

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
June 14, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

THE CLERK: — I'm obliged to advise the Assembly that Mr. Speaker is unable to open the session today.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the legislature a couple of school groups today. They are both located in the Speaker's gallery. And the first one I'd like to introduce to the members are about 15 students from grades 4, 5 and 6, from a seat in my constituency, the town of Creelman, and from the Creelman Elementary School. They're accompanied here today by their teacher, Joan Kreiger, and as well the bus driver, Mr. Mott. I'll be meeting with them for pictures about 2:30 and drinks at 2:35. I would ask all members of the legislature to join with me in welcoming them here to the legislature today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. HEPWORTH: — I might point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Creelman is the home of the world's biggest little one-day fair, and I look forward to being out to that event again this summer.

As well, on behalf of the Minister of Rural Affairs, the Hon. Mr. Pickering, who today is away in Swift Current on a rural municipal affairs meeting, I would like to introduce 14 students from the Parry School, from grades 1 to 6, also seated in the Speaker's gallery and also accompanied by Brenda Arnold, Joanne McCheyne, Lana Zieg, Jack Matchett and Shirley Gress. I hope they too, have found a tour through the legislature informative and educational. I will be meeting with them as well for pictures at 2:30 and refreshments at 2:35. And I would ask as well that all members of the Assembly would join with me in welcoming them to the legislature today.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

QUESTIONS

Cruise Missile Testing

MR. YEW: — Thank you, Deputy Speaker. My question today is directed to the Minister of Justice. He will know that yesterday the American government formally asked the Government of Canada to allow cruise missile tests over Canada; more specifically, Deputy Speaker, over northern Saskatchewan in and around the Primrose Lake Air Weapons Range. This morning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the members of the opposition I sent a telegram to the Minister of National Defence asking Mr. Lamontagne to quickly reject the American request. Can the minister, at this point in time, please inform the House what action his government has taken today to let the

Canadian government know that you are completely opposed to any testing of the cruise missiles over northern Canada?

HON. MR. LANE: — We have several difficulties in attempting to take action because, as the hon. member has probably forgotten, selectively and deliberately, that some many years ago the CCF government signed an exclusive weapons testing agreement with the then Government of Canada giving the Government of Canada the power to test — and I state that it refers specifically to missiles — in the air weapons testing range in Saskatchewan. That agreement was reconfirmed by the NDP government, and in fact gives exclusive use of the weapons testing range, secondly to the Government of Canada. So legally there's no action we can take.

Secondly, in terms of the constitutional position, we've again made it quite clear that the constitutional power for defence rests solely with the Government of Canada, and that under the doctrine of paramountcy an exclusive federal jurisdiction will take precedence over a provincial jurisdiction. So what I'm saying to the hon. member is that we have expressed our deep concern over weapons testing, and we've expressed our concern over cruise missile testing. We've made our position quite clear that we as a government do not accept the doctrine of unilateral disarmament proposed by the New Democratic Party, that if it will in fact help mutual disarmament, we would be quite supportive of no cruise missile testing, but only on the condition that in fact there would be mutual disarmament. We reject categorically the NDP position of unilateral disarmament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. YEW: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Justice will know that in just recent months there have been two fatal crashes of the cruise missile in Nevada — one on December 19, another on May 24 of this year — for some malfunction or other. Now my question to you, Mr. Minister of Justice: does the minister not understand that he must act very quickly? Yesterday in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister said that a decision on the American request would be made as soon as practical. And he implied the Canadian government would approve the American request very soon. Are you or are you not going to oppose those cruise missile tests with vigour, and state what your official position is with respect to those missile tests in northern Canada?

HON. MR. LANE: — I share the concern that the public of Saskatchewan has, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the difficulty that the people of Saskatchewan find themselves in because of the action taken. The hon. member suggests that we have not expressed our concern to Ottawa, and I've already indicated that we have.

I find it very, very difficult, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I took it upon myself when the debate was brought up earlier, to go back and check the press releases of the tour of Russia by the then premier, the now Leader of the Opposition. In no press release was there an indication made that the question of the advantages of mutual disarmament was raised. I suggest to the hon. members opposite, when they were over in Russia, when they were over in Russia on their tour and had an opportunity to express their concern, they remained decidedly silent. So I suggest to the hon. members, I suggest to the hon. members that you can stand up and advocate unilateral disarmament all you want, which is precisely what the debate is.

I heard nothing from the hon. members — I don't recall any; I'm subject to correction, Mr. Deputy Speaker — when the Russians had difficulty with some of the

intercontinental ballistic missiles that went crash, and what they said about those. They didn't say too much. So I suggest realistically that you're taking a hypocritical position. You signed an agreement; you put us in a legal box; and you have perpetrated the situation that we're in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. YEW: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to remind the member, the Minister of Justice, that the people of northern Saskatchewan did not sign that agreement, that unilateral agreement, or whatever. I was not involved in those negotiations either. Many people are concerned with respect to the proposed agreement between Canada and the U.S. There is a dire concern for the safety of people in northern Saskatchewan , , ,

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! On a supplementary question, the member knows that you're not allowed any preamble, so would you please ask the question.

MR. YEW: — My apologies, Deputy Speaker. My question to the minister then is: does he not realize that he has a moral obligation to the people of this province and to the people of Canada with respect to the cruise missile agreement? Can he not state his position officially to this House, and to the House of Commons, to the Prime Minister, and the Minister of National Defence, Gilles Lamontagne?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the moral obligation that is subject to question is the moral position that the former CCF government took when it signed an exclusive missile testing agreement with the Government of Canada, and it reconfirmed that agreement. It was the NDP that signed that agreement. Even Tommy Douglas in Ottawa was shocked to be reminded that he had signed the agreement, or his government had signed the agreement, and it was reconfirmed.

Just so that the public is under no misconception, the NDP signed a legal agreement giving exclusive rights to the federal government to allow missile testing. Secondly, that agreement was reconfirmed by the NDP government. Thirdly, when the NDP representatives were over in Moscow, they didn't talk about disarmament; they advocate unilateral disarmament. Fourthly, I would like to read into the record a telex of June 3, 1983 to the Hon. Gilles Lamontagne, Minister of National Defence, from Premier Grant Devine:

In view of recent press reports indicating that evidence of technical difficulties relating to the guidance system has arisen as a result of cruise missile testing conducted in the United States, I am writing to express concern on behalf of the province of Saskatchewan that testing should not occur at the Primrose air weapons range until such time as assurance is received that apparent technical problems are resolved, and that no mishap will result to individuals or property.

Let me suggest to the hon. members that you're the ones in the breach of the moral obligation of people of this province, not this government.

Extra Billing for Medical Services

MR. LINGENFELTER: — A question to the Minister of Health. I wonder if the minister could indicate to the Assembly and the people of the province what his stand is today on extra and direct billing in the province of Saskatchewan.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the stand of the Government of Saskatchewan on extra and direct billing for medical services in this province is as it has been since we have taken government, is as it was since the Saskatchewan Saskatoon agreement of 1962, that the doctors in this province earned the right in 1962 to extra bill. Extra billing in this province, I'm pleased to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a very minimal amount, less than 3 per cent, and has not increased over the past year.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The minister indicates that the number is 3 per cent. This is quite different than the number of doctors he indicated during estimates were direct billing, and I believe the number he gave me at that time was something over 20 per cent. What I would like to know, and why I am asking the question , , , You will be aware of the Canadian Medical Association's opposition to the proposed new amendments to the Canadian health act which will include, it's thought, restrictions which will outlaw and ban direct billing and extra billing in Canada. I want to know, and get you on record, Mr. Minister, as to where you will stand when that legislation is brought in before the Parliament of Canada: whether you will be supporting the federal minister at that time, or whether you will be opposing any changes which would eliminate direct and extra billing in Canada.

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it's quite a bit to ask one to react to legislation that one has never seen, and I'm the type of minister that I will give no commitment as to how I'm going to react to legislation until I see that legislation, and study that legislation. But I want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government, who have protected medicare and will protect medicare, will fight for the medical rights of the people of Saskatchewan if the federal government should attempt to alter those.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other reason that we are interested to know what this government's position is on medicare is examples like New Brunswick which has a Tory government, and Alberta which has a Tory government, and the recent leadership convention at which many of the delegates, and many of those who were involved in that convention were indicating their support for changes to the medical care insurance program in Canada. That is the reason why we're trying to find out from you where you stand on the proposed legislation. I'll ask you one more time: when the legislation is introduced in Canada, will you give an indication to the Assembly and the people of the province where you will come down on the issue of extra billing?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, let me indicate once more to this Assembly and to the member opposite, when I see the legislation and have studied the legislation, I will certainly let the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Canada, know where I'll be coming down. And that will be coming down protecting the medical services in this province, and the people of this province realize that the myth that the government opposite tried to perpetuate in this province in 1978 was nothing more than a myth. That shallow cry of, 'Don't let them take it away,' has been proven to be wrong by the actions of this government in the past year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I have had the greatest faith in the Minister of Health and I supported him for the leadership when he was running; he knows that.

What I would like to know of the minister is whether or not he has sent letters or met with the ministers of health in New Brunswick and Alberta to allow them to share his concerns for the medical care system in Canada, and to show his opposition to those ministers of health in Alberta and New Brunswick. If you are as concerned as you would lead us to believe, have you been in contact with your comrades in those other provinces to tell them how upset you are with the minister of health in Alberta and New Brunswick?

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — Well, one thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the world unfolds slowly, and finally I found out why I lost; he supported me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. TAYLOR: — However, I just reiterate that the health ministers of this country are in continual consultation; the deputies are in continual consultation regarding the possibility of the Canada health act. I will certainly react to that act when it should be brought forward, and I have no indication, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that act will be brought forth in the immediate future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

Seat-belts in School Buses

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Highways. And this has to do with the report of Saskatchewan's chief coroner, Dr. Stewart McMillan. And with respect to the accident of May 26, the truck-school bus accident near Strasbourg where two people got killed, in his statement, Dr. McMillan notes that both people killed in this accident — the school bus driver and the child passenger — were thrown out the front windshield of the bus. He goes on to say, and I quote:

Dr. McMillan said the driver's seat was equipped with a seat-belt, which however was not in use. He said that, in his opinion, if the victims had been restrained they would not have been ejected and the fatalities may well have been prevented.

In light of that statement, Mr. Minister, would you at this time seriously consider or reconsider your position, and will you indicate to this House before it recesses for the summer whether you are prepared to institute mandatory seat-belt use in school buses?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of taking advice from the member opposite when we will bring the new Vehicles Act, or the school bus accident, which I'm just wondering how serious he really was about the new Vehicles Act, or the school bus accident, which I would like to assure you, Mr. Speaker, all members on this side of the House — all members from the government side — and I think it's fair to say that all members in this Assembly will agree that it was a tragic day in the province of Saskatchewan, a very tragic day.

