

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

November 22, 1983

EVENING SESSION

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

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

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Nice to see that you ladies and gentlemen have seen the error of your ways of your ways on the Collver issue, and that you are prepared to amend past sins.

I want to turn to a related subject — what I consider to be a distressing tendency of this government with respect to legal actions in general — and that is the settling and the compromising of disputes involving public assets by agreements which are secret, for reasons which are not explained to the public, whose assets, after all, are being dealt with.

It's our view that when there is a legal action involving public assets, which is settled behind closed doors, the greatest care should be taken to make it crystal clear to the public that the settlement was 100 per cent above-board. If for any specific reason the matter is open to question in the public mind, a second legal opinion should be obtained from as impartial a person as can be found, and both opinions should be made public.

The government has adopted a very different course of action. In cases where questions might arise in the minds of the public, they've made a practice of dark-of-night settlements, with no details disclosed.

I would ask the members to consider the opposite. In the nature of its operations, the government must pursue ordinary citizens and make them pay what is owing to the government. The government must resist unreasonable claims by citizens under SGI insurance policies. Members of the public understand and respect this, and accept it even when they themselves are involved, providing, but only provided, that they believe that everyone else is being treated in the same way. They must believe that justice is being done evenly and fairly, and they must see some evidence of this in cases where questions might reasonable arise.

I turn to the Dick Collver case. In the ordinary course . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Ah, surprise, surprise! In the ordinary course of business, Mr. Collver, who was the owner of a construction company, secured a performance bond from SGI. He could have purchased . . . (inaudible interruptions) . . . Yes, indeed. Show some courtesy to the member from Turtleford. In the course of business, Mr. Collver, who was the owner of a construction firm, secured a performance bond from SGI. He could have purchased the bond from any company he chose, but he chose SGI. Again, in accordance with perfectly normal practice, he gave a guarantee to SGI, guaranteeing the performance of his company. Buildall.

Buildall failed the performance contract. SGI, in the normal course of its business as a bonding company, paid out money to complete the contract and again, in the normal way, claimed its right to be paid back by Buildall, which was defunct, and by its guarantor, Dick Collver, who was not.

In the meantime, Collver had become a member of the legislature. Because of Mr. Collver's position, SGI decided in the course of its claim to engage Mr. Si Halyk, a lawyer of unquestioned reputation and integrity. He had no, I repeat, no connection with the NDP. Halyk was proceeding with the case in the ordinary way when the 1982 election took place. The PC government proceeded with the case in the ordinary way when the 1982 election took place. The PC government removed Mr. Halyk from the case. No reason was given, and no credible reasons can be given.

Another lawyer was appointed; a lawyer of very much less experience and stature than Mr. Halyk; a lawyer who was associated with the Progressive Conservative Party.

There then followed a decision by SGI to drop its claim, a claim of over \$1 million, against Mr. Collver. No credible reasons have been given; no credible reasons can be given. No legal opinions have been made public, and I suggest no legal opinions can be made public. So far as the public are aware, no second opinion has been obtained from Mr. Halyk or from any other independent lawyer. Until more facts are known, it is certain many of the public will suspect that Collver received special consideration because he was a former leader of the Conservative Party, no doubt had many friends waiting within the Conservative Party, and that while the ordinary citizen has to pay his bills owed to this government, Dick Collver does not. That is not in the best interest of the administration of justice.

Or consider the claim with respect to Island Falls power plant owned by the Churchill River Power acquired by SPC. Under a contract that said that when the water rights reverted to the Government of Saskatchewan after 50 years, the government should pay the value of the power plant, the government, acting through SPC, offered \$42 million. Churchill River Power, claimed \$100 million. In a settlement, for reasons that have not been made public, SPC, under the chairmanship of the Minister of Labour, agreed to pay an extra \$14.8 million over their offer — an extra 14.8 million.

Now, who is the Churchill River Power Company? The company is the power subsidiary of Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company. And who is Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company? Hudson's Bay Mining is the company which made a contribution in 1982 to the Saskatchewan Progressive Conservative Party of \$5,000. And again, no details have been made public. If there is nothing to hide when all these grounds for public concern are made known to the public, it's strange indeed that the government makes no effort to remove any suspicion of any impropriety.

Or take Coronach. Take the legal action by SPC arising out of the construction of the Coronach power plant. By a report dated March 10, 1983, we were told SPC was claiming more than \$20 million against the construction companies, including Swan Rooster Engineering. We heard no more of this thing. My guess is that the claim has, or will be settled, again behind closed doors. Again, it appears . . . (inaudible) . . . Again, without an independent legal opinion being published.

And who, asked the member from Saskatoon Centre, is Swan Rooster? Swan Rooster is the company that in 1982 made a contribution to the PC Party of Canada of \$4,500. Under these circumstances . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . \$4,500. Under these circumstances it is the duty of the government to remove any suspicion of favouritism, to come clean in all of these cases, and to make an independent public opinion from people whose impartiality is unquestioned.

The fact that the government has acted to cover up facts, rather than to make facts known, does nothing, absolutely nothing to dispel the suspicions which these facts could rise to. That's a sorry performance. It's particularly unfortunate because it touches on the impartial administration of justice.

Nowhere, I think, is the do-nothing nature of this government more apparent, and more tragic, than with respect to water for the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. The government has been successful in avoiding this problem ever since it took office. It now appears that they have run out of fresh excuses for their inaction for they seem to be recycling old excuses.

A year ago a water corporation was announced as something that was going to revolutionise the quantity and quality of water for the Regina-Moose Jaw area.

Members of this side of the House enquired, quite naturally, how such a body might improve upon, or add, or differ from the Saskatchewan Water Board, which has been in existence for

many years . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . going to be a crown corporation.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, the Saskatchewan Water Board is a crown corporation . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Nothing that one could grace with the dignity of an answer was ever forthcoming.

Now in this speech, we have the same pointless promise repeated as if it had not been the subject of sufficient scorn before. The throne speech contains no statement as to how we're going to tackle the problem, or if we're to have a pipeline, or if we're to have a filtration plant. Nothing of these fundamental considerations found their way into the throne speech. That points out the nature of our objections to the continual reference to a crown corporation to deal with water. It's not the solution to the problem; it's merely a vehicle.

The public are not so much interested in how you're going to solve the problem, but what you're going to do to solve the problem. And we stand accused of approaching the problem in a very confused fashion. It makes no sense to enunciate the means by which you're going to solve it until you've decided what you're going to solve.

No doubt you feel it's in your best interest to keep the public confused. you no doubt feel that in this area, as in so many others, your incompetence will be forgiven if you continue to talk about the problem and not do anything about it.

I say again, you will be judged, not for your words, but for what you've done. And you've done nothing, and you show every sign of blessing that approach with permanent tenure.

Really, Mr. Speaker, it's a great tragedy. Regina and Moose Jaw need better water, and it's even more apparent that we need the jobs. It's a time when our economy is at slack capacity. Why hasn't this government acted? We have the right to some intelligible answers. The public have not received any.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent from the throne speech that this is a government which has run out of steam — run out of steam after 18 months. And, Mr. Speaker, I predict this will be pretty much of a do-nothing government for the balance of its terms. Now, obviously by the smug smiles of the members opposite, they believe that that's all it's going to take, all it's going to take — just to sit quiet, bask in your own self-appraise.

I suggest to the members opposite that polls are not the be-all and the end-all of a government in office. Members opposite might take some advice from members of the former government who relied on polls which collapsed. Your polls can collapse. I'll tell you what the beginning of the collapse is: it is arrogance. And I see it written all over the faces of members opposite. Members opposite believe with 55 members they are impregnable. I say they are not. I say they are not . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, with yourself there is 56 but not with yourself entering the debate. I would not accuse the Speaker of arrogance as I was accusing you people of arrogance, so I think I will return to 55 members if that's all right. I say to members opposite that you are going to pay for your arrogance. You are certainly not going to have me voting for it, and I will therefore, Mr. Speaker, be opposing the motion presently before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me as the member for Saskatoon Centre to get up and speak on the throne speech in this session.

I'd like to start out by saying I don't have a hard act to follow. Even the colleagues of the member

from Regina Centre didn't think I had a hard act to follow, because there was only one of them there at the time he came to the conclusion of his speech.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine document, as read by our new Lieutenant Governor a couple of days ago. It has many positive plans for Saskatchewan. Some of them are: commitment to job creation using existing federal and provincial programs; a feeder association guarantee act to enable farmers to receive government loan guarantees on feeder cattle; a farm products research promotion and market development act to provide a fund for research and promotion of farm products; royalty tax changes to encourage enhanced oil recovery; a department of science and technology headed by my good friend and colleague, Mr. Currie; a women's secretariat; and a water corporation act to provide a vehicle for supplying communities with water.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives are a government of this province for several reasons. The most obvious was that the NDP philosophy beat themselves. That was clear. The NDP land bank policy was contrary to what our freedom-loving farmers believe in. The state owns the land in the U.S.S.R. and in Communist China. Our farmers have said most clearly that they don't want that system here.

The NDP has a policy of ever increasing taxes because they had to bankroll their family of crown corporations. And they increased the gasoline tax, oil taxes, and business taxes along the way.

They were hatching a nefarious plot, Mr. Speaker, to nationalize much of the province's industry. Blakeney was sitting on the nest like a vulture about to incubate the eggs when on April 26, 1982 the people of Saskatchewan hard-boiled his plot. Some egg. Some omelette.

In 10 years the NDP added 10,000 to the bureaucracy, yet population growth was static at that time. Mr. Speaker, if we do some elementary arithmetic, 10,000 in the bureaucracy over 10 years adds up to well over \$1 billion in salaries — \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker. Well over \$1 billion taken out of the pockets of Saskatchewan taxpayers. It adds up to the failure of socialism and points out NDP mismanagement.

Mr. Speaker, in 11 years of socialism, young people flocked out of this province to find work and explore business opportunities which they couldn't find here. Now they are coming home. Others from other provinces are coming here also. Our population is growing rapidly, and we'll soon hit the 1 million mark. People are moving into Saskatchewan because they know that people come first, not government. The NDP had it all wrong. You had government first, you had bureaucracy next, and personal initiative was dying when a fresh new wind blew into the province in April of 1982. We found that we faced a big task when we moved into these Legislative Buildings in May of 1982. The NDP had misled the people. The heritage fund was a joke. The NDP had squandered all that resource wealth on propping up mismanaged crown corporations. SGI had a \$50 million loss. The power corporation was in deep financial trouble. The bureaucracy was bloated, and productivity was low.

The NDP cooked up a \$400 million illusion. They told us there would be a \$200 million surplus when, in reality, it was a \$200 million overestimate of revenues. A \$400 million con job, that's what it was. The NDP are hypocrites.

