

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
November 22, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING, SELECT, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

CLERK ASSISTANT (PROCEDURAL): — Mr. Tusa, from the continuing select committee, presented the first report of the committee which is as follows:

Your committee, in accordance with rule 88 of the Legislative Assembly, has established a select committee on fire prevention — protection. The terms of reference of the said select committee are as follows:

That a select committee on fire prevention — protection composed of five members be established to consider and report on:

Training requirements for fire brigades; training needs of volunteer, professional and industrial fire fighting personnel; institutional fire emergency programs, hotel fire emergency programs, government-owned buildings, emergency programs and fire-fighting prevention needs of police forces; the depth of training regarding; desirability of certification programs; arson investigation, educational requirements; injection of fire prevention education components into trade school courses, i.e., plumbers, sheet metal, electrical, etc.; the desirability of a permanent training facility with fire ground and burn facilities, classrooms, dormitories and a drill hall of adequate size for indoor ladder and fire fighting unit practice; so that training may be carried on throughout the year; to provide specialized facilities for training in hazardous goods and materials; specialized training in automatic sprinkler protection; advanced officer training; and facilities for small city fire departments to use. The adequacy of present fire statistic program maintained by fire safety unit and as required by section 4(b) of The Fire Prevention Act; and other matters of fire prevention or protection as may be relevant or appropriate.

And that the committee have the power to sit during intersessional period and during legislative sessions except when the Assembly is sitting; and that the committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, to receive representation from interested parties and individuals to engage such advisers and assistants as are required for the purpose of the inquiry, to require the assistance of staff employed by departments and agencies of government, and to hold meetings away from the seat of government in order that fullest representation may be received without unduly inconveniencing those desiring to be heard.

And that the committee be instructed to submit an interim report to the Legislative Assembly by March 31, 1984.

MR. TUSA: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a motion of concurrence but before so doing, with your permission, I would like to make a few remarks.

On April 21 of 1981, Mr. Speaker, there was a report submitted of the special committee on the review of rules and procedures of this Legislative Assembly in which they made a number of recommendations. Among the recommendations they made referred to select committees. I would like to read a few of the recommendations that that report contains.

That the rules be amended to provide for the establishment of a continuing select committee to be made up of nine members.

In this session of the legislature that hasn't been done, and there are seven government and two opposition members on the continuing select committee. Another recommendation was:

That the committee will have the power to establish from time to time select committees with the power to call for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath, and with the power to travel and to hear testimony away from the seat of the government.

That the continuing select committee will have the power to determine the broad topic for review, consideration and report by each select committee.

That the select committees be empowered to report directly to the Legislative Assembly from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of select committees has been modelled after the system used at Westminster. In their parliament they have select committees which continuously sit throughout the life of the legislature or parliament. However, we here in Saskatchewan do not have enough members to have continuously sitting select committees. Therefore, the mechanism of continuing select committees which would, from time to time, strike select committees, has been established.

These committees, Mr. Speaker, are particularly for the use of private members on both sides of the House. Through the mechanism of these select committees private members are able to have a direct input into the decision-making of government. They also have the opportunity to go out and talk to the public. So the public also has greater communication with their government.

I would like to point out to members on both sides of the House that select committees are very powerful. As the recommendation stated, they have the power to travel from the seat of government. They have the power to call witnesses. They have the power to make them swear under oath. They have the power to call for all papers that they deem necessary to carry out their study. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge members, and particularly private members, to look at the mechanism and vehicle of select committees very closely, and that they give serious consideration to using them in the future.

With that, I am very pleased to announce the striking of the first select committee, and the following members will be on a committee on fire safety and prevention. They are as follows: the member from Rosthern, Mr. Ralph Katzman, will be the convenor; the member from Kelvington-Wadena, Sherwin Peterson, will be on the committee; the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, Mr. Michael Hopfner, will be a member; the member from Regina North West, Mr. Bill Svenson, will be a member; and the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, Mr. Allen Engel, will be the fifth member.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move:

That the first report of the continuing select committee be now concurred in, seconded by Mr. Lingenfelter, the member from Shaunavon.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just but a few moments of the time of the Assembly to agree with the member who is moving the motion to establish this select committee that we indeed are in favour of the committee, and my colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg will be taking part as a committee member.

I think, however, I would be remiss if I didn't point out the fact that a similar committee proposed by the member from one of our northern constituencies, Mr. Fred Thompson, was

turned down only earlier on in this year — a committee that would have studied economic conditions in the North, the fact that 85 per cent of the people in the North are unemployed — that our proposed committee dealt with by the continuing select committee was turned down. I would hope that in the future that the kind of co-operation that is expressed today by the opposition in setting up a committee proposed by a government member, that we would get the same kind of co-operation, which hasn't been evident in the past, and I do second the motion by the member who made the motion.

SOME HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. MR. EMBURY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the House, 22 grade eight students from Davin School in Regina, from my constituency, and their teacher, Terry Vargo. I hope that they have had a good tour of the buildings, and they are here to watch with question period. Unfortunately, I will not be able to join them at 2:30, but my colleague, the Minister of Culture and Recreation, Mr. Folk, will join them. I would ask the members of the House to welcome them to this Assembly.

HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to join my colleague from Regina Lakeview in welcoming these students from Davin School. While the school is physically in Lakeview, the vast majority of the students actually come from Regina Centre, the heart of Regina centre. So I want to second what my learned friend said, and hope that your visit today is educational and worthwhile.

HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RYBCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, 35 students from the Regina Plains Community College, registered with the adult education upgrading class. They are accompanied with teacher-chaperones Bob Brown and Rosemarie Sturge, and are seated in the West Gallery. I hope their stay here will be both educational and entertaining, and I look forward to meeting them at 3:00 o'clock for pictures and refreshments, and I would ask the House to welcome them here please.

HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — This is a repeat performance. I take the word of the staff of the Assembly that this school is physically located in Regina Victoria, although the Regina Plains Community College is in Regina Centre. And I suspect that many of their classes are taken in Regina Centre.

Once again I want to welcome these students. I hope that your visit here is educational and worth while as it often has been in the past when you've met with the member for Regina Centre.

HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Saskatchewan Inflation Rate

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of

Consumer and Commercial Affairs. It has to do with the latest cost-of-living figures which have become public this morning, issued by Statistics Canada. And those figures show that Regina and Saskatoon are tied at having the second highest inflation rate in Canada year over year. In the last 12 months, Regina and Saskatoon are tied for having the second highest rate of inflation. The inflation rate in Regina and Saskatoon is 6.1 per cent while the national average is 4.9 per cent. And this can only get worse as winter approaches.

My question to the minister is this: what specific plans does the Minister have to reduce the rate of inflation for citizens of Regina, Saskatoon, and elsewhere in Saskatchewan this winter?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, I might remind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that under his administration the cost of living was as high as 12 per cent, and I think that getting it down to . . .

HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Eighteen months later it's at 6 per cent. I also might add, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for the slight increase is the cost of alcohol and food, of which we really do not have much control.

The latest increase in alcohol was directly attributed to the federal excise tax.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the fact that Saskatchewan has about the highest inflation rate of Canada, does the Minister of Consumer Affairs agree with the actions of her government in increasing utility rates two, three, sometimes four, and even more times the rate of inflation?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — In response to the Leader of the Opposition's supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to remind the hon. member that under his administration utility increases increased three times a year, at times as high as 23 to 27 per cent. Now we froze, Mr. Speaker, we froze utility rates in Saskatchewan for one year, as we told the people we would out on the hustings, because we wanted to know for sure that those increases that the utility crowns were requesting were justified. We have put into place PURC. PURC is doing an excellent job, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in meeting with the consumer association of Saskatchewan branch, a few weeks ago, they were most pleased that PURC is in place and that the consumers finally have an input into determining utility costs.

SOME HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the minister will know, PURC grants no increases . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. This is a time for asking questions not giving information. If the member has a question, proceed.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the public utilities review commission grants no increases that are not asked for by the utilities, and in view of the fact that your government has imposed a 5 per cent guide-line on working people, on school boards and hospital boards, do you agree with the utility should impose the same guide-line on themselves when asking for increases in utility rates by the public utilities review commission?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — The utilities apply for an increase, given the information they have inside, given their projections for the upcoming year, given projections in the long term for additional capital expenditures. That's what utility increases are based on, Mr. Speaker, and I might add that PURC will not play with utilities like the former administration did. When an

election was coming up, down went the utility rates. When the election was over, up went the utility rates. We want our crown corporations to work efficiently and provide a service to the people of Saskatchewan. PURC has the authority either to grant a higher increase than is asked for or roll back an increase that was requested. I think we have a lot of knowledgeable people sitting on PURC, and I tell you, this government has faith in their decisions.

SOME HON MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it no part of the policy of your government to restrict the requests that the utilities make for rate increases to something akin to what you are asking working people to accept as increases in incomes?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that under the former administration the performance of the crowns . . . After the massive borrowings that were ordered by the previous administration, the debt ratio of the crowns are extremely alarming. It is something that this government will have to cope with and we are coping with it, and we are making long-term plans. And in essence, what do the utilities do? I can recall the former attorney general saying that utilities must be able to provide a service to the public at a break-even cost. We're trying to provide that. Unfortunately, because of the massive debts incurred by the utilities prior to us taking over, those previous debts must be addressed, and this is the only way that we will accomplish it.

Statistics Canada Report on Inflation

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. In the StatsCan report for July, Statistics Canada attributed the rising rate of inflation in Regina and Saskatoon, which was already then at near record levels, to natural gas and power increases. In the Statistics Canada report for August, Statistics Canada attributed the rising rate of inflation in Regina and Saskatoon as accountable for by the SGI insurance premiums. Stated by Statistics Canada in their report. Members opposite who deny that can look at the report. My question to the Minister is this: in the light of the July Statistics Canada report and the August Statistics Canada report, can she continue to deny the relationship of those utility increases with the rising cost of living and her failure to protect consumers?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, the increase in the CPI that have just been let out for October, the rise is attributed to the cost of alcohol — now the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we lower the cost of alcohol — and the increase in the cost of food. Now he is taking the stance of his federal leader's wife; he wants us to pay the farmers of Saskatchewan less for their products than they deserve.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I am somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear grain prices get into that answer, but I guess they did.

