

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

November 21, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to the Assembly a group of members visiting us from New Brunswick. These members are situated in the Speaker's gallery. We have the Hon. James Tucker, Speaker of the New Brunswick legislature; Gerald Clavette; Mr. Alan Graham; Mr. B.J. Harrison; the Hon. J.B.M. Baxter, the Minister of Finance from New Brunswick; and Hazen Myers. This committee is here today to look at the operation of our Legislative Assembly. I hope that their stay will prove to be useful and informative for them, and I know that all members would like to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly today.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Saskatchewan's Minimum Wage

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. As the minister will know, the last time Saskatchewan's minimum wage was increased was nearly two years ago on January 1, 1982, under the previous government. The minimum wage provides a wage for a full-time worker of about \$9,000 a year. The poverty line for a family of three is \$15,000 a year. The government announced some time ago a two-year wage freeze on the minimum wage and, since even this government is unlikely to extend a two-year freeze on minimum wages beyond two years, my question to the Minister of Labour is this: by how much will the government be increasing the minimum wage when the two-year freeze expires on December 31, 1983, and when might we expect the announcement?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, when we have arrived at any decision on the minimum wage we'll be making our announcement.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the Minister of Labour to be saying that the minimum wage freeze will extend beyond two years, and that there will not be an announcement effective January 1, 1984?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I haven't made any decision on the minimum wage. I think you have seen in the press where I've suggested that we receive briefs to do with the various items in The Labour Standards Act under which the minimum wage comes, and we'll be looking at all the facts that come out of the briefs and make our decision after that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary. It has been traditional to give employers at least six weeks notice of increases in the minimum wage so that they may adjust to the announcement. I ask the minister: has any notice been given to employers that an increase will be made effective January 1, 1984?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, at the time I make my decision we'll give the regular notice, but until such time as a decision is made, I guess there'll be no notice go out.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Labour taking a position that persons who have endured a two-year freeze of minimum wage are not entitled to any increase in minimum wage effective January 1, 1984, and that he is going to continue the

freeze for a further period, and that he is unwilling to tell this House the length of the continued freeze?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I said exactly what we were planning to do. We're monitoring the minimum wage, and we are still number one. We're the super king of Canada at \$4.25, and until we start getting pushed, we may just stay there. I'm more concerned with people having jobs at \$4.25 an hour than no job at all.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I ask the Minister of Labour whether he feels that that attitude is fair, that the wages of minimum wage persons should be depressed so as this government can create jobs, when at the same time it is offering handsome increases up \$11,000 a year to its senior public servants?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage isn't the maximum — it's a minimum. And I talked to a gentleman three weeks ago that started out on minimum wage. He's now at 4.75 an hour. So if the people are out there and going to their work and doing their jobs, they'll be recognized, and, I'm sure, get more than what the minimum wage is stated at.

Appointment of Mr. Dennis Ball

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to also address a question to the Minister of Labour. as you are aware, Mr. Minister, the freeze for the minimum wage was put out by the government as part of the economic policy of this government, and was to get economic activity going. I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that you have in fact appointed Mr. Dennis Ball to a part-time chairmanship of the Saskatchewan labour relations at 95,000 a year, which means that Mr. ball earns more in a six-week period than a man on minimum wage . . . I ask you, Mr. Minister, do you think that that is just and equitable to the working people of Saskatchewan, that you freeze minimum wage, but at the same time you make \$95,000 payment to a part-time employee?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the gentleman opposite from the lakes, the Quill Lakes, is getting his information from. Dennis ball is not a part-time chairman of the labour relations board.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to ask the minister if he could indicate to the House (it's a supplemental, Mr. Speaker) how many days over the past five years on the average, the number of days in fact that the chairman of the labour relations board was in fact required to operate in the office of the chairman of the labour relations board. How many days on the average over the past five years?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. If you ask questions you must give the minister an opportunity to be heard to answer them. Would you please retain some decorum.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we've . . . I don't know about the average over the last two years, but I know it's in the 80 to 100 sitting days per year. We've had a tremendous increase in the number of sittings, and at the rate that even with the chairman that you had a place with the sitting days that we've experienced this year, I would cut him back also, because it would have been excessive, and that's all we did with Mr. Ball. His rate will be about \$396 a day compared to \$670 a day that you were paying your chairman.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister: Mr. Minister, are you aware that this part-time chairman of the labour relations board makes more than the Vice-President of United States? \$91,000 for the Vice-President; \$95,000 for the part-time job. I ask the minister do you in fact feel . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order. Order. I'm going to ask the members to refrain from unnecessary shouting in the Chamber. The member that has the floor has the right to be heard,

and I'm certain that the minister that is supposed to answer the question could not hear what he was saying, so I'd ask for decorum.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister now that the shouting has died down: is the minister aware that this part-time chairman of the labour relations board makes more than the Vice-President of the United States — \$91,000 versus \$95,000? I ask you: do you feel that this extravagant payment — salary — to this part-time chairman is justified, and how is it consistent with the restraint program advocated by your government.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify the point that Mr. Ball is not a part-time chairman. I made the change when I made him a full-time chairman. And I ran into a little bit of difficulty when I came in to look after the potash corporation, with you people giving the president \$140,000 a year to run the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

MR. KOSKIE: — Final supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister of Labour: is he aware that his part-time chairman of the labour relations board makes more money than the judge, any judge in Saskatchewan, including the chief justice of the court of appeal? I ask you: do you feel that this part-time job and this extravagant salary paid deserves . . . Do you feel that the part-time chairman of the board, in fact, deserves to receive more than the chief justice of the court of appeal.

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that the chairman of the labour relations board is a full-time chairman, full spelled f-u-l-l and not p-a-r-t. To get the right kind of person in that kind of job you have to pay the price, and I relate that to our lost time of work stoppages this year — 26,000 man-days compared to 416,000 last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLAREN: — I'm not getting any complaints from either side, the union or the employer side, about the decisions that are being made by Mr. Ball, and to me that is worth a bit to that organization or that committee.

Firings in Provincial Regulatory Agencies

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. It has to do, Madam Minister, with your decision to fire the heads of two important provincial regulatory agencies. As has been the case in the past, you have failed to provide any meaningful explanation or possible justification. I call on the minister now to explain her actions. First, in what way had Ken Stevenson failed to perform his duties as chairman of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission? What had he done wrong?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I wouldn't say that Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Speaker, did anything wrong. We were in the midst of rewriting the Saskatchewan securities act, and I think it's acknowledged that Mr. Stevenson is well respected across the country in his knowledge and his regulatory capacity. I wanted more of a user's view on the securities area.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Supplementary. I wonder if Madam Minister would define what you meant by a user's chairman. The enthusiastic response to your answer was such that I couldn't catch it. I thought you said a user's chairman, and I wonder if you'd expand on that.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I can understand why the gentleman across doesn't understand. I want someone to make proposals, to rewrite the act, that has a lot more experience from the user's point of view. I think the fellow we have in there now, Mr. Gord Kuski, is very, very knowledgeable of the act and the securities area, and he's just the type of person I want advising me on a new act for Saskatchewan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Supplementary, Madam Minister. What do you see the role of the chairman to be — to facilitate the work of investors or to protect the public?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Both.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, are you telling us, Madam Minister, that you fired Mr. Stevenson because you received complaints from the users, and you are thus buckling to their pressure and at the same time endangering the public protection?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I think I can say, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's question: I had no representation from the industry. I have been in contact with various agencies across the country and, from my point of view, what we need in Saskatchewan is a lot of acts and bills and things like that, we reckon, to get out a lot of the restrictive, oppressive regulations that the members opposite instituted when they were in power.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question. Does Madam Minister not admit that the primary purpose of the chairman, and of the commission, is to protect the public, and are you saying that the former chairman was a bit too diligent in doing so.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, I didn't say that at all.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Surely, Madam Minister . . . A supplementary. You will surely admit that that, in fact, is what you are saying. What you are saying is that he was not pliant enough in meeting the needs of those who sought to sell securities.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The chairman of the securities commission, I think, has an extremely vital and very sensitive job in this province, as he has right across the country. The interest of the consumer, the consuming public, has to be protected. In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I might say, with the change in the government, we had had over 157 per cent increase in filings at the commission alone. That's a tremendous increase of confidence, investor confidence, in our province and it is crucial, Mr. Speaker, that we protect that investing public from so-called fly-by-night operators that might try to come into the province, and we will be doing that. That's one of the main functions but it's not the only function.

Crow Rate

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In last March's throne speech your government promised the farmers that if the crow rate fails or is lost, your government would have some involvement and some money for the farmers. What happened to that promise? I could quote: "Measures will be placed before the Assembly to keep Saskatchewan's grain and livestock farmers competitive with those in other parts of Canada." Well, thanks to your gallant efforts the Crow rate is gone and so is any mention in the throne speech. My question is: what has happened to this promise?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. Of course we wouldn't even be addressing that question today. Mr. Speaker, as member will well recount, if we look at the history as it relates to the Crow debate, if it hadn't been for five NDP MPs in Ottawa who betrayed the government of the PCs in the first place in Ottawa and put Mr. Pepin and Mr. Axworthy in . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — . . . who have taken the Crow away from us. If the hon. member is trying to appear sanctimonious insofar as what they have done to defend the crow, as opposed to what we have done to defend the Crow, we'll put his record up against yours any time. Insofar as what we will do to protect the farmers of Saskatchewan, we'll continue to do the kinds

of things we've already done for them. We wrote the book on keeping farmers' input costs down. In the face of his transportation costs going up, we'll address that in the future, as we have in the past, with continued new initiatives and exciting programs. I think of none other than things like the interest rate rebates that we've put in place.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it won't take much for us to protect the farmer out there compared to what the NDP did in the last 10 years even when the Crow was in place. Because we've only got to look at your record insofar as the number of census farms that disappeared in the 10-year-period between '71 and '81. We've only got to look at what happened to the livestock industry in that some 10-year-period and, the hog industry, and all the rest of them.

So we'll be doing the same kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, that we've done in the past. There'll be more new initiatives to protect our livestock producers and enhance our livestock producers, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think the farmers will quite enjoy what we have in store for them insofar as protecting their interests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm very disappointed in the minister's comments that the farmers enjoy what he has done for them. We haven't heard one word from this minister regarding the Crow debate or any mention that he would fight the Crow — not one word since the minister was appointed.

In last year's throne speech you said you're committing the treasury to fight for them. What have you done since you're minister? What have you done for the farmer regarding fighting for the Crow rate and maintaining that interest? Answer first that part of the question first.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, in so far as what we've done for the farmers since I took over as minister, I'll be happy to recite a few things for you, and in so far as you want a further recitation of what our lead minister has done in so far as the Crow rate is concerned, I'll perhaps let the hon. member from Souris-Cannington enter into the question period as well.

But if you're wondering what our commitment is to the farmers out there and the kinds of things we do to protect them, I would ask you this. Number one is, as it relates to the seaway tolls, I would ask the hon. member: did you take the time to write on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers? Did you take the time to do this?

Well, quite frankly I wrote to the minister, and quite frankly we had a little success on that one. We had a little success on that one. And in fact, in their news release, Mr. Rothwell, on behalf of the seaway association, thanked the number of western MPS who'd become involved in the debates in parliament, and Lorne Hepworth, Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture, who supported the association's stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Now you who pretends to speak out, you who pretends to speak out for Saskatchewan farmers, did you take up the cause on their behalf on that one? Did you?