Mr. Speaker, I have announced to the media, to members opposite, that I am meeting with SSTA, and for the members opposite that don't understand that, that's the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, this Friday, 9 o'clock, in my office, to discuss not only seat-belts in school buses but safety in school buses, transportation of

our children. It's a very important area. It's an area that has to be explored. There are some concerns from people throughout Saskatchewan. The legislation is in place now in the new Vehicles Act that seat-belts can be introduced as mandatory on school buses in the province of Saskatchewan, but I have not intentions of making that commitment before I consult with SSTA.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Minister, this is not merely a concern of the opposition or of myself. This is also a concern of Dr. McMillan, because in his statement, and I quote again:

Dr. McMillan states that he has conveyed his opinion to the Minister of Highways, Jim Garner, and has indicated that in his view the issue of seat-belt restraints in school buses should again be explored.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the concern of Dr. McMillan, of myself, our caucus, and many people in Saskatchewan, the parents of the students. Will you at this time give us a serious commitment that you will seriously look at having seat-belts in school buses?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, I undoubtedly take this as a very serious issue. I have told members opposite. I have told the media. I have told the people of Saskatchewan that we are going to look at this. Look at it very seriously. There are some areas of concern that we have to explore. Number one: design of vehicles. I mean you don't just come out and say you're going to slap seat-belts on school buses if they can't be anchored to the floor adequately, if the seats cannot be held in place adequately. That's maybe the way the socialists would do something, Mr. Speaker. That's not the way this government acts. We act very responsible. I have stated to the members opposite that it is in the legislation. Through regulation we can bring it in. There has to be some consultation.

And I will share with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one example of one of the concerns that has been brought to or attention if there are seat-belts on school buses. Who is responsible for making sure that every one of those children are buckled up? Whose responsibility , , , Is it going to be up to the driver? Is the board going to be responsible?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a big one.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, I hear the members opposite, saying, well, that's a big one. I am concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the safety of these children. We are going to explore all avenues of whether it be seat-belts or safety , , , the transportation of these children of ours. I'm meeting with SSTA on Friday morning. I've also just, as of yesterday, sent a letter to the chief coroner asking for a meeting with him in my office to discuss this very same issue. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going about this in the proper way, a very responsible way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The minister questions about how serious the opposition is about the bill, The Vehicles Act, which was passed by the Assembly. I would question the minister whether he was serious when during the year that he had to review the bill, he did not do the type of study that would have allowed for the implementation of seat-belts in school buses. And the simple fact that if he would tell me why, at the time that there was an amendment introduced to the bill that would have included seat-belts in school buses, he stood in this place and voted

against the amendment. And if you are serious about it, can you explain to the Assembly and the people of the province why you voted against the amendment to The Vehicles Act that would have put seat-belts in buses?

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I mean it looks quite obvious to me that the members opposite now want to start playing politics with the lives of the children in Saskatchewan. I am not prepared to play politics with children's lives. Maybe you are, but I am not. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what have the NDP done in 11 years for putting seat-belts on school buses? I read into the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on second and third reading of that bill where two of the former ministers of transportation had sent letters out — one was to the New Democratic youth federation — saying, no, not at this time. We're not prepared to do it. Now all of a sudden, after there's tragedy, the NDP are ready to jump on the bandwagon. That's playing politics with children's lives and believe you me I'm not prepared to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, getting back to the question at point, I asked the minister why he voted against the amendment to put seat-belts in school buses. I think the ranting and raving is of little importance in this issue, but I would like to ask him that question one more time, if he can indicate to the Assembly and the people of the province why he voted against the amendment that would have put seat-belts in school buses, which many parents are now requesting. I think it's a new feeling throughout Saskatchewan, and that is why we're dealing with it now. I agree there are many things we didn't get around to do when we were in government. I say to you, Mr. Minister, that your job is not to criticize previous governments, but to do something. And that's what the people of the province are waiting for. I would like to know why you voted against putting seat-belts in school buses when the opposition moved an amendment to The Vehicles Act to that effect.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it points out just the same results that took place last April 26 in 1982. I didn't have any confidence, any confidence at all, in the ability of the last NDP government. They're prepared to do things before investigating. I mean, as I explained earlier, why put seat-belts on school buses if the seats are not anchored properly to the floor?

Once again, SSTA, at the time, were opposed to them. That's why we're consulting with SSTA today to find out their view, and not only just seat-belts; there's many other things — structural design of the bus. It just isn't a matter of strapping children onto the bus if the structural design of the bus cannot support it. So we're looking, not only at seat-belts, but at bus safety for all of the children in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

Taking of Blood Samples Under The Vehicles Act

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Highways, and that's in respect to the new opposition in respect to The Vehicles Act, and that provision has to do with the taking of blood samples. As the minister will be aware, the concerns expressed have been expressed by the Saskatchewan Medical Association and in fact they are advising their members that they will not in fact be taking blood samples because of the responsibilities under the

Criminal Code that they could in fact be convicted of an assault. The minister has indicated that he has taken so many precautions in consultation in the introduction of all his legislation and responsible actions. I would like to ask the minister whether or not the SMA are in fact indicating their refusal to take blood samples.

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I mean this is just a typical example of how inconsistent and how the members opposite, the opposition, aren't really genuine and aren't really concerned about the new Vehicles Act. On one hand, they're saying seat-belts; on the other hand, they're saying no to blood tests. I mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they can't have it both ways. What we have simply done, we have brought in a section of the act, after consultation with the medical practitioners in the province, SMA, and that section does read:

No action lies against any person as a result of the taking or analysing of a sample of blood taken pursuant to this section except an action for damages arising from negligence in taking or analysing the sample.

That's for a civil suit. The Attorney-General has stated publicly, Mr. Deputy Speaker — publicly — he has stated publicly that there will be no prosecutions under the Criminal Code for the taking of blood unless it's in a negligent way. I mean, we have gone all the way, I believe, as a government in protecting the medical practitioners in the province of Saskatchewan. I believe that they are very seriously concerned about this issue. We are too. I believe the protection is there. Everyone in the province of Saskatchewan is going to have to accept their responsibility in order to make the new Vehicles Act work. The government is prepared to. SMA, I know, is also prepared to. It just seems to members opposite want to allow drinking drivers on the roads in the province of Saskatchewan.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 107 — An Act to amend The Agricultural Incentives Act

HON. MR. ANDREW: — I move first reading of a bill to amend The Agricultural Incentives Act.

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

CONDOLENCES

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day I would like to move a condolence motion, again with leave of the House. The motion would read as follows, or does read as follows, Mr. Deputy Chairman:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of the Legislative Assembly and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contribution he made to his community, his constituency, and the province.

Thomas John Bentley, who died June 2, 1983, was a member of this legislature for the constituency of Gull Lake from 1949 to 1952, and from Shaunavon from 1952 to 1960. He was born in Nova Scotia in 1891. He came West in 1907, and worked with logging, construction, and farming. He served in the First World War and received a Distinguished Conduct Medal.

He settled in Saskatchewan and lived in various communities, farming in Preeceville, operating a grain elevator in Kelvington, and working with Saskatchewan Wheat Pool at Canora and in Swift Current. In 1945 he was elected as a member of the Saskatchewan legislature, he served as the minister of public health from 1949 to 1956, minister of social welfare and rehabilitation from 1956 to 1960. After retiring from politics he served for two years on the Thompson committee advisory panel on medicare. He retired to Saskatoon and afterwards to Vancouver, where he passed away.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy to the members of the bereaved family.

Prior to moving that motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can indicate that while I did not know this gentleman I think all members of this Legislative Assembly recognize the contributions made today and in the past years by anyone that stands for office. I think it's fitting that we, at this point in time, express our condolences to the family of the deceased and recognize the contribution he made, and many people made, in the province of Saskatchewan. The gentleman obviously sat for a long time as an elected member; he held important cabinet posts; he obviously made important contributions to the health care system in the province of Saskatchewan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my seat-mate, the Hon. Minister of Health, this particular motion.

I apologize for that. The tradition is that the seconder of that is the hon. official Leader of the Opposition. Just a short-sight on my part — if I could perhaps change that. Seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to add a few words to the motion which is before the Chamber. I did not serve in this legislature with Tom Bentley. Tom stepped out before the election of 1960 and I was elected at the election of 1960. However I knew Tom Bentley and I knew him reasonably well. He was, as was indicated, a cabinet minister during the entire period from 1950 until 1960, and during eight of those years I served as a public servant and had many dealings with Tom Bentley. Tom Bentley was a good person who one would characterize as a very down-to-earth person who showed a good deal of guts and a good deal of compassion. His war record indicates that he was a man of personal courage, but one didn't have to know his history of service in the services to know that that was Tom Bentley.

He was one of that band of people who did so much to establish the health care system we now have in Canada. Tom was in parliament from 1945 to 1949, and he didn't succeed in the 1949 federal election. When a by-election emerged provincially, he was elected and immediately taken into the cabinet.

It will be recalled that the first major plank in building the health care system we now have in Saskatchewan — perhaps that overstates it, but a major plank — was the introduction of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan in 1947. As we all know, it's one thing to introduce a plan like the Saskatchewan Hospitals Services Plan, and it's another thing to make it work and be effective in serving people by getting hospitals built across this province, and getting services available.

We all also recall, if we turn our mind back, that Saskatchewan experienced some very, very rough times prior to World War II. The '20s were still a pioneer era in Saskatchewan, and while the cities had good health facilities, many of the rural areas did not. During the '30s, all too little was able to be spent on providing new hospitals and new medical facilities. During World War II it was not possible to do a great deal in renewing facilities which were now old, or in some cases non-existent. Accordingly, immediately after World War II, Saskatchewan found itself really without an adequate health care plant, without adequate hospitals, except in the major centres. Even they, in some cases, were aging.

None the less, the decision was taken to launch the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, and it fell to people like Tom Bentley to make the plan work after he became minister of health in 1949. Tom was tireless in his encouragement of communities to build hospitals, in the organization of union hospital districts, and generally in mobilizing people to face the challenge of providing hospitals for the people they served. Such was the nature of provincial finances at that time that a great deal of the money needed for hospitals did not come from the provincial purse, or from the federal purse, but from money locally raised — locally raised from farming people who had experienced the same long number of years of inadequate farm income and were themselves renewing their machinery, and renewing their capital plant to carry on scientific farming. But nevertheless it was done, and Tom Bentley, in many, many ways, was a leader of this movement.

He shifted over to Social Services in 1956, and this was just about the time when people were beginning to realize that we were going to need a great deal of senior citizens' housing and nursing homes. Saskatchewan quickly leapt into the forefront in Canada. I'm speaking now from memory, but I believe that when Tom Bentley left office as minister of social services and reconstruction — I believe they called the department then — Saskatchewan had a greater number of nursing home beds per capita than any other province in Canada. This again was, to a large extent, due to Tom Bentley's drive and his belief that it was up to us, acting as a community, to prepare for the day when we would have to provide much greater facilities for elderly people in this province. That day has now arrived. A look at the figures will indicate that the number of elderly people, as a percentage of the population, has increased dramatically since the late '40s and '50s, but the planning was done and we were on the road in Saskatchewan.

So those monuments are there for people to see, but the real monument, so far as Tom Bentley is concerned, is the many personal relationships he had and the number of people who came to like this down-to-earth, solid, hard-driving person who had such a strong social conscience.

When he left politics in 1960, he went over to join the Thompson committee, and that was the committee headed by Dr. Walter P. Thompson, the president of the University of Saskatchewan, which was planning a medicare plan for Saskatchewan. The report of the Thompson advisory committee was the basis upon which the medical care insurance of 1961 was formed. Indeed, the act was drafted largely on the basis of the Thompson Committee's reports, and that act, with some changes, as it was changed to respond to community desires and community pressures, is the basis of the medical care insurance scheme in Saskatchewan today, and really the basis of medical care as it's shaped in Canada for coast to coast. The Saskatchewan scheme was undoubtedly copied when the Pearson proposal emerged in the mid-'60s, and

basically the other plans in Canada are closely patterned off the Saskatchewan plan. So that is yet another legacy of Tom Bentley, and what he has done for the people of Saskatchewan.