They are moving more and more towards radicalism. Their leader is now promoting strikes and militancy. He's not here this evening; he must be out drumming up more strikes, more militancy. Where is the statesman that we used to know? He's turned into a radical. A leader should be promoting productivity and job creation, not strikes and militancy. The NDP leadership is lack-lustre. The party is dying on Devine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — The NDP is at an all time low on the polls, and my prediction is that Broadbent's bums will be clobbered when the Hon. Brian Mulroney forms a few federal government next year.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Blakeney-Hunt union has failed. The consummation hasn't produced any fruit. Folks in Saskatchewan said so in April of 1982. The union has failed, and the socialist dinghy is sinking into the mire.

On another topic, Mr. Speaker. While I'm not a farmer, my heart is with the soil in this province. I do grow a bit of hay on a small acreage near Saskatoon, but I'm not directly affected by the fall of the Crow rate. But, of course, all Saskatchewanians will be affected, as the farmer and the health of the agricultural industry reflects on the well-being of everyone here.

Pierre Trudeau and his myopic mandarins pushed Bill C155 through the House of Commons a few days ago, and our farmers will feel the first bite on January 1, 1984, when freight rates increase an average of two and a half cents a bushel. And I agree, Mr. Speaker, with Ted Turner, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, when he says the federal government has created a monstrous situation. Turner adds, "The fight's not over yet and the federal government must now accept increasing responsibility for the health of prairie agriculture."

This government's position hasn't changed. We stated our position and we reaffirm it now. We tell Ottawa, number one, that there must be a statutory rate written into law for grain freight shipments. Our farmers must not be left at the mercy of the monopoly powers of the railways, or inflation. Freight rates must take into account the fluctuating nature of world grain prices and rates, and must be tied to the price of grain. The federal Liberals have foisted this monstrous situation on our farmers as though they were governing in a dream world. In fact, on November 14, Liberal Senator and Speaker Jean Marchand dozed off during debate in the Senate and had to be wakened at 9:45 p.m. to adjourn debate. That's how interested the Liberals are in the welfare of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, a few brief comments now in the field of health care. Our government remains firmly committed to making Saskatchewan's health care system the best in Canada, and we continue to oppose health care premiums and hospital user fees in the province. The Minister of Health, Graham Taylor, has taken initiatives in cancer programs, ambulance services, and a foot care program focusing on seniors.

By the end of year 2 of this government, we will have spent nearly \$11 million on the construction and renovation of special care homes — a very substantial increase over the total for the previous administration. Mr. Speaker, in our budget we held government spending below 7 per cent. Yet, by internally reallocating our financial resources, we were able to increase health care expenditures by over 11 per cent.

Improving health care is a tremendous challenge for our government. The expenditures are huge — \$1 billion, or about \$1,000 for every man, woman, and child in this province. Every citizen of this province has to do his part or her part to control expenditures. For example, there's a continued and fairly dramatic increase in the utilization of health services by the public. In 1971, the average Saskatchewan resident was treated by a physician six times during the year — in 1971, six times during the year. By 1982, the average number of visits had increased to 10 — from six to 10 in a span of 11 years. Utilization of doctors' services has increased by 60 per cent over this period, with virtually no increase in population or the basic health of the individual here.

Universal health care is basic, but it's not a free ride. It must be paid for through taxation, but the public purse is not bottomless. Mr. Speaker, I have great confidence in health minister Graham Taylor. I know that he and the good people of this province can, and will, make our health care system number one in the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — I could speak all day on positive things that have happened in the last 18 months here in this province, Mr. Speaker. The removal of the gas tax, the single highest tax cut in the history of the province. Gas is more than \$1 cheaper here than it is in Quebec. The mortgage interest reduction plan allowed many young people to get into home ownership despite high interest rates. The Build-A-Home grants of \$3,000 spurred construction and, therefore, jobs in the province. The farm purchase program has helped more than 600 farmers to buy land so far — 631 was the last figure I saw, Mr. Speaker. Three thousand and six hundred, and more, jobs have been created through the small business employment program. And a \$600 million oil upgrader attached to the Consumer's Co-operative Refinery, a project which brings Federated Co-operatives and the provincial government together in co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, where the NDP failed so miserably in their efforts to get an upgrader, it has taken this government only a few months to promote a joint venture with a dynamic company, Federated Cooperatives Ltd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — But, Mr. Speaker, this government's initiatives to revitalize the oil industry have been particularly gratifying. The oil patch is booming again and people are working. The oil industry in other parts of Canada is faltering, but it's booming here because of our industry recovery program introduced in July, 1982. Production, drilling, and land sales have all increased dramatically since the recovery program was put in place.

Under the NDP the oil industry in this province languished. High royalties and taxes and burdensome regulations effectively stifled investments. Many companies never bothered to consider this province at all. Now a total of 1,537 wells have been drilled so far this year. It's a record for the province. Land sales revenues have been consistently high. In March there were 15.3 million; in June, 15.2 million; and in September, a record 28.9 million. This turn-round in the industry can be directly attributed to our program. Drilling activity is conservatively estimated to be double that which could have been expected without the royalty tax holidays.

Land sale revenues have tripled. Money is being invested here that would have gone elsewhere under the NDP regime. Companies — small, medium, and large — are crediting our program with bringing them to the province. Five hundred and more direct jobs have been created this year in the oil patch, not including jobs created in the supply and service sector. Approximately \$400 million to \$500 million will be invested in exploration and developments in 1983 — double what it would have been without royalty tax holidays.

So, Mr. Speaker, all this proves our Premier's point that the country is in a recession, but Saskatchewan decided not to participate. In fact the Conference Board of Canada in the October summary says, and I quote:

Saskatchewan is forecast to exceed the national growth rate again in 1983 and '84. The comparative provincial strength in these years, unlike 1982, rests on superior performance of certain industrial sectors in the province, and not merely on its mix of industries.

Demand for heavy oil has improved dramatically in 1983 and is forecast to remain strong next year.

Potash production is also forecast to recover from the depressed levels observed earlier this year.

Construction industry gains in 1983 have been impressive, particularly against the

background of a flat national performance. This pattern of construction activity, more robust than the national rate, is predicted for Saskatchewan once more in 1984.

That's from the Conference Board of Canada, which the NDP puts big stock in.

From the Alberta report I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Premier Devine's royalty holiday — Saskatchewan triggers a drilling boom.

From 1975 until December 1982, Saskatchewan's Heritage Fund awarded grants of up to 75 per cent of total costs of drilling all oil and gas wells. The results were generally dismal. The government paid from 40 million to 60 million annually to companies which had drilled holes, over 30 per cent of them dry.

In the summer of '82 the Conservative government of Grant Devine introduced a new program in which wells are exempt from provincial royalties during the first to the fifth year of production. Drilling companies have responded enthusiastically. By the end of September, 1,182 oil and gas wells had been sunk.

And I gave the current figures just a while back. That's a lowing report from the *Albert Business* magazine.

Another glowing report from *Oilweek*, the October '83 edition. The note pad of Alex Rankin said if ever there was an oil province that could boast a 180 degrees turnaround, both in the fiscal and philosophical realm, Saskatchewan has to be the example. And so on.

On another topic, Mr. Speaker, I have to take this opportunity to speak my mind on alcoholic beverage advertising in this province. It's one that I've spoken my mind on before. I'd like to do it again, and a few pointers.

The hypocrisy of the NDP on this matter enrages me. During their 11-year regime, they allowed liquor advertising to pour into the province through magazines and cable television. They had the power to stop it. Why didn't they? They have a double standard, Mr. Speaker. When in power, they didn't have the intestinal fortitude to make a decision either way. Now that they are in the opposition they've found it much easier to take a position.

I've taken the liberty to bring along tonight a couple of magazines — magazines that have been coming into this province for years. One particularly, the *Reader's Digest*, a fine little publication which speaks of drama in real life, positive thinking, love, and all those good things. It's been coming into this province for as long as I can remember. I was paging through it today, and if you'll believe it, Mr. Speaker, 11 liquor ads. There's one for good Alberta premium. There's another one for rum. There's another one for Irish cream. and so on.

Twelve liquor ads in this one little magazine. The NDP had the power in the last 11 years to say no more liquor advertising in the province of Saskatchewan through the print media. They didn't. Why didn't they? Because they're hypocrites. That's why.

Another magazine, *Maclean's*, has been coming into this province for as long as I can remember. I thumbed through this magazine today, and it has some four or five liquor ads on it. Right on the first page. Pardon me, the second page. A good ad for another rye drink. This stuff has been coming in here since as long as I can remember. Mr. Blakeney and company, if it hadn't been for their hypercritical double standards, could have said, quite easily, no more liquor ads in the *Reader's Digest* or in *Maclean's* magazine.

And then there's that epitome of piousness. He preaches from his pulpit. He was the author of this report in 1973, the final report of the special committee review of liquor regulations in

Saskatchewan. One Mr. Dr. Don Faris B.A., B.D., Ph.D., and so on. NDP Chairman of this committee, Mr. Don Faris.

What were his recommendations? I want you to listen to this, members of the Legislative Assembly. That pious hypocrite, who gets on radio and television and preaches his message, that pious hypocrite said we should have beer and wine in the grocery stores of Saskatchewan. That's what he said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Don Faris, Dr. Don Faris. His recommendation was this: that all independent grocers in the province of Saskatchewan be allowed to sell alcohol content beer and low-alcohol wine from their business premises at lower prices than those charged for regular alcohol content beer and wine. That's one of his recommendations.

Here is another recommendation from Dr. Don Faris, the hypocrite. Special liquor vendors, in his recommendation:

... that there be additional appointments of liquor vendors in the province of Saskatchewan if required, and that the number of appointments be responsible to the liquor board.

Another recommendation by the pious Dr. Don Faris.

And then this one. Those hypocrites over there roasted us because we allowed the people of Regina to have a referendum as to whether or not they wanted to serve beer at Taylor Field at sporting events. Well, here is Dr. Don Faris's recommendations. Pick it up and read it. It was written in 1973. For sports events:

Let the Saskatchewan Liquor Licensing Commission, at its discretion, allow (allow a-l-l-o-w, allow) the sale and consumption of beer at sports events in Saskatchewan.

Pious hypocrites.

Another one that truly amazes me on their stand on liquor advertising — hypocritical. In their family of crown corporations, they decided to finance and build a malt plant in Biggar. Well, what is beer made of?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — You're right. Good stuff.

Another point. Which government was it that lowered the drinking age, the legal age, from 21 to 18? They did.

What government increased the number of outlets in the province of Saskatchewan in 1980? That government did. Licensed outlets in the cities of Saskatchewan and Regina tripled.

Mr. Speaker, liquor advertising, while it is not universally popular in this province, came about because of the reality, because of the facts. In this editorial in the *Saskatchewan Anglican* news letter . . . If I may quote from this article in the *Saskatchewan Anglican* news letter. It says:

What really makes people drink? Do ads have that much power over us? People drink because they choose to drink. No amount of advertising can ever make you drink even one drop.

That from the *Saskatchewan Anglican* news letter.

The real issue is not whether to advertise or not to advertise liquor; the real issue is whether to drink, or not to drink, in the first place. This government has been realistic and responsible in its lifting of the liquor advertising ban. It is up to the individual to be just as realistic and responsible in his or her decisions about the use or non-use of liquor. Surely he can decide, now that Big Brother is not standing over him.