But if you want me to get a little more specific on some of the things we've done for farmers to help reduce their input costs, we just this past two or three months ago gave them an additional \$400,000 to put in place a new soil testing lab which, as you will well know, is important in increasing their output and decreasing their input costs. And as well, we put in \$100,000 in additional funds for soil testing.

And I could go on and I could go on. But do not fear. We will look after Saskatchewan's farmers and we will not repeat the travesty of the record that existed between '71 and '81 when you and

your colleagues were the government in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might answer my half of the question.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I don't believe you were asked a question.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Agriculture what he's done about the Crow rate and what the farmers are going to lose. Six hundred million dollars it's going to cost the farmers in Saskatchewan, because this government assured the feds that they would give them no fight if they changed the Crow rate. And he didn't give them a fight. He's been a minister all summer, and he hasn't . . . All I asked is what he has done, since Mr. Axworthy was appointed, for example, to encourage the Saskatchewan farmers and say, "Mr. Axworthy, don't go ahead with the Crow rate change." What have you done about it? That's all I asked. I didn't ask any of these other questions. I'm asking the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture hasn't done anything. I want to know what he's done.

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Well, I would ask my hon. colleague, the member from Souris-Cannington, Mr. Speaker, who has carried the ball from day one on this one, to enunciate for the hon. member just what he has done.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I know it escaped notice of members opposite that a few months ago when we had a cabinet shuffle that the Crow and the Crow question is so important to the province of Saskatchewan — was and is — that the Premier felt that we shouldn't be changing horses in the middle of the stream and that the minister that carried it at that time should continue with the responsibility for defending the Crow on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers. And I want to tell . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend, the Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Lorne Hepworth, tells me that they have recently come up with a cure for whatever is that . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — But I want to tell, Mr. Speaker, just to . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And I guess it's true, if we had a horse in that shape we would shoot it, right? But I want to . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, can you not control the opposition . . . (inaudible) . . . ?

I want to just set, for the record, Mr. Speaker, just some of the things that we have done to defend the Crow. No, Mr. Speaker, we didn't spend a lot of time running around Saskatchewan with the former minister of agriculture, stirring the pot, causing dissension, making sure that no consensus could be arrived at. We didn't do that, Mr. Speaker. We spoke across this province. We spent over \$80,000 (I'm guessing, round numbers; don't hold me to it), 80 minimum on an advertising campaign across Canada, particularly east-central Canada, giving the Saskatchewan view on the Crow, and our position on the Crow question. We spoke . . . I personally spoke in every province in Canada, or to . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — . . . or to every government in Canada, with the exception of Newfoundland, and Newfoundland convinced me that they didn't have a lot of interest in the Crow. They said it would cost them more in a telephone call than they would lose by any loss of Crow benefit in Newfoundland. So I spoke to every government in Canada as to Saskatchewan's position on the Crow.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when all governments in Canada presented their views to the federal government, the federal government had a different view. The federal government had

different vested interests. The federal government had political interests other than ours. And I remind all members of this House that that group right there is in large part the reason that we have the federal government we have today.

We lobbied industry in central Canada. I presented the position of this government to the House of Commons transportation committee. Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on and on. The member opposite wanted to know what we did to protect the Crow. Manitoba worked very hard to save the crow; Quebec worked very hard to save the Crow; the Maritime provinces worked very hard to save the Crow. We worked very hard to save the Crow. All of us together couldn't turn around their friends — your friends — in Ottawa. Your friends in Ottawa were determined to see the western Canadian farmer on his knees again. And Mr. Speaker, I hope people understand the brief outline that I've set out as to the actions that this government has taken to protect the Crow to the benefit of all Canadians, Mr. Speaker, but particular to the benefit of the Saskatchewan farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Restructuring of the Senior Citizens' Advisory Council

HON. MR. DIRKS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens of Saskatchewan, through their years of hard work, faith and vision for the future, have helped to make Saskatchewan the prosperous province that it is today. This government recognizes its responsibility to place a high priority on delivering quality services to our many thousands of fine senior citizens. In order for us to deliver needed services effectively it is important for government to listen carefully to what our seniors are saying, to provide a mechanism which will enable seniors to advise government and to ensure that seniors' services are co-ordinated and that information concerning those services is readily available to all seniors and their organizations.

In keeping with these themes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today the Senior Citizens' Provincial Advisory Council is being restructured to make it more representative and a more effective advocate on behalf of seniors. The members of the House will be interested in the following information.

The former seniors' council consisted of 11 members; the new council has been expanded to include 15 members. The former council did not include representation from Action Now, one of the two large senior organization in our province. The new council will include representatives from both the Saskatchewan Seniors' Association and Action Now. The former council will include representation for the native community. The former council did not include representation from northern Saskatchewan, even though all of the MLAs from northern Saskatchewan were members of the former government. The new council will include representation from northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the former council operated with a rather strange organizational structure in which the chairman of the council also acted as the chief executive officer of the council, thus mixing accountability and responsibility. The new council will operate with a separate chairman and a separate chief executive officer. The former chairman and executive officer will continue on in his capacity as the chief executive officer. A new chairman will be designated from the ranks of reappointed council members. In order to ensure continuity of membership, five of the eleven former council members are being reappointed.

Mr. Speaker, this government's commitment to seniors has been amply demonstrated in the area of medicare initiatives, housing programs, and now, as well, in the area of social services. One

month ago my department organized the first ever seniors' forum to be held in Saskatchewan. To quote one of the seniors who attended. "This is the first opportunity for direct contact by seniors to government on important concerns." Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote to you just one or two other statements made by some seniors that were in attendance at that forum. "First time I ever attended. I was very impressed, and I know it's the first time that natives were invited. Thank you." "Excellent. You have achieved more in two days than has been done in ten years."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

HON. MR. DIRKS: — "I feel you have not only given our seniors a big lift; you have recognized our needs." "A great contract between us seniors and our government." "Excellent. The very best way to put democracy in action. I commend the minister and his staff on a job well done."

Mr. Speaker, at that forum I announced the establishment of a seniors' bureau in the Department of Social Services which would provide a focal point for seniors. I am told that seniors were requesting the establishment of such a bureau for over a decade. This bureau, Mr. Speaker, coupled with today's announcement of a restructured, more representative senior citizens' advisory council, demonstrate my department's and our government's commitment to listen to seniors, to work with seniors, and to respond to seniors. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, it's with a bit of surprise that I find that the Minister of Social Services has gone ahead and made drastic changes to the Senior Citizens' Provincial Council here in Saskatchewan. I believe the Senior Citizens' Provincial Council, which was a very independent body that recommended to government and to the past government and also to this government a number of very interesting and very innovative concepts in dealing with seniors' problems, including the home care program which the seniors' problems, including the home care program which the seniors' provincial council was very involved with in the early stages and on an on-going basis. In particular, I would like to comment on one of the people mentioned by position, an individual by the name of Harry Mullens, who over the past years as a minister in Saskatchewan — a member of the clergy — has done a great deal to carry on the needs and the concerns of the seniors in the province. While the minister did not mention whether or not Mr. Mullens would continue in his present position, whether he would be one of the people retained, and as the executive director of the operation, I would like to . . . And the reason, Mr. Minister, is that there was a good number of things that he said in his statement that was not passed to me in this document. But I would encourage him to treat with great care an organization which was set in place many years ago and did a great deal to encourage our government and your government to go ahead with programs that will deal with seniors' problems.

I know one of the concerns is increase in the Saskatchewan Income Plan that both the past council and your council will be encouraging you to increase in the near future. For the past two years the Saskatchewan income program, or plan, which allows for \$25 a month for single seniors and \$45 a month for couples, has been frozen in this province. And I would encourage the minister to look closely at some of the things that are in place that should be increased, to go ahead with them, because you don't have to do a lot of consulting for that.

I look as well at other recommendations that the Senior Citizens' Provincial Council has given to you as minister, that is that nursing home rates not increase, and that you and your colleagues cease and desist this increase every three months in nursing home rates here in the province.

I want to mention as well the form, Mr. Speaker, that the minister commented about. I heard a report on CBC this morning that said that out of all the government members invited, only the member for Rosemont attended, and that there was great disappointment that the Minister of Health was not there, for example, and that there was concern that in the panels, Mr. Speaker, in the panels the concern was that nursing home rates in the province were at record highs since

the government came to power, and also were concerned about the waiting list which now stands at 1,200 in the city of Regina alone.

So while the minister has done a great deal today to pat himself on the back, I would encourage him to give credit where credit was due with the past council, and we'll look forward to see whether programming for seniors goes ahead the way it should, or whether this is merely more back-patting on the part of the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Birth Announcement

MR. SPEAKER: — Before orders of the day, I would like to make a brief announcement to the House. Our former Clerk Assistant, Gwenn Ronyk, has been blessed with a baby girl on the 13th of October named Brittany Ann. I just thought members would like to be aware.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Schmidt.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, before I return to my remarks on the Speech from the Throne, I would like to take a few moments to mention a matter seemingly remote from our province and our times. Twenty years ago tomorrow, President John F. Kennedy, was assassinated in Dallas. On that day, perished the hope of millions throughout the world that political life in the United States might respond to his dynamic personality, his style, and his gifts of intellect, purpose, and charm. Had he lived there would no doubt have been disillusionment, but there would perhaps have been an enthusiastic, embracing of the vast potential of that great land. Martyrdom, no doubt, saved him from many of the defeats and compromises that inhabit the imperfect and contingent realm of everyday politics. But his death very probably robbed the United States of its best opportunity in modern times to surge forward, united in the pursuit of high ideals, which have always been a part of the American heritage and the American dream.

Nothing is so remote as for what might have been, but I think it is fitting that we recognize this day 20 years ago when our neighbours to the South lost a gifted leader who offered to his fellow Americans confidence, hope, and a clarion call to service. We join with them as they continue to mourn their loss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I had taken my seat on Friday, I had congratulated the Lieutenant Governor on his appointment. I had congratulated the mover and seconder. I had not had an opportunity to congratulate the new cabinet ministers. I don't acknowledge that we need 25 cabinet minister, and 12 legislative secretaries. But to that multitude who have been appointed, I extend my congratulations. I noted that the mover and the seconder did not extend their congratulations to the new ministers, and that's perhaps understandable. To fail to make the first team, the cabinet; or the second team, the legislative secretaries; or the third team, the committee chairmanships and the whip and the deputy whip must be pretty discouraging.

Understandably, under these circumstances, congratulations to the first and the second and the third team would come a little hard from those who haven't made any one of those.

But I want to extend my congratulations to the new ministers. It is an opportunity accorded to very few of our fellow citizens to serve in the cabinet of Saskatchewan, and I want to wish the members who have been chosen for the cabinet the best of good fortune, at least for the time that they are in office. I will certainly do everything I can to speed their retirement from that office but, while they occupy the office, my best wishes go to them.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech talked about jobs as being a priority, and that should have been true long ago. Consider some figures, Mr. Speaker. Since this government assumed office, the welfare rolls have skyrocketed. I speak now of welfare case-loads, and these are the people who are actually getting the cheque. There are far more beneficiaries than this since a single cheque frequently supports two or three or four or five beneficiaries. But in 1981 there were 19,500 on the case-load. In 1982, in September — and I'm using the September figures as the latest ones available to me — there were 25,500 on the case-load, and in September of 1983, 28,000 on the case-load. And of course the number of beneficiaries is far higher. It would approach 60,000.

But the unemployment figures are far worse than the welfare figures. The number of people looking for jobs at Canada employment centres across this province tells a dramatic story. In October 1981, under the previous government, the number was 18,000; in October 1982, 32,000; in October 1983, 59,500 — 59,500 people, registered and looking for work.