MR. SPEAKER: — Comments of that type are not allowed in question period.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — My question to the minister is — the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs — will the minister no admit, in the light of the StatsCan report for July and August, that the time has come to end the double standard, that the time has come to admit that a double standard isn't just bad leadership — it aborted your restraint program before it began?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I apologize to the member. I didn't hear your question. I couldn't hear it over your colleagues that were hollering.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Will the minister not admit that the time has come to end the double standard of one rate for people's salaries and no controls at all on utility increases, in the light of

the clear and straightforward report of StatsCanada for July and August?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I would hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a double standard. We have imposed a 5 per cent limit — that's better than what Manitoba has done. They're at zero to three. I think we're quite generous with the 5 per cent. The government, I don't think, would want at this point, and I don't think we could get into price controls. There's too many outside factors.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. When the utility rate increases of 13, 15, 18.5, and 43 per cent were announced, what information did your department provide you with on the impact of those increases on the cost of living?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I don't quite understand the thrust of the hon. member's question. The increases that were allowed by the public utility review commission were based on information that they had had. There's two opposing sides to every question. The learned men and women sitting on the utility review commission base their decisions on the information provided to them by the crowns on behalf of consumers, The Consumers Association, Saskatchewan branch, made a presentation, made their feelings known, and the utility costs that were permitted are a decision purely of that board.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I would direct to the minister's attention the same question since she didn't answer it. What information did your department provide you on the impact of those utility rate increases on the cost of living when they were announced by the utilities?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — My department didn't provide me with any impact. We don't do our own survey here in Saskatchewan. We rely on the Canadian figures as they are gathered right across the country. We don't have the resources to do that.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, supplementary. Is the minister telling this House that your government went ahead, increased the utility rates without any thought and without any information on the effect that that would have on the pocket-books of the average consumer, the small business person, and the farmer in this province? How do you call such a department a representative of a Saskatchewan consumer?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not realize what the Department of Consumer and Commercial Affairs does. I can say that in determining the type of increase that the crowns have to ask for, I am very confident that the people sitting in those crowns are very cognizant on the increasing costs to consumer for certain utilities. But what are we to do? We have an awful debt to service, a debt incurred by the members opposite when they were in power. And those debts, you know . . . I don't know how they borrow money, but on this side of the House when you borrow money you got to pay it back. And we're attempting to pay back the literally hundreds of millions of dollars that they borrowed without any thought of ever having to come down to the day when those capital borrowings had to be paid back, and that's what we're doing right now.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well was that, was that . . . By that brief, concise answer were you telling this House that those utility rate increases were announced without any information, and without any idea of what impact that was going to have on the Saskatchewan consumer?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — No, they weren't. Mr. Speaker, PURC, when they meet, PURC is opened. Various organizations make representations to PURC. One was the consumers association Saskatchewan branch. Small businesses have made representations. Various organizations who are users of utilities have made representation, and I must say in looking at what some of the utilities were asking for as a rate of increase, and what PURC actually will allow them, I would say that the members of PURC took into consideration the representations made to them by the public.

Claim Against Richard Collver

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. This question, Mr. Speaker, has to do with what I term the sweetheart deal which he approved at the expense of the Saskatchewan taxpayers with respect to the former leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, one Dick Collver. My question to the minister is this: will he table in the legislature the independent legal opinions which he received which recommended to him that the claim against Dick Collver of in excess of \$1.1 million be dropped?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the hon. member to repeat the last part of the question. I'm sorry I didn't hear it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this: will he table in this legislature the opinions which he received from independent legal counsel advising SGI that they should drop a claim of more than \$1 million against Mr. Richard Collver?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, no I will not table those documents and I don't know why the . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order. Order. When the Speaker's on his feet the Assembly is to be quiet, and if that rule is not obeyed then I'm going to ask a couple of members to leave the Assembly. Will you give the member a chance to answer?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I will not table any of those documents. The hon. member opposite had the same information handed to him when he was government. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that it was a political move on their part to begin with to initiate that law suit. They spent \$100,000 or more in the time that they were in government. Mr. Speaker, it would have cost us another two or three times that amount of money to continue with it, to service nothing more than a vendetta, as my hon. colleague indicated.

They had six years in which to bring that case to trial, and didn't bother moving on it at all during that period of time, Mr. Speaker. The suit was initiated, as a matter of fact, just prior to the 1978 election for the sole reason of embarrassing the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party at that time. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have no reason, I have absolutely no reason to protect Mr. Collver or anyone else, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order, please.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is this: on what condition does the minister refuse to table the independent legal opinions on which he is giving up a claim for over \$1 million which the public of Saskatchewan have a right to recover if it is in fact recoverable?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I indicated I won't table any of the information that we have. They have the information while they were in government. They were given the same advice by legal counsel at that time. The main reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have no intention of tabling that information is I don't intend to allow these people to harass any of those people.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the information given to the House that the previous government had a legal opinion advising the dropping of the suit, in view of the fact that that information is totally and 100 per cent wrong, will the minister now obtain an opinion from independent counsel and lay it before this House,

indicating that in the opinion of independent counsel that claim of more than \$1 million should have been abandoned?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: —Mr. Speaker, if I may have my chance at this. The decision that was made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would you like to try it? Thank you.