I'd also like to quote from an editorial in the *Leader-Post*, September 1983. The headline says: "The new law in liquor advertising a reasonable compromise." A reasonable compromise; the reality is that Saskatchewan's viewers, listeners, and readers are already exposed to advertising for beer, wine, and spirits. Since the late 1970s, when cable television has become a fact of life in an increasing number of large and smaller centres in the province. American television programs, complete with wine and beer commercials, have been part of the daily information fare. For years, magazines and other publications printed outside the province and carrying liquor ads have circulated unimpeded in Saskatchewan. Why didn't the hypocrites do something about it then when they were in power.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make a few remarks about my area of responsibility, the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. Co-operatives can and are playing a major role in the Saskatchewan economy. An excellent example of the fine work, the vitality, and foresight of the co-operative sector in this province made news in August this past year, when our government announced a joint venture with Federated Co-operatives Ltd. to build a \$600 million oil upgrader attached to the co-op consumers refinery in Saskatchewan — something you weren't able to do, but it took this government only a couple of months to accomplish.

And our credit unions handle almost 50 per cent of all the transactions — the financial transactions. They employ about 3,000 people with the yearly pay-roll of over \$32 million.

And the retail co-ops, with sales over \$700 million, handle about 15 per cent of the market. Thirty-three per cent of the population in this province are members of retail co-operatives. The figures that I just quoted cover just two of the major co-ops in Saskatchewan, namely credit unions and retail co-ops. Of course, co-operatives account for some 600,000 memberships in this province out of a population of a million.

In addition to these are many smaller co-ops that people have formed to build homes, to operate day care centres or play schools, to provide transportation or recreational facilities. They market goods, and in the northern part of the province we have fisheries co-ops and so on. Those smaller groups also contribute to our economy.

As you can see, co-ops are a significant part of our lives. Our government is committed to keeping the co-op sector strong and a vibrant part of this great province.

Mr. Speaker, my department has a high priority to encourage co-operatives to participate in the development of new and additional enterprises in the province and is meeting with co-op leaders on an ongoing basis to achieve this aim. Co-op leaders have indicated to us that they're anxious to become involved in our economic development policies.

Mr. Speaker, the new Co-operatives Act was brought through this House last spring. It was hailed and approved by the co-operative sector as a good and comprehensive piece of legislation. It was proclaimed on October 17, the first day of Co-op Week.

Our next legislative aim, as the Lieutenant Governor outlined in the throne speech is the Credit Union Act. Saskatchewan's credit unions have requested an updating of this act. We have held our first round of meetings. Now my department and the legislative review committee is in the

process of preparing a second discussion paper to be put before credit union members, and we hope to have it completed and through this House in the fall of 1984.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to rise again in this House and speak on the throne debate — to rise from a seat that was occupied by a former leader of this great party in this province, who represented the party very well. When Mr. Pederson was in this House, the NDP occupied that same corner, and I can tell you you're going to be there a lot longer than the distance between '64 and '71.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the mover and the seconder for the fine job they did — the members for Melville and Saskatoon Nutana respectively.

Mr. Speaker, we are debating a Speech from the Throne with emphasis on development as opposed to welfarism. In 1939, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan was the third largest province in this country. It had a population of 906,000 people, to be exact. Forty-four years later, and after 30 years of NDP government, the population of approximately 1 million people has changed but little, and we are now the sixth largest province.

Why, Mr. Speaker, why have we not increased our population? I think the member from Melville explained it very well. The NDP bought holes in the ground, or other existing businesses. They were so bereft of ideas that nothing was ever started or invited to come into this province. Our young people migrated. The land of opportunity was well known for its absence in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, what were the headlines in the *Star-Phoenix* following the throne speech? "Blakeney Uses Spurs: Gets PCs Jumping." Mr. Speaker, perhaps those headlines might have read, "Successful PC Programs Spurs Blackened into Action." And what are these programs, as enunciated in the Speech from the Throne? They are extensions of those that have been in action over the past 18 months. And how does this affect my constituency, the constituency of Mayfair — a fine constituency to represent, I might add — consisting of tradesmen, professionals, seniors, and business men — hard-working people all?

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the small business development program, and its effect on job creation. The Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member from Elphinstone, stated that the program was for big business. Well, let us examine the facts. And I again refer to my constituency. And this just happens to be a small computer print-out. A small computer print-out. And what does that represent? that represents \$1.45 million that went into the Mayfair constituency, to small business, creating 337 jobs with 131 companies participating. That is no small program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there have been 50 new businesses come into my constituency in the last nine months. That is only one constituency, Mr. Speaker — the great constituency, again I will say, of Mayfair.

All small businesses took advantage of the program, and succeeded PC programs for progress. And I think we've got to get that slogan going. For jobs. Keeping our young people at home. Other provinces across this country drew at our expense in years gone by. The pendulum is swinging. They're coming back. It is our turn and we're going to make it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — Headlines again: “PC Programs Slur Blakeney into Action.” Well, it is too late for the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Which leader?

MR. GLAUSER: — The hon. member from Elphinstone. But maybe tomorrow it’s different. Time has run out. There is dissension in the ranks. The radical left are deserting.

These small businesses I refer to, Mr. Speaker, it provides us with a breath of fresh air. It is the first time they have been able to talk with members of this legislature for years. All of my colleagues are participating in dialogue with them. They no longer fear confiscation of their firms. They trust us, and that is the meaning of “open for business.” And it is too bad that the member from Regina Centre isn’t sitting here because he wanted to know what the meaning was of “open for business” today. I would just like to repeat that for his edification if he were in the House.

And that reminds me of the young fellow I encountered on my rounds of the constituency. When I asked him how he felt how the government was doing, his reply, “I think your policies are great.” He further stated he had always voted NDP, but no more. My next question was, “When did you change?” His reply, “Since the last election.”

Yes, Mr. Speaker. And for the information of the opposition, that is not an isolated case. They are coming over to this party, and that is what is worrying the Leader of the Opposition. He’s worried. They are coming over to this party, Mr. Speaker, because they know we are dedicated to making this a province of opportunity.

During the life of the previous administration, they had little to concern themselves about employment. And why? Because there was no one coming home, and it was a foregone conclusion that after graduation you had to leave the province, unless, of course, you were their friends. And we’ve heard here today how they hired 10,000 of those in the last 10 years.

If you don’t believe me about friends, let me give you an example. This is a personal experience of my own. In 1945, when three of us brothers returned from overseas, we endeavoured to start a business. We wanted to purchase three trucks and start a moving and storage business. We applied for permits. You had to have permits in those days to purchase trucks. Well, anyway, we applied for those permits. We were turned down by the local office in Saskatoon, so we asked for, and received, an audience with the minister of the day, a Mr. Sturdy. There is a building in Saskatoon that reminds me of this. But to no avail. Our application for permits to purchase the vehicles was again refused.

He knew, and the government knew, the results of the armed forces vote that had taken place only six to eight months earlier, and they knew it was anything but a socialist vote; it was a free enterprise vote. So that’s what happened to a person trying to start a business in Saskatchewan in 1945. And what has changed? It’s all changed since April 1982.

Mr. Speaker, I have covered job creation. I would like to turn my attention now to health under our most capable minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — The member for Melville, in his address, Mr. Speaker, said that the opposition did not dig one hole, one new hole. But, Mr. Speaker, he was not exactly right. They dug the one they are now sitting in. And you should listen to this, because, you know, that hole you are sitting in you’re just digging it deeper and . . .

Mr. Speaker, let me just mention two projects which the Leader of the Opposition alluded to in

this debate. I will turn firstly to the Regina rehab centre. That was one of the last ditch stands to regain voter confidence. Now, you ought to listen to this also. They thought the pressure so great they went to an architect and gave him 48 hours, over a week-end, to produce a model of a 24 million facility to rehab centre. Well, that poor architect couldn't find an architect firm open that could sell them supplies. He went around to, oh, Canadian Tire, or wherever he could find material to put that thing together. It was a hurry-up deal because they wanted a picture of it to be photographed and run as a news story — a last ditch stand when the election went on. There were no plans. There were no specs. There was no budgeted money. None of this existed, Mr. Speaker, and that model still sits over there in the Plains hospital. I understand, and is another monument to NDP unsuccessful bid for re-election. It was nothing but a figment of their imagination, and strictly a political ploy to obtain votes in the upcoming election.

What more can be said about the level 4 facility in Saskatoon? The only thing that existed there was an option on some property. Again, an election ploy, and that was a hurried-up option as well. Here again, no plans, no specs, no budget figures — figments of their imagination to get them out of a hole that gets deeper day by day as we proceed through the 20th parliament.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to pick up the pieces, and without a heritage fund. We did inherit, though, run-down hospital space, obsolete equipment, and equipment, by the way, that was third-hand when they bought it 10 years ago. That's the kind of equipment that was being used in St. Paul's Hospital. Shortage of continuing care beds. What would the deficit have been if they, the opposition, would have regained power and carried through all their promises? Would it have been 400? 500? How many million? No, Mr. Speaker, it would have been unfilled promises, and still a large deficit. And now, Mr. Speaker, as hypocritical as they are, they say they are the only champions of medicare, and they continue to use it as a political football.

Even without a heritage fund, and depressed natural resource markets, i.e. potash, uranium . . . what has happened in health care? Let me just talk about Saskatoon; \$2.7 million for the Kinsmen children centre; \$4 million for special care housing construction; \$2 million for upgrading equipment and facilities at City and St. Paul's Hospital, replacing equipment, again as I want to remind you, that was a third-hand; \$250,000 for planning and design work for a new cancer clinic — all in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. One million dollars per year over five years for major equipment costs and funding for cancer foundation. Staff funding with \$150,000 per year over the next five years — \$775,000. And the list goes on and on, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Give it to us — all of it.

MR. GLAUSER: — You want some more.

AN HON. MEMBERS: — I want some more of that. That's good stuff.

MR. GLAUSER: — An increase in both 1982 and '83, and in 1983-84, for open-heart surgery in Regina; an increase that has raised the number of procedures on average from 12 per month to approximately 18 to 20 per month.

A small hospital initiative package in '83-84 which provides 500,000 for pilot projects to extend and enhance the role of small hospitals. An additional 180 new nursing positions in hospitals, 70 per cent of which are directed to reducing waiting lists in Saskatoon.

The development of a new pediatric extensive care unit at University Hospital in Saskatoon.

Funding to the Lion's Club of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan and University Hospital to support the establishment of the first eye bank in western Canada. The establishment of a special task force involving hospital administrators and medical staff to examine waiting list situations.

A 2 million commitment per year has been made to Saskatoon to deal with the waiting list situation — \$2 million a year. Further improvements are under development in conjunction with the Saskatoon hospital planning council.

An expansion of speech therapy services by doubling the number of speech therapist positions from 10 to 20.

Well, the NDP did make several improvements in their first few years of office but the . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . No, I think that this information bothers him tremendously . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Well, anyway I'm going to give you '73,'74 and '75 of your time in office.

Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan: that's good; elimination of premiums, Saskatchewan Dental Plan; Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan; Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living . . . What happened after 1975? The NDP became complacent with health care and their attention turned to other things, like buying potash mines and expanding crown corporations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are other people who would like to go over a few other areas that they have selected and I certainly will be supporting the throne speech, and whatever comes out of that corner as an amendment. I will be voting against.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MULLER: — It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in this House today in answer to the throne speech. It isn't very often that we back-benchers get a chance to speak. There's so many of us, and I'm sure there's bound to be more of us with what has been coming across the floor in the last few days.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned in his answer to the throne speech . . . He brought up the issue of the Crow rate. Coming from the opposition, this has to be one of the biggest shams that ever was. For the last few years, they've been running around the province talking to the people of Saskatchewan, telling them how they were going to save the Crow. They didn't go to the other provinces and try and gain support from the people across Canada; they just talked to the people of Saskatchewan.

Now they're taking shots at this government, but this is the only government that really tried to save the Crow rate for Saskatchewan. We went out and launched an advertising campaign second to none in the history of Canada. It's too bad that we had not been government in 1978 where we could have organized these groups, went down to Winnipeg with one idea, one voice, instead of going down in splinter groups and having the federal government split us up. They did conquer us just because of that. They got rid of our Crow.

They didn't even support the Clark government, the one government that would have saved the Crow rate. Defeated the federal government . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Certainly have. Five of their friends put Pierre Trudeau back in power so he could take the Crow rate away from western Canada. They supported the eastern government. Now they lay the blame on the Conservatives.

The one member of the federal NDP that disappoints me the most is the member from Prince Albert, the wheat board critic. He's supposed to be the champion of the western farmer. He's fought this Crow issue, or bill . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . so hard all along, taking shots at the Conservatives, taking guarded shots at the Liberals.

But let us stand and be counted. Approximately a year ago in B.C., when the grain handlers were

on strike, the government was going to legislate them back to work. The member from Prince Albert got up and spoke in favour of the farmers. He said how important it was for them to be able to ship their grain, how important it was for the grain to be kept moving. That's the federal member from Prince Albert, Mr. Hovdeba. But when the time came for the vote in the House of Commons, the member from Prince Albert was absent. The vote was to put the grain handlers back to work. Mr. Hovdeba was absent. Can you believe that? The champion of the grain farmers absent. Mr. Hovdeba made a statement to the *Prince Albert Herald* a few days later that his vote didn't really mean anything anyway, and that's why he refused to vote for the western farmer whether the bill was passed or not to legislate the grain handlers back to work.

What do you big farmers across the way have to say in support of the member from Prince Albert that fails to vote? They sit across there empty-minded, empty of ideas. They never dealt with anything bigger than the crown corporations, who didn't know how to deal with the federal government except to defeat the only government that would have saved the Crow for us.

Now that I've gotten that off my chest, I'll turn to something a little more positive in the throne speech. Job creation will continue to be our top priority. Small contractors will be put back to work in the bush, which certainly relates to my part of the world.

We've just come through a successful summer in the housing starts with 29 per cent increase over 1982, thanks to our Build-A-Home program.

And certainly the most important part of my seat of Shellbrook-Torch River is the agricultural part of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: —Do you see Ted up there at all?

MR. MULLER: — Oh yes, he sold some of his land. He's still farming part of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is this Ted Bowerman?

MR. MULLER: — Yeah, Ted's still farming.

We continue to look to the agricultural sector as a key element of Saskatchewan's economy. And our rural communities need the energy, dedication, and vigour of the family farm. We're going to have to probably do something to alleviate some of the problems we're going to have with paying more freight rate, but our former minister of agriculture has already said that this province is ready to back the western Canadian farmers in Saskatchewan.

I am a little bit like my colleague from Moose Jaw South. I don't speak very long. I play out very quickly. I will be supporting the throne speech and I'll be allowing someone that may be more articulate than me to get into the debate now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker, before I get into this, I've got a basketful of goodies here that I've been hauling in the legislature all day. I don't know really where to begin, but I'm going to begin somewhere, let me tell you. We can keep us here six years and try and rehearse the facts of what the NDP had pulled off in their administration as government.

But I want to first of all congratulate the Premier in the fact and the size of government and of cabinet that he has brought upon. I've been questioned in my constituency about the size of cabinet, and I want to let the opposition here know that the people in the Cut Knife-Lloydminster constituency are no longer questioning the rhetoric that the NDP had kind of

thrown out there as kind of slur and propaganda. The past minister of highways tried through the media, or their writers, with his signature on the bottom of a lot of literature, through the media, to put out the propaganda against this government. I want to say that my answer to the media when I was questioned in this fact was that we have lessened the bureaucracy by 2,000 plus; that the civil service today has picked up its feet and have become more of a productive individual and individuals; that they are going to progress upon their merits, and we are not going to have a bunch of this here political favouritism as long as this government is in power.

I want to congratulate the Legislative secretaries that have been appointed. I would suggest that these fellows are going to do as good, and if not now a better job than what our past Legislative Secretaries have done, because we've got more experience of government, and we know now where we do stand as government in the positive ways that we have been moving, and the more directive ways that the Premier is bringing the government about. Let me tell you that this positiveness is right throughout the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — This, Mr. Speaker, is why we're here today. If I can go back to some of the facts of questions, and what the Premier had brought here, is why did we get elected? Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the members opposite that we got elected because we had positive measures, and we had positive ideas to take this province and move it forward to expectations that really none of us foresee yet.

We can't even put our hands on what this province is actually going to be in five to 10 years down the line. And I plan on being around here a hell . . . a heck of a lot (excuse me, Mr. Speaker), a heck of a lot more than just the five and 10 years. I feel that I'm a young enough member in this House, and I can contribute to the province of Saskatchewan for at least 20; then I feel that I should maybe step aside and let another youth in here so they can come in with more new ideas, instead of what happened to the NDP party. I looked into their rooms when they were . . . My people looked into their rooms (pardon me, I was too doggone busy campaigning against them in that convention) . . . But my people looked in their rooms, Mr. Speaker, and they only had the old die-hards, the old die-hards; they still have them. I would suggest that their convention in Saskatoon is just going to be about the same; the same old looking people in there with the same old ideas. In fact, I would suggest that they may not even have the same old ideas; they might be a little more leftist ideas, and more into the fact of the socialistic attitude that calls for militancy. Militancy, Mr. Speaker, because when I heard, and this was just by travelling throughout the constituency, but when I heard the John Gormley show in Saskatoon as I was travelling from point A to point B, I heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition talk on the show and telling the unions to become more militant. I just watch and just exactly where the members opposite want to take this province and the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it's a good example, the Van Mulligen case, and I really don't want to get into that. But doggone it, Mr. Speaker, this government makes stands, and we need people in our bureaucracy that is going to carry through the philosophy and the dreams of this party and this government. And, Mr. Speaker, a guy like Mr. Van Mulligen could stand up and outwardly — outwardly — lash back at this government for its policy it was trying to implement. We now see in the ranks by the hon. member . . . I believe . . . Let me see, I have to get him straight . . . Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, Mr. Speaker, is now backing that same individual that's been passing Mr. Van Mulligen as leader for the NDP party. I would suggest that these are the kind of people that they want in there — people that don't want this positive reaction in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of fighting going on across that floor that the public out there don't realize. I would suggest that the Hon. Allan Blakeney, pardon me, the member from Elphinstone, Mr. Speaker, may not be around very much longer. The members opposite, they can't seem to get their acts together. They're poor in question period. If it wasn't for the media feeling sorry for

them and trying to give them a little bit of pity . . . and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, that I feel the media is more of an opposition in this province than the opposition members.

I sometimes question the fact of a few individuals of the media, whether they should have the freedom of speech and writing and sending out the word into the public sector. I suggest there are many credible writers within the media and telecasters, but there are just a few that I feel should just as well go and sit across the floor there and shake hands with the opposition. They are misleading this province in trying to spread doom and gloom and statements that are about as far from the truth as is possibly can be.

Mr. Speaker, this government is committed. This government is committed to the province of Saskatchewan, and the people in the province of Saskatchewan, to make this province a province that is leading all of Canada. We are not to take a back seat to any of the other provinces, in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like to say that under our leadership, under our leadership, Mr. Speaker, I would dare anyone — anyone that will even attend that convention in Saskatoon come this weekend under the NDP — I would dare any of them to try and stand up to our leader. and I'll give them 5 or 10 or 20 years to gain the experience to stand up against our leader.

There is no credibility within your party; there is no credibility as far as the people and the public are putting onto your party right now. Your people are going to be . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . What's the question? Do you have something? . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Lusney might be the next leader. The member from Shaunavon wants to know who the next leader is going to be. It might be Lusney; I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, rhetoric has been spread throughout, and I thought the summer off would have gave these people a little bit of time to re-arm themselves; to come on out here with some positive criticism; to be abler to come out here and kind of add a little bit to our positiveness of the policies in which we've been trying to implement throughout the 18 months . . . 18 months, Mr. Speaker. We've been in power 18 months. We've done more in 18 months than they've done in the last 10 and 12 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — The only doggone thing I've heard from them is the way they want to regroup, and that's through militancy. And then we've got to get our minister, the Hon. Lorne McLaren, to try and write a nice letter to the hon. member opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, and downplay the situation, suggesting that if it please the hon. member, the people of Saskatchewan do not want you to talk this way. They do not want this militancy. The labour unions don't want this, the members of these unions don't want to be that way.

We're working in harmony today. We are working . . . We've got a working relationship out there in the province of Saskatchewan that we've never, ever had for years and years and years. We've got it today, Mr. Speaker, and we want to hang on it today and the people out there want to hang on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — I don't know. You know, you talk about productivities. Mr. Speaker, there's many, many, many, many different ways we've moved. There's many different ways we moved in, and I just want to move into some of those, Mr. Speaker, and this is going back to what the Premier has spoken on earlier. I don't want to repeat any issues, but I'm going to reword some of them. I'm going to talk on some of them basically, and reword it a little bit, because of how they have actually affected my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, when we opened up the books . . . For instance, on the number one situation that the Premier brought out, we said we would open the books when we got elected as government. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what we did. We opened up the books and the hon. member from Regina Centre, well, I think basically he came out here and he said that we've been hiding situations of legal assets, etc. You know. I don't even want to get into that stupid, little, dumb naiveté that they've been trying to throw it across the floor here.

Mr. Speaker, when the people out there in my riding ask me a question as to what is happening with Sask Tel, Sask Power, SGI, you name it, you name it, Mr. Speaker, I tell them, and if I don't have the answers with me or in my office or in my briefcase, I get the answers for them. I go out there and I'll write a letter, or I'll get on the phone directly to the ministers, and let me tell you something, they're co-operating. They're saying, "By all means, we'll give you the information," and they doggone well get it out to me. And my members get it. And I put it in the media. I give everybody a chance to read the reports I get from the departments. If they want to contradict, or, pardon me, not contradict, but if they want to complain or come back on the government as to how far the openness is concerned, I'm open to that criticism. I enjoy criticism. Positive criticism, Mr. Speaker, is the most functional thing that we can have in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — We said we were going to freeze the utilities. We did it, Mr. Speaker. We froze those utilities. Yes, Mr. Speaker, while we froze those utilities, we set up PURC (Public Utilities Review Commission). We set up PURC, we froze the utilities. We gave everybody a chance to settle down, get into the situations. The books were opened up. Notice, all three of those ran in together. Notice how all three of those ran together. We opened the books; we froze the utilities; we set up PURC. What did they say? What did they say? They condemned this government. They condemned this government for the openness this government pushed and gave to the people of this province.