Now the Premier attempts to explain this huge figure by spinning visions of thousands of people coming into this province. And that indeed is what he has said to this House, and to many people across this province. And I wanted, therefore, to check some figures and lay them before this House so that this House would know just how many thousands of people have come into this province, and how many have left.

Now I want to look at the figures for the last nine months, Mr. Speaker, the period from January to September inclusive in this year, 1983. And according to the government's own records, the number of people who have entered our province to take up residence here as disclosed by the SHSP — Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan — records, the number coming in is 16,120 and the number leaving is 15,300. So the difference, and the exact difference, is 828. Just over 800 people have come into this province on a net basis over the last nine months. Now the Premier justifies this list of 60,000 people registered and looking for jobs on the basis that a net of 800 people — man, woman, and child — have come into this province, not more than half of whom will be looking for employment.

And what about families? Members opposite are fond of talking about families. And I want to give to this House some figures on the number of families, particularly families with children who have come into this province. And again, I'm going to use the figures for January to September, 1983. These are the numbers for families with children of 18 years of age or under. The number of families with children . . . it's really 17 or under . . . The number of families with children under 18 who came into this province in those nine months is 1,957 — one thousand nine hundred and fifty-seven. And the number of those same families who have left is 2,024. We have suffered a loss of 67 families.

Now, I want to again point out how many children have come, and how many have left in those families. Speaking again of those families with children 17, or under, the number of children coming in was 3,609; the number leaving, 3,791 — a loss of 182 young people. Oh, I'm not suggesting that these are catastrophic losses. They're not. Sixty-seven families less. 182 young people less, is not a large loss for our province, but it certainly does not justify the huge increase in the number of people who are registered and looking for jobs. It does nothing to justify the fact that last year, while unemployment in Canada was declining by 10 per cent, in Saskatchewan it went up by 10 per cent.

And the reason why we are having increased unemployment is not because people are pouring into this province, as the Premier would wish us to believe. It is because the government's open-for-big-business policies are not working, and we simply do not have enough jobs for the people who are seeking employment.

The government opposite has said that they are going to make jobs a priority and those very words are bad news for people looking for jobs in this province, because the Minister of Health said that he was going to make rehabilitation a priority, and for 18 months he has done precisely nothing about a rehab centre for our province — a strange priority. He announces that it's his priority, but he does nothing. The Minister of Social Services has said very recently that he has made family violence a priority with the social services department, and those are quotes from the *Leader-Post* of November 14. He says that he's making action on family violence a priority in the face of the overwhelming evidence that alcohol plays a large part in family violence, and in the face of the fact that this very minister has supported the widening, indeed the opening up, of alcohol advertising in our province — a very, very strange priority.

For the unemployed, I suggest to you, this priority is equally strange. The Hon. Mr. Rousseau, the chairman of the crown investments corporation as he then was and as it then was, just short months ago agreed to sell the shares of Intercontinental Packers when he knew, or ought to have known that that company was proposing to close down its Regina plant, probably permanently. The result of the action by that minister was 125 jobs gone and probably gone for good. That is his idea of making jobs a priority.

The government, short months ago, adopted the report of the member for Arm River, now the Hon. Mr. Muirhead, which called for a pipeline from Lake Diefenbaker to Buffalo Pound Lake. The member for Saskatoon Sutherland, the Hon. Mr. Schoenhals, agreed with that; the member for Regina Lakeview, the Hon. Mr. Embury, similarly has agreed. Each of them has agreed that this pipeline should be a priority, but aside from agreeing they have done nothing — nothing except announce in two successive throne speeches that they are going to create (and I say to hon. members opposite, forgive the term) a crown corporation to deal with water. As a result of the inaction by this government, and particularly by the ministers which I have mentioned, they have no pipeline, no orders for steel pipe at Ipsco, and hundreds of Ipsco jobs lost. Some priority, some priority!

Mr. Speaker, for 20 years Federal Pioneer has operated and manufactured transformers and other electrical goods in Regina, and it has depended on orders from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And for 20 years successive ministers in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have managed to funnel enough orders to Federal Pioneer so that that plant, by and large, kept operating continuously. Now, in the words of the plant manager, "Business is terrible." And according to the hon. minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation there is little or nothing that the government can do. Oh, I understand that they will probably push some orders — who knows? — in the direction of Federal Pioneer, but I very much doubt whether or not they are prepared to do what other governments have done and seen that orders went to Federal Pioneer so that jobs would be saved. And as a result of inaction by the government opposite, we have seen 75 jobs go. Some priority, some priority!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — They went the same place that the Ipsco jobs went, Mr. Speaker. They went the same place that so many jobs have gone when this government has failed to act, the same place that the hundred jobs went in the forest industry this summer, the same place as so many other jobs have gone. The job disappears and the person finds his name on the unemployment roll and he becomes one of those 60,000 people who are listed as looking for jobs in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard earlier in this House a comment by members opposite as to their concern for senior citizens. Well, for many there has been a little program called the senior citizens home repair program. Senior citizens of limited means were given grants to help modernize and improve their homes.

In many instances a new heating system, or some new plumbing, or a new entrance ramp was all that was necessary in order that a senior citizen might be able to stay in his own home and enjoy the fellowship of the friends that he had built up over the years. In many cases this is exactly when the senior citizen wanted.

Now I know that the members of the Progressive Conservative Party do not approve of grants. They would agree that to them it was better to decline to give a grant to a senior citizen — a one-time grant of say \$1,000 — which would allow him to stay in his own home, and force that senior citizen to enter a nursing home where he would require additional public money of \$1,000, not once, but every month. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, of this apparent view on the part of the government opposite, they have discontinued the senior citizens home repair grant, or so my constituents tell me.

Now this grant not only provided assistance for senior citizens, but it also meant that there were jobs for construction workers on small projects throughout the winter months. Notwithstanding this inexpensive program which provided benefits to senior citizens, helped nursing homes deal with their growing waiting lists, and provided jobs for construction workers during the winter months; notwithstanding all of these benefits, the government has — again according to my constituents — discontinued this program. The result? Senior citizens don't get any help, construction workers don't get jobs, nursing homes have growing and ever growing waiting lists.

I ask the government to act to at least reinstate this senior citizens home repair grant. It is not an expensive program; it has worked very well in the past. There can be no justification for discontinuing this grant. Surely they can do this small thing for our senior citizens, and for people who need construction jobs in the winter.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on another matter which happened outside of this House, and I refer to the approval by the government of radio and television and newspaper advertising of liquor. We on this side of the House have expressed our strong disapproval of this decision, of the manner in which it was made, and of the likely consequences of the increased consumption of alcoholic beverages which will flow from increased advertising.

I have watched the ads of television; I have watched the ads with care. And to me they are aimed at young people. To me they tell the story that alcohol consumption is glamorous, and trendy, and the thing to do. I am convinced by the mass of evidence which I have seen, and I suggest all hon. members have seen, which proves to my satisfaction that increased advertising means increased use of alcohol, that increased use means increased abuse, and that increased abuse of alcohol means increased family violence, increased child neglect, increased auto accidents and deaths, increased crime and disorder.

I am pleased that the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association has passed a resolution asking that the ban on liquor ads be reinstated, and I congratulate the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association for their stand. I was not surprised, but none the less disappointed, when at the Progressive Conservative convention they not only did not support a renewal of the ban on advertising, but they also turned down a proposal that there be increased advertising to warn of the dangers of the unwise use of alcohol.

The two delegates who spoke against these AWARE-type ads which have been so well received in the past — and which I suggest we need even more today than we needed in the past — the two who are quoted as opposing this was the member for Rosthern, Mr. Katzman, and a Mr. Peter McCann, the manager of the Carling O'Keefe brewery. They evidently carried the day.

One of my colleagues will lay before this House on an appropriate occasion the accumulated evidence that supports the restriction of liquor advertising. My purpose today is to make clear my personal opposition to the advertising of liquor on radio and television, and my personal objection to the decision which the government made.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the subject of agriculture. For farmers, 1983 had some good news and some bad news. The good news was that we had perhaps the best crop in . . . (inaudible interjection). . . No, I think perhaps the best crop, taking volume and quality together, in the history of the province.

This followed a very good crop in 1982. So nature and the farmers who were able to use the moisture given to them by nature did their part. Some farmers have benefited from the ill wind that savaged their neighbours in the United States. As drought seared crops in the U.S. and as the U.S. government payment-in-kind program came into effect, stocks of grain in the United States dropped dramatically. And this has had the effect of strengthening the world market for feed grains and of keeping wheat prices perhaps a little higher than they might have been.

The bad news is that livestock producers have been hit hard by rising feed-grain prices and falling market prices, resulting partly from heavy marketings in the United States following the drought. And of course grain farmers are being faced with the sharply rising freight costs before the Crow rate has been killed.

Now comes more bad news, more bad news. In the face of these pressures on farmers there is nothing in this throne speech that offers any help of any kind to our farmers in Saskatchewan. No help of any kind.

The forces who were organizing to kill the Crow were allowed to rally without any significant opposition by the government opposite. We have heard them say that they put ads in the paper, that there were phone calls to other governments. But what was needed was a rallying of opinion in western Canada to make it abundantly clear that there was overwhelming opposition to Bill C-155. And that rallying was not done. There could have been a plebiscite among producers which would have produced a massive rejection of Bill C-155. There was no plebiscite. There could have been a statement on behalf of the three western governments and every single MP from western Canada, except Mr. Axworthy and his lonely colleague, and we would have been able to show beyond peradventure a doubt that Bill C-155 had no support in western Canada. But that was not done. And as a result the federal government was able to get by with their story that westerners were divided and that many supported Bill C-155. That is not true. That is not true, and we did not have the leadership from our government which would have made this abundantly true and clear not only to the federal government (who weren't listening anyway), but to all those other people in Canada who were listening, and who would have pressured their federal government if they had known just how much this bill is opposed in western Canada.

So there was no leadership on call. As will be known, the March throne speech offered assistance to farmers who might be damaged by the removal of the Crow. That was certainly in the March throne speech. But the Crow is now gone and so is the promise. This throne speech is absolutely silent — silent on the promise made to farmers in the March throne speech, of assistance, assistance from the provincial government if the Crow rate put Saskatchewan farmers at a disadvantage. And it most assuredly does.

There is no question that if the Crow rate goes (and it is going), and if the costs of shipping our grain increase, they increase most for Saskatchewan farmers, and perhaps Peace River farmers in

the far north of Alberta. But much more for Saskatchewan farmers than for Alberta farmers, or for Manitoba farmers, we are put at a disadvantage. The government promised action if this happened and in their throne speech they were silent. They said not one word on their previous problems — promise.