The decision that was made by the board, Mr. Speaker, was a very proper one, and it was a business decision that was made by the board and by management. As I indicated earlier, that claim sat for six years. It was started in 1976, initiated in 1978, and by the time we came to government in 1982 nothing had happened with it. The sole intention of that claim was for the purpose (for political reasons) to embarrass the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

He talks about a \$1 million suit of recovery. First of all, there was a credit check made. There were no assets in Canada. Mr. Collver had no assets in Canada. Had we won the case, there was no guarantee we could have recovered any money. Secondly, there was a credit check done in the United States. The cost of attempting to recover anything in the United States was astronomical. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the counter-suits could very well have cost SGI an equal amount of money without any opportunity of recovering any of the money that we might have won on, had we won it. There was no guarantee . . . As the hon. member knows full well, there is no guarantee that we might win a case. We may spend \$200,000 or \$300,000 in attempting to win a case, lose it, lose the counter-claim against the case that had been initiated by Mr. Collver, and end up by paying an equal amount of money. And in the long run, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan would be a million-and-a-half the loser rather than not be losing anything at all as it is now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the business decision referred to by the minister was made by the board of SGI, and in view of the fact that that board at that time consisted of the minister who was a Collver candidate in 1978, Mr. Ray Malinowski, who was a Collver candidate in 1978, Mr. Al Wager who was a Collver candidate in 1978, and Mr. Eli Fluter who was a campaign manager for a Collver candidate in 1978, do you not think it would have been better to assure the public that an impartial decision was made to obtain an independent opinion from an independent lawyer and make that decision public?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. If members ask questions I believe it's only proper that the minister be given an opportunity to answer, and I believe his colleagues could also give him an opportunity to hear and to answer.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — First of all, Mr. Speaker, he also left out 12 other members of the board that are on SGI's board of directors. Secondly you had six years in which to move on this case. why didn't you do it while you had the chance? Why didn't you use the opportunity when you were government? You blew it. You had until April of 1982 to solve the case. I'll tell you why — because you were told not to. That was the reason you didn't move on with it. You were told by your own management and your own board there was no point in moving on it, so you didn't. Now you wonder why we didn't move on it. We at least did a review of it. We spent a year reviewing it, and we did get an independent opinion on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. With respect to the counsel, the very distinguished counsel, Mr. Si Halyk, engaged to pursue this matter, who engaged it, who commenced the action and pursued it to the examination for discovery stage, did you obtain an independent opinion from Mr. Halyk and, if so, will you make it available to the House?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: —Mr. Speaker, in 1980 late . . . I can't remember the exact dates. In 1982 the case was transferred to another solicitor. I might also add — he talks about Mr. Halyk in

this legislature — that it was in 1977 that the minister at the time who was responsible for SGI called a meeting of three or four individuals, asked if there was a possibility of pursuing a case against Mr. Collver. This was in November of 1977, Mr. Speaker.

It was immediately thereafter that I believe it was Mr. Halyk came back with the recommendation that yes, there was a possibility for action. He was then instructed by the minister not to do anything until May of the following year just prior to an election . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. We've shouted the question period out. I think we'll proceed with the order paper.

Order, please. It's very difficult to accomplish any work in the House if members are not going to co-operate, and I would ask for them to co-operate so that we can be heard.

MOTIONS

Hours of Sitting

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Meadow Lake, by leave of the Assembly:

That notwithstanding rule 3 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, that this assembly shall on Thursday, November 24, 1983, meet at 10 o'clock a.m. until 1 o'clock p.m., and that when this Assembly adjourns on Thursday, November 24, 1983, it do stand adjourned until Monday, November 28, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, this is at the request of the members opposite to attend their provincial convention, a percent that has been maintained in this House for some time. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I move the said motion.

Motion agreed to.

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Yes, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day, I wonder perhaps if I would be permitted to make a short comment with regards to an event in history that happened 20 years ago today when John F. Kennedy, then president of the United States, was assassinated in Dallas, Texas.

History in the making at that time was abruptly stopped, and I suppose was left to the imagination of the world as to what was going to happen and what in fact did happen. Today we perhaps ask ourselves, and perhaps the media more than we ask ourselves, how good of a president was John F. Kennedy? And too often it seems to me, that's what we see in the headlines of a newspaper. It seems also that it's rather foolhardy. I would suggest, to argue a man's greatness 20 years after his death. The reality is that, the way I would see it, is John Fitzgerald Kennedy brought a new sense of politics when he came to office more than 20 years ago today. Perhaps new idealism, a sense of populism, a sense of youth, a sense of vitality, that the American and perhaps the world — a political stage — had not seen before, or certainly had not seen before for many generations.

Kennedy was a symbol of hope for a lot of American people, and I think a symbol of hope for a lot of people in the entire western world; a man who defied all odds. Is suppose, to become the first Irish Catholic citizen of United States ever to become a president; a man who devoted himself and brought a new focus to the whole concept of equality in American politics to, I

suppose, the civil rights movement and to many other things.

He met various crises in his thousand days as president of the United States on the international stage — the Bay of Pigs, Laos, the question of Berlin, the Vietnam situation, and the extension of that particular situation.

Perhaps more than anything, the death of John Kennedy signalled a new era in American politics, and perhaps in western world politics, in the advent of violence to our society, and violence against leaders of our society that perhaps we hadn't seen at least in several decades before that.

With the murder of this, what I believe to be a great man, we see following that, the murder of various other figures, including his brother, Bobby Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, and several other people. But certainly I think it augured in a new era of violence against politicians, and I think, looking at this from members of this Assembly, members who are elected by the people of our jurisdiction, I think something that we have all had to live with in that era of time.

Perhaps all of us would have the memories that we would see of the former President Kennedy. Perhaps I, like many others, would be attracted to the inaugural address when John Kennedy just became the president of the United States. And the words that he spoke at that time perhaps are very true again today, and perhaps could be forcefully advanced again today, when he said:

Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country.