I dare any one of those members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to get up and unjustly the three points that I've already spoken on.

Mr. Speaker, our increases in SGI rates, or our increases in Sask Tel, or our increased in Sask Power still are amongst the lowest across the country, and all across Canada, and indeed North America. And yet, they will stand across the floor there. They will stand up there and they will try to get this thing off over the media, over the camera. They'll look directly in that camera.

You know, it's too bad. It's too bad that they can't see the other members laughing and smirking and smiling while one of them out there is talking and speaking about as far from the truth as they possibly can speak. I can't understand it, but they've had years and years of practice. They've had years and years of practice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Would they recognize the truth?

MR. HOPFNER: — No, I don't think they'd recognize the truth, Mr. Speaker. A question was asked of me if they'd recognize the truth. No, I don't think they'd recognize the truth.

I've had the situation in my constituency by the past minister of highways — by the past minister of highways — spreading, what I told before, what I spoke on before, about situations about as far from the truth as possible. He said: no highway programs in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, it took a complete idiot — a complete idiot — to believe it.

And let me tell you something. I haven't found since my input into the media, my answers are the people that haven't been really actually travelling into the inner part of the province . . . I've told about the programs that the Minister of Highways, the Hon. Jim Garner, has been doing, and

I want to go down here on record as saying right now that I appreciate just exactly how he's handling that department.

You know, I want to tell you something. The Hon. James Garner . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . You betcha. He is honest. I had some remarks shot out here, but he's honest. You betcha, he's honest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — The hon. member said he will not announce a highway that is not going to be built in the province of Saskatchewan until it's going to be built in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I concur with that.

I concur with that because I've had nothing but problems, and so have the other members, had nothing but problems about the past minister, the minister of highways, the past minister that I defeated from cut Knife-Lloydminster going out and promising every doggone back road individual that lived on every back road, a highway, a by-way, a bridge, you name it.

That's all he's been . . . (inaudible) . . . That's all he promised. And this was going on right throughout the doggone province. Mr. Speaker, you know, I just couldn't believe it — I could not believe it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It makes you see red.

MR. HOPFNER: — You betcha it makes me see red.

Mr. Speaker, there is a list — well, that list could go right across, and from fingertip to fingertip, and you couldn't get them all on the promises. And you could print them as fine as you could doggone well see, but you couldn't get them on that — you couldn't get them on you. That's how thick that list is of promises.

Well, I'll you something, Mr. Speaker, right now. I'm not a minister, but I want to tell you something. I'm going to sit here or stand here, pardon me, and I am going to promise these highways; I'm going to promise these hospitals; or I'm going to promise these nursing homes; or I'm going to promise whatever — a sidewalk; I'm going to promise these nursing homes; or promise I'm going to promise anything the people want to hear because eventually, if I don't give them to them, they're going to go out there and get them themselves, and then they're going to say, "Oh, what a wonderful guy, he promised it, and he made this country good enough for me to get it." Because eventually we're going to have these services.

But I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker, that when I have a minister make an announcement in the seat right now, I want to tell you something, is that I want to know that this thing is going to go ahead — this project is going to go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the luckier members in this Assembly today. I've had two hospital announcements since the election — two hospital announcements, one in Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, and one in Cut Knife, Saskatchewan — two hospitals. and I am not quitting there, Mr. Speaker, because I'm backing the Maidstone issue. And when that doggone thing, when I can find the fundings, when the Minister of Health can find the fundings, when we can get that fundings through treasury, we're going to build that doggone hospital. But I'm not going into another election. I'm not going to make that an election promise, and I hope to heck it doesn't come around an election, because I am saying today I don't want that as an election promise. It'll either go before or it'll go after. Well I'm fed up with the fact that this is exactly how that, those guys, those members across the floor there, have survived as long as they've survived.

Mr. Speaker, I sat here calmly today. I sat here calmly since we came back, but doggone it, you

know, I am a business man. I am a business man. I never did regard myself as a politician, really. But I guess you're forced into it. Once you're here, you're forced into calling yourself a politician. But I want to tell you something. I want to tell you something, that when you can look at things in a positive manner, when you can be responsible, you can make decisions, Mr. Speaker, positive decisions, decisions that are meaningful, and a job will get done through that kind of positiveness.

We have to have incentives, incentives, Mr. Minister, Mr. Speaker, that will create an atmosphere in this province that each and every one of us in our own hearts develop — that type of incentive, that type of positiveness.

I want to go on here to a few more little issues, Mr. Speaker. I want to go on to some more of these promises that we've kept since we've been elected. We have removed the gasoline tax, Mr. Speaker. Yet the members opposite, they say, "What about the gasoline tax you took off, eh? You know, less nursing homes, less this, less that. "Eighteen months we're in government, and we spend \$11 million, \$11 million, compared to . . . what was it? . . . eight or seven years or ten years, or whatever it was, of your expenditures in nursing homes in this province of Saskatchewan.

I'm just giving a little example here now you guys, just a little example of your 13 million. Eighteen months, eighteen little months and you've got the audacity to stand up there and condemn this government and condemn my minister? Well, that's . . . (inaudible) . . . I just can't understand this. I just cannot believe it. The gasoline tax had put bread and butter on the table for a lot of the people out there in rural Saskatchewan, for less fortunate individuals — the person that was hunting for a job at that particular time, that had been out of a job under your administration, out of a job under your administration.

Well, I want to tell you something. You talk about job creation; you talk about building nursing homes, building hospitals, so that we can create jobs in the province of Saskatchewan. But then a minister under your administration had, and it's in writing, a moratorium on nursing homes in 1976, a moratorium on nursing homes. You know, I couldn't believe it. You know, that should have hit the shred, because I'll tell you something, my people out in Cut Knife- Lloydminster are going to hear about that, they're going to doggone well hear about that, because when the times were good, when the times were good, when there was revenues coming from the industry — from oil, from potash, from uranium, from all of these commodities. When the times were good, where was the money? Tell me, where was the money? There was no gasification programs; there were no farm purchase programs. Where did the money go?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Big towers — Cornwall Centre.

MR. HOPFNER: — It went to big, big towers. Exactly. Big, big towers. Big towers that were built by contractors from Ontario, and then they (which get me back on another point which I want to talk on later on), but where in the heck did the money go? Where did the money go? I want to know, because I need a nursing home in Lloydminster. And eventually I'm going to make that announcement. Not today, not today; but eventually I'll make that announcement. I need a nursing home in Cut Knife. I want one in Lashburn. I want one in Maidstone. That's what I hear; people want these things.

But where was the money then? You could of built those homes. You could of, instead of scaring the hell out of those poor folk.

Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't get into that kind of . . . Apologize to the House for that.

Instead of scaring these poor folk in these few homes that you did have, and in their own homes, that you were doing the best of your ability to look after them. That you should have really, really saw in your hearts to make use of that money.

I look at the member from Athabasca, and you know, he stood up in the House — and I believe it was Monday on question period — and he asked my minister about what he was going to be doing about the situation, about the poor folks in the North. He was using a percentage. Well, Mr. Speaker, his percentage was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 95 per cent. Today another member gets up in the House, and he says the percentage is 85 per cent. Well, that's pretty good. We dropped 10 per cent in two days. So I want to take a little bit of credit then, I guess, for the government's side, because they're working towards getting this percentage down. And that's what I call real incentive, I'll tell you.

But, Mr. Speaker, you know those people in the North could have been looked after with this money also. It's not only into nursing homes and hospitals that need the dollars. The economic situation right throughout with good motherhood, good governing, could have established industry in this province — industry which should have taken in this into positive lumbering, into mining positively, and into other spin-off varieties of business from that kind of situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They wanted to own it all.

MR. HOPFNER: — They want to own it all. Just exactly right. They wanted to own it all. I can't, for the love of me, understand why any government would want to own really anything. I think we have a great, great amount of people out there right now that are willing to take this province into their hands and make something of it.

The members opposite have talked about this government, this government, being in bed with big business. Well, Mr. Speaker, this government is not in bed with big business, unless they are going to agree that the small business of Saskatchewan is big business, because what I would call big business we don't have in this province. We have barber shops, hairdressers, clothing stores, hardware stores, hotels, motels, little grocery stores, corner confectionery stores, you name it . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Yes, they mentioned the barbers today. Well, I'm mentioning it now. They are big business because small business is big business because small business, if you look at the statistics, small business employs 70 per cent of the working force across this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — This is where it happens — on the small issue. You know when I look . . . I would like you to give me an example of big business. I wish one of you would stand up and give me an example of big business and I'd tell you whether that thing really meant anything to me. I would tell you whether that big business, politically or morally, really meant anything to me because, let me tell you something, the heart of the people are the small guy to me, and the heart of this province and the incentive and the growth come from the small people, and I'm small people, and I'd glad to be small people.

I want to tell you, and I want to congratulate the minister who's in charge of small business, the Hon. Jack Klein. He came out, he came out, Mr. Speaker, with a program. And I just think I have some information on this one. But, Mr. Speaker, through his incentives . . . Here's just a little chart. Here's a little chart. We're versing Canada. Little Saskatchewan versing Canada, all of Canada, totally.

Our employment goal, our employment goal just as of when this came out here — and I believe it was from April to October. Now the percentage of economic employment. I mean . . . (Pardon me, the goals of the employment rate in the country. Canada, on a Canadian basis, was at about 3.7 per cent, and here's little Saskatchewan with an incentive program that my minister and my Premier came out with at about 5.9 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. HOPFNER: — Now how in the heck and you can stand up in the House, and you can stand

up in the House and the Leader of the Opposition and all you fellows, can stand up in the House and ridicule this government . . . I don't believe it. That's why I've been carrying in basketfuls of material, facts, facts. Then you're entitled to come over . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Pardon me?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hold your teeth in!

MR. HOPFNER: — Sorry about that. I was told to hold my teeth in. You're right; the hon. member is right, Mr. Speaker. I do get excited. I do get excited, because I find it hard to be able to control myself. And if my teeth hit the floor, that's your fault.

But . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . liquor advertising. You want to get into liquor advertising? I'll come back to small business.

Liquor advertising, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk to you people about liquor advertisement right now, because I think somewhere amongst here I have something on liquor advertisement.

Thank you. My members are very co-operative tonight. My colleagues are very co-operative toning.