Well, now what of livestock producers? They're under great pressure. I hope nobody denies that livestock producers are under pressure. Some are getting help from our support programs, the beef stabilization program and the hog assured returns program the so-called SHARP program. But reports suggest, reports suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government is proposing to enter into other types of support programs which are not primarily based upon cost of production but on market price. I do not know whether those reports are true. Who, Mr. Speaker, could possibly tell what a ten year rolling, weighted index average is? But certainly it suggests, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have a program based primarily on previous market prices and not on today's cost of production. And if this be true, if this be true then the hog producers and beef producers will be in even greater difficulty than they are today. And I would like the Minister of Agriculture, at an appropriate time, to make a clear statement of the policy of his government with respect to support prices and support programs, and to make clear to our livestock producers that he will support no program, that he will commit the Government of Saskatchewan to no price support program for livestock which does not have a significant degree of cost of production in the calculation of the support price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I began my review of the throne speech last Friday, I pointed out that there's precious little in it for the ordinary citizen, precious little for Saskatchewan's nurses or teachers or secretaries or sales clerks or farmers or small businessmen. This wasn't their throne speech. It didn't speak to their needs and concerns. It didn't because it lacked concrete proposals to deal with the two key problems facing ordinary people in Saskatchewan, and that's unemployment and the rising cost of living. If this had been a throne speech designed to deal with the needs and concerns of the average citizen, it would have contained concrete proposals for job creation, and there were none. There were none. It would have had proposals for helping farmers and small businessmen deal with low farm prices — and I hope people don't deny that many farm prices are lower than can be sustained on a long-term basis — and programs to help people with high interest rates, because those interest rates are still double digit. But we didn't have those programs in this throne speech. Now was there any commitment in this throne speech that this government would stop its gouging on utility rates and give ordinary citizens in this province some relief from double-digit increases — huge double-digit increases — in utility rates. We have never had increases in utility rates, and power and gas and the like, of the kind with which we are now faced.

But this throne speech failed to do any of those things, Mr. Speaker, and in the process, it revealed that this government is not one that has the needs and concerns of ordinary people at heart. While there were precious little in this speech for the ordinary person, there were lots and lots in it for big business. In the 12 pages of the throne speech, it was absolutely full, chock-a-block, with things which were of interest and of benefit to big business. The throne speech met their needs and their concerns very well, but at the expense of ordinary people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Someone has said, "Would you give me a for instance?" Well, I'll give you a list — it's a long list — but I will give you a few things that were in there for big business. First, the throne speech bragged about the government's big tax cuts for big oil, and then went on to promise more tax cuts for big oil, and additional incentives to the oil companies in the weeks ahead. Next, the throne speech hinted at tax breaks for potash and coal. It said we were going to revise the tax schedules for potash and coal. If those revisions are anything like the revisions which were given to the oil companies, more millions are going to the multinational corporations and coming out of the pockets of Saskatchewan people.

The throne speech also made it clear that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the

corporation owned by the people of Saskatchewan, would not be allowed to compete head to head in overseas sales with the multinational potash corporations but would be forced into the cartel which is operated by those corporations in selling potash overseas.

The throne speech promised changed to The Planning and Development Act. We'll have to wait to see the act, but my bet is that those changes are going to be of benefit to real estate developers, and they are going to be not of any benefit to ordinary citizens.

The throne speech also promised changes to mortgage foreclosure laws, and if that isn't pretty ominous I don't know what it. It's pretty difficult to think of this government doing something which is going to help ordinary mortgage holders resist the foreclosure by their banking and mortgage company friends. I think there is no question that, when we see those changes, the changes will make it easier for banks and mortgage companies to foreclose mortgages on homes and small businesses.

And there was the promise of reduction protection of the environment and reduced protection for working people at their place of work. This was made clear in the promise that we were going to see deregulation. Deregulation has been a code word, as we have seen it operate in the United States and operate in British Columbia, to mean less environmental protection, less protection in the work place, and my bet is that when we find out what deregulation means it will also mean less protection of the environment, less protection in the work place. And, indeed, Mr. Speaker, ministers have been quoted . . . The Minister of the environment has been quoted as saying that the change in environmental regulation will make it easier for developers.

Not bad pickings for big business out of one throne speech. All of their priorities have been met by this throne speech. All of their needs and concerns were addressed. But, as I said a moment ago, much of this came at the expense of ordinary people. Because of this, it shouldn't come as much of a surprise that none of these gifts or goodies for big business were found in the Conservative campaign platform of 1982.

How many people remember the Conservatives promising at election time, "Elect us, and we will cut the oil companies' taxes by \$100 million"? How many remember that? "Elect us, and we're going to make it easier for the banks and mortgage companies to foreclose on your home or small business." "Elect us, and we'll prevent the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan from competing with the multinationals but PCS. We are going to stop them from doing that." Did you hear that promise? No, you did not. No one will remember those promises of 1982, because the Conservatives didn't talk about their alliance with big business then — at least not in public. But while the government has delivered on many things which it did not promise in 1982, at least in public, it has failed to deliver on many of the promises which it did make in 1982, in public.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's worth reminding the government that they still have to perform on many, many of the promises which they made in 1982. I am not asking that they follow the policies of the New Democratic Party. I am asking that they follow the announced policies of the Progressive Conservative Party as made in the campaign of 1982.

There was a promise, for example, of free telephone for all senior citizens — free telephones for all senior citizens — and I haven't heard anything more of that. There was the promise of the removal of education and health tax on all utility bills. This was going to happen immediately after their election. I've not heard of that. There was the promise to remove the 5 per cent education and health tax completely — completely — over their first term. Have you seen any progress towards that, Mr. Speaker? I have not.

When was the last time you heard any Progressive Conservative who campaigned on reducing income taxes by 10 per cent, when was the last time you heard any of them mention that again?

For them a campaign platform is something like a railway platform. It's something that you use to get in on and after that you leave it behind. And this is in fact what they have done with that campaign promise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Then there was the campaign promise that they were going to have balanced budgets. They were going to have fiscal responsibility. When they got in office, their first budget, their very first budget, had a deficit. They had a huge deficit, and they have in their second budget had a huge deficit, and it seems to me that it is entirely likely that in their budget they will have a huge deficit.

And what about the campaign promise that Saskatchewan small business people would get loans at 9,625 per cent interest? What happened to that one? There's another campaign promise which has been left behind.

These are just some of the major campaign promises made by the government opposite which have been left behind when they sit on the treasury benches — major campaign promises, which have not been kept. And while these important promises have failed to be fulfilled, the government is moving rapidly, rapidly to give more and more goodies to big business. People ask what promises have we kept? Well, it's your private promises to the oil companies and the potash companies which you have kept.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I say that this throne speech is a big business throne speech. They will applaud it. They will say that there's lots in there for big business, but ordinary Saskatchewan citizens can find scant in that throne speech with addresses their problems and their concerns.

And with the legislative plan, as with the past 18 months of Conservative government in Saskatchewan, the rich will get richer, and the poor will get poorer, and the working families of Saskatchewan will continue to lose ground. And I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, since the government came into office the rich have become richer, the poor have become poorer, and ordinary working people have lost ground — ordinary teachers, ordinary nurses, ordinary clerks, ordinary salesmen have lost ground.

This brings me to a key point which my colleagues and I have been talking about throughout the fall. And that is, Mr. Speaker, the double standard approach that this government takes to the management of public business. So much of what this Conservative government does fails to meet any standards of fairness, equity, and justice. So much of what this government does fails to keep Saskatchewan's working families ahead of the game or even up to the galloping inflation, but benefits big business — benefits big business, the government, and the government's friends.

Now, members opposite say that the inflation rate is the lowest in Canada. They are, of course, entirely wrong in that. The inflation rate in Canada is now 5 per cent. It is in Saskatchewan 6, 6.5 approaching 7 per cent. Members opposite know that the city with the second highest inflation rate in Canada is Saskatoon. They know that the city with the third highest inflation rate in Canada is Regina. And under those circumstances it is absolutely impossible for Saskatchewan to have the lowest unemployment rate; indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it has among the highest of inflation rates in Canada.

The ultimate symbol of the double standard, I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the minimum wage freeze. The Conservative government has frozen the minimum wage for two full years and the 60,000 people in this province who are at minimum wage or had their wages move with minimum wage, have received absolutely no benefits since this government came to office. By the end of next month the Conservative minimum wage freeze will have cost working people each \$2,000. Working people who work full hours at a regular minimum wage will have lost \$2,000 because this government has frozen minimum wages for two years — surely the longest

drought of minimum wage, the longest freeze, certainly since 1970, and I would suspect, since long before that.

And it's made even more unfair, this freeze in minimum wage, by the fact that the government is not asking others to make similar sacrifices. It is asking minimum wage earners to have a two-year freeze in the name of restraint, but not other people. They're not to be restrained. And this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the double standard of which I speak.

Last spring, in the midst of the minimum wage freeze, the government opposite gave senior public servants a \$3,000-a-year productivity bonus; 500 senior bureaucrats got a productivity bonus, so called, of \$3,000 a year, and they were all already getting \$50,000 a year or more. This fall, with the minimum wage again frozen, the government gave 16 of its top administrators, and particularly its political advisers, salary increases of from \$2,700 a year to nearly \$11,000 a year.

In one case the salary increase was more than 17 per cent. And each of those who got these salary increases was already getting \$59,000 a year or more, and some of them were the very same people who in April had got \$3,000 a year as a productivity increase.

And this, Mr. Speaker, at a time when people of the lowest wages, who had their minimum wage — their really quite tiny wage in these terms — frozen for two full years. There is one person who got indeed an increase; the size of his increase was more than a minimum wage person earns in a whole year full-time work.

I say this is not fair. I say this is not just. I say this is not an equitable distribution of restraint. I say it is a government which wishes to see that people who already make a lot of money make more, and people who don't make a lot of money don't get much more.

Just a few years ago, still in the midst of the minimum wage freeze, the government increased the pay of the chairman of the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board — a part-time job, I say — to \$95,000 a year. Never in the history of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had a chairman of the labour relations board ever earned as much as \$50,000 a year, and we now have this chairman (unless it was last year, under this government) but certainly prior to this government coming to office, no chairman of the labour relations board had ever earned as much as \$5,000 a year.

And now for this job he is being paid \$95,000 a year, plus a car, plus expenses — more than the chief justice, more than any other judge in Saskatchewan — and this offered in the name of equity, this in the name of restraint. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not fair, it is not just, and a great number of people in Saskatchewan know that it is not fair and it is not just.

Another point to be made about this government's double standard approach with respect to minimum wage is this: it has asked ordinary people to accept restraint, to accept no increase in minimum wage — none. But has it exercised restraint itself? Has it exercised restraint itself? It has not.

All these people who are getting minimum wage — all of these people are going to face far higher costs this winter. And a lot of those extra costs are because the government has made decisions which demonstrate absolutely no restraint, which hammer the public, the public, who are asked to accept no increases in minimum wages, or perhaps 4 per cent, or 3 per cent, or 5 per cent. What can you say of a government which says to an employee, public or private, "You ought to be satisfied with 5 per cent," and then goes out and raises natural gas rates by 13 per cent, telephone bills by an average of 19 per cent, power bills by 15 per cent, STC bus fares by 18.5 per cent, SGI vehicle deductibles by as much as 43 per cent? All these utility rate increases are well above the rate of inflation, well above — indeed, double, triple, in one case seven times the rate of inflation. They justify this on what grounds I do not know, but they are saying to them ordinary people, "Accept zero or 3 per cent in the name of restraint."

It's unfair, Mr. Speaker. It's a blatant, double standard, and that is the government's approach — a blatant, double standard. And I say, with respect to minimum wages, it should stop. I say to the government oppose that a two-year freeze on minimum wage. I say, is too long, but I say to them, in any case it's long enough, and in all conscience you should announce an increase in minimum wages effective January 1 so that these people would have had their wages frozen for two years and no more.