He was out in a nursing home in Vancouver in later years, in Shaughnessey I believe, a nursing home. I didn't have an opportunity to see him very often although he used to write me a couple of times a year, commenting on affairs and offering his comments on what ought to be done, indicating a continued interest in political matters. Indeed, up to short months ago, my former colleague, Walter Smishek, kept in touch with him and occasionally had an opportunity to visit him in Vancouver, and I report to the House that Tom kept vigorous of mind right up to the end — the same Tom Bentley, the same person who was interested in his community and in what he could do for it.

His life is one which is an example of using talents for the benefits of others, and I know that hon. members will wish to join in extending our condolences to the members of the family. Some of Tom's children have now passed away, but tow of them at least are alive, and other members of the family are alive although Mrs. Bentley is not, and I would want to express to them our appreciation for a life of service, and our condolences at the loss of a quite outstanding father or relative.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I just want to add a few words, the very eloquent words of my colleague and of our leader, on T.J. Bentley who represented the seat of Gull Lake and, later, the seat of Shaunavon, which I presently have the privilege of representing, and I know that as I go around the constituency even today it's hard to be compared with one of such a distinguished career. It seems like everywhere you go, especially in the west bench in the Shaunavon area, it seems like every farmhouse Tom Bentley had stayed there at one time or another. And I think it shows what politics used to be about, because he was very well known to each individual family throughout the constituency.

I think his strength was in that he was an avid supporter of the ordinary folk within the constituency, and I think that shows in the fact that he represented the federal constituency of Swift Current, later the seat of Gull Lake, and after that, Shaunavon. And as my colleague mentioned, he did a very outstanding job in the House, but I think his real strength was, as well, at the community level. And I think that shows in the fact that he was one of the politicians for our area who is very well known even though he hasn't been in the constituency for some length of time.

I had the opportunity to meet with the woman who was the administrator at the nursing home, Mrs. Levi, last year when she was with her husband, Norm Levi, in Saskatchewan, and she said that he followed very closely the activity and actions of the government in Saskatchewan. And if he thought something wasn't going quite right, he made sure to tell her, and I'm sure, as the member from Elphinstone mentioned, did let us know when things weren't going right by our government, as well as other governments of the day. And so I would like to join with other members in extending to the family sincere condolences, both on behalf of my family, and the people in the Shaunavon area who would remember T.J. and want me to do that for them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I join the debate to talk about a man that knew we used to call the cheer-leader. When he moved to Saskatoon he lived across the street and down the alley from where we always played hockey on the road, and he used to come out on Saturday afternoons, or Sunday, and cheer us on and watch us and talk to us all as young lads, and always had time to spend talking to us. And in those days he

used to even talk to us about politics — for the Leader of the Opposition's benefit — but he always had time for the bunch on the street, and for that I would say he was a human being that respected the youth of the day, and for that he should be remembered as well.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the resolution just passed, together with the transcript of all tributes to the memory of the deceased member, be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Andrew that 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** be now read a second and third time.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that I welcome the opportunity to enter in the debate on the appropriation act. As members here will know that yesterday the Minister of Finance led off in the debate on the appropriation act. As a result of the remarks, the brief remarks, that were made by the Minister of Finance, I think a number of conclusions can be made. For here was an opportunity for the Minister of Finance — the man in charge of the fiscal policies of this province — an opportunity for him to outline and to reinforce those policies, and to enunciate those policies for this House and for the people of Saskatchewan, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance did not avail himself of this opportunity, and I ask why. Oh yes, in his speech, his 15-minute speech that he gave yesterday, he attacked our federal leader, Mr. Broadbent, and he attacked our provincial leader, the former premier of this province of 11 years, Mr. Blakeney, and he attacked the economic policies of the New Democratic Party and outlined that their policy of spending one out of the recession. But the interesting fact is that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, during his 15-minute speech he did not outline the economic gains made under his administration or what is in the future for the people of Saskatchewan.

As I said, when one listened to the remarks of the Minister of Finance a number of conclusions could be drawn, for there was no defence given of this budget. And what are the conclusions that can in fact be drawn from the remarks of the Minister of Finance, his refusal to outline any defence of the fiscal policies which he is responsible for/

I said there are conclusions that you can draw when a Minister of Finance has an opportunity in closing the debate on a financial budget of this province and he does not avail himself that opportunity. And what conclusions can you come to? I think you can come to the conclusion that the minister is arrogant, that he has said to this House, 'We have brought in a budget. We were elected with a massive majority. I don't have to waste my time explaining it to the House or defending it.' So there's a possibility that the

approach used by the Minister of Finance yesterday is not seriously addressing the debate on the appropriation act was one of arrogance. Engrossed this groups could be in their victory, totally losing sight of their responsibility by their huge majority, unaccountable to this House. That is one observation that could in fact be made.

The second observation that one might look at is to say whether it's just total incompetence. But here is the Minister of Finance that came in who probably was more concerned in his efforts to elect an eastern lawyer as a leader of the Tory party, federally, than to bother coming into this House and putting forward his debate.

Or perhaps this Minister of Finance is grappling with the financial and fiscal problems of this province and is surrounding by the greatest incompetence of ministers and government that this province has ever seen. And I want to say that that's a viable argument, viable because if you look at what has happened in the crown corporations in one year — in one year the potash corporation fell in profit from \$141.7 million. And if they hadn't cooked their books — \$12 million in the red.

And I want to say in respect to CIC, the crown investment corporation, here the Minister of Finance is looking at what has happened with the performance of the crown sector. And under this government, imagine what the Minister of Finance is faced with. The year before, 1981 under the NDP, \$115 million profit under crown corporations. And you know what this Minister of Finance is faced with under the incompetence of the Devine government — \$126 million deficit.

So I can understand the Minister of Finance being rather timid in trying to defend the fiscal policy and the economic management of the Devine government, because there isn't any. So his performance yesterday, I submit to the member here, was either one of arrogance, that he felt no responsibility to enter in a serious way and address the economic and fiscal policies of this government; perhaps he has given up trying to be a Minister of Finance in view of the great incompetence within the Devine government; or, thirdly, the indefensibility of those economic and fiscal policies.

I would submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a basic honesty with the Minister of Finance. I want to say that this is one of the ministers that I have the highest regard for. I think that he came into this House yesterday and he decided , , , He said to himself, 'I cannot defend what this government has done; I cannot defend the direction that this government is going,' so he said, 'I'm not going to try. I'm going to diffuse the issues; I'm going to attack the NDP federally; I'm going to try. I'm going to attack the NDP provincially.' And that's what he did. There is hardly a line in his whole speech where he addressed the issue of the appropriation act — his budget.

I think the Minister of Finance said to himself, he said, 'You can't make a silk purse out of a pig's ear.' And he said, likewise he said, 'I can't make a dismal economic policy and disastrous financial picture look good and believable.' That's what he said to himself. So obviously rather than defend, he attempted to detract for the disastrous financial picture in this province by attacking the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, it's always difficult, I say it's always difficult, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to prejudge the actions of another person, and I am reluctant to do that. Because, trained as a lawyer, we were trained not to prejudge before all the facts were at our disposal. I want to say therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I'm going to do what should be done and to look at the facts. I want this House and all members — and particularly back-benchers who are denied the opportunity to enter this debate — I want them to look at

the facts that I bring forward this afternoon. I want them to decide what was the motive of the Minister of Finance and why all of you have been not allowed to enter this debate.

I want to turn my attention to those facts to help me decide why the Minister of Finance — the Minister of Finance, the most powerful minister in government, next to the Premier — refused to put forward the defence of his budget and this government's economic policy.

Yesterday, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Minister of Finance entered the debate, the large number of government back-benchers , , , I sensed they sat on the edge of their chairs, excepting the Minister of Finance to come forward with the facts and the figures supporting their course of action. These inexperienced government back-benchers wanted to believe, they wanted to believe, and they were excited when the Minister of Finance stood in this House, but I want to tell you Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were so sure that the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Finance would set the record straight. He would set the record straight and he would deflate any opposition's attack on the economic policies and the budgets. But Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Speaker, the government back-benchers, they listened to the Minister of Finance, and I want to say they were disappointed. I want to say they left this House disillusioned last night for they all remembered the last election, and they remembered the Tory slogans: 'Saskatchewan: Open for Business'; 'There's so much more we can be.' And even the most committed, even the most devoted of those back-benchers, that silent group of back-benchers, now realized that these slogans were just Tory election slogans. They were not a reality. They all realize that what was said was going to be done during the election was not in reality but was taking place, and was not a part of the policies of this government.

Yesterday, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government back-benchers got their first test of reality, the reality that this Tory government has embarked this province on a disastrous economic and fiscal policy which will destroy the strong economic position that this province held under the New Democratic Party, I want to discuss, and I want the record to know, and the record to disclose what were the facts under 11 years of the New Democratic Party. This is what we gave to this group of mismanagers. This is what we gave to this group of mismanagers.

First of all, when we left office in 1982 this province undoubtedly had the lowest per capital debt in Canada. The lowest per capita debt. Secondly, we had in Saskatchewan the greatest economic growth in Canada. Thirdly, we had the lowest unemployment in Canada — 4.5 per cent. Fourth, we were providing services and programs for people unequalled in Canada and financed through resource revenues primarily. Fifth, we had 11 successive balanced budgets, and I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when we left office in 1981 not only did we have 11 balanced budgets, we had \$140 million surplus in the 1981 budget.

I want to say that we left our crown corporations in excellent shape, excellent shape. I want to demonstrate how good a shape our crown corporations were. Do you know what? In the potash corporation alone in the last year of our administration, we earned \$141.7 million for the people of Saskatchewan. Last year they ran it into the ground. There was a net loss of \$12 million last year from \$141 million. And do you know what the Tories were able to do? They were able to declare a \$50 million dividend from the potash corporation this year from the retained earnings that had been put in place by the NDP good administration.

I want to say that we left this province with an economic plan to stimulate the economy

and to provide employment — a sharp contrast to what is happening today. I want to say that we had a housing program to assist the low and middle income people build a home. Most of those programs have been set aside. I want to say that we had a plan for future resource development in potash and oil and uranium forest industry. I want to say that we had a very successful crown corporation in the resource industries, and as I indicated, in 1981 it gave revenues to the people of Saskatchewan in the neighbourhood of \$150 million.

You know, the Minister of Finance yesterday, he assaulted and assailed the NDP policy, and he said, 'The NDP are our big spenders.' He said, 'they intend to spend themselves out of the recession.' Well, I want to set the record straight. In fact, I got news for the Minister of Finance. We of course did spend money for the people of Saskatchewan with programs and better services, but the one significant thing is that we spent in accordance with the revenue that we received. That's more than what the Tory party can do, the Tory government can do, because in two budgets they have cast this province into a deficit of \$537 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

So again I come back and I ask the question: why didn't the Minister of Finance yesterday take the opportunity to praise his budget and the policies embarked upon by that right wing reactionary government opposite? Why didn't the Minister of Finance, why didn't he stand up and talk about what he had done for the working poor of this province? Ask that question to yourself. Well, I'm going to say that he would have a hard time, because many of the working poor are people on minimum wage. And you know what the Minister of Finance and his colleagues have done to the working poor? They put a two-year freeze on minimum wage. So you can understand why he didn't talk about what he did or is going to do for the working poor. I ask you: why didn't talk about keeping down utility rates? You know, during their election and during their campaign they criticized the NDP for excessive utility rates. Why hasn't the Minister of Finance the intestinal fortitude to stand up and tell at least the facts today? And I'll tell you why he won't talk about utility rates. Because, do you know what we have in store for the people of Saskatchewan after electing a Tory government who promised to give lower utility rates, who said they could freeze them and still balance the books? I'll tell you what we've got. We got double-digit utility rate increases in telephone, power, and vehicle insurance right across the board.