And I think, more than anything else, that phrase and those words depict to me, and to many other Canadians, and certainly to many other Americans, the meaning of John Kennedy.

I think the world lost a great leader 20 years ago today. I think Canada had a special place in its heart for John Kennedy, and certainly the Americans did. And I would simply like to join with other members of this Assembly in commemorating the death of a great man 20 years ago today. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, may I add a brief word to that which has been addressed to the House by the Minister of Finance.

John Kennedy was a remarkable figure in the history of the United states and the history of the world.

The world suffered an enormous trauma during World War II, and following that, there came leaders who were by and large associated with World War II: Mr. Clement Attlee, and Mr. Charles DeGaulle, and President Eisenhower, and Winston Churchill was another. And then at the end of the '50s the world had more or less reached the time when a new leader could turn, not backward toward the conflict of the previous decades, but forward toward the promise of what the rest of this century might be able to hold for us.

And in the very forefront of that change of mood, potential change of mood for the world, was John F. Kennedy, a person who brought a dynamic personality, a particular sense of charm, of intellect, of ability to rally around him fine minds that the Americans have called on many occasions "the brightest and the best." And he was able to do that, and in the course of so doing hold out hope and promise for a world which was searching for that hope and that promise.

Undoubtedly, he would have suffered the same problems that other politicians suffer when in office. Martyrdom no doubt saved him from the compromises that inhabit the imperfect world of politics, but when he came upon the stage he offered to the people of the United States an opportunity to dedicate themselves to the high ideals which have always been part of the American dream and the American heritage.

None of us can say what would have happened had he survived. All of us, I think, can acknowledge that this best hope of a new frontier — the words he used — of some new initiatives, perished when he died on the streets of Dallas. The Americans picked up their lives and the public affairs of their country in a way which was the admiration, I think, of the world. None the less, they picked up their lives and the public affairs of their country with a sense of sadness and a sense of loss from which they have never fully recovered.

I know that all of us in Canada, who had a great affection for John F. since he came from Massachusetts, which has many, many connections with Canada, share their sense of loss, and I join with the Minister of Finance today in expressing our sympathy and sense of sharing their loss with the people of the United States.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Schmidt that a humble address be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, before getting into the main thrust of my remarks this afternoon, I would like to congratulate the addition to cabinet, my new colleagues in cabinet, particularly the Minister of Agriculture, who as legislative secretary to the former minister of agriculture was very well trained and I think is going to be an excellent Minister of Agriculture, and additionally, the legislative secretaries that have been added to the list of those who are out serving the public of Saskatchewan. Additionally, I would . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, and additionally I would like to congratulate those who have received appointments as officers of the legislature and officers of our caucus, and while I'm doing that I might also congratulate any changes that may have been made or may be coming to members opposite, Mr. Speaker.

Now that I have that off my chest, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal for a while with some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday when he was addressing this Assembly, and in no particular order, I'll just deal with them as they come to mind, and I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition will listen attentively, because I don't raise these to embarrass anyone, I just raise them to set the record straight.

And I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition was embarrassed when the member from Shaunavon raised earlier this summer the issue of the luxury cars. And it's true that many of us on this side of the House do drive luxury cars. I have, Mr. Speaker, a luxury car, and I enjoy it very much. It's a good car. It's got about 90,000 kilometres on it. I get about 18 miles to the gallon; I haven't made the metric conversion on mileage yet, but it's about 90,000 kilometres on it and it's a good car. It's a luxury car. It's a 1980 or '81 Olds Delta 88.

But not all in my caucus have a luxury car, Mr. Speaker. I have a cabinet colleague who invited me to ride to Saskatoon with him here a couple of weeks ago. I couldn't get into his car, Mr. Speaker. He has a little wee tiny Ford, trucking on down the highway there. We turned around. My colleague, the Minister for Small Business and Tourism, now he fit the car all right. I couldn't get into it.

My colleague, another little guy, the Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower, drives a 1980 or '81 Camaro, a nice little sports car just zinging on down the road there. But he didn't buy

that, Mr. Speaker. He didn't order it through the CVA. The fellow who had that car, that nice little sports car zinging around the countryside, out impressing the agriculture community of Saskatchewan, was the former deputy minister of agriculture, Gerry Gartner, the fellow that the Queen found it desirable to terminate. He's now in that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where is he? Manitoba?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, yes. He's now in Manitoba doing to Manitoba what he did to Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — But I want to get back to my luxury car. I want to get back to my luxury car, Mr. Speaker, because my luxury car, depending how the sun's shining on it, is either yellow or green. I'm not sure; just kind of in between there. But aside from that, it is identical to the luxury car that the Leader of the Opposition drives which happens to be black. Now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And yours has more miles on it?

And where did I get my luxury car, Mr. Speaker? Well I think I may be given a small clue when I tried to describe the colour of it. My luxury car, before I inherited it, was driven by one Don Cody, former minister in the Blakeney government. and I just wanted to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker. We have luxury cars. Absolutely. Pontiac Parsienne, luxury car. My colleague, the Minister of Energy. We have luxury cars but where did we get them? We inherited them, Mr. Speaker. They left them for us.