Surely it is unconscionable to ask the least well paid in our society to have their wages frozen for a period longer than two years. These are people who do not have the power of a trade union to bargain. There are people who not have economic power, and in the face of 60,000 people on the unemployment rolls looking for jobs they are unable to say, "I will move to another job." They have to take what their employer offers, in many cases; they are unable to improve their economic position. It is in these very circumstances that a government owes it to these people to protect them by increases in the minimum wage. The government has not done it for two years. I call upon them to act now so that these people will be penalized no longer than two years. It is quite long enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The finance minister is already say, and I come back to the matter of deficit budgets, that we are likely to have a third straight deficit budget. I really can't understand why. We've had two record crops — and there is some argument about whether this year was the record or last year was the record, but certainly we have two record crops so the agricultural sector is, on balance in good shape. Certainly, livestock is not, but on balance. The oil industry is, I am told, at an all time high, an all time high. I am told by members opposite that the potash industry is rebounding, and if we are to believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Saskatchewan isn't participating in the restraint and the recession that's across Canada, and if in fact potash is reviving, oil is going great guns, if we've had the two best crops in history, and we're not participating in the recession, what can be the justification for a budget deficit? What, indeed? What, indeed? And then there can be no justification except the mismanagement of the government opposite — the fact that they have decided that they are going to give huge benefits to the resource companies, so that they are unable to balance their books. And we're going to have, by the look of it, the third straight budget deficit. This government is taking us down the Trudeau trail of huge consecutive budgets. It's a slippery road, and the Government of Canada has been going down the Trudeau trail now for six or seven years and is in a position that . . . Canada is in the worst fiscal and monetary position that it's been in for decades because this policy was pursued, and a great number of people believe that budget deficits are a bad idea. A great number of people believe that budget deficits, continuing deficits, are a bad idea. I say again that our party has said in the past that a deficit for a specific short period of time for a specific purpose may be justified, but a deficit which is simply one of continuing deficits based upon no plan is not to be justified.

And just before members opposite criticize me too vigorously let me talk about an article which appeared in the December 1982 edition of Grain News in which a prominent Saskatchewan public figure refers to deficit budgets and I quote: "as a deferred tax which must be paid by future generations." A deferred tax which must be paid by future generations. Who said that Mr. Speaker? It was not me. It was none other than the Premier. The member for Estevan said that, the Premier of this province. The same Premier whose government has introduced two straight deficit budgets, and the same Premier who is going by all accounts to introduce a third straight deficit budget, and hit future generations of this province with a massive deferred tax. And I'm using his words — a massive deferred tax. The man who is mortgaging the future of our province and our children is the man who said that this is a deferred tax.

The same man has been highly critical, and I think rightly so, in the past of the Trudeau government's dismal economic performance. And I hope no one argues that the Trudeau government's economic performance has been dismal and its fiscal performance has been dismal; and the government opposite is following the same fiscal role as the Trudeau

government — a dismal performance — going down the Trudeau trail of huge deficits for the sake of winning temporary political popularity. Now, let me assure the House and the Premier that it will be a very temporary popularity as the bills for this government's gifts and give-aways to big business start coming home, and they're coming already. The give-aways to big business are already costing ordinary taxpayers massive sums and those sums are going to get bigger every year.

Governments are not judged on the basis of what they say they will do. Governments are judged by what they do when in office, and they're judged by what they do for the ordinary citizen of this province, and this government is going to be judged by that. They wish now that they would be judged by their performance to the oil companies. On that they would score very high. But when it comes to performance for ordinary citizens they will score less high.

The government has come to power claiming that it would represent the needs of ordinary citizens, and it has abandoned them. It abandoned them in last spring's budget. It abandoned them in the throne speech. It abandoned them in favour of big business. And I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker and to all members opposite that when the next election comes the people of this province, considering that record, will abandon this government, will abandon this government in favour of another government that represents the interests of ordinary people in this province.

This throne speech stands condemned, condemned of failing to meet the concerns of ordinary people, of failing even to address the problems which they're facing, and as surely as ordinary people come to understand this, just as surely they will reject what this government is offering to big business, and suggest that they too ought to get some of the benefits flowing from the provincial treasury, not to ordinary people, but to the big business in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons that I've stated, and many more, I will be opposing the motion before the House, and one of my colleagues will be moving an amendment at the proper time later in this debate. I will oppose the motion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is indeed a privilege for me to rise in my maiden speech as a cabinet minister, and speak on the throne speech.

The member from Regina Elphinstone, the Leader of the Opposition, mentioned his congratulations for the new cabinet ministers of this government, and he spoke in reference of the A team, the B team, the C team. I would relate to him, Mr. Speaker, that on March 26, 1982, the people of Saskatchewan voted and said goodbye to the A team, the B team, and the C team, and represented and voted in a government that is one team, working for their benefit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the negative attitude of the opposition amazes me. This government does care about the ordinary person. I see the Leader of the Opposition leaving now, but he made numerous references to the ordinary person. I would like to remind the members opposite by quoting from the throne speech that this government has:

... goals of developing policies and programs which encourage initiative and not dependence, and which recognizes that economic strength and diversity will flow, not from the actions of government, however well intentioned, but from the vision, energy and industry of our own citizens.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that means the people of Saskatchewan, their individuality, their vision, energy and industry. I do not know how the members opposite relate to the citizens of

Saskatchewan, but I think that April 26, 1982 was an example of their relating.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am a citizen of our province, an ordinary person, which is why I'm a part of this government that gives so many opportunities to the people, the citizens of Saskatchewan. Perhaps the members opposite cannot see what this government holds for the citizens, because they themselves do not think in terms of the individual. However, on April 26 last year the average citizen of Saskatchewan voted, and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my colleagues, myself, and even the members opposite, began benefiting greatly from this government that thinks in terms of the individual.

I intend to demonstrate today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, just how the ordinary citizens have been so fortunate under the present administration. For example, my own constituency of Saskatoon University, there have been 24 new businesses start up from May 1982 to May 1983. It is this government that gave the people the opportunity through various programs, but it was the initiative and drive of the individual citizen, the ordinary person, that makes those businesses work. My constituency is just a small part of what is happening throughout our province. Saskatoon itself is experiencing the same surge of new businesses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — My colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, announced just last week that a new record has been set for oil and drilling in our province. Last week the total number of wells drilled to date for 1983 reached 1,537 wells. That broke the record of 1,498 in 1980. The number of wells being drilled is up four from 1982, but 1983 is not over yet and the total drilling for this year is projected to be double of 1982.

That activity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can be directly related to the oil recovery program introduced by this government in July of 1982. For the record, that was when this government introduced the one-year tax and royalty holiday for new wells. An important point to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that this move cost an estimated \$40 million in foregone revenue, but compared to the \$60 million the previous administration paid out annually under their cash incentive program we have not only a more effective program, but a less expansive one too.

That means that we, the taxpayers, the ordinary citizens, have to pay less in taxes, and yet the return for our dollar has more value. The foregone revenue will be more than offset by increased receipts from the sale of drilling permits and leases this year, which will be realized at the full rate, will generate continuing benefits for our people in Saskatchewan.

May I also point out that the increased drilling activity will lead to significant additional production over the long term. There will be direct benefits in the forms of jobs. The Ministry of Energy and Mines has estimated that over 1,000 jobs have been created in the drilling and related activities alone. Jobs, Deputy Mr. Speaker — when all around in this country people are scrambling in their search for employment, Saskatchewan is still hiring.

Mr. Speaker, I recollect quite clearly last Friday when my colleague was announcing this, and think back to the role of an MLA in Saskatchewan is to work for the betterment of our province — all of us, all 64. When I looked at the faces of the NDP members, their chins were hitting the floor. When good news like this comes to our province, they are disappointed. This government is working for the benefit of Saskatchewan. Those are the gloom-and-doomers, the people that like to have a black cloud hanging over our province at all times.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan leads the country with the lowest unemployment rate. We were the only province to create jobs in 1982, and those jobs were in the private sector. When every other province was turning away people, we were welcoming back our citizens, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the first time in history our labour force exceeded 500,000 people in July.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — That is a peak employment performance in the Saskatchewan labour market, an improvement of 50 per cent from July, 1982, compared to an overall Canadian employment performance improvement of 1.6 per cent for the same time period. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm also anxiously anticipating when our province very shortly will be reaching the one million mark in population.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — No wonder people are returning to Saskatchewan; no wonder we are attracting other provincial citizens. The ordinary person has a chance in Saskatchewan.

While we are increasing the work-force, we are also streamlining the government system. Over the past 17 months we have cut the bureaucracy by 2,000 people, yet over the past 10 years under the NDP administration, it increased by 10,000 people. Mr. Speaker, 10,000 people in 10 short years of NDP administration. Yet if you look at the hours lost over that 10 years, on an average it was 173,000 hours per year due to strikes. That is lost work time. However, with a smaller, more effective system, we have seen the work-lost hours for 1983 drop to 26,000 hours. That can only benefit the ordinary citizen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and may I add it is only one of the many benefits the ordinary citizen has experienced since April 26, 1982. There are many, but I shall only mention a few right now.

First of all, because it was one of the first things this government did, we removed the provincial gas tax on gasoline. In overall terms this meant a savings of \$182 million to the people of Saskatchewan. taken individually, an ordinary motorist travelling an average distance has saved approximately \$285 since the tax was removed. I would also like to mention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this tax cut is the largest ever in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — If you lived in Quebec, it would be 50 cents a litre, or in Manitoba under the NDP administration, you would pay 48 cents a litre. In Saskatchewan, you and I pay approximately 40 cents a litre. This is certainly something that benefits the ordinary citizen of Saskatchewan.

The natural gas distribution program . . . (inaudible) . . . Sask Power extending natural gas service to 945 community customers and 2,330 rural customers. The work generated required that there be 80 per cent Saskatchewan labour content in the project. Not only were Saskatchewan people working for Saskatchewan people, but whole communities benefited by having their service upgraded.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government was also the first to introduce the mortgage interest reduction program. That plan enabled home-owners across our province to realize the dream of owning their own home by providing a steady 13.25 per cent interest rate ceiling. The ordinary person became more active in the economy. To date, 43,000 Saskatchewan citizens have taken advantage of this program. Yet the Leader of the Opposition says there's no benefits for the ordinary people in Saskatchewan. I just can't figure that out.

A further benefit has been the Build-A-Home program. As of September 1, 1983, there were approximately 5,900 families who applied and received a \$3,000 grant to purchase a new home. Not only was this a prototype program for all of Canada, but it worked. The housing starts rose, and again, the ordinary person participated actively in our economy and benefited.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the youth of our province is learning that Saskatchewan is the place to be. Not only do new families and singles have an opportunity to own a house, but through the farm

purchase program it becomes possible to own your own farm as well. By providing interest rebates on loans used to acquire the land, this government is demonstrating our confidence in our citizens.

Health care has also always been an issue, and our government remains firmly committed in striving to make Saskatchewan's health care system the best in Canada. By the end of this second year of progressive administration, this government will have spent nearly \$11 million on the construction and renovation of special care homes.

And, Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, I think I heard reference to some kind of a moratorium under the previous NDP administration. And yet they get up there and speak about that as if they are the big advocates of that type of program. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is what I call hypocrisy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that affects the ordinary citizen. We are providing services and programs to the people of Saskatchewan — for you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my colleagues, myself, and even the members opposite. The issues are treated on their individual basis, with constant attention to how they affect the citizens of Saskatchewan.

This government established the public utilities review commission whereby the citizens can sit in judgement at the rate applications by the utilities. As a result, utility increases were kept to zero per cent until the books had been studied. The commission reviews applications for increases by the utility companies with the individual in mind. That means the ordinary citizen has a say in what goes on. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are listening to our citizens.

Just a couple more points, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The sales tax on children's clothing has been removed. It has also been removed from electrical rates on irrigation systems. Everything I have mentioned is aimed at benefiting the individual, ordinary person in Saskatchewan.