Mr. Speaker, their colleagues — the members opposite, the NDP — their colleagues in Manitoba . . . Well, they want to talk about double standards. I'm going to give them a double standard right now. Here they're talking in Saskatchewan how crude we are; how mean we are; how thoughtless we are; how bloody we are; and here's Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, introducing same day delivery service for delivering liquor from the liquor board stores of Manitoba to the households in Manitoba. The Manitoba Liquor . . . I'll read it. I'll read it.

The Manitoba Liquor Control Commission announces improved (improved!) home delivery service in the greater Winnipeg area. Just phone in your order for any of our listed spirits, wines, imported or domestic beer, available at liquor commission outlets. Our authorized, bonded drivers will deliver your order to your door the same day.

You know, I thought I would send them a note and ask them if they'd like to expand on it and maybe pick up a pizza as delivering the beer. You know, they might as well. They might be able to charge . . . (inaudible) . . . But they've got the phone number there, so if anybody's travelling to Manitoba, I'll read you the phone number right now, and you'll be able to have it delivered to your hotel room also, because that is your home when you are visiting Manitoba. So you'll be able to call 783-7177 between 8 a.m. Hell . . . Mr. Speaker, I again apologize to the House. I got a little excited again. But this here is terrible. You can't even hardly get out of bed in the morning and they're selling you liquor from door to door.

This is from 8 a.m. You can call anywheres between 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Your order will arrive C.O.D. with a minimum of \$2.95 delivery charge. They are making money, aren't they? Quick . . . Mr. Speaker, it says here it will be quick, convenient, reliable. It doesn't say anything about the taste. I think maybe we should tell them they should print something about the taste and everything. But the same day delivery service from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission.

Their colleagues, the NDP of Manitoba, bringing out this kind of stuff. There it is. Right here. Here it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't read between the lines, read it all.

MR. HOPFNER: — Mr. Speaker, the member opposite says, "Read it all and don't read between the lines." Well, I wish to heck they would practise what they preach then. I wish to heck they would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. I'm going to caution the hon. member that you've been bordering on unparliamentary language a number of times throughout your speech, and I would ask you to stay with the type of language that's normal to this House.

MR. HOPFNER: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize again. I guess that I'm used to using it out there with my constituents when, you know, like we speak in a normal manner and when we do get excited. I find it no reason to use them in this House. So I do apologize to this House and I do appreciate you putting me in my place.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like the member opposite to appreciate the fact that if you expect to be treated like decent human beings that you do start to stand up, and I think you would be respected out in your own constituencies a lot more if you would stand up and start speaking and give the government credit when credit is due, instead of nit-picking. You people aren't doing yourself any favour by standing there and reading between the lines and nit-picking.

I just want to say that I, myself, Mr. Speaker, have been in the liquor business and I am not totally in favour of liquor advertisement, but I want to say one thing. Mr. Speaker, that, you know, really the business aspect of it aren't allowed to advertise. It's done strictly through the, in the other portion of it . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . No, it doesn't. The advertising wouldn't help in any aspect whatsoever, other than the fact if you want to put on some sort of constituent function for the NDP party — it may help, you know, serving ice cream to children and beer to the papas and mamas.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP had the chance to outlaw advertising. In my constituency of Cut Knife -Lloydminster, we've been living with advertising of spirits and wine, beers for a number of years, and we have had no control over it. I know I got a few letters stating the fact of the advertising aspect. But really via satellite now, and the non-control that we not had on these satellites, etc. It was pretty hard for us to employ any measures, if you will, Mr. Speaker, the facts of more positive or use of alcohol.

So we did make a commitment to the fact to the people out there that we want to see a more responsive attitude of use of alcohol, etc. So I would suggest that although I'm not totally in favour of the fact of the related advertisement, we are going to have to control it by other means.

And I do respect, I do respect the individuals that do write these letters because of their concerns, but they also must respect the situation that this government was placed in because of other governments, including the members opposite, that have allowed it in other provinces and we got caught up in the crossfire. I can't apologize for that crossfire because I have no control of the air waves. I know there was one party that was once in power in this province that might have wanted control of the air waves. But, Mr. Speaker, for myself, I love breathing, I love people talking. I love people having the access of air waves. I know the members opposite, if they could have charged some sort of a taxation or fee for breathing, or maybe using the free air system, the waves, that they probably would have done it to us. Let me tell you, they probably would have done it to us and boy . . . no, I don't want to get into that.

But I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, we've provided more help to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. We've given them, a guaranteed mortgage rate at 13.25 per cent, Mr. Speaker, 13.25 per cent that they know where they were going to be from day to day. The way the economic situation turned about through positive programs, interest rates come down, competitiveness started again, but we had the insight to bring this kind of program forward in case things like this wouldn't take place in such a short time.

We were fortunate enough, the taxpayers of this province were fortunate enough, not to have to put out any great deal of money. But we were prepared to, we were prepared to go in debt for these people. But, Mr. Speaker, it goes back to this doggone, to the . . . Pardon me, Mr. Speaker . . .

to the fact of where they get caught up with balanced budgets, more government spending on one aspect and then less taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say that you can have two of them. But I'll challenge any one of you right now. I'll challenge any one of you . . . just exactly what I said. Balanced budget is what you're after. You're after more government spending, and you're after less taxes. But I'll challenge any one of you, because you can't have all three at the same time. I challenge any one of you to draw two, to draw two and then speak in this House on those two that you've drawn. I'll challenge any one of you right now.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to move into oil before I wind down. I want to give some of my other colleagues a chance to speak. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to use the *Oilweek* Saskatchewan report. Okay? I just want to bring some good points out here, because I think the members opposite forget very easily what we as a government have done, what we have done in the province of Saskatchewan in 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, it says here:

When Grant Devine's government took office 18 months ago, it found an essential industry in a state of stagnation. Through a combination of onerous federal taxes, regulated energy prices, high interest rates, and economic recession, high provincial royalties under the previous administration (and taxes under the previous administration), the oil industry was at a virtual standstill.

Virtually at a standstill. They bragged about the 1980 record that was set in the province of Saskatchewan as far as drilling was concerned. Well, Mr. Speaker, we topped that. We topped that. I'm going to get into that a little in a few minutes. I just want to go on here a little bit more and say that:

Clearly action was needed. (It says here.) After extensive consultation with the industry, a five-point recovery program was introduced in July of 1982. While the program provided major royalty and tax relief to a significant amount of existing oil production, major emphasis was placed on promoting new activity. A new royalty tax structure was established for high-cost enhanced oil recovery, and a system of royalty tax holidays was introduced to encourage conventional deep drilling. One-year holidays were introduced for non-deep drilling, while three-and five-year holidays were made available for development and exploratory drilling.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, these five little issues, these five little issues that would have got the province of Saskatchewan, or would have kept them on an incentive program — the industry on an incentive program — that these drilling rigs that these people had gone bankrupt through the moving out of all these rigs and service rigs, etc. . . . We wouldn't have had near the problem, near the problem, (and I guarantee the members opposite wouldn't have had near the problem they ran into either) if they would have had some real impressive outward programs — positive outward programs that we had.

Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to the economic growth in the province of Saskatchewan for job creation. There here five little points right here that I've named, created a situation in the Cut Knife-Lloydminster area and it spreads into The Battlefords, into the Kindersleys, into the Estevans, into the province of Saskatchewan as a whole, in which the total economy had improved. The total economy had just — Bang! — taken off in a real positive reaction to these little bit of dolled-up situations here.

The members opposite sit there — they're flabbergasted. They can't believe it. They can't believe that just a little push of the pencil, a little signing of a signature here or there to just change a little bit of policy, to give a little bit of incentive — that could make things happen the way they've happened. Well, it goes on here:

. . . as important, the increased activity brought with it renewed sense of confidence and interest in the province of Saskatchewan, creating a momentum carried over into 1983.

Half carried over from 1982 to 1983, and we're still going. Now we've hit an all-time record. We've bypassed the 1980 record that they so much as challenged us. I can remember 12 months ago, they stood up in the House and they asked the ministers here, they asked the Premier, they asked everybody in this House: "Where can you better the 1980 record? Where can you better the 1980 record?" Every one of those members opposite stood up and asked that. Every one of them. Go back into *Hansard*. Every one of those members stood up.

Well, I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker: we did it! We did it and we came up and we took over the records of growing, we took over the records of sales, Mr. Speaker, what did that mean? That meant jobs. Our working force today has never, ever topped, has never, ever reached beyond the 500,000. Never in the history of their administration, has never topped 500,000. I think it was something like 470,000. I think it was something like 470,000. We're over 500,000, and I think we're somewhere in the neighbourhood of 530,000 or something like that. I haven't got the exact figures in front of me but I can get them, if the members opposite ever want me to come back into the House and speak on it.

In January this year, Mr. Speaker, several additional measures were announced. A three-year royalty tax holiday of new oil reference price production and non-deep exploratory well. That one-year royalty tax holiday for incremental production from any new or water flood project approved after December 31, 1982.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these little incentives, these little incentives have given us the most positive reaction. You know something, I go home, I go home, and I can't even visit with my friends that are in the related oil service business any more because of running around the clock trying to keep[up the situation. My friends are all busy working in the thing and it's strange. They can't build trucks. They can't build water trucks fast enough. They can't build service trucks fast enough. You know something's happening out there, and these guys, these members opposite should come on down there, and I would introduce you to some of the fellows, and you would hear this positiveness.

But when you come up in the House here, and you state that this government hasn't done anything, you know, really fellows, again you don't give yourself any credibility. You don't give the legislature here the credibility it deserves. You know, the people out there they ask, you know, they say, "What is this all about?" You know, you're saying, you know, "We see what you guys as doing as government, what you men and women are working hard to do as government." And I mean men and women, because we've got both of us over here and we are working hard. They said they can see, they can see it happening in this province — the positiveness. And yet, they say, "Where do they get the determination to be able to stand up in this House, to be able to stand up in this House and ridicule positive programs?"

Mr. Speaker, I think probably what I should do is just wind this up, because they're probably tired of listening to me because of . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Probably to you it is the best idea I've had.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say this, you know, is that I would welcome any one of those members maybe if they would like to cross the floor. I would welcome any one of those because I always say this, because I've got faith in people, I always say that you can eventually reach a human being — a person with heart and a person with convictions. If these people got heart and conviction, I'm sure that eventually they'll see the more positive notes of this Assembly.

But I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, talking about social services . . . Mr. Speaker, I was going to

wind down. I want to get into Social Services and I want to congratulate the Hon. Minister Dirks for what he's done. I just happen to have a few of the initiatives that he's trying to implement under social services. The hon. member from Shaunavon should really take note because I do believe he was once in charge of that particular department.

But I want to say, here's a list of the initiatives taken since April, 1983 from social services: number one, begun the reform of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan; review of The Family Services Act; ministerial advisory council on child protection has been formed, and has met with over 100 groups or individuals. The council has held public meetings in Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, and five northern communities.

Violence against women. A task force on battered wives has been established. He's met with a number of women's groups on various issues; review of day care programs which the hon. member from Saskatoon Riversdale is now undertaking, and is meeting with the public to discuss proposals containing any discussion from a paper that is now available to us as government members.