The Minister of Finance , , , He couldn't talk about what he's doing to help the working poor. He couldn't talk about what he's doing to keep down utility rates when they're rising. Well, let's see what he might have talked about. Why didn't he talk about strengthening our social services? Why didn't he talk about all the things he has done to help those people who need help most? Well I guess he talk about all the things he has done to help those people who need help most? Well I guess the reason he couldn't talk about helping the social services recipients is because he has in his budget emasculated the help that was there before. Slashed are the funding to non-governmental agency. And also, what has happened is they have in fact diddled around with the qualifications, and as a result, individuals who used to qualify can no longer qualify for assistance in need. So he couldn't talk about any program of helping social assistance. He couldn't talk about helping non-government agencies, because he has slashed their budgets.

Well, why didn't he talk about the good Tory management of the province? These businessmen that were supposed to come in and know how to run. It is pretty hard for him to do that too, because previously we had 11 years of balanced budgets in this province, unequalled anywhere in Canada. And what has this government done in 13 months in office — 537 million deficits, combining the November and the March budget. So he couldn't talk about good management.

So then I ask: why didn't he talk about the treatment and his respect for civil servants? I want to say the reason he didn't talk about how he treats civil servants is because since they assumed office they have fired over 200 — 200 — civil servants for purely political cause. Fired them. And it cost the taxpayers about \$2 million in settlements in order that political hacks could replace many of those professional civil servants that were doing their job. So he couldn't talk about building and strengthening a good and proper civil service.

And why didn't he talk about the good Tory management of crown corporations? They set up the Wolfgang Wolff commission. Why in fact hasn't he talked about their management in the crown corporations? Well, their management has been such a disgrace that if it wasn't so serious, it would be pretty funny. They have mismanaged every crown corporation that they have put their hands on. They have to get the award for the biggest mismanagers this province has ever known. They took CIC from \$115 million profit to \$126 million, and that isn't the actual amount. They took the potash corporation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from \$147.7 million profit to be one of competence, so how could the Minister of Finance talk about crown corporations?

Well, I ask, why didn't he talk about compassion and fairness of this government? I say he couldn't even talk about compassion and fairness, because this government is the most riddled government with political patronage that Saskatchewan has ever, ever had to endure. I want to say that careers of professional civil servants, who had worked under the former Liberal administration, who had worked as professional civil servants under our administration, and these new-found leaders of our province came forward and ruined career after career of competent civil servants.

I want to say that the potash corporation had the most respected civil servant in the whole potash industry, Mr. David Dombowsky. And I want to say that this group, who have no conscience and no compassion, fired that man because he was doing too good a job for the crown sector — doing too good a job for the crown sector. So how could this Minister of Finance stand up and talk about compassion and fairness when there is no fairness? How could he stand up, this Minister of Finance, and talk about fairness when the exorbitant salaries that are being paid to the political employees that they have hired
, , ,

Just imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they brought in a deputy minister to the Premier; \$54,000 he worked for under the Lyon government in Manitoba, and they filled his pocket when he walked into Saskatchewan with \$86,000. We have gone through all the records of the exorbitant payments that they have made to their political friends, up to \$410 a day — \$410 a day. I want to ask the farmers, and the working people, and those on minimum wage that have been frozen, to ask yourself: is this a government that cares? Is this a government of compassion? Is this a government of fairness?

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this Minister of Finance could not stand up and talk about being fair, or a government of compassion, or a government of the people, because indeed their actions show otherwise. I ask: why didn't he talk about strengthening up programs for the underprivileged in our society? Again I say: how could the Minister of Finance stand up and address, or want to talk about, strengthening programs for the underprivileged in our society? He couldn't, because look at what they did at Valley View. They fired one of the most competent speech

therapists who were helping those with physical and mental disabilities.

If you look at the legal aid, they have taken the direction for government central control. If you look at helping those who have been incarcerated to rehabilitate in society, what has this government done? They have scrapped the John Howard immersion program. They have done away with the bush camp in northern Saskatchewan for the rehabilitation of young people. They have scrapped program after program to help this sort of people. So the Minister of Finance again couldn't talk about programs, or strengthening programs, for the underprivileged.

I ask: why didn't he talk about agriculture? Well, I guess the obvious reason is that he couldn't very well even talk about their co-called favourite topic, agriculture, because they slashed the budget by some \$11 million or \$12 million from the previous year. They've cut it back some 13 per cent.

He could hardly talk about agriculture when he destroyed the family farm improvement board, or program. He could hardly talk about the great things that they're doing for agriculture because when you take a look at their farm purchase program I want to say that the facts are this. Do you know how much they spent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the farm purchase program? The total costs that is budgeted for this program is \$6.5 million.

There are over 65,000 farmers in Saskatchewan — about 67,000. And so do you know what? On the average farm do you know what their farm purchase program means to an individual farmer? \$97 is about the average amount that they are providing under the farm purchase program poor farmer. So I guess they couldn't talk. The Minister of Finance couldn't get up and talk about agriculture.

Well, then, why didn't he talk about their very favourite economic there, open for business? Well, I wondered why the Minister of Finance wouldn't talk about their favourite theme, open for business. And so what I did — and I wanted to have the facts and put the facts before all of those disenchanted back-benchers who were so discouraged by the lack of performance of the Minister of Finance , , , And I want to know why in fact he didn't talk about open for business.

Well, I went to the bankruptcy data. The bankruptcies to date in 1983 in Saskatchewan reads something like this: consumer, January to May, 1983 — 286; business bankruptcies, January to May, 1983 — 132; a total of 418 during that period of time. If you compare that with January to May of 1982; consumer, we had 155; business, we had 111; 266. So in bankruptcies alone we had a 57 per cent increase in bankruptcies. From May of 1982 through to April, 1983, the Conservatives' first year in office, there were 912 bankruptcies in Saskatchewan — 912 bankruptcies under the Tories during the first year. And I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this was a 90 per cent increase over the 479 bankruptcies in the previous 12 months. And the same goes on with farm bankruptcies.

So then I went and I took a look and I wanted to know about jobs being created in this province. And so I got some statistics and I wondered why the Minister of Finance didn't talk about open for business and the great number of jobs that have been created under this new direction. I looked in 1973. The increase of new jobs created in Saskatchewan was 7,000. In 1974 — 7,000 jobs. I looked in 1975 under New Democratic government — 15,000 new jobs. I looked in 1976 — 13,000 new jobs. I looked in '77 — 14,000 new jobs; '78 — 8,000 new jobs; 1981 — 9,000 new jobs. do you know what? Along came that Tory government, 1982 — a miserable

1,000 jobs. so why would they be wanting to talk? How could the Minister of Finance possibly come in and talk about the jobs created under this derelict, economic philosophy of the past?

And then I said, well, what are people doing under this government? And so I went in and I got some statistics in respect to the welfare cases. I took a look at the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan case-load data. I want to look here at the total Saskatchewan SAP case-loads, April 1983. April of 1982 there was 23,900 on social assistance. Do you know what? One year later, one year later increased to 29,798. Unemployable employable case loads — that rose from 8,916 in April of 1982 to 14,676. Do you know what? Under this Tory government in one year, we have over 60,240 total beneficiaries dependent on welfare — 60,240 total beneficiaries on welfare under this Tory government. And I guess that answers why the Minister of Finance didn't want to talk about the greatness of open for business.

Then I took a look at today's loss because of industrial disputes and see how they're getting along with labour. I look at the workers' days lost in strikes and walk-outs per non-agricultural paid worker, Canada and Saskatchewan 1975 to 1982. In Saskatchewan, 1975 they lost 0.73 workday per worker; in Canada, 0.39. In 1980 we had 0.20; in Canada it was 0.95. In 1981 we had 0.20; in Canada, 0.91. Seven-year average in the province of Saskatchewan was 0.50; the average in Canada was 0.95. In 1982 , , , Let's listen to 1982 under the Tory government. This is the worker-day lost in strikes and lock-outs per non-agricultural paid worker. In 1982 in Saskatchewan it rose to 1.31; and the average in Canada was 0.62. So I guess those statistics indicate that their operation and their working with labour was also a colossal disaster.

So I want to say then, I asked a number of questions as to where the Minister of Finance might in fact have spoken and addressed this legislature. He was unable to talk, as I indicated, in respect to open to business because it has been a colossal failure. Well then I said to myself, surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance had some things he could mention, some things which are positive Tory actions during the last 12 or 13 months.

Well, I thought for a while and I thought, well, yes he could. He could stand up and he could say , , , he could mention that he fired over 200 competent civil servants without cause — without cause — at a cost to the province of \$2 million. I guess he could have stood up and said that, but he was too ashamed to do it. I guess he could stand up and brag about the political staff, the political staff that is hired by each cabinet minister, a cost to the taxpayers on the average of \$150,000 to \$200,000. He could have stood up and said, 'We in this government during our first 12 or 13 months have certainly achieved a political machine. Well, heck, we have hired, we have hired four and five executive assistants and special assistants.' And you know, he could have bragged about that and he would say that we have this Tory machine together, people of Saskatchewan. And the only thing I want to tell you is it's only costing you, on the average, between \$150,000 to \$200,000 for that political machine in every minister's office. That's what it's costing.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about that young, dynamic team they have at the top?

MR. KOSKIE: — I'm going to mention that young, dynamic team. I guess the Minister of Finance, he could have, you know, stood up and announced that the senior member of

the Premier's staff — the one known as Derek Bedson — he could have stood up and said, 'You know, we really respect and get the top-notch people, and what we have done is we have paid this fellow \$86,000.' But I guess he didn't think that was a very positive action, because he didn't mention paying those exorbitant salaries and personal contracts in the Premier's office and in other ministers' offices.

I guess, what else could he have talked about? He could tell this Assembly that since he assumed office, labour disputes have increased, because that is what has happened. That's pretty difficult for the Minister of Finance to stand up and say, 'Well, we assumed office for a year, and our record with labour is dismal in that the loss per worker has increased threefold.'

I guess he could stand up and say, 'Well, we've done something positive. We have appointed 10 Legislative Secretaries working in assistance of those incompetent ministers.' And he could tell the taxpayers that these Legislative Secretaries only cost them, as part of the Tory political machine, \$6,500 each. Now that is a positive thing that this government has done.

I guess the next thing he could stand up and have said is, 'We have addressed a very serious concern in this province, and that is liquor laws. We are passing legislation in this session to relax the liquor laws in this province. And if we can't feed them, we're certainly going to make the people of this province , , , availability of booze of the people. They may not have jobs, but certainly we'll give them booze.' And so, he could have stood up and then bragged about relaxing the liquor laws.