I would now like to turn to the Department of Culture and Recreation and outline some of the specific programs and plans that work towards the best for the citizens of our province. The provincial cultural, recreational facilities capital grant program was introduced earlier this year by our department. Under this program, the communities can renovate, construct, or otherwise complete facilities so crucial to Saskatchewan life. From the \$32 million we will distribute over five years, it is expected to generate \$100 million in jobs, construction, and various other side benefits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the citizens of Saskatchewan have a say into what will be built where. They will be actively working to see that the town hall, the curling rink, the skating rink, or the senior citizens' centre be built.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — To date in that program we have received 173 grant requests totalling almost \$17 million in construction projects. There have been 75 projects approved for a total of almost \$1.5 million. At this time there have been 43 projects that have received funding already for a total of \$898,000.

There are many exciting things going on in this province, and I am proud to say also in the Department of Culture and Recreation. We announced the intent of our cultural policy and I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize some of the important points. We have been concentrating on the importance of the individual in Saskatchewan and how our citizens benefit.

In the cultural policy, our first move was to recognize the crucial role of the creative individual in the cultural process. We also believe that the very components of culture must be available to all Saskatchewan people. Right now, discussions, and final plans are being made to implement a

pilot artist-in-residence program. We hope to hire and place two artists in Saskatchewan communities by working in conjunction with two provincial cultural organizations.

There are also the talent hunts, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Both the visual arts and performing arts talent hunts have been providing an avenue to Saskatchewan artists to display their works, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many of us will recall the other night some of the tremendous Saskatchewan talent that's available.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are emphasizing the individual's contribution to this province and at the same time intent on bringing more opportunities to Saskatchewan citizens. That is why we have reiterated that Saskatchewan culture comes first. We are world class and we intend to demonstrate that.

Another aspect of the cultural policy and this government's attitude is that we believe community based volunteers are essential to the continued growth of Saskatchewan's cultural scene, Mr. Deputy Speaker, volunteers are individuals. Once again this administration recognizes the valuable contribution to Saskatchewan that the individual ordinary citizen makes. Saskatchewan is proud to be our country's leader in volunteers. We have 27 per cent of the adult population involved in some form of volunteerism. I would like to point out that the national average in that is 15 per cent.

This is a province where the ordinary person matters not only because of what they contribute but because they are citizens sharing in the bright future this province has. I say to this House, and specifically to the members opposite, that this progressive government is concerned about the ordinary citizen and always will be. Through some of the radical members opposite seem to prefer to see a more militant labour force on strike more than on the job, and though the out of touch members opposite seem to feel that the ordinary person is not being served, I say that not only are they wrong but that this government's administration stands for all citizens in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I reiterate the fine words of the throne speech and affirm the fact that our government recognizes the quote: "...vision, energy, and industry of our own citizens." I am proud to be a citizen of Saskatchewan and honoured to serve in this government. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to speak with respect to the throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I would like to support the motion made by the member of Melville. And certainly, even though I am a very open-minded person and I would very much like to hear the amendment made by the member of the opposition, I am prepared to mention right now that I will be opposing that amendment. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all, we people have certainly congratulated the new cabinet ministers. We are very pleased that our cabinet has been expanded, that has included a great deal of talent, a great deal of vision, and has included more ordinary citizens with unusual ability to help other ordinary citizens to bless and to use their abilities, whatever they have.

I would also like to not only congratulate the expanded cabinet but to be the first one to congratulate the eight Tories who will replace the eight opposition members in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — It is a terrible and awesome job to try to change a province for the better after 40 years of socialism. It needs more than an expanded cabinet. It needs more than a vigorous caucus. It needs more than capable backbenchers. We also need eight more MLAs. And I congratulate those Tories who are actively working right now to replace those eight.

Mr. Speaker, I very much enjoyed the speech from the hon. member from Melfort, but when he talked . . . or is it Melville?

AN HON. MEMBERS: — Melville.

MRS. CASWELL: — Melville, I thank you. Sorry there. But when he talked about the NDP that they should expel the waffle, I think that occasionally the hon. member from Melville and I disagree a little bit with the history of the NDP, possibly both of us have brushed it and understand it quite well, but sometimes with a little difference. The government, the NDP, never expelled the waffle. The NDP amalgamated the waffle. The NDP made sure that the most radical doctrinaire socialists had control of the government, and if the most doctrinaire, radical socialists did not get elected, then they formulated the policies.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this province must understand the way socialism works. One would think, of course we know how it works; we've had it for 40 years. But I think that even after those eight members are gone, I think it will be necessary occasionally for somebody to stand up in this House and to say, "This is how the socialists did it. This is why they did it." And I'm prepared to be that member who occasionally reminds people how socialism works, because I never ever want to see that brand of oppression in this province again, no matter what the penny ante leader they have. Socialism is one evil that goes beyond the personality of the proponents.

The role of the socialist was to define and to accelerate any potential antagonistic section in society. Wherever there was a relationship between two sections or two individuals in society, it was the socialist's goal to drive a wedge between those two groups to make sure that the state had control, and thus they continually created a militant labour force; they continually created grievances; they continually created a sense of oppression; and if the people weren't oppressed after the socialists got through with them, indeed the oppression was realistic.

For the socialists love antagonism. The socialists love conflict, and they will consistently use their ability to create, to expand and to reinforce that conflict, whether that conflict is between natives and white, whether it is between man and woman, whether it is between parent and child, whether it's between urban and rural, whether it's between Americans and Canadian, whether it's between the producer and the consumer, whether it is between the employer and the employee, whether it is between one religion and another. The socialist's role was to convince people that those people who had a vested self-interest in their well-being, such as employer-employee relationship, was in fact their enemy, rather than a co-worker — someone who, in fact, was providing a service while you provided a service to them.

It was necessary for the socialists to convince people that others were their enemy, because as everyone has known, if you've ever played as you're growing up, how the bully gets his clique to go around protesting people, and then the bully in turn has his own little bunch of people who he has a thumb under. It is no accident that the socialists are continually upset when our economy is booming. They're continually upset at success. They're continually upset at peaceful labour relations. They are upset about that because a socialist can only survive under negativity, a socialist can only survive under conflict. And they have cultivated and they have worked at creating that conflict.

I was going to quote from the book, but I'm sure that the hon. members opposite in the corner over here will immediately run and get their own copy. I was just reading a book, Jan Sejna's book, *We Will Bury You*, in which, as a top-ranking Soviet leader in Czechoslovakia, he talks about how the socialist plan is to control Australia, Great Britain, Canada, United States, etc. He

talks about how the socialists continually infiltrate the labour unions to bring on “progressive forces.” And in Canada their plan was to promote the view of nationalism.

Now, I am a Canadian. I have grown up proud of being a Canadian, and as many of the people on this side, we are not opposed to nationalism, and we are not at all opposed and we are proud of our heritage of the queen, of Canada, and of our province. But the socialists always made sure that nationalism meant nationalism. And when nationalism means nationalisation, then, the book explains: when you can convince them to take over the American businesses, when you can convince them to kick out the American, or the British, or whatever businesses, and the government run them in the name of nationalism, they will be on the road to socialism.

I think that we have . . . Another lie the socialists have always perpetrated is that a conservative, or someone who is honestly a liberal democrat (meaning someone who believes in the true liberalism, not the Trudeau socialism) is really connected to somehow a fascist right-wing.

And I think the biggest lie we have been told in our history: that fascism and socialism are at the ends. But in fact fascism and socialism have always been one side of each other. Hitler was a great admirer of Stalin and learned a great deal from it. and I think that the thing we have to understand is that the socialists have deliberately done this, have said that the fascism is on one end and if we have too much conservatism we'll end up in fascism, and if we have too much socialism we'll end up in communism, whereas communism and fascism are one and the same, and the only road to go to communism and fascism is the socialist route. And I might add that Galbraith and the Fabians get there as fast or better than any of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — And one other thing: I think that when the teenagers and young people of the '60s were enamoured by opposition to the war in Vietnam and other so-called noble but possibly misguided causes, people saw these people as somewhat a threat to society. It is unfortunate that they took them 10 years to realize that the so-called enamoured socialist, who is in love with the rhetoric, who wears a headband and is a hippie, is not a threat. It is the three-piece businessman socialist, who talks with a well-modulated, educated voice, who is a threat to society. And I think that we also have to understand that in North America we have created a society where to have upward mobility one must at least espouse socialist causes. Socialism is the religion on an elite in society, those people who believe they have rather a master plan for the rest of us.

As someone who grew up in a family of nine, when my mother was a widow, we had time for principles, we had time for debate, we had time for discussion. But I think fortunately my mother gave me an example that the most important thing was to run your own life and to run it well, and after you do that you have little time to create a master plan for the way other people should run their lives. And, I think that this is why the elitism of socialism and I think this is why we have encountered a society, when the grass roots speak, they will speak with a Conservative voice, because a Conservative says, first of all give me the right to run my own life; give me the right too look after my own family; leave me alone, let me have my influence in my community and my church, and I will contribute to society, but save me from those elitists, save me from the socialists.

And as the socialists have always espoused the cause of the poor, the cause of the native, the cause of the working man . . . (inaudible) . . . but, in actuality, they espouse those causes, because they understood the poor were the people they could control. When you do not understand, and do not appreciate the value of the individual human spirit, you do not also understand how difficult it is to control people who have been inculcated in a spirit of freedom. So that even though the socialists, for years, said that natives were the property of the socialists, and the working class was the property of socialists, and Saskatoon west was definitely the property of the socialists . . .

AN HON. MEMBERS: — John Brockelbank . . .where's John?

MRS. CASWELL: — He's being an NDP knee-jerk and alderman. But, anyway I think that we have to understand that the reason why . . .(inaudible interjection) . . .It's just that my fans are so enthusiastic, Murray. Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you encourage my fans, and my opponents to be a little quieter. Okay. I think that we have to understand why they love the poor, as I said, it's because they can control them. And I think we have to understand they love the ranks of the poor to swell, not of course by having babies which, of course, to them was an obscenity and they did love to cure poverty by killing the children of the poor — if they were unborn at least. But, I think that we have to understand is that they love to have the, is we love to have the poor in our ranks, and to have them increase by making sure the upper middle class, or the middle class cannot also support themselves, cannot also raise their families, cannot also look after themselves. So they had a concentrated effort to break business; and how they broke business, as the hon. member well knows, is to regulate it to death, is to have regulations and taxes to the point that the business simply could not thrive. And, then to have a government business that would compete and to make sure that the government business had all the advantages, had all the plums, had every new thing it needed, and its one job was to destroy the entrepreneur, the person who indeed wanted to raise himself . . .(inaudible interjection) . . .Okay. I've just been instructed by the hon. member from Meadow Lake that I was supposed to continue.

When people are in conflict with one another the whole civilization is disrupted. Democracy does not work. Every institution, basic institution, is attacked and weakened. People are afraid. People are unsure of themselves. The socialist role is to destroy all those institutions and to weaken them and to replace them with one thing: an all-prevailing, oppressive state.

I think that if we keep looking, with every problem we have, whether it's in the whole gamut from agriculture to social services, that is precisely what they have done; they have a plan; they have a doctrinaire philosophy; they have a program and they work it; and they work their plan and we work for them until we've had enough.

They understand the free market-place must go. The strength of the family must go. They must understand that real culture pluralism must go and that the state will replace these institutions as they see it.

The hon. member from Regina Elphinstone really believes he has something on us because of the liquor advertising. The hon. member says, "Aha, once again I can play the role of the noble virtuous man in Saskatchewan who will save us." But I think that we have to understand whatever is my position on those liquor advertng, that you can't make a lot of noise about something about liquor advertising where in fact you are eroding the whole basic structure of society. You're destroying the value of the home and the church and the family in all kinds of ways that people do not understand. It isn't very nice to have to show people a moral facade by talking about liquor advertising when you have created a machinery that replaces every value in society with a status-endorsed brainwashing.