I want to talk a little bit . . . I'm sorry to see the Leader of the Opposition going but I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And it's going to get heavier. Because I want to talk a little bit, Mr. Speaker, about double standard, something that the member for Quill Lakes will be very, very familiar with, Mr. Blakeney, in his . . . I mean the Leader of the Opposition, because I have to be formal in this place. Mr. Speaker, I can't call him Al or Mr. Blakeney. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday talked about the new government hiring our friends. Well, yes, we've done that; we've done that. George Hill is my friend, and Dennis Ball is my friend. Al Wager is my friend; Eli Fluter is my friend; Cliff Wright is my friend; Wally Nelson is my friend; Herb Pinder is my friend. Nadine Hund is not my friend. Nadine Hunt is not my friend. I don't apologize at all for hiring our friends; we hired a lot of competent people. They're doing a great job for us.

Now, I want to talk to you, Mr. Speaker, for a while about the incestuous relationship that had gone on with the previous administration, and I do hope that the member for Quill Lakes comes back before I get half-way through the list because he who's up on it. He shows up on it a time or two. and I know that you people had a lot of friends and you hired them all — every one of them. I'm sure. But I want to go through just . . . And this by no means all-encompassing, Mr. Speaker. This is just a few of the names that I was able to just pull off the top of my head earlier today.

But we have here, Mr. Speaker, a fellow . . . And I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that some of these people may have even been competent professional civil servants. But the point I want to make is that, by and large, they were friends of the government opposite, and they got their positions, buy and large, through their connections with the members opposite. And I'm going to go through some of the list, just you know, because I don't think that everybody is aware of this. And I will go, only because they're written this way, in alphabetical order.

I have here the first one: Harvey Abells. Who is Harvey Abells? Harvey Abells is a former Tommy Douglas organizer. Look at this — son-in-law to Auburn Pepper, former NDP MLA for Weyburn . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And that's fine, that's fine. I think probably he was; I think probably he was. I think probably he was, Mr. Speaker, a competent, professional civil servant. The fact is, he was a friend of the former administration. I'm not critical of you for hiring your friend; he was

a good guy, probably did a good job. We hired a few good guys, too, that are doing good jobs, and they're friends.

Oh, but look at this, Janet Abells, (or is that Jeanette?) daughter of Auburn Pepper, secretary to the minister of northern Saskatchewan. And she was probably a very good secretary and a friend.

Now we have, in alphabetical order, Mr. Speaker, Doug Archer. Doug Archer was an EA to the hon. (your predecessor, not while he was Mr. Speaker. I'm thinking that it was much earlier than that) but Doug Archer was an EA to the former hon. Mr. Brockelbank, and he was appointed director of administration, Government Services. What's his connection with the party? What's his connection . . . I guess what I'm trying to figure out, Mr. Speaker, how was it he was able to get his job? Was it because he was competent? Was it because he was a friend of the former government? Was it because he had some blood relationship to someone in the former government? Well, I looked on my list, and it says here that he was in fact a brother-in-law of Mr. Bill Knight, former NDP MP for Assiniboia.

I'm going to bring you right up to the present day, I'll tell you that, if it takes me till 10 o'clock tonight. The list is long.

Then we have Pat Atkinson. Now Pat Atkinson still works for government — not for me. She might even be doing a good job. I don't know, because she doesn't work for me. But how did she get her job, Mr. Speaker? I'm a little curious. It might have even been through a competition. I don't know, but she's a friend of members opposite. And who is Pat Atkinson? Pat Atkinson ran against my colleague from Saskatoon Nutana for the NDP in the last election. Now what did she do prior to that to cement this relationship with members opposite? She was vice-president, Mr. Speaker, of the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan. Her dad's name was Roy Atkinson — Roy Atkinson, a very, very dear friend of mine, former president of the National Farmer's Union, Mr. Speaker.

Now we have in alphabetical order, Mr. Speaker — and I'm skipping a few because I don't want to take up the whole day on this; I'm just doing this for the record you understand — we have a fellow here by the name of Curtis Bowerman. Curtis Bowerman, Mr. Speaker, worked for the highway traffic board. And who is Curtis Bowerman, Mr. Speaker? Curtis Bowerman is the son of Ted Bowerman, former NDP cabinet minister.

And continuing, Mr. Speaker, in alphabetical order, George Burton — George Burton worked with the transportation agency as director of public communications. I don't know where George is today, Mr. Speaker. I think George might have even been competent. I don't know, I never knew the fellow. But I know John, and John was George's brother. John was the former NDP MP, and I even forget what riding, but that's not important. Then he was given this position by my predecessor when I was in agriculture. He was given the position of director of the transportation agency, Mr. Speaker. I found it to be the Queen's wish, Mr. Speaker, that he should no longer work for government, and so I obliged the Queen and he no longer works for government, Mr. Speaker. Now we have another Burton. We have another Burton — wife of John F. Burton, Zenny Burton, and she worked for the Highway Traffic Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Zenny Burton. I don't know where John is today. I kind of sense from the question periods lately that he is doing the research for members opposite, but I'm not entirely sure about that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, he may have.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have another name here that will be familiar to all. I'm driving a luxury car that used to be his — Don Cody's. Don Cody was an MLA from '71 to '75, when my colleague, the Attorney General, put him into retirement. A rather cosy little arrangement was worked out with his friends opposite. He was given a senior position, Mr. Speaker, in SGI. Some retirement.

Some cosy little arrangement. Talk about looking after your friends. And this incestuous little relationship . . . (inaudible) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on a few more.