The successful seniors forums in October; the Senior citizens' Provincial Council has been restructured and expanded. A senior bureau has been established to improve communications with seniors throughout the province.

Newly appointed social service appeal board members, and members of the regional appeal committees. Development of training programs for foster parents. Begun to automate the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

Native people. Accommodate the unique needs by promoting native responsibilities for delivering child welfare and other social services.

Reorganization of social services department . . . (inaudible) . . . Expanding services for disabled. Begun a new partnership with non-governmental organizations. You know it just keeps going. Here's some more:

A verification staff into the regions. Decided to close the Roy Wilson centre in favour of facilities closer to the clients at home. you know, this thing goes on and on and on and on. You know the list goes on. You know. I don't want to take all of it away on the hon. member because I'm sure that he's going to be able to really expand on the situation, and I mean expand. So I just want to say, Mr. Speaker,, at this particular time, that again with acknowledging the Chair, that I thank you on behalf of the people of my constituency. Cut Knife-Lloydminster, for allowing me the honour of standing in this Legislative Assembly and giving it the opposition for a change, and I promise them I will be back with more positive stuff here, because I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I do have baskets full if you'd just like to come around and look. I do have baskets full and there isn't time.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I rise in this Chamber with pride to speak on the throne speech and debate with the hon. opposition over there — what's left of them — to debate all the positive action coming from the throne speech, and not the negativism that we've heard for the past 11 years in this province. I would like to take this time to congratulate the new ministers, and to congratulate the new legislative secretaries appointed to some of those ministers.

At a difficult time in the history of this country's economy, when all provinces save that of Saskatchewan have had a decline in the work-force, the work-force of Saskatchewan has exceeded 500,000 people. Now, to get the significance of that number, you must realize that in

1982 April election there were 640,000 eligible voters. So we have a darn good record, a darn good record — 25,000 jobs in the last year, in the last 18 months, pardon me.

I don't know if they can hear me over there, but I hope they do, and I hope they're listening. They seem to have a conference. I understand the NDP convention is coming up this week-end, and they're trying to choose a new president. I guess that precedes choosing a new leader.

AN HON. MEMBERS: — Not much to choose from.

MR. MYERS: — Well, my hon. member from Saskatoon Fairview says, there's not much to choose from, and I must agree with him. Right now there isn't much to choose from.

This government has been so successful in maintaining the province's economy through these difficult times that it's encouraging the native sons and daughters to return. I was once told a figure that there were only 57 per cent of the people born and raised in Saskatchewan now living in Saskatchewan, and we would like to have the rest of that figure back here to develop a vibrant and strong economy.

Mr. Speaker, this government was the first province to move on the NEED (New Employment Expansion and Development) program last winter — the first province in the country. And although we had to co-operate with the Liberal government, which we really don't appreciate, we co-operated with them, and we established jobs over the winter with the NEED program — an enormous amount of jobs. Something in the last 11 years the former government didn't do. They tended not to create jobs for people outside of government; they tended to create jobs for people within government — expanding the bureaucracy.

Back in 1944 when they took power, when they took power there were a little over 8,000 jobs in government and you have to compare that with over 28,000 people involved in the government today. And what more service do they get? People are asking what more do they receive than they received in 1944. Well, their taxes are higher. They've got a lot more bureaucrats to talk to, and they really haven't had much action from those bureaucrats prior to the election of this government.

Last year when we stated this province was open for business, guess who said it couldn't happen. True, the NDP sitting in that small corner with the same mentality they had prior to the last election. Negativism.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Several cabinet ministers went into business.

MR. MYERS: — My fellow colleague from Regina North West tells me several ministers or former ministers have now gone into business. Yet, I understand there's a Bun Masters in Prince Albert run by a former minister. He's probably succeeding more in that line of endeavour than he succeeded in the time he spent in this Chamber, but only through our incentives which he utilized to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, the doors of this province are not closed to new business. We would like new business to come in and set up. We do not want to be involved in their business, but we will assist them in whichever direction they may need to get started in this province. And not only will we assist the new business coming from outside this province, we will assist those businesses wanting to establish within this province by people from this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board of Canada also disagreed with the NDP, and it wasn't too long ago they were up in this Chamber, and they were saying the Conference Board of Canada predicts the lowest growth in the nation. The lowest growth, and it came from that small corner over there. While the conference board state something positive and I don't know if they want to hear it. But the claim that this country had a recession, but Saskatchewan decided not to

participate, is borne out in large measure by the conference board who estimate the provincial real domestic product in 1982. Production in Saskatchewan fell by only 1.1 per cent as compared to 4.6 per cent in the rest of the country. Saskatchewan is forecast to exceed the national growth rate again in 1983 and 1984, and that's a far cry from what you were saying last spring. This is positive, positive thinking, and it's borne out by the Conference Board of Canada. I don't know where you had your figures from, but if they come from the same source as the Leader of the Opposition takes his, I'm not sure if they were correct. I'm not even sure he had the right figures from the right year.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He doesn't dream my figures. He dreams figures up.

MR. MYERS: — I'm told by my hon. member and colleague that he dreams these figures up. He may well dream. He's dreaming of another election, and he can only dream of another election if he's still a leader of the opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A nightmare to go through first.

MR. MYERS: — My fellow colleague from Turtleford says it may be a nightmare for him right now. It may well be, but I would think the last 18 months have been a nightmare for him.

About a week and a half ago the Premier of our province was asked: what did we do in the last 18 months for the people of this province? and he sat down and he jotted out 35 points which have come to pass in the last 18 months. And you may have heard some of them before. Well he said we would open the books, and we did, and we found nothing there. We didn't find that magnificent heritage fund which was supposed to be there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How much was in it?

MR. MYERS: — How much was in it?

AN HON. MEMBER: — How much was it? I bet you it wasn't \$100 million.

MR. MYERS: — There wasn't even \$100 million in that fund, and they went throughout this province in the spring of '82 promising this, that, and the other thing. A promise-a-day election is what they had. And they tell us to cut taxes, to increase spending, and how are you going to do it? And not only on top of that, they want the books balanced. Well, rather than cut services to the people at this time, we decided to carry on the services, and in most cases we carried them on to extent that we even proved them. That's borne out by the highest per capita spending on health in the history of this province.

We also said we would freeze utility rates and we did; we froze them for a year. And then we brought in PURC (Public Utility Review Commission) and it's through PURC and it's through people's input into PURC that now determines, that now determines the utility rates.

I should remind them of their rates they had on SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). In 1976 they increased the rates; in 1977 they increased the rates; in 1978 the year of the previous election, they decreased the rates, but in 1979 they bumped them right back up again. And they talk about us in double-digit. They double-digit us twice in that year. They take it, they bring it down for the election. They used to bring it down for the election and then bump it up right after the election. Hypocrites and double standards. They tell us we have double standards. That's one of the worst things you can do. You're preying on the people themselves.

We also said we would remove the gasoline tax and we did. Within five minutes, within five minutes of the time that this cabinet in our government assumed power, it removed the gasoline tax and it didn't come a month later. It came that very night at 12:00 o'clock. That very night. When we promise something, we keep it. Not two years down the road, or four years down the

road or six years down the road, but when we're able to do it, we keep that promise, and we do it immediately.

We said we would provide a mortgage assistance program and we did, and we did. And we didn't hear too many people in Saskatchewan losing their houses after that program was established. We didn't hear that.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Did you hear what the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg said? He said, "Big deal."

MR. MYERS: — He said, "Big deal." Well, I understand the member from Gravelbourg has a big farm so maybe it shouldn't bother him too much.

We said we would help those people. We said we would help those people and we did. We fixed the rate at 13.25. Now the economy's gone down, those people still have their homes through the incentives we established.

We said we would set up a farm purchase program and we did. Another promise we kept in 11 years of NDP rule in this province. 151 farmers were able to buy land from the land bank — 151. Within two weeks of setting up this program, we had 1,500, ten times what they had in 11 years.

We said we would provide natural gas to the people of rural Saskatchewan and we are doing that. We are doing that under a long term program. Now they criticise us for providing gas to rural Saskatchewan, but they must remember where their roots came from. In 1944 Tommy Douglas said he was going to provide electricity to the farms under rural electrification and he did, but it seems they've forgotten their heritage. They were too tied up within themselves to go out there and provide something for the people. I'm interested in rural gasification because we had capped wells in this province. We had stagnate gas exploration programs in this province, and now with rural gasification we are able to utilize our own gas, and we don't even know how much we have, but conservative estimates put it at 30 years and it's growing.

We said we would lower the tax and oil royalties and we did. My colleague, and the member who spoke prior to myself, pointed out five points how this assisted the oil patch. And now in the oil patch, we've been able to increase the employment by over 1,000 people. The service industries in Estevan are not going bankrupt. They're booming, and they're booming because this province has opened it up for them, not closed it down.

We said we would increase homes for senior citizens and we have, and we have. We would change Saskatchewan's image and we did. We let the whole country know we were open for business. That we would bring our children home and we are. For the first time in this province's history, by the end of this year the population of Saskatchewan will exceed 1 million people. One million people! They had 11 years to do it and they couldn't do it.

We said we would get businesses open and we have. And this is borne out by the applications. We would encourage profit because profit isn't a bad word. When businesses are making profit they're employing people. And when people are employed the economy's booming. Profit's not dirty. Unemployment's a dirty word, but not profit.

We said we build schools and educational facilities. We are. Just in Saskatoon we announced last spring two new high schools. You know the public school board hadn't built a high school in Saskatoon since 1965, long before their administration — 18 years without a new high school. We said we would expand the facilities for technical institutes and we have by 1,100 openings this year over last year. And the number will grow even greater next year.

We said we would reduce the dominance of crowns, and run them like businesses. And you know, in Saskoil . . . Saskoil never made a profit up until last year. Last year they made a million

dollars. And this year, this year, run properly, they should exceed \$20 million. Now that's good news. That's good news because that's revenue to provide the services to the people of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member from Regina Centre says I'm in the back row, but I must remind him he's in the back row of his party and may stay there for a long time.

We said we would sell crown land to the farmers and we are. We are selling the land bank land which they were using to keep some young farmers in servitude in his province. We are selling that and letting them do their own thing, not under the thumb of the former government.

We said we would encourage irrigation and we will. We've got a vast resource sitting out there. Lake Diefenbaker's a vast resource which we have not even begun to draw upon for irrigation. And that will take place over the next several years.

We said we would stimulate the housing industry and we did last December. We did. A home building program — \$3,000. \$3,000. And you know in Saskatoon we were up 150 per cent in new housing starts this year. We were up there, and it wasn't because the former government couldn't have done it. They didn't want people to own their own homes. They would rather build the homes and have them rent them from them. As a matter of fact that former government is totally against ownership and that's borne out, that's borne out by the former leader and the Leader of the Opposition who worked, who worked during the constitutional hearings to remove property rights, to remove property rights from the constitution. The only ones . . . The only one who wanted to remove it. Well, the constitution hearings are coming up again and we intend on putting property rights back where they should have been in the first place.