Before I was elected I often talked, as I still do, with many people who are concerned about parents' rights. They're concerned that parents seem to have their rights being eroded, and they're very concerned because they want to have the responsibility of raising their children as they see fit in a proper manner. They were continually telling me that every time they turn around there is another state agency that is in fact literally corrupting their children or eroding their responsibility. Needless to say, they did not get a hearing with former government because that is precisely what the former government intended to do, although of course they would cloak it with other language.

The socialists have no understanding of privacy. The socialists have no understanding what is your is your business, how you think, how you feel, is your business, but all must be

inculcated into the state. I think if we understand what has happened in Sweden, that they have minute information, expansive information, and every citizen in their computer system, so that they can more effectively, they say, help the citizen, but in fact control them, we can understand what the socialists were doing.

I have here a youth, health, and lifestyle female questionnaire. The questionnaire was given children 17 years of . . . That was written . . . This was given to students who were 17 years or younger. It was certainly given to people who were 11 years old, and in it there are 34 questions that a child is expected to answer. They send it out with the health insurance numbers but they did not get a sufficient replies so they sent it through the schools. They were selective how which schools got it and they selective on who got it. Many principals and teachers in their good wisdom did not co-operate with the socialists in having our children on computer, but I would like to . . . This 34 questionnaire talks, goes in detail; are you male or female, when is your birth, where do you live, are your parents foster parents, so on and so on, what is the education level of the parents? and it goes on in 34 pages that anybody, anybody . . . The hon. member from Shaunavon is particularly embarrassed by this question and this is why he will run interference as I explain it, but if the deputy minister would keep the hon. member at least quite enough that we can get this on record so the parents of Saskatchewan know that we know what the NDP were doing to their children it would help greatly.

It goes on for 34 pages that anybody looking at any questionnaire could immediately identify a child with no difficulty at all, but just in case there's still the problem it says, "Tear off the form below, fill it in and seal it in the small white envelope and seal the envelope and take it immediately to the nearest mail box." and then it says, "Please complete the form below so we're able to process your \$5 payment. This form should be sealed in a small white envelope provided and enclosed in the large brown envelope along with your questionnaire." So it has a name, mailing address and so on and so for \$5 a 12-year-old is encouraged to tell all to granny state. He's encouraged to . . . And I would like to give you a few questions of how often do you do any of the following: listen to the radio, read a newspaper or read comic books. This is very important, of course, but we go on, "Have you ever gone steady?" Now the state needs to know that, "How many boys have you gone steady including the first one? Have you ever engaged in light petting?" And in the state who likes to regulate everything has given us a definition of light petting. "Have you engaged in heavy petting?" And I will not read it in the legislature because it would be offensive to the dignity of the House, but I'd like to remind you that this was given to our 12-year-olds in our schools.

It goes on to talk about and would ask children, "How many boys have you had sex with this week?" How many beers have you had before breakfast? But I think what we have to understand that the purpose of a questionnaire is not to find information. The purpose of a questionnaire is also to inculcate a propagandic message, and indeed I would think that most 13-year-olds, if they read this, they would have the idea that their government believes they are deviant if in fact they are not drinking, not being sexually active (which used to be called fornicate) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I can. And I think that we have to understand that things such as this were in fact and it goes on and on giving all kinds of information about you must give information about your parents. But I think we have to . . . it's such a clear, blatant example, how that they were encouraging teenagers to see that the state is your nanny, the state is your parent, and we will protect you from those people called parents who may discourage your lifestyle or make decisions that you may not like. And the questions are often such that it would encourage a child to not respect their parents or to believe in the parental values.

I think that we have to understand that when the NDP are running their little games about liquor advertising and parading with moral righteousness because they did not allow liquor advertising, etc., etc. — unless of course it was a Shaunavon NDP picnic, where they had a beer garden advertised along with the free ice cream for the children — I think it's about time to understand really what was the NDP up to, and why were they up to it? Things in the NDP did not just

happen, they did not just grow like Topsy, but they were a planned, definite view to replace the family, to replace religion, to replace the independent school board with an all-oppressive, all-pervasive state.

There are those who say, what has happened? How does this relate to the throne speech? I think first of all it relates to the throne speech for the simple reason the throne speech was made by our government, led by Premier Grant Devine, and that government is in there not just because of their economic policies, not just because they were breaking businesses and driving people, not just because they lied all the time. They were there because people were beginning to understand that the very basic institution, the family, has been attacked and eroded consciously, deliberately, by the NDP . . . (inaudible) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. CASWELL: — I think that we have to understand that while we are talking about how terrible the NDP has, we also understand and we also know that we have a goal and we have a vision. We just don't see the negative of the NDP, but we are looking towards a future, and this future includes people in Saskatchewan who are law-abiding can live without fear, can live in families who are cohesive, who can maintain their culture and religious heritage without harassment, either deliberately, subversively, or otherwise, from the state.

We are looking towards a goal where people can run their own lives, can solve their own problems and that they can engage in voluntary co-operation in church and community without undue harassment or over-regulation.

We are looking towards a province where people have the right to advance, not just the right to be equally poor or to be equally oppressed, but the right to advance; and the right to have welfare when you need it, but the right to have a job, and the right to have a job by an employer who can afford to pay you; and the right to advance according to effort and ability; and the right to become a businessman without the government driving you out of business before you start.

We also believe the businessman should have the right to create more jobs, more services, more spin-off industries. The person has a right to do that because they have earned that right to create jobs because they are providing a service in Saskatchewan, and it is not the government business to them they are evil people because they make profits and because they provide jobs. But it is up to the government to say, "Let me see how I can help you and not interfere with what you are doing because you are providing a service to people and that service is you are providing jobs." Profit is not a dirty word; profit is the success note of somebody who is working hard enough to create a job for somebody else.

I believe we are creating a province where people will see their taxes will be spent properly in ways that help everyone, in ways which are not padding for special interest groups and the groups that fit the socialist agenda. We will have a government that does not encourage change agents to traditional values.

Mr. Speaker, I have travelled throughout the province, and I must admit that it is really an interesting experience speaking in this House because, although occasionally I meet people who do not always agree with me, the absolute ignorance, or I mean not ignorance, but let's say the absolute bothersome, irksome of the opposition is unsurmountable anywhere in Saskatchewan.

We have a right to have a government that understands the limitations of government, that believes in the individual's ability and right to solve his or her own problems and to create their own opportunities. We want to have a province that protects victims of crime, and a province that concentrates on opportunity, on potential, on successes, and on ability. And we want to have a government and a province that helps people because they need help. We do not want to have a government that helps people because they see we can control them eventually.

I've committed myself to these goals of creating a Conservative opportunity society which is good for the ordinary citizen such as myself. I've committed to these goals because I believe that people care. I believe that people understand unless we protect the family we can't have a free economy, we can't have prosperity, and we will only have slavery and statism. And, although I'm sure that soon the eight members will have to find their own opportunities in our creative Conservative opportunity society. I want to be made very sure that people have that opportunity to create a society where they run their lives and not the government.

Thank you very much for listening to me, fellow colleagues. I know that I have irked the members opposite, but that is unfortunate. And I think it is a wonderful opportunity they have to be in opposition for three years so they can at last listen and understand what they did wrong. And I really hope that they appreciate what a privilege it is for them to sit here and have to listen to me because . . .and they don't like my speeches because of course they know I'm absolutely correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. FOLK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Hon. Len Simms.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. FOLK: — Mr. Simms is a fine, outstanding, clean-living gentleman from Newfoundland who is here to join us for a meeting later on today, and we look forward to visiting with him. I would ask all members of the Assembly to please join with me in welcoming him here to Saskatchewan. Thank you very much.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, before I go into the speech that I was going to give in the House, let me also welcome Mr. Simms, who I've had the opportunity of knowing through our parliamentary association and have spent a week or so with him enjoying Quebec City and that area. As the minister has said, he's a very involved politician.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about the throne speech, but I'd also like to talk about the Leader of the Opposition's rebuttal to the throne speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Which leader — the new or the old?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, there are a whole group of them aiming for leadership, but I'm not sure which one's going to get it. I would hope that the member who is leaving would wait around for one more minute . . .(inaudible interjection) . . .Well, let's talk about double standards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Let's talk about double standards. During the NDP government, was a deputy minister's daughter assigned a government car? What's the answer. The answer is yes.

Not a government employee, but a deputy minister's daughter had a car. Now what department would that be in?

AN HON. MEMBER: — That would be a luxury car.

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, it was a little sports car, a little sports car. Now let's talk about these double standards. You know, we've heard talk about double standards and our cabinet minister and cars. Well, the same rules applied for us as you. They haven't changed, except we don't give deputy ministers' daughters cars. You did.

Let's talk about double standards. Let's talk about the standard where you stood in this House when you were on this side of the House, and talked about how great you were for labour. No, you weren't there. Today you're saying, "Labour go on out and strike; do without your wages." Why? Because you want to be government. Not because it's best for them. Double standards, that's what you've got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Let's talk about some more double standards. I had the opportunity of going into every cabinet minister's office of the former government when you lost office. What was left behind other than the odd pencil, the odd paper clip? Nothing. I understand you even sent telephone books to the archives. I mean, you're paranoid.

Now let's go a little further. Now let's talk about other things. I understand that many months after we took government we had to find a machine that belonged to the government in a former minister's home. He didn't tell us about it. I wonder who that could have been. I wonder. I think he actually spoke today in this House, too. Ask him about it.

Now let's talk about double standards. You guys invented double standards. Let's talk about appointments to boards and commissions. Let's talk about Sedco grants. Let's talk about a former MLA of the NDP persuasion who . . . They didn't go back on his guarantees. It was shown in Sedco. They didn't ask him to fulfil his guarantee, but they went after other . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's the same place. But they go after other members. It's interesting to note. Double standards — you guys invented them so don't stand up and talk about them.

You know, talking about that double standard, I've got to go to a newspaper clip. Let's go to something — Public Forum. I believe it comes out of the PA paper, and the writer is Bob Long.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who?

MR. KATZMAN: — Does anybody remember long Bob? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He might be in the leadership race.

Let's talk about that member. And he wrote a letter complaining that the government gave some contracts to an Alberta firm. Terrible. But let's take a look at what he did. He did the same thing and he was the minister. What's he got, two sets of rules? One, I can do anything, but you can't do nothing. That's the way you're going. Let's talk about it.

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — From 1978 to 1982 your government bought \$48 million from the company. But you said we shouldn't do it, even though they were the lowest tender. We shouldn't do it, but you could do it. That's the set of rules.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Double standards.

MR. KATZMAN: — Double standards. Well, there's a word I would love to use that was just said, but I understand by the rule books you can't use that word so I won't.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Try hypocrisy. It's close.

MR. KATZMAN: — It's close. Fortunately it's close.

You know, the former premier quoted a newspaper the *Star-Phoenix* today about the beer ads. Take a look. Where did beer ads start in Saskatchewan? Did they start in the last six months, a year, two years, three years? When did they start? They started under the NDP regime in Saskatchewan, no other one. You had the ability to stop them. No, you didn't do it. You talked about it, and you made all kinds of threats, but you never did it. You talked, guys; you never delivered.

