few remarks to you. I want to deal with one or two of these welfare provisions now.

I want particularly to deal with the cuts at Valley View, the Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw, which is, as members will know, a centre operated by the Department of Social Services for mentally retarded. And I want to point out what this government has done with respect to speech therapy and with respect to a highly innovative plan, a highly innovative method of communicating with people who were suffering from some measure of mental retardation.

I first learned about this particular method of communication with the mentally retarded when I was asked to say some words in support of the George Reed Foundation. And one of the things which I was asked to particularly stress was the so-called PIC (Pictogram-Ideogram Communication) program — the P-I-C program — of communicating with the mentally retarded, and I inquired about what this was. I was asked them to tell me a little bit about the program which they're asking me to promote, and they very kindly did so. They indicated to me the nature of the program, how successful it had been, and how innovative it had been. And I was very pleased at that. It was one of the many firsts for Saskatchewan in the health and welfare area that I hadn't heard about, and I was glad that the program was going to be continued and presumably had the support not only of the George Reed Foundation but of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Imagine my surprise, Mr. Speaker, when in discussing the budget for the Department of Social Services it is revealed that the initiator of the whole method, the inventor of the method, the innovative person who made all of this possible, is no longer going to be retained in the service of the Government of Saskatchewan. And imagine my surprise and confusion when it was first indicated: that that can't be true, that these announcements that this matter was under review, and a further announcement that it was under further review, and yet a further announcement that, yes, indeed the first story was true — that we were not going to retain the services of that particularly innovative person.

I was disappointed at that because I think that there can be few groups in society who are more deserving of our sympathy, and our practical sympathy in the form of tangible support, than those who are mentally retarded. Many of us have difficulty relating to them. Some of us have to overcome an initial uneasiness in dealing with them, and I'm free to admit that I had to overcome that and I suspect that other people had the same problem. And I know that that's not right, that we owe these people their opportunity, their opportunity to take their place in the sun, and that we need to attempt,

notwithstanding the difficulties that many of us have in communicating and relating, we ought to attempt to do whatever we can to assist those who are skilled in this area. And we have made giant strides in the last few decades — indeed, in the last 10 or 15 years in this province.

Many of us who attended the breakfast sponsored by the Saskatchewan Association of the Mentally Retarded and read the material which they provided to us will recall the fact that the ordinary educational system has been opened up to people who suffer some measure of retardation. For them we have found ways to use the ordinary educational system to communicate with the mentally retarded. I recall, Mr. Speaker, when there were virtually no educational institutions in this province directed to the concerns of the mentally retarded. There was Valley View and North Park Centre, but their educational programs were minimal.

It was my pleasure, when I was minister of education, to attend the official opening of the Harrow deGroot School here in Regina, which I believe to be the first such school for the mentally backward. I'm not sure what levels, but I will refer to them as mentally retarded, and if I've chosen the wrong word I know they will forgive me. Great strides were made then. The next step was to integrate those schools with the regular school system. The next step taken in about 1972 or '73 was to open up the school systems.

We still had the problem of those who were suffering from a greater measure of mental retardation — people in Valley View or North Park Centre. By and large, Valley View has younger people, and North Park Centre has people who are somewhat older. And then came this breakthrough of the PIC (Pictogram-Ideogram Communication) program and the people who were able to devise a method of communication.

And we now see the priority which this government puts on that program. We're not talking about any large sums of money. We're talking about small sums of money directed to the cases and concerns of a particularly needy group in our society. My purpose in recalling history was to say that we have not been pursuing the particular needs of this group for long in our society — for perhaps 20 years. Prior to that, they were thought to be practically beyond our ability to assist. And that, I am happy to say, is no longer true, and I am happy to say that we are making these forward strides. We had been making them in a dramatic way at Valley View under the leadership of the originator of the PIC program, and now we find that one cut from the budget. I am sure that the program will suffer and suffer very, very severely on that account.

I want to turn to one other area and to just to touch upon it, and that is university funding. Mr. Speaker, our universities have a proud record of service to the people of Saskatchewan, the University of Saskatchewan going back to the earliest days of our province as a province. Before the province was 10 years old, just about, the University of Saskatchewan was founded, just about 1915. Since that time it has served generations of Saskatchewan people and established an outstanding academic reputation.