I see here that's a Donald Faris. Donald Faris,, Mr. Speaker. He's the independent guy on the . . . (inaudible) . . . Exactly right. Appointed, Mr. Speaker, director of communication. Did he sit in this House from '71 to '75? Donald Faris, I understand, sat in this House from '71 to '75. He was torpedoed from office, Mr. Speaker, by my friend and colleague, the Hon. Gerald Muirhead. He will never see the light of day inside this Chamber again. And, Mr. Speaker, from '75 to '78, where was Donald Faris — or '75 to whenever we got to him.? Oh, I'm sorry. I made a mistake. '78. It was '78. It was '78. It was '78 that you finally fixed him up and made him director of communications and education, Department of Co-ops . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm going to get to that. I'm going to get to that.

And continuing in alphabetical order, Margaret Fern. Margaret Fern was an NDP candidate in '82 in Regina South. Sought the NDP provincial . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, she took two runs at it. She took a run at a seat in Saskatoon in '81 and didn't get the nomination so she came down to Regina thinking . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, I understand that you would be. I understand that you would be. It was a nomination. It was a nomination, and I should take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to explain to the member from Regina Centre the difference between a nomination and an election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think the record will bear it out.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on, and we have guys like . . . I know this guy to be competent, but I'm wondering if he would have been here had it not been for his relationship with the previous administration.

One Ted Glover, NDP candidate in Milestone. Remember him? David Henley. Gwen Jones, Don Keith, Bill Knight. Who's this Bill Knight? Former NDP MP, appointed principal secretary to the premier. Where is he now? I understand you guys blamed him for blowing you out of the water last time, and so you've banished him to . . . Oh, and Mr. Speaker, here's another Knight — Howard Knight, bother to Bill Knight, appointed EA to minister in charge of the Rentalsman . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right, cousin to Doug Archer; cousin to Bill Knight.

Look at this one, Mr. Speaker. We have here . . . Surely this can't be his whole family.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, I don't think he had anybody in his family who didn't work for government.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — I'm sure. You all may have heard of the name Koskie. Deanna Koskie. I'm just going to touch a few of them, Mr. Speaker. Deanna Koskie, wife of Morley Koskie, sister-in-law to Murray Koskie. Well, she worked in the AG's department. Linda Koskie, well, sister-in-law to Murray Koskie, Morley Koskie, brother to former cabinet minister, Murray Koskie.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What did Morley do?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Vice president of SGI. Is he still there? He's not there anymore, Mr. Speaker. Ted Koskie, appointed executive assistant to the Minister of Consumer Affairs; brother of Murray Koskie.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think part of the reason for the slight increase in the unemployment figures in Saskatchewan today is that the Koskie family is no longer working for government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Well, we have names like Kramer, Kuziak, Liggett, Kowalchuk, Lusney.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Which Lusney would that be? Is that Norm's EA?

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — No, Kimberley Lusney, appointed clerk, Minister of Finance. Father — you'll never guess — Norman Lusney, MLA.

Gordon McNeil, Mr. Speaker. Gordon McNeil, NDP MLA from '75 to '78. He used to sit right in that chair beside my colleague, only my colleague wasn't there then.

I can remember when he used to get up her and get carried away on some emotional tangent. What happened to him, Mr. Speaker? Well, after the 1978 election, he was fixed up with a nice, cushy job at SMDC. But he was the man that had some character because, when the government changed hands in 1982, he had the decency to resign. He didn't wait for yours truly to become chairman of SMDC and take care of it otherwise.

Nesdoly — giving him a job with community college in Nipawin. And the list goes on and on.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't stop. Don't stop.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Schmeichel. Dale Schmeichel was an EA to the Hon. John Messner, sought the nomination for the NDP but lost, and as his reward for his valiant effort, he was given a job at SMDC. I took some personal delight in seeing that that no longer existed, but he had a brother called Francis Schmeichel was an EA to the Hon. E. Cowley. I mean this really is a happy family you guys have.

Going back into history a little bit, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Regina Centre came up through the system as well. He got his training as EA to the former attorney general. Then there was . . . I don't know. Is she still your partner in law — Louise Simard? If she is still the partner in law of my colleague, she's by far the smartest of the two. She also sought the nomination for the NDP and worked for the attorney general.

Randy Snyder, son of Gordon Snyder, former minister of labour; Alex Taylor, defeated NDP MLA appointed director of negotiations, Department of Health; George Taylor, Attorney General's department . . . I mean, Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. The member for Cannington takes some delight in setting the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit more about double standards. That takes me to the question of beer and wine advertising. On the one hand . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Mr. Speaker, I think I struck a nerve. I think I struck a nerve.

Mr. Speaker, you see, we had in the neighbourhood of \$400,000 a year going out of the province, advertising dollars going out of the province, to pump advertising back into Saskatchewan through cable and satellites and magazines and books and out-of-province publications. So it was here anyway. All we said was let's take a look at putting some controls in, putting some positive advertising tied to it — some control, as it were, and keep the advertising dollar at home. That's all we said, and we did that. So the advertising dollar is kept at home.

I see that the member for Shaunavon agrees with this . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . The member for Shaunavon agrees with this, Mr. Speaker. He has, on Saturday, August 13, in Admiral, Saskatchewan — in Admiral, Saskatchewan . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now he's denying that he had anything to do with it, Mr. Speaker. I understand that he wasn't invited.