And anybody that got the cable television in this province got beer ads and have been getting them for a long time. So don't give us this hypocritical statement. You know you're more . . . (inaudible) . . . Then the worst part of the whole thing is the fellow leading the campaign against it. Well we won't take personalities into this discussion. We won't talk about you financed the place through Sedco and joint partnership that makes malt for beer. We won't talk about that. we won't talk about, we won't talk about that you guys could have stopped the beer ads if you really believed in it. Because you could have, but you didn't have the guts, and the only people that were being harmed with the Saskatchewan-owned and operated stations. Those you were leaving out, but your Yankee buddies were making money.

Now going back to your buddies, let's talk about the donations from the liquor companies to the NDP. Now we've talked about those in the House before — Seagrams, and all those other companies — and its a long list. And I can see why there's only two members left because they're shameful, and they know that they got their money there. But they don't want to tell anybody. They didn't want to pretend they're holier than thou. Well, why don't you come clean and admit it for once?

You know, we had a former member in here that used to talk about the Regina Manifesto. You want to control the land; you want to control the media; you want to control this; you want to control that. But, gentlemen, the people of Saskatchewan last April learned about your ways and said, "No more." The member that spoke before me said, "Soon there will be none." I hope that Saskatchewan will have that privilege soon. But before that privilege we're going to get rid of you provincially on the federal scene, because Saskatchewan cannot afford the luxury of NDP members in Ottawa because they always double-cross Saskatchewan people. And when you defeated the Clark government you showed you weren't interested in anything but your Liberal buddies getting back to office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!.

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, it's interesting that the former leader talked about the intercontinental Packers arrangement. What he didn't tell anybody in this House was that you overpaid for it, and your files show it. And the fellow that was involved, Mr. . . . I believe, Mr. McArthur, became a cabinet minister later, even indicated that in his reports. So, two standards: don't you guys sell it, because you didn't get market value. We did get market value. You guys paid through the nose for it. That was the problem.

You know, I heard you complaining about water supply — the water supply board, I heard some comments made about, and the proposal of a new water crown. It's possible, gentlemen, when the minister stands and explains it all to you — and I know that's going to be difficult to explain anything to you gentlemen because you're getting a little thicker between the two outer points which are called ears — but if you listen carefully you may see that it'll be good for the province.

Earlier in the comments made, the former premier and soon to be former member of this House made references about the labour relations board chairman. The minister responsible replied that the average per diem cost for the former member or chairman was over \$600 per day. Certainly he was a part-timer; I don't dispute that. The present chairman is a full-timer and his average salary, if you take it and divide it by the amount of working days in a year, is slightly under \$400. That is a saving to the province. But the most important saving for the province, as the minister said earlier, is the days of loss because of strikes are going down. That's the key issue. And, you know, the member from Shaunavon was quoted on radio in Saskatoon, and I don't have the exact words, but if we were to pay the new chairman at the rate we paid the old chairman and made him full-time, it would be a \$200,000 job. That's what he was quoted as saying on radio in Saskatoon. In that case we got him for 95. We stole him. You should be applauding the minister, not giving him a bad time about it.

You know the former leader indicates that this speech is a rehash of what's happened before. Well, I've sat in this House for a few years, and I don't know. There was many a speech delivered by the former government that seemed like a rehash in the second and third and fourth year. But what about the accomplishments and what the promises prior to an election? The member stood on his feet and said, "What about the telephones?" Well, to my knowledge nobody put a date on that promise.

Let's just take something else. Did we or didn't we talk about something? Let's talk about Bill 1, Bill 2, 1975 fall session of the House. Did you ever tell the electorate prior to that election that you going to nationalize that industry? You never told them. So don't get double standards again and say, "Well, you didn't tell them. We always told them." Bull ding-a-ling. You never told them about the potash industry takeover. And so don't ever say, "You didn't tell us about that," because you invented the double standard, because that was our first session in the House. And boys, I'll tell you something, before we came here we read the rule book. You know, after two days in this House we knew the rule book meant nothing, because you guys didn't follow the rules. You ignored them. You did as you pleased, how you pleased, and when you pleased and you used your majority.

Mr. Blakeney spoke about a referendum on the Crow. Let's talk about referendum. I remember my constituency when we had a problem called MVA. You know, it's still around. It's still around but when the RM had a vote — do the people want in or do the people want out of it? — what did the minister in charge and the former deputy premier say? "They were a bunch of radicals." Why? Because they didn't want to do what he wanted them to do. Therefore, they're radicals. They're not worth listening to. But he finally did listen, and he listened even better on April 26 when Jo-Ann Zazalenchuk replaced him in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where's Roy?

MR. KATZMAN: — Somebody says, "Where's Roy?" I'm not sure, but I know where Jack Messer is. He was over in China with that David Dombowsky fellow working against Saskatchewan. That's where he was. He's also in Saskatoon, if I remember correct, at several dollars a day on the Liberal committee, better known as the MacDonald. I think that's his leadership bandwagon for him. I don't know where Mr. Lingenfelter and his ice-cream and beer is coming from, but I assume he's going for leadership, too. You know, double standards.

I'd like to quote from a distinguished member of this House who happens to be our Premier. "We've made several promises and we've accomplished them. We said we'd open the books; we've done it." You know, go before PURC and listen. For the first time, I don't hear — "it's not in the public interest," to tell us where their costs are. They now have to answer.

He said we'd freeze utility rates for one year. We did. He said we'd establish PURC and we did,

and now because of PURC we must prove that the increase was necessary.

Now let's talk about those increases for a minute. In the cost operation of any crown corporation is the cost of the borrowed money, and over the years you gentlemen, when you were government, loved to borrow money from everywhere you could. The cost of paying that money is a cost that is calculated in the cost of running those corporations. Rather than putting the money into the government treasury as you did, robbing the heritage fund as you did, therefore, the rates could have remained the same. No, you put borrowing and borrowing and borrowing, and now to justify the payments the rates must go up.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, we had to build that bathtub.

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, the member behind me reminds me of that fancy bathtub in Saskatoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The bathtub's nothing. Have you seen the office?.

MR. KATZMAN: — The member asks me if I've seen the office in Saskatoon. I'd love to tell the member about my little trip with the *Star Phoenix* to the office in Saskatoon just prior to an election. Well, I went up there and I noticed they were very busy putting wallpaper on what I was told was beautiful, fancy wood. The evening before I had a man crying on the telephone, a European craftsman. He said, "I worked hard. I spent hours making sure that I did it right. It was the first time I got to work with beautiful wood again. And do you know what they did? They covered it up with wallpaper because they're scared the opposition might find out about it.

Two bathrooms, one shower, one bathtub, but only two employees. I was a little concerned about that, but we'll leave that one alone.

The Premier said we'd provide help on the mortgages. Where were the NDP on the mortgages? In this House, when they were still government, they brought in their mortgage protection act. It was a bunch of rhetoric and words. They didn't put a buck where their mouth was — just talk, talk, talk. We came in, we put a buck where our mouth was, and it helped people save their homes. Little guys, bug guys — they're all people of Saskatchewan, and they all help save their homes.

We set up the farm purchase plan. Let's talk about that one. You say you don't like it. You know the reason you don't like it is you can't politically play games with it. It's straight up and it's honest, and the fellow that wants it gets it. If he's rented the land he has the . . . Even your NDP buddies that were able to lease those land bank lands get an opportunity to buy them. We're not saying because you're red you can't have it. Because they were blue you wouldn't give it to them before, but not now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!.

MR. KATZMAN: — You know natural gas lines. Now I remember the former deputy minister of Sask Power, whatever he was with Sask Power, said that we couldn't do it. It was an outrageous plan, but it's going in. Two miles from my home I see natural gas lines being plowed in all over the area, and the people are glad for it and they are happy for it. But they say, "Ralph, you remember years ago when they brought the electricity it didn't look like it was the right thing to do, but it proved to be the right thing to do and natural gas will once again prove to be the right thing at the right time." You said we couldn't do it. We're doing it because we said we would.

We've lowered tax on oil and gas revenue. You say we gave a fat present to some big friends. Hey, guys, look at the book. We're making more money because of the way we did it. That's what it's all about — dollars for the treasury to help the people of Saskatchewan.

We said we'd help make health care number one. Well, the Minister of Health is now saying

we're spending over \$1,000 per person in Saskatchewan on health care. Never before has that happened in this province. We've increased homes for seniors. Once again, the Minister of Health announced a major home in Saskatoon into Dwayne Weiman's constituency.

We will bring charge; we would change the Saskatchewan image. Instead of being an image where government controls and wants to control everything we've said our hand is open, our hand is open to bring you and greet you as you bring your wealth to our province which will give jobs to our citizens, not to see them go out of Saskatchewan with our wealth but to come back and to cause jobs here, and that's what they're doing.

And on that point I went to Mexabition the other day in Saskatoon and ran into a young lady from the Minister of Highway's constituency who has left her teaching profession and started a small business of her own, a business of making blankets and suitcases and garment bags. Private enterprise — as she said, she couldn't do it before but she's giving it a try now because of our new program for employment.

We talked about profit earlier, the member from Westmount. Profit isn't a dirty word, fellas. It makes the economy spin, and the more profit they make the more tax we get the more we can help those who aren't able to help themselves.

We said we'd help with building schools. Well, you know if I could ever get the member from Shaunavon's attention I might inform him about all the schools aha are now being built. I've had more schools built or started to be built in my constituency than any other constituency in the province. That must mean that we have some growth, and we have schools building there, and it's four of them. Oh now, I won't touch that one, Mr. Minister of Agriculture.

We said we would improve relations with our neighbours, the United States. We're not the guys that burnt the United States Flag. It was the NDP and NDP cabinet ministers that were involved in that. And that's no way to make friends and help us out.

We said we would reduce and gradually eliminate the sales tax. Just for the members, again I will repeat: we said we would gradually reduce and eliminate the sales tax. You heard that. Now you people were government. You talked about the clothing. We did it. We done it on irrigation pumps, electricity, so forth and other areas. But we're doing it gradually, progressively, and conservatively, so to make sure the budge of this province isn't drastically affected.

You know, we talked about improving labour relations with workers and making the rights of workers fair and just. Well, I'm afraid I could spend an hour on this topic alone. But I know that the clock won't allow that. But I'll give you a couple of more minutes of that before I ask leave to adjourn debate so that I can continue tomorrow.

Let's talk about labour. Let's talk about 1970, Davidson Hotel, second floor, the little clandestine meeting that said every member of every union's got to give 10 cents every pay-cheque to the NDP. I hate to admit that I happened to be at . . . Just for the members' benefit, just so that you all know it's true, I was there. I happened to represent my union that time. We were again it, but we lost out. And so we paid. And it's now up to a quarter, and it may be higher because I haven't checked it out. That goes in . . . Just for anybody that wants to check how it works, this is the way it works. you pay your dues each month, and in your dues there's a portion for Saskatchewan Federation of Labour — Nadine Hunt and crowd. And in that portion they gave a little bit, which is the 15 or 25 cents to the defence fund, because that's what it's called — the defence fund — which is actually the NDP. You know, they've used the labour movement for everything they possibly could. But the rank and file have said when they saw Bill 104, we like that because no more do the radical union bosses control us. We have the right to control our unions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, the former assistant to the minister of labour, Larry Brown, who is now with the unions, we all know where his loyalty is. In fact if I would suggest that he would even like to go farther than the NDP would ever considered going, and would be closer to, as Gay says, fascism and communism than he would be to NDPism. But that's his personal views and that's up to him.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just noticed the time of the day, and I do have a considerable more I would like to add. I have only gone through about 19 of the accomplishments that we have had since we are government — a little over half way — and I could certainly add more. So rather than stop the clock and go for several more hours, I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:58 p.m.