I guess he could also have stood up and said that in creating this open for business type of approach, what we have done is we have sent ministers all over the world. He could have said, 'We sent the minister of industry and commerce (as he then was) off on a trip to Europe at a cost of \$30,000 to the taxpayers.' But then someone might have asked him was there any results from all of these travels of these ministers floating around the world. And of course he would have no answer for that, because this province has no economic activity since this government took over. And I guess he could have stood up and said, 'We have fulfilled an election promise. We have established PURC, the public utility review commission.' But you know, the poor fellow, he couldn't even stand up in this House and take credit for that because the very fact is they set up the public utility review commission and then their very own ministers are circumventing the public utility review commission.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we certainly have stood in this House ever since 1975, since I was first elected. Never before has there been an occasion offered to a new finance minister to outline in crystal clear from his financial and economic policies which they are embarked on. And I want to say, to the disgust of his back-benchers, to the total disgust of the opposition, and I want to say to the disgust of the people of Saskatchewan, the Minister of Finance refused, refused to make a statement of any significance in support of their economic course.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to put onto the records the dismal performance of this government cannot be done in a short time. My colleagues are going to be adding to what I have to say. But if I look at the area of education, and here again the Minister of Finance could not in fact stand proudly and say as they can in Manitoba, where they have , , , In Manitoba they gave a 10.3 per cent increase for funding for universities and operating grants. And do you know what they've done here? A miserable 7 per cent increase for funding for education for our universities. And the university commissions

indicated to them that our universities, to maintain the programs and to meet the demand of an increasing enrolment, needed 11 per cent.

So rather than properly funding our universities, guess what they did, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They abolished the universities commission rather than funding the universities.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would have thought that the Minister of Finance would have stood up and said, 'Ah, this Tory government is four-square behind maintaining the health quality of this province, the universality of our medicare founded by the NDP, the universality of hospitalization.' But I want to say that the Minister of Finance was even afraid to stand up and say that there will be no user fees on our health care and we give that commitment. How could he? Because across Canada we see the erosion of our health care program in other Tory provinces — Ontario, Alberta and New Brunswick.

And as I said, though perhaps he would stand up and indicate that in respect to agriculture that this was their favourite song, that they would in fact put forward some comments that this government has been doing for agriculture. But as I indicated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government is losing the faith and the trust that the people of Saskatchewan gave them a year ago on April 26th.

They came in, Mr. Deputy Speaker, indicating that they would in fact provide and implement many promises. And I want to say that there is no way that I am going to allow this government to get off the hook for two very basic promises that they made during the last election.

They indicated to the people of Saskatchewan that they would wipe out the sales tax. They didn't tell the people of Saskatchewan how much that would cost. Well, I'm going to tell the people of Saskatchewan that that is the most insignificant Tory promise that was made in the last election, and not a move on removing the sales tax. That sales tax, if they had kept that promise, is between \$350 million to \$370 million. That is the carrot that they hung out to the people of Saskatchewan, and which they are failing to meet. I tell you the people of Saskatchewan will no longer believe in these false promises, these promises which were never intended to be kept — removal of the sales tax, cutting back \$350 million of revenue.

I want to say, the other major promise that they said during the last campaign is that they would cut 10 per cent down on the income tax paid by Saskatchewan residents. And I want to say that that would amount to about five points; and if we treat that five points on the income tax scale and each point is worth approximately \$12 million, there is another \$60 million that was promised by the Tory government and they haven't been able to keep it.

I want to close my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to say how disappointed I was that the Minister of Finance was unable yesterday in this debate to come forward with a general supporting statement of the direction and the economic policies of his government. But as I have concluded by setting from the facts here today, the Minister of Finance — who I said before is an honourable man — being an honourable man was not going to come into this House and deceive the people of this province, because he recognizes the disastrous course that this government is on.

As I've said before, \$337 million deficit — and I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know

the significance of the magnitude of that deficit. Our interest payments alone under this Tory government, has risen to \$66 million. That's what we have to pay to the banks and the bond dealers before we can implement a single program in Saskatchewan. And do you know what that means? It means the cost of interest to this province has increased so drastically under this mismanagement of the Tory government. It means that that 66 million that we pay in interest could, if we had not owed it . . . Under an NDP government we could have financed our drug program, and we could have financed our dental program. And do you know what we have to do now? Do you know what we have to do now? We have to raise from the people of Saskatchewan \$66 million to pay for Tory promises and mismanagement — 66 million bucks before we can offer to the people of Saskatchewan anything. And if we want to continue the drug program and the dental program, we have to raise over 130 million bucks to keep those two programs viable.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, never have we seen a poorer performance by a Minister of Finance. But he has a defence. The Minister of Finance, I want to say, has a defence for a poor performance, because of the dismal and disastrous performance of the Devine government. I think that as this story is told to the people of Saskatchewan, the credibility of this government is on the wane. Today, today instead of creating jobs and getting the economy going, in stead of doing that and addressing that, we have before this session labour legislation which is an attack on the working people of this province. This is then the dismal performance.

I want to say that in the correspondence, and the people that I meet across this province, more and more are saying, 'You know, I made a mistake on April 26, 1982, but I'll tell you one thing: I won't make that mistake again.' Thank you.

MR. KLEIN: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all I would like to thank the opposition for allowing me the little time that's left to have a few remarks to make. I'd particularly appreciate being invited by the member from Regina Centre, as well as the Leader of the Opposition, to enter this debate and address my comments accordingly.

I wish most emphatically to put some emphasis on setting the record straight regarding jobs that the member from Regina Centre kept talking about last night. Now I don't know whether they get their numbers from, Mr. Speaker, or how they analyse them or how they read them, but I would like to read into the record proper numbers regarding employment and how it sits since April 26, 1982, as it relates to Saskatchewan.

In Saskatchewan the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate declined from 7.6 per cent in April to 7.5 per cent in May. Now on an adjusted basis the annual rate declined substantially from 8.3 in April 7.0 in May.

Now, Mr. Speaker, being that Saskatchewan still continues to have the lowest unemployment rate in the country, and being that this unemployment rate still continues to drop and is dropping not only month to month but on an annual basis, I find it extremely hard to believe and accept the figures that the member from Regina Centre was throwing about and talking about last night. I just really can't understand where he get them from or how he analyses them.

The labour force in Saskatchewan increased by 20,000 from May, 1982, and in addition participation increased by almost 2 percentage points over

the same period.

Now this is an indication that the people are more optimistic about employment prospects in the province than ever before, and that indeed Saskatchewan is open for business. In May, employment increased by 23,000 from April, and by 11,000 from May, 1982.

They talk about agriculture. Let's do that for a while.

Employment increased by 6,000 in the agricultural sector, by 5,000 in the non-ag sector from last May. In May, the number of unemployed declined from 39,000 to 34,000 from April.

And that is 8,000 above the number of unemployed in May of 1982. In the meantime, while we're sailing along at this 7.0 rate, the national employment rate across the country is still 12.4 per cent. I really find it difficult to believe, difficult to accept how the opposition continues to throw these figures around. They keep chiding us into saying that we have to defend our budget. It's not the budget that we have to defend, Mr. Speaker. The only defence that we need is in defence of the statements that the opposition continually makes — statements that don't reflect at all what is happening, statements that the people of Saskatchewan may misread — and all we have to do is just simply correct these statements.

I take exception to the distasteful remarks made by the opposition towards our Minister of Finance. Their observations are twisted and distorted to their liking. Our minister tells it like it is. These statistics that I have just read, Mr. Speaker, reflect exactly what is happening and not anything different. I thank the opposition for allowing me these few moments, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to become involved in the debate on Bill 105, the appropriation act, which will allow for the spending of the almost \$3 billion which this government has set out. And before I take my place, I intend to outline why I and members of my caucus will not be supporting this bill, because we feel that it is completely out of place, that it is completely out of line with in attempting to meet the needs of the people of Saskatchewan at the present time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hear the member from Weyburn talking from his seat again. He is unable to stand and take part in the debate, as are many of the other members in the government back benches. I appreciate that one out of the 56, one out of the 56 took the opportunity in the past two days to rise to their feet to defend the budget and spending appropriation of this government. But I suppose that's fair to say that I would have a difficult time rising to defend a budget and a spending priority program of this government if I were attempting to get re-elected in any of the constituencies in Saskatchewan, and have to attempt to defend the budget that even the Minister of Finance , , , In keeping track of the time that he spent actually talking about the budget, that when he got talking about the New Democratic Party in Canada and Ed Broadbent, he didn't talk about the leadership of the Conservative Party either, and I can well understand that.

But I do want to take a moment to briefly outline why we are also upset with this government in choosing the leader for the Conservative Party that they did. I think last week-end was a display of how the Conservative Party acts when they get close to

victory of the federal government. I think it's happened before. It happened with another leader, one John Diefenbaker, the only other prime minister, Conservative prime minister, for many, many years. Now we have another individual, that person being Joe Clark, the former prime minister, very well liked throughout the country, riding high in the polls, probably the highest the Conservative Party has been at 52 per cent, and what does the Conservative Party do in their wisdom? They turf him out.

Where was Mr. Clark from? Maybe that's the reason. Maybe the reason that they turf these individuals out, who do well politically in a federal election, is because they're from western Canada. John Diefenbaker, for example, from Prince Albert — the eastern Conservatives could not stand this individual, could not accept him because he was from western Canada. We now have the individual Joe Clark who did a very good job. I think the people in the party, the Conservative Party, underestimate the ability of Joe Clark to have organized the party to raise them up to 52 per cent in the popular opinion polls, and by anyone's estimation, would have certainly won the next federal election.

But I think here again the multinationals and Bay Street and James Street put their money behind the person who they best saw would meet their interests after the day of the next federal election. I guess that's not surprising because at any time when you elect a right-wing government, whether it's in Canada or Saskatchewan, you will find that big business will attempt to elect that person that they feel will best serve their interests.

What I and many others in Saskatchewan, including many Conservative members listening to open-line shows, are upset about is that the delegates who went from Saskatchewan, and in particular a large number of Conservative MLAs, did not fall behind, did not support, did not in fact support the western leader, that person being Joe Clark. Now, there were a few who saw problems with Mulroney, and I can respect the wisdom and the political integrity of the member for Rosthern for this point. He very clearly outlined why Mulroney could not possibly win support in western Canada, and there's not many things that the member for Rosthern and I agree on.

I suppose in terms of the bill that he has worked very hard on, the horse-racing bill, I will not have a great deal of difficulty in supporting that. I don't think that I can find great fault with it. There's things in it which would include more red tape, more regulations which I have a bit of a problem with, especially coming from a government that got elected on the theme of cutting the red tape and regulations. I can also support him in believing that Brian Mulroney does not understand western Canada, and in fact will not be able to 'cut it,' as the member so aptly put it.

I think that when the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta and B.C. are called to the polls, it will not only be people in the Conservative Party who cannot quite put their X for another Montreal lawyer, another Montreal corporate lawyer, to replace yet another Montreal corporate lawyer, one Pierre Elliott Trudeau. I think that the people of Saskatchewan will say, 'We've had enough of Montreal lawyers. We have enough to do with eastern-dominated political parties,' and they will opt for someone else who will much more ably represent those people in the middle and lower classes who will understand what the whole operation of western Canada is about. And in question period yesterday, I think was a good example of this new leader's opinion of the Crow rate. He believes very firmly that the Pepin plan is in line with what he believes. And I think that the people in this Conservative Party in Saskatchewan will not be able to convince Mr. Brian Mulroney that the Crow rate is in fact in order and should be kept.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say some words about the Conservative leader so that we have on record something to respond to the comments and words that were allowed by the Minister of Finance when he took the majority of his Speech in terms of speaking of the NDP, the federal leadership of the NDP, and I'm sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you check the record that you will find that the balance of his speech or the majority of his speech was spent talking about the leadership of another political party.

And so I think that when we come to the next federal election that the people of Saskatchewan who will be called on to elect the next prime minister will not want another individual who lives in the great city of Montreal. And I think there are a number of great people in the city of Montreal, but he represents only a small minority of the people in that province and represents an even smaller minority across the province of Saskatchewan and the country of Canada , , , (inaudible interjections) , , ,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Weyburn continues on. I suppose his travelling , , , he may be suffering from some sort of jet lag just getting back from Africa. But it he would rise on the occasions when he has a chance to speak — and I want to make a point that we have allowed ample time, each time we take our place, for the members to rise and he refuses to do so.