The University of Regina is much newer. As a separate institution, it is about 10 years old. But it is already establishing an enviable reputation. During the 1970s, money was provided. There was never any lavish grants to our universities. One can argue that they were modestly underfunded in the 1970s. I think that, compared with other provinces, they were reasonably funded, and by and large they grew and prospered without imposing heavy burdens on students.

This year is every indication that student enrolments are going to expand substantially. We have already heard the both alarming and accelerating figures released by the president of the University of Regina indicating that his enrolments for the fall semester are at this time over 40 per cent higher than they were last year for last year's fall semester. And that is spectacular. I do not anticipate that enrolments will actually increase 40 per cent, but even if they increase 10 or 15 per cent, this will put enormous pressure on that university. I expect that the figures in Saskatoon will also indicate substantial increases in enrolments. That being the case, one would have thought that the government opposite would have provided some funding for the university which would reflect, perhaps, a 5 or 6 or 7 per cent increase per student in the grants to the universities.

That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. In the face of evidence to suggest that enrolments will increase at each of the universities in excess of 10 per cent, the government opposite has provided increases in this budget of less than 7 per cent. In fact, on a per student basis, they will be slashing the grants to the universities. It is simply not possible to operate the universities on less money per student than they had last year. It is, I suppose, always possible to operate any educational institution for a very short period in the face of almost any cut. But since universities have as their main cost item staff costs, and in the face of the fact that if you have more students you need more staff — and there is a real and substantial limit to the extent to which you can expand the classes — then surely it ought to be clear to the members opposite that we need some increase per student for each of the universities. In fact, we need an increase of 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 per cent student. And if the government opposite would assure the universities of that, they could get busy with the job of staffing up for the fall in the sure knowledge that they will be able to provide the educational offerings which young people in Saskatchewan are entitled to.

If this is not the case, Mr. Speaker, the university will have to improvise; they will have to wait until they find out how many students they have before they start hiring staff; they will then have to hire staff on very short notice; and they may or may not be able to find people who can give our young people the educational offerings they deserve and the educational offerings which are up to the standards which have been the tradition of the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Regina.

Members opposite may well shake their head at this. I think that what other people would like them to do is to shake their piggy bank and let some of that money come out so the universities could see how much is being offered. But the Minister of Advanced Education says, 'We will look at it; we will look at it.' Why does he not say to the universities, 'We will give you 5 per cent or 6 per cent per student.' Then they would be able to plan. Then they would be able to know that if the enrolments are very high, they still will be able to go out there and get the staff needed. That seems reasonable, and yet that is not what is being offered. We are being offered indications that it will be reviewed, that it will be studied. No doubt we will hear that a committee has been appointed or a task force is going to be appointed. That is not what is needed. Some minimum guaranteed to the universities is what is needed, and that is what is not forthcoming.

The universities have not been overfunded in this province. As I can say, a case can be made for the fact that they may have been modestly underfunded. I don't adhere to that, but I do adhere to the fact that the universities have not had grant increases. There have been some peak years. In the early '70s, when costs were growing up very rapidly there

were some years of rapid increase. And in some other years, notably a year or so when enrolments started to rise rapidly, there was some increase. Last year there was some increase because of rapid increases in enrolment, there is no adequate increase in university grants.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I ask members opposite to review this government and review it with care. I ask him to undertake to the universities that he will give them a minimum grant increase per student so they, as they see admission that he will give them a minimum grant increase per student so they, as they see admission applications come in, will be able to start planning. The universities are going to be under great pressure. The public knows that; that's why the applications are coming in — so people can get at least some of the classes that they would like to have. But the universities must do some rational planning, just as you or I have to do rational planning in our daily affairs, and the government opposite must do rational planning in the conduct of the provincial affairs. It is not good enough, Mr. Minister of Advanced Education, to tell the universities in June that you will look at the problem in July, or perhaps even August, and then they can get busy starting to hire people to teach students who are going to be at their gates in September. That's good enough — not fair to the universities, and not fair to the students.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call it 5 o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.