We said we would proceed with an upgrader and we have. It was announced recently that that upgrader would be built in Regina in conjunction with the Co-op Refinery, not built out in the middle of prairies on a model. They seem to build a lot of things, most of them built with models. They could never get the models off the ground. They could never find the enthusiasm to build them.

We said we would improve relations with United States and we have. Governor Olson sat down here last spring and we became neighbours across the border. He was happy to be here and we were happy to have him here. You would never have seen that under the former government. They'd like to keep Saskatchewan closed, a secret. We said we would market Saskatchewan internationally and we are. We are marketing Saskatchewan through the hon. member from Souris-Cannington who is now going out and selling this province and selling its products. We will build a vibrant industry, small business industry, to provide that type of service.

They ask us what we are in Saskatchewan. And we are basically a farming province. So we develop basically farming parts and farm machinery. And that farm machinery is among the best in the world. In fact, Rock-O-Matics have been imported into Russia. They've had communism over there since 1917, and they still can't build a good rock picker. They do most of it by hand.

We said we would develop a comprehensive water policy. Last spring, under several members who toured this province, we are now putting together a water policy, and we have a minister in charge of water and a water corporation in this province.

We said we would reduce and gradually eliminate sales tax and we did. It wasn't the former government who took sales tax off children's clothing; it was this province. They only said they would do it, like they said they would do a lot of other things, and never did. If they were genuinely interested in doing it, they would have voted on their budget prior to the election. But it was like everything else they did: they held it up. They held it up like a carrot, and wanted us to bite, and as soon as we tried, they would have taken it away.

We said we would build a tourism industry. The minister responsible for that area is now developing a policy upon which we can build a tourism industry.

We said we would clean up DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan), and I believe it's basically cleaned up.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's getting there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There's some way to go yet.

MR. MYERS: — Oh, the minister formerly responsible for that area now tells me there's a long way to go, but he'll be there. He'll be there in a short time.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Just a little way.

MR. MYERS: — Just a little way to go? That's even better than a long way to go, because they had a long way to go — \$100 million a year on DNS — \$100 million. And when DNS took in Sask. Native and Rural Housing, 1,600 homes they built, and only 1,300 fit for habitation. There were so poorly constructed that it's taken a two-year program to go back and repair them.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about the equipment?

MR. MYERS: — And the equipment left laying out in the bush . . . We're only starting to get an idea of how extensive an inventory they had of equipment.

We said we would improve labour legislation and worker rights. Through Bill 104 we improved worker rights. We improved worker rights. We improved them so greatly that when they tried to muster a campaign against it, the workers quite frankly refused to come out. Their campaign just fell flat on its face.

We said we would negotiate the energy agreement, and we will be under the Minister of Energy and Mines.

We said we would place nursing homes under health care, and ambulance service under health care, and we did. We did place it under health care. That's where it should have belonged in the first place. And I would like to thank the hon. member for Moosomin for doing the study and submitting the report which brought about this change.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. MYERS: — Nursing homes; we've spent more in the last 18 months than they spent in the last eight years, in the last eight years. I just saw a list today of nursing homes which were cancelled. They were submitted but cancelled, and cancelled by the former government under their control.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They put a moratorium on it.

MR. MYERS: — They put a moratorium on, as my fellow member for Mayfair mentions.

We said we would fight inflation and we did, with 1 per cent less than inflation. We fought it, and it's coming down.

We said we would create jobs successfully, and I've said in the past we just did — 25,000 jobs in the last 18 months.

And most of all we said we would listen. We would listen to the people. We wouldn't become

incongruent to their needs. We would listen, and we have. It was their government that was too arrogant to go out to the people. They found out last April. They weren't listening. And it's only by some quirk of fate that they have eight members left.

Now, the members across the floor say we work by double standards, and as was pointed out, whose double standards — the double standards of Manitoba when they say they'll have same-day home delivery service, same-day home delivery service on alcohol of all things? Just reading form it as my fellow colleague did:

The Manitoba Liquor Control Commission announces improved home delivery service in the greater Winnipeg area. Just phone in your order for any of the listed spirits, wines, imported or domestic beer, available at the Liquor Commission outlets.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What province?

MR. MYERS: — Manitoba. And for those who don't know what Manitoba is, or which government it is under, it is under the NDP — the NDP. The same NDP members who, in the by-election, were flooding Prince Albert-Duck Lake, assisting the former member, Mr. Hammersmith, in trying to get re-elected. He is gone and we don't have home delivery service . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Oh, I understand, yes — double standards on alcohol.

I see the member from Shaunavon sitting across there. He's sitting there . . . I'm not sure if he's listening or rehashing his rounds into the leadership race of that party. I'm not sure, but when he holds a picnic, when he holds a picnic for women and men and children, he advertises beer gardens and free ice cream. That's the same member who stands up and criticizes liquor advertisements. They have said so much and meant so little. They are a party devoid of any philosophical or political design. They're an enigma sitting over there. They don't know which way to go. I'm told they're going down, and they realized that last February. They went from nine to eight and we didn't even have to wait for a general election.

Mr. Minister, Mr. Schmidt, the mover of the throne speech told us on Friday how, when he was young and full of socialistic ideas, that he was a member of the NDP party, and that when he attended the 1976 convention and tried to remove the gift and succession duties, that he was outvoted by a margin of 134 to 2; and he advised the Leader of the Opposition that he still had one good man left in that party. well, he's not sitting over there, so you guys had better go out and find him if you're looking for a new leader.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to thank the opposition for making it possible for this Chamber to be graced by Mr. Schmidt. You changed his ideas, or he changed his own, because of the ideas you had. He thought the NDP were a free party, but they're not. They're not a free party.

I would just like to glance on a few of the items in the throne speech. Agriculture — we've heard it from the hon. member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and we may have heard it from the member from Regina Centre, but we took the lead in trying to retain the Crow in this province. If the NDP had such an interest in retaining the Crow, the five federal members wouldn't have voted with the Liberal Party which now have revoked the Crow. And when Mr. Benjamin appears in the House of Commons with a stuffed crow, I believe he must have gone out and shot it because he sure did everything in his power to prevent us from keeping it.

I'd also like to touch on the livestock program. We need to revitalise that industry — revitalize it. Our finished cows are moving into Alberta and Ontario to be processed. Now, that's an industry we can seize upon and develop and revitalise, an industry we left, we lost under a former government.

I'd also like to touch on natural resources and energy — a record number of wells drilled as I said

before, a record and it's only November. And they challenged us last spring to beat the 1980 record their government set. Well, we beat it all right and it's going even higher. And when we became government 60 per cent of the oil fields were operating, only 60 per cent, and now we've got almost full employment and full operations in that sector.

Am I keeping you awake? I'm sorry, but the people of Saskatchewan should hear this, Mr. Lingenfelter.

We went to an upgrader, and we are studying a further upgrader in Lloydminster, a further upgrader in conjunction with private industry.

I'd like to touch upon crown corporations. Now we've been criticized for the sale of Intercontinental Packers. We sold it for \$4.5 million. We lost hundreds of thousands of dollars on it previous to that, and they lost hundreds of thousands of dollars previous to that.

When they bought Intercon, when they bought Intercon they did not even take the time out to have the value of the company appraised that they were buying. You know who appraised it? You know who appraised the sale of Intercon? Doug McArthur, the former minister in the former government. Doug McArthur appraised it. And before we sold it, before we returned it to the family who built that industry up, we had Coopers Lybrand appraise it, and that was the appraised value. But even when Doug McArthur appraised it, he said it was only worth \$6 million. And why? . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . How much we paid? We paid over \$10 million. They paid. I will correct that. They paid over \$10 million for something one of their own members appraised at \$6 million. I stand to be corrected, because they didn't pay it. The people of Saskatchewan paid it in taxation — taxation that went higher and higher under their government. Taxation that should never have been there.

I'd also like to touch upon the status of women. This government will be establishing a women's secretariat so women of this province have an outlet to proceed through for legislation that is required by them.

I would also like to touch upon health and social services. We made this province number one. In Saskatoon alone, a 238-bed facility costing \$17 million, a facility to care for all aspects in that area. A bed to care for people who may need assistance. Respite beds . . . respite beds. Although the Minister of Health may know what that mean, I shall explain it for the opposition.

Respite beds are when a person who is kept at home by their family, and caring for that person at home, would like to go on a holiday or take a vacation. These beds are available for a short duration of time for them to stay at . . . an institution for them to stay at, where their loved ones can at least have a holiday.

It also has a day care centre for people who are caring for those needy people, that they can take them during the day. Now it may be said that how do you provide such a facility? Well, you provide it through compassion for the people who require it. Seventeen million dollars — a figure they never spent in Saskatoon before on that type of accommodation.

The Minister of Health also announced \$17 million for a new extension to the cancer clinic services — long overdue and badly needed. And you know how badly needed it was when the cancer workers went on strike. You sat in here and you voted to put them back to work. So you knew how badly that service was needed. Two-point-seven million dollars towards the Kinsmen children's'. Now this Kinsmen children's is in conjunction with the University of Saskatchewan Hospital and the Department of Education. And it's also tied to a school. And the minister tells me it's the first in Canada, and I believe it's the first in Canada. The first in Canada. And they kept telling the people how they provided them with such services. Well, why didn't they provide it when they were in government? They had been petitioned and asked by the Kinsmen to provide such a service, but instead they kept the people in the rehab centre in old buildings built

during the war for the army and air force — old aircraft hangars. They also provided a million dollars for badly needed new equipment for St. Paul's Hospital, and another million dollars for City Hospital in Saskatoon. Now when you put it all together, it's a great figure, a figure that we've never seen in Saskatoon before.

Education and manpower — we provided Opportunities '83 program. We put the youth of this province to work during the summer, and it was them, that small group over there, that challenged us to do it, and we did it, and we exceeded, we exceeded our expectation.

Justice — touching upon justice; we have new acts that are badly needed.

Municipal government — we have a new urban and renewal planning and development act coming out, after . . . And this has been in consultation with the municipalities throughout this province; legislation they've wanted, they've wanted for 13 years, and now we're providing it for them . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . My colleague says, "Explain the word 'consultation'."

Well, let's explain what they were doing before. They weren't doing it; they weren't consulting the municipalities. They used to sit there in their little room, and decide how they could take control of this province, take the authority away from the municipalities — take it away; buy the farm land; buy the potash mines; buy anything their little hearts desired. Their little hearts were costing us a fortune. They bought a pulp mill in P.A. and they paid too much.

I'd like to touch upon Highways for a moment. Highways, under the hon. member from Wilkie, James Garner. The Borden bridge is now being built. They said it for several years; they were going to build it. They never did. Just like they said they were going to do a lot of other things. They were going to build roads here and there; roads that never got built. Sure, they two-laned, finished off the two-laneing between Saskatoon and Regina, but they never did any maintenance on it; they never tried to improve it. It was improved, improved this fall under the hon. minister.

It's a record in 18 months I am proud of, and, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the throne speech.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues, as well as myself . . . And I know, I have many things that I would like to add to this debate, but as it is near 10 o'clock, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:50 p.m.