I would like to now turn to a couple of issues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which would indicate why we in the NDP caucus and in fact many people in my constituency are having trouble with the budget that was brought down in this Assembly by the Conservative government. In the Shaunavon constituency for example, we were promised during the last election that we would have an attempt to reduce farm fuel costs in the province of Saskatchewan. In fact the candidate who went around there promised farmers that they would receive 40 cents off on every gallon of farm fuel. And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that those kind of promises, promises that the members opposite and many candidates were promising throughout the election campaign, have done a great deal to put this government in bad stead with the farmers in my constituency.

There were other promises — natural gas for every farm. They promised that they would have natural gas out there very quickly. Well, I don't think in the past year or the past 15 months that there has been one farmer, for example in my constituency, who has been connected to natural gas. There was a nursing home, which was planned to be constructed in Shaunavon. That was cancelled. There was sheltered housing programs which were ready to go in the town of Kincaid and Frontier. They have been cancelled. Highway construction on 13 has been cancelled. Highway 37 construction which — in fact the bid had been let at this time last year — was cancelled. And the list goes on and on.

Another example is exploration for oil. They were going to do great things about exploration for oil in south-west Saskatchewan. Well, in that area of the province drilling for oil has not risen to any extent. Production, while it has improved, is not what it should be. I think the people of that constituency are wondering whether or not this government in Regina is doing anything to protect the best interests of that part of the government in Regina is doing anything to protect the best interests of that part of the province. I'm sure that this isn't an isolated feeling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's something that all constituencies , , , I'm sure my colleague from northern Saskatchewan, from Athabasca, when he rises to speak on this bill, will outline how people in his area are not satisfied with the fact that unemployment is running rampant in northern Saskatchewan, and we will hear from him at that time.

There are other areas in my constituency which have seen set-backs. Many young

people were looking at the opportunity of leasing land which would come up for lease over the next few years in the Shaunavon constituency. Well, with changes to the lands branch regulations, we find that most of that land will be eligible for sale to very large operators in south-west Saskatchewan. In some cases that goes up as high as a township — 36 sections in some cases — where one individual will have the opportunity to purchase it. I would imagine that if he has the right blood test that he will get that land at a very reasonable price, and that a good number of young farmers will be cut out of the game, cut out of the game of getting lease land from the provincial government, the Conservative government, because they will be playing politics in attempting to sell it to their friends at a very reasonable price — like we have seen with Intercontinental and other major companies in the province of Saskatchewan, where they sell off drag-lines, sell off meat-packing plants, sell off Agra Industries. But I think the selling of our heritage — the farmland and the agricultural land which was held in trust by this government — to satisfy some of their deficit problems , , , I think in rural Saskatchewan when that land begins to be broken up and the cattle industry is destroyed in that part of the country, that you will see a backlash which you will have to deal with then.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things which we have talked a great deal about in this debate is the cut-backs which have occurred — and my colleague from Elphinstone mentioned one of them which I want to elaborate on for a few moments — and that is cut-backs in the area of Social Services.

One of the most shocking, I suppose, cut-backs that we have seen is in the area of Valley View. The 11 staff positions which were not filled; positions which had people eliminated out of , , , I would like to just go through that whole issue of some of the people who were taken advantage of there — were axed. I think one way I can do that is by outlining how Dr. Subhas Maharaj was fired from his position as a speech pathologist at Valley View in Moose Jaw. One way of doing that — outlining how this individual was dismissed — I think, is outlining what his role was at Valley View. And I have here an article from a reporter. I don't know who he was — a Ron Petrie of the *Leader-Post*, from Moose Jaw. The title of the article is: 'Famed speech pathologist axed as position is ruled redundant.' I'd like to just quote from this little article a couple of things that would point out what this program was about. I would like the government, or one of the members, or perhaps the finance minister to rise and tell us how this position was redundant when I complete my remarks.

A worldwide reputation for communicating with the mentally retarded hasn't protected a speech pathologist from the provincial budget axe at Valley View Psychiatric Centre.

Dr. Subhas Maharaj, the centre's one-man speech pathology department, will leave his position May 31, taking with him a diagram system of communicating now used by the severely retarded in 14 countries and three languages.

Maharaj was one of six permanent employees to lose their jobs when the Department of Social Services eliminated what it says is 11 redundant positions at the centre.

Like others who lost their jobs. Maharaj is anything but a junior employee among the 670 persons who work at the psychiatric centre, sprawled along

the banks of the Moose Jaw River.

For 13 years he has worked out of a small basement office, tearing away at the communication barriers confronted by those people who can't put their thoughts and emotions into spoken words.

And for the past seven years, he and the George Reed Foundation for the handicapped have been developing and distributing the Pictogram-Ideogram Communications System — PIC for short.

The 400-symbol system designed for the severely retarded to let their fingers do the talking may be one of the reasons for his dismissal, Maharaj said in an interview.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I jump now to another paragraph that says:

Therapists from Sweden to California and to the Middle East have applauded the tiny black-and-white pictures for simplicity of design, a feature making PIC much easier to teach than more complicated designs of earlier researchers.

Close ties between management at Valley View and SAMR led directly to the axing of the speech pathologist division, Maharaj said.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that while the dismissal of these employees and the cancellation of a number of positions is bizarre enough in itself, I think what followed was even more bizarre. The article was in the *Leader-Post* on April 13, 1983. On the 14th, when the issue was brought up to the minister in the Assembly, she was reported in the press to have said that she would review that decision. The title of the articles were: 'Smith plans review of job cuts.'

Now none of this is made up. It's all documented in *Hansard*. But I think we should outline and review it so it's down appropriately in the record in one place. In the article they go on to say:

In a brief statement to the legislature, Smith indicated that the situation regarding Maharaj had been brought to her attention as a result of the newspaper article (the one which I have just previously read) that appeared in the *Leader-Post* Wednesday (that was the day before). Smith said the situation with regard to Maharaj had been handled contrary to direction. She regretted that it had become necessary to make a clarifying statement in the legislature.

Now that's on the 14th, the day after the article in the *Leader-Post*. On the same day an article in the *Star-Phoenix*: 'Specialist firing big mistake,' it says. The article goes on to explain why it was such a big mistake that this Conservative government had made.

By the 16th the story had changed again:

Smith will wait for review. Social Services Minister Patricia Smith said she won't reinstate 11 people fired from Valley View until after review of the situation has been completed next week.

Now we are back to limbo and the employees know whether they have been fired or not fired. And we go to other articles of the same day in the Star-Phoenix where 'Smith decides Wednesday on Valley View dismissals,' and we are still in limbo.

Finally on the 20th we get a decision from the government that the original decision was the correct one, that these people were to be fired. And the article of the 20th of April 1983 are entitled, 'Speech pathologist dismissal confirmed.' This is a report from Regina staff of the *Leader-Post*.

A world-renowned speech pathologist and five others are being axed by the Social Services Department a week after Minister Pat Smith said she would reconsider. Smith told the House Tuesday she reviewed the dismissal notices sent to Dr. Maharaj and five colleagues at Valley View Centre Psychiatric Institute in Moose Jaw and determined that the notices issued were in order.

Other articles:

Employee won't be reinstated. World-renowned speech pathologist, Dr. Subhas Maharaj will not be reinstated at Valley View Centre, Social Services Minister Pat Smith said Tuesday.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason I wanted to take a moment to outline that, it gives an indication of what this government is really about. I think that the government admitted they had made a mistake. I think after the first initial shock of the fact that Dr. Maharaj had been fired that the instinct that they had was to say that they had made a mistake. I think the minister honestly believed that a mistake had been made.

But what I believe ultimately happened is that the government, when they had their cabinet meeting to decide what they would do with this problem, decided that they had the power. They had 56 members. And why would they admit to anyone that they had made a mistake? I believe that most decisions are being made in cabinet because I can see by the people taking part in this debate that the caucus is not taking any part in it — and I would believe that a cabinet decision was made to not reinstate these employees because of the fact that they could not accept that, in their wisdom, the 56 could possibly admit to the public of Saskatchewan that they made a mistake.

So we saw individuals like the speech pathologist being dismissed. We saw an employee with 42 years experience with the government, in that same round of firings, being dismissed, when very simply, they could have gone to the individual and asked for retirement, and I'm sure that the individual would have agreed with that.

But, I'm happy to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Dr. Maharaj was not forced out of the province; he did not leave. He is a Saskatchewan person and he intends to stay. And I had hoped that the Speaker would have been in the Chair, because I believe that Dr. Maharaj was able to find a job, a good job, in the Speaker's constituency in Rosetown, and is now working for several school divisions in that area as a director of speech and language training for the school divisions out in that area.

But I think that these kinds of displays of meanness, I suppose you can say, will indicate to the people of Saskatchewan what this government is all about. And I think it's a sad story that is to be told about the individuals who were fired from Valley View, and I think

it's one that we should not let this government forget. And I'm sure that it's one that the people of Moose Jaw, at any rate, will not let this government forget.

But the story goes on; that's just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are lists of different groups and I have , , , This could take all day going through the news articles of different groups who had their funding cut. And I won't take the total time of the afternoon because I know my colleague from Athabasca will want to be involved, to put on record what he thinks of the budget that was brought down. And I must say that this gives a good opportunity to the members of the opposition, and could give a good opportunity to the members of the government back benches to rise and explain how their constituencies are not satisfied with the budget that this government has brought down.

I go to two other cuts — SANGSSA (Saskatchewan Association of Non-Governmental Social Services Agencies), for example, a group which represents an association of non-governmental agencies. Here again, I could go through the news clippings from the day when their funding was cut totally to subsequent meetings where the minister said, 'Well, we may fund,' to finally ultimately where they're now having still further meetings with the deputy, Walter Podiluk to see whether or not they can work out a funding arrangement, and I think probably they will be getting some funding. And maybe this is what the government is using. Maybe they use the idea that , , , the old Trudeau idea, that you tell them it's much worse than it really is and then you give them a little bit and they're satisfied. Maybe it's the old Crow rate debate trick that one Pepin has used, where he tells you how bad it's going to be and then they start to back off. And maybe the old Liberals who are in the caucus, and there's a good number of them who have been involved in the Liberal Party in the past, are attempting to put into play some of the political actions that that government in Ottawa has used — and I say — politically successfully, morally not so successfully. But I would question the logistics of using that kind of an attempt to control and stifle people who are attempting to put their views forward, and lobby for those people who are less advantaged than others.

I would like to read you just a few of the titles of news clippings that have gone on over the last couple of months. 'Co-ordinating council on deafness upset about cut-offs of the provincial government.' And this is during the month of May when I believe the government of the day declared as 'Hearing Month' in the province of Saskatchewan. The same month we have the government cutting off the funding to the deaf people in the province of Saskatchewan.

This past week we saw announced as the senior citizens week in the province of Saskatchewan. The provincial co-ordinating council for senior citizens had their funding cut. And what I think that most groups would ask of this government is that they would quit declaring weeks to honour various groups, because inevitably the funding for these groups are cut back. I think it would be a good idea if the one person that I've had some agreement on, the member for Rosthern, would take that issue to caucus and tell the group that they should look at it — if they're going to declare May as the month of the deaf, that they would not cut off funding during that same month, that they would at least wait until another month or another part of the year to do the dirty work of cutting off funding.

The Canadian Hearing Society decries telephone dumping; 'Co-ordinating groups told to seek individual grants.' 'Government pulls the plug on Community Switchboard'; Program for natives get grant cut; won't get any money next year.' These are the titles

from various newspapers. 'Deafness council funding eliminated;' Minister says agencies straining at the seams.' Well, it's no wonder with the money being cut off. 'No provincial grants means seniors' program dies,' and this is a program , , , I just quote one paragraph:

A unique senior citizens' service in Saskatchewan will die today for lack of 19,000 provincial grant to the Yorkton Society for the Involvement of Good Neighbours.

'Fair Tax Deal Service folds,' which offered support in filing out taxes, and also loaned money to various poor people who could not afford to carry on but yet had some tax money coming back to them. These people are now forced to go to the banks or to some organization which will charge them as much as 50 or 60 per cent interest on that money. And it can be well documented that that is the case — that they charge in some cases \$5 or \$10 or \$15 and \$20 for two months, and on the amount of money that's coming back to that individual amounts to as much as 50 or 60 per cent.

I see the members opposite frowning, but I defy them to check out some of the records of these individuals who work with the Welfare Rights Centre, the director, Morris Eagles. And check the facts and you will find that there are a number of individuals who are being ripped off to the tune of 50 to 60 per cent in terms of the money that they get back for a two-month charge for doing that service for them. These services had been provided through the Fair Tax Deal, and there is no replacement within Consumer Affairs or any other department to take its place.

Here's another one, 'Funding cut-backs bewilder social service agencies'; 'Group protests government cuts'; 'Agencies told to tighten their belts'; 'Non-Government agencies worry funding in jeopardy'; 'Agencies cut back' and 'Sheltered workers wages cut.' That's an example I think, one of the more horrendous examples, where the SCCCA, the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults, because of the lack of a \$200,000 grant had to go through the process of cutting the wages they paid the handicapped people in their workshops in centres like Swift Current and Saskatoon and Regina from \$100 a month to \$50 a month. I have documented for the press at the time the question was asked in the House, with slips and stubs from individuals who were paying out of that \$50, \$45 in transportation costs, which left them \$5 for a month's work. I think these kinds of examples, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can be pointed out in many, many areas.

In the area of social assistance, we find that such things as the household allowance and clothing allowance have been cut back for those people who are thrown out of work for the first three months. My colleague, the member from Quill Lakes, went through the list of the increases in the unemployed employables, these people who would be most directly affected by the cut-back in shelter allowance and clothing allowance, where we see this year, April over April, an increase of 65 per cent in that group. So it's no wonder why the government is attempting to cut back in that area because it saves them money. But what is difficult to believe, that at the same time as they would cut back in that area, they would in the same budget and same budgeting process, allow a hundred and thirty million-dollar cut for the oil companies in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am just barely getting going but I would very much , , , I'm sure that we will have an opportunity during question period another time to carry on this debate, because it's a sad story to be told , , , (inaudible interjection) , , , I'm glad to

see one member, the member from Moosomin, who is chirping from his seat — a fellow who supported Pocklington and later Mulroney — is back in the House, but I will take my place and allow the member for Cumberland to carry on. Thank you.

MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I once again with a great deal of pride and pleasure rise on behalf of the people of Weyburn constituency to enter into this debate, and after having listened to that last speech, I'm reminded of a quotation of the famous James Russel Lowell when he said: 'Blessed are those who have nothing to say and cannot be persuaded to say it.'

Be that such as it may, Mr. Speaker, the member from Shaunavon went through a number of news clippings and quotations in lieu of a speech, but it's always interesting to note which ones they obviously avoid. The ones that they avoid referring to are the ones from our neighbouring province, Manitoba, who have had a lot of headlines that are related to deficits in their budget, but they never go out of their way to point those out.

And as well, Mr. Speaker, many of the members have made light of the Tory leadership vote held in Ottawa just recently, and there they are all lining up now valiantly behind Joe Clark. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was this same NDP, the five NDP members from Saskatchewan, who in fact turfed Joe Clark out. Now here are these same NDP, members of the same party, Mr. Deputy Speaker, lining up valiantly behind Joe Clark, and yet it was their colleagues who turfed out Joe Clark — another act of hypocrisy, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

But then again it's no secret that the NDP are the flying saucers of politics. You can't make head not tail of them. they're never seen twice in the same place. And they're never twice in the same issue on the same place. One day they want a balanced budget; the next day they can't make you spend it fast enough. Where do they really stand? We don't really know, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think I've hit a nerve, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The little group of eight here are a pretty lively corpse. They're a pretty lively corpse, and I think the wake is being held this summer in July when they'll be discussing the Regina Manifesto and 'where did we go wrong?' It's been said that the NDP in B.C. are in opposition; in Ottawa, they're invisible; and in -Saskatchewan, thank goodness, they're protected by the endangered species law.

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan clearly rejected state capitalism some year ago. They seem to want to ignore facts and I can understand that because practical politics, which is what they seem to pride themselves in, practical politics largely consists of ignoring facts. And all you have to do is look through the commitment brochure that this party made to the people of Saskatchewan a little over a year ago and see that we have fulfilled every one of these promises and in fact done more. People in Saskatchewan at that time rejected socialism. They rejected socialism for many reasons and in fact it's been said that there's only two places where socialism will work. One of those places where socialism will work is in heaven where they don't need it. And the other place is in , , , well, the other place and they already have it there.

There's a number of promises that were made in the commitment brochure: eliminate the gas tax — done; revitalize and improve health care — we've just seen a budget come down where the Minister of Health could probably more aptly be described as the billion dollar man. He's a man who brought in health programs that have seen increased spending in social services, improved grants for hospitals. In fact we've seen evidence of these sorts of things in my constituency with the sod-turning for a nursing home. The Minister of Social Services in fact was down not that long ago to officiate at

an expansion to our Wor-Kin-Shop down there.

And just the fact that the Minister of Health and the Minister of Social Services have been down into my constituency on at least two occasions points out exactly why the people rejected the NDP some year ago. Because they never saw them. They never saw them conversing with the grass roots people in Saskatchewan. They never had a chance to have their views expressed one-to-one with these given ministers.

The brochure went on to talk about improving the quality of rural life and I can only think there of things like the rural gas program, the Build-A-Home project , , , (inaudible interjections) , , , The minister from Shaunavon is chirping away like a little bird and I'm only reminded once again of in Ottawa , , , or in Washington, they talk about hawks and doves, and in Ottawa they talk about parrots. And the hon. member from Shaunavon is just like one of those parrots because whatever the Liberals say the NDP just endorses. They endorse the turfing out of Joe Clark and the putting in of Jean-Luc Pepin who is stealing the farmers livelihood in Saskatchewan. But then again, they are not interested in protecting Saskatchewan farmers. And in fact they are the ones that made secret deals with Jean-Luc Pepin and the changes that he brought about for the Crow rate anyways , , , (inaudible interjection) , , , Your absence at the stock growers' meeting was notable.

And while I'm on the Crow issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can think that there has probably been no man in Canada who has done more to see that farmers are protected in this vicious attack by Jean-Luc Pepin and the NDP-Liberal coalition in Ottawa, than the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan, Hon. Eric Berntson. And Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only is this Minister of Agriculture in this government interested in making sure that grain farmers are protected, but they are interested in making sure that people in swine production, in feedlot production, in cow-calf operations, in feeder operations, in poultry operations, raising rape crops or faba beans or legumes or whatever, he is interested in seeing that every one of those people is protected. He is interested in seeing, as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a efficient rail transportation system for this country, and we do want and do expect, and will have our livestock feeding out here and our secondary processing, but it's no thanks to the NDP opposition. I think the government, and Mr. Berntson in particular, are to be commended for the job they've done so far in constraining Jean-Luc Pepin from imposing this disastrous transportation policy of his upon us.

And, of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the commitment brochure, protecting and preserving the family farm was one of our commitments to the people of Saskatchewan. And with that commitment, Mr. Speaker, has come our acknowledgement of our responsibilities in fighting the Pepin plan. And as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as part of protecting and preserving that family farm was the introduction of the farm purchase program which has been a resounding success, and its companion bill, the repeal of The Land Bank Act, which perhaps Mr. Deputy Speaker, in so far as important as rural Saskatchewan, to them repealing The Land Bank Act was probably as important as putting in the farm purchase program. It was like a breath of fresh air for them out there.

No longer did those farmers who were retiring and wanting to see the land go to their sons, no longer were they frustrated by the fact that when a quarter came up for sale and 35 young farmers were interested in buying it, who were they beta out by every time? Who had the biggest wallet in the province? The government. The land bank commission. There they were, the biggest land owners in the province with the biggest wallet, spending in any given year up to \$40 million. And the people of Saskatchewan

were as happy with the repeal of The Land Bank Act as they were with the farm purchase program.

And just to close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it's worth my while to bring the legislature up to date on the latest statistics as it relates to the farm purchase program, because whereas the land bank and the farm purchase program that's funded in this budget, along with other things like an agricultural division of the heritage fund for Saskatchewan farmers, this budget is doing things for agriculture. And just to bring the legislature up to date on the farm purchase program, as of approximately June 1, '83, we now have had some 3,390 eligible applications. We've got about 1,677 that have paid their appraisal fees, and that's on land purchases totalling about \$200 million. When you compare that with 151 young farmers that were helped in 10 years under land bank, and stack it up even against the 2,750 lessees over 10 years, you can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in five months this government, that Minister of Finance, the Minister of Agriculture and his programs, have done more to help Saskatchewan agriculture in five months than the NDP did in 10 years.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to remind them that in the 10 years that they were in power , , , I'm sure the agriculture critic who was a member of that government caucus, that he'll be wanting to , , , I should remind him in fact of their record when they were in government, in that there was some 9,000 — in excess of 9,000 — census farms went down the tube in Saskatchewan, and the farms, need revitalizing. They just about destroyed it. With that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I end my remarks in this debate. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, the clock tells me I have very few minutes to speak. So to make it short, I've listened to the NDP talk, and they seem to want a budget that looks after you from cradle to grave. They believe the budget should be always doling it out to you, saying you can have so much of this and so much of that. You know, the member should think that the best thing for a government is not to always be involved in the game, to set the rules as the referee. That's what a government should do: pull back, not be involved all the time. that's what you people believe on.

I've got to answer a couple of comments that have been referred to me in the leadership campaign. I cannot resist. You know, I can say one thing: there was five or six candidates in that contest that would make a better leader than anybody you people have ever had or ever will have. Included in that group is Mr. Mulroney. Let me suggest to you . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — We can even include in that group Neil Fraser.

MR. KATZMAN: — At least he stood up , , , At least Mr. Fraser stood up for principles and what he believed in. You know, remember, you guys signed that little cosy back room deal to put metric into Saskatchewan, not us. You know, you signed that little cosy deal on that missile testing. You signed lots of those cosy deals, we're discovering. But I better get back because I only have a few minutes to talk about , , ,

The budget that was brought in by the minister was brought in with money being very tight. He has taken and used it to stimulate where he can. One of the best things that has come about is the plan that is looked after called opportunities '83, giving student

employment. The incentive to hire a new employee in a company — that's going to help down the road. You have to, members of the opposition, sometimes look for long-term programs rather than short-gap. That's all your member from huff, your huff and puff member, talked about, was the short range, short range. You got to look long range of the betterment of everybody.

And that's what this budget did. It started to plan ahead. During your 11 years all you did was short range, short range, and today we're paying the price for it. That's unfortunate. But this budget is a long-range budget and that's what's important. I will take my place.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. According to item 15, clause (2):

On the said day, at thirty minutes before the normal afternoon recess or afternoon adjournment, unless the debate has previously concluded, Mr. Speaker, shall interrupt the proceedings and after allowing twenty minutes for the mover of the motion to exercise his right to close debate, shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, 77 days ago today we brought down our budget in this very place. Our strategy on that budget was basically fourfold. Number one, we identified the key problem that we had to go after was jobs and job creation. We had to address the longer-term problems of relocation, or retraining, and we believe we tried to address that.

Number four, we had to, given in difficult times, we had to bring in a program that dealt with the restraint — that government had to restraint every bit as much as the business community, as the average consumer, the average family across this country and across North America. We also were committed to no significant tax increases other than on luxury items.

I think we have to ask ourselves how we did on that. Let's take the job question first of all. The most recent statistics from Statistics Canada, I think, tell the story. From May 1982 to May 1983, there are 12,000 fewer jobs year over year in Canada — the entire country, 12,000 fewer jobs. In the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Saskatchewan there are not fewer jobs — there's 11,000 more jobs than there was a year ago, May 1982.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What is more important, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the numbers that have resulted from the budget. In April 1983, one month ago, from these statistical numbers, to May of 1983 — one month different, where we saw the impact of the budget, where we saw the impact that the budget could have on the provincial economy — it wasn't 11,000 new jobs month over month, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was 23,000 new jobs May over April of 1983, many of them a tribute to the budget that this government advanced 77 days ago.

Not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are 5,000 fewer people unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan in May of 1983 than there was in April of 1983, and we make no apologies to anyone for the performance that we have given in the last month

and in this budget with regard to unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — The members opposite talk about restraints, and they brought up several programs where they said, 'Look at what they have cut. Look what they have cut.' One advanced — I forget which one it was, the Leader of the Opposition or one of the other members — 'you cut the 'Snoop' program. You cut the 'Snoop' program out of Environment, and aren't you awful.' Perhaps some of the members here hadn't been here long enough to know what this new program was. This new program was put out by the Department of the Environment under the NDP and it was a colouring book. It was a large picture they sent to the kids to colour. Now I don't think, in more difficult times, that the government has to send out colouring books to kids. If we cut that program in the name of restraint, then I'm sorry to the people that don't have those colouring books. I think that's responsible and we will continue to act in that responsible way.

And we brought in a wage guide-line program, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We brought in a wage guide-line program and we have had well-received, well-developed programs with regards to that. And we do not apologize for that. The NDP as seen by one of their grand leaders now defunct, Dave Barrett — half-way through the campaign in British Columbia, by all assessments at that point 10 to 15 points ahead in the polls, heading for sure victory — couldn't resist announcing, 'We are going to increase the salary of all civil servants 15 to 20 per cent.' 15 to 20 per cent — that's their theory of restraint. And what happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker? 15 per cent went down to zero and then below that. And if anybody, if anybody blew an opportunity to win an election, Dave Barrett was that man.

Well, where did we not but, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We never cut in Health. We never cut in Social Services. We never cut in Education. Those are programs that we are delivering to the people of Saskatchewan and we will continue to deliver to the people of Saskatchewan.

But what did we really hear in the NDP's grand wrap up for the session? What were they wrapping up in the session? Very often in the political world you judge the importance of issues by the amount of media attention approach to it, how much the media are reacting to it. Yesterday's brilliant wrap up by the NDP — and I've read the paper today — not one line, not one line in the *Leader-Post*. I watched television last night — not one story on television. Doesn't that tell you folks something? Doesn't that tell you folks something? It tells me two things. It tells me one of two things. Number one, there was nothing in the budget to criticize, nothing in the budget to criticize. You can take that option — take that option. Or number two, if that's not the case, you are the most incompetent opposition ever to assemble in the Legislative Assembly in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — But perhaps it's a combination of the both. Now I will not expend, then, a great deal more effort with regards to countering the massive attack advanced by the members opposite. But I do want to say one thing. They put their effort into saying, 'Ah, here's what the Tories have done with their leader.' I will tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Brian Mulroney, the new leader of the Conservative Party, is better than

anything or any combination of what the NDP can put up. And to prove that, I suggest to the members opposite if they have any influence with Mr. Trudeau, call an election today. We're ready to go to battle with the NDP or the Liberals any day, any time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Not only are we prepared to go to battle with them, we could take them both on together, and we will get more votes than both the Liberals and the NDP in the whole entire country of Canada.

Oh, they talk about this boy from Bay Street — typical NDP — they talk about the boy from Bay Street. I'll tell you a few things, Mr. Speaker, about this so-called boy from Bay Street. The son of an Irish immigrant, the son of an Irish immigrant, unionized electrician, working in rural Quebec with seven children; he raised those seven children, died early in life from , , , The man went on to school, Mr. Deputy Speaker, put his brothers and sisters through school. Is that the sign of a guy from Bay Street? I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problem with the members over there is they know full well in Eddie Broadbent they got a product that they can't sell in Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia and Quebec and Ontario or any place else in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What they have now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and what they're looking at, and the only guy that's not there is now their leader, and he's growing old, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He's growing old, he's been in this game a long time; right today he sits since 1960. Since 1960, and you know what, Mr. Deputy Speaker? He's afraid to retire, and I'll tell you why he's afraid to retire, because there is nothing over there, Mr. Speaker, to replace him. Anything over there would take them down not to eight, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but take them down to nothing, and that's exactly what they have over there.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe when we completed the budget, and I think it's important to read the final paragraph of the budget speech, and it's just as true today as it was 77 days ago, the budget must satisfy many goals and difficult choices must be made among competing priorities and conflicting strategies. I am confident the course that we have set before this Assembly this evening will guide us through the economic turbulence that still remain, and bring us soon into the calmer waters of recovery. That's still our view, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We believe it was a good budget. The people of Saskatchewan believe it was a good budget, and the NDP believe it was a good budget because they never had one constructive, legitimate criticism advanced in the last 77 days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order!

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 37

Birkbeck	Smith (Swift Current)	Hopfner
Taylor	Weiman	Martens
Andrew	Bacon	Caswell
Berntson	Tusa	Gerich
Lane	Hodgins	Domotor
Sandberg	Sutor	Maxwell
McLaren	Sveinson	Embury
Garner	Petersen	Dirks
Klein	Glauser	Hepworth
Katzman	Meagher	Baker
Currie	Schmidt	Dutchak
Duncan	Parker	Folk
Schoenhals		

NAYS — 7

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Lusney
Thompson	Koskie	Yew
Engel		

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 18 — Economic plight for Saskatchewan Farmers

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The resolution that we have here in the blues today said:

That this Assembly regrets that the Devine government has failed to recognize the increasingly severe economic plight of Saskatchewan farmers, who are suffering from a grave cost-price squeeze, and regrets that the Devine government has not implemented adequate measures and programs to address these problems.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submitted that resolution on March 18. Today we are half-way through the month of June and we're finally getting around to dealing with this resolution. I think it's an indication of how this government is administering the business that we have before this House, the amount of time that's being spent, the delays that have taken place, and how we've been trying to get legislation before us to expediate some programs and to help some farmers. You can see that this motion is designed to try and help the farmers of Saskatchewan in particular. We regret 'that the Devine government has not implemented adequate measures and programs to address these problems.'

Now, we've taken some time yesterday and today to explain to this House some of the things that farmers have been looking for and been waiting for. All the people of Saskatchewan, in fact many of the people of Saskatchewan that are poor, have been waiting for something to alleviate the pressure that's been placed on them because of the cost-price squeeze they are facing.

In March, in early March, in this spring, as the farmers were anticipating going to work on their fields and start farming, things were bad. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say

that today things are worse. In the months that have passed that this government has had a chance to do something, we've gone through the entire session, and at the close of the session, this resolution shouldn't be necessary. I should have been able to stand in my place and say, 'Stand. This government has acted, has implemented some programs that, with the \$3 billion that you're spending in your budget, you've done something to relieve a little pressure for the farmers.' But has that happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Have we seen some programs in place that would help the people of Shellbrook, for example? Are your neighbours and your farming operation and things that are happening there north of the river , , , Are there programs in place that are alleviating the pressures that farmers are facing?

If you really think about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think you'll have to agree with me and say that this government didn't do one thing to help alleviate the pressures of farmers. Not one item was spent — not one dollar. Not one measure was taken to alleviate the cost-price squeeze farmers are facing this spring. I think that's a sad omen for a government that says they represent farmers, for a government that is led by a Premier who says he has a quota book and brags that he is a farmer, for a Deputy Premier that's the biggest person in this room and wields a lot of strength when it came to cleaning house in this legislature, or in the various government departments, and heading up a transition team and flexed his muscles and showed us how strong he was. But what did he do for the Saskatchewan farmers and for the people that are farming in Saskatchewan? I'd like to say, 'Nothing.'

Bankruptcies are up. Pressure is on. Foreclosures are taking place, and this government sits by and hasn't got any initiative and hasn't got any desire to alleviate the cost-price squeeze.

Farm cash receipts for the first three months of 1983 are going down. Farm cash receipts are down lower this spring than they've been for a long, long time. Most provinces declined, compared to 1982. Quebec and Alberta are up, but Saskatchewan's receipts are down.

I have stated in this House on many occasions, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the net farm income could drop by as much as 40 per cent over last year's net farm income this coming year, because of the announced price, the new initial price of grain. Our farm net income could drop by as much as \$540 million. And here we have a Minister of Agriculture and a government that has no intentions of doing anything, have \$3 billion-plus budget and aren't planning on spending anything to alleviate that pressure that farmers are facing. This is the lowest the farm net income has been since 1972 — the lowest it's been since 1972. And that is bad. In 1972 the now Attorney-General sat on a committee and we toured the province of Saskatchewan and we were looking at business , , ,

AN HON. MEMBER: — What party was he with then?

MR. ENGEL: — He was a Liberal at that time. But he, along with another Liberal, Mr. MacLeod from Moose Jaw, and number of our people got together and we toured Saskatchewan and we listened to business men in all parts of the province. We went all over the province, and the same message they were saying was that their equipment was piling up in their yards. They weren't able to sell their equipment and here we're facing a year where the farm income is going to be as low as it was in those days; 1972 was the last time the net income was as low as it is expected to be this year. In fact, the net farm income this year will only be one-third of what it was in 1981, for example.

Farm costs, on the other hand — take your fuel and your chemicals and your input costs — are three times as high as they were in 1971. And here we have an income that's as low as it was then. And yet our costs are three times as high. That indicates to me that the farmers are going to have three times as much trouble as they did in those days. And what is this government doing? What are the Tories doing to try and alleviate this crisis? What are the Tories doing to help some of these young farmers? They encourage them to borrow more money. Here we've got a \$350,000 farm purchase plan. That's their flag and their banner they're holding up. 'This is what you do, young fellow, if you want help from us — borrow another \$350,000.' Big deal! They can buy three quarters of land and anybody's mathematics will tell you that that won't pay the interest rate on \$350,000.

Our young people from across the way here — 55 of them — I'm not sure how many of you went down East to help alleviate the problems. Instead of getting a Westerner to represent your party to go to Ottawa and lead a government that tells that this is the problem that the West are facing, they elect a Montreal millionaire. All the people from the West — in fact my own MP was one of the guys that we saw on TV speaking in favour of this Montreal millionaire. I don't think that's going to solve the problem in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's not going to solve the problem of the cost-price squeeze.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.