Mr. Speaker, let me read from this advertisement from the *Maple Creek News*, Mr. Speaker. It says:

Sponsored by the Shaunavon New Democrats, admission free, take part in the horseshoe pitching, play some bingo, ride real ponies, cool off (Mr. Speaker), cool off

at the beer garden.

It says, "Cool off at the beer garden, children," just to read one line, Mr. Speaker. It goes on to say: "will receive free ice cream."

We have another one here, Mr. Speaker, Regina Victoria NDP association. And they have on Sunday afternoon, October 16, 1 p.m., \$10,000 in winnings, Mr. Speaker, lunch and refreshments. I don't know what refreshments mean in this case . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I don't; no, I don't, because I take you back to the days of the Schenley awards in 1977 or '78 when the Schenley booze company was the biggest donator to members opposite. I'm not sure that patronage was one of the conditions of that particular donation, but \$10,000 in prizes, Mr. Speaker, for an NDP constituency association gathering on Sunday afternoon?

Let's talk about double standards for awhile, Mr. Speaker. I think I dropped the most exciting one, Mr. Speaker, we got into booze in a big way in Saskatchewan, this advertising and promoting and making it all happen. But when we say we deliver we don't mean quite the same thing as our counterparts in Manitoba. I'm going to table this when I'm finished talking about it, Mr. Speaker, because I think it should be. It says, and this is an ad sponsored by the Manitoba liquor control commission in NDP Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, introducing same-day delivery service:

The Manitoba liquor control commission announces improved home delivery service. Just phone in your order for any of our listed spirits, wines, imported or domestic beer.

And the member from Shaunavon says: why didn't they think of that?

Our authorized bonded drivers will deliver your orders on the same day.

That's the NDP answer to home care, Mr. Speaker. And just in case members opposite are ever in Manitoba, the phone number is 783-7177, Monday through Saturday. Your order will arrive C.O.D. with a \$2.95 delivery charge. Quick, convenient, reliable, same-day service from the Manitoba NDP liquor control commission, Mr. Speaker, and I'm wondering Mr. Speaker if it wouldn't be appropriate to ask our friend and former colleague, Donald Faris, to go over and counsel the members of the legislature in Manitoba as it relates to what surely must be considered a double standard, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination.

Now I'd like to talk about some other so-called facts, Mr. Speaker, as set out by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, and I quote Mr. Speaker, from page (it's got to be here some place) but anyway it's from the Hansard of yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking. He said:

Just short months ago our government agreed to sell the shares of Intercontinental Packers when he knew, or ought to have knows, that that company was proposing to close down its Regina plant, probably permanently. The result of the action taken by that minister was 125 jobs probably gone for good. Is that (he goes on to say) his idea of making jobs a priority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here minutes, Mr. Speaker, of September '81, I believe CIC board meeting. This is Intercon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You are absolutely right; this is a board meeting of Intercon with Mr. Beatty and Mr. Barg. Mr. Beatty and Mr. Barg, known to many of us, worked for CIC under the former administration. And it says here, Mr. Speaker . . . This is September '81, this particular board meeting and it's being a little reflective because it recognizes now that the previous administration made a terrible mistake back in 1971 when they bought into Intercontinental Packers, and encouraged them to do the Regina expansion in the first place. But it's talking about 1971 and it says:

At the time hog production was expanding rapidly in the province and projected to triple from 1 million hogs in 1971 to 3 million hogs in 1981. The Department of Agriculture had a number of programs in effect to encourage increased production and many new hog production units were being established in various parts of the province. The new facilities were completed and officially opened a short time after the provincial government became a shareholder in the operations in early '73.

But by this time, Mr. Speaker, producers began to drastically reduce hog production rather than the predicted increases. Production actually declined by 50 per cent. Why did it decline, Mr. Speaker? Well, it just happens that in 1972 the previous administration imposed a hog marketing commission on to the producers of Saskatchewan and they just weren't going to tolerate it. So hog production dropped, the operation was no longer viable, and it took them from '71-'73 to 1981 to figure this out.

But in the meantime they had done a few things, Mr. Speaker. They, in 1974, discontinued hog-cutting operations in Regina. In 1976, hog-killing operations were discontinued in Regina, and there were several other things they did in Regina to try and keep it alive. But it was noted, Mr. Speaker, that the study recommended consolidation of Saskatchewan operations in order to increase general cost effectiveness and ensure long-term viability and greater profitability for the Saskatchewan operations. This is 1981. Current projections show continuing weak performance for both Regina and Saskatoon. If the consolidation doesn't take place — Mr. Deputy Speaker, just one other small example of the double standard and bordering on hypocrisy of members opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Bordering on untruth.

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — My colleague says bordering on untruth. He is a learned individual and far be it for me to argue with him . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Where does it say that? I didn't go quite far enough.

The board then reviewed a report and recommendations pertaining to the construction and distribution building in Saskatchewan to enable — September 1981, when you guys were over here, and because of this kind of jiggery-pokery you'll never be over here again — to enable Regina operations to be made to Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. Board minutes with Mr. Garry Beatty, Mr. Steven Barg, employees of the former administration, CIC, sitting on the board, representing the government — clearly, Mr. Speaker, the double standard.

Mr. Speaker, how long have I got? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We agreed to let you out for the convention so just sit tight. There's lots more coming.

This is the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House:

But the unemployment figures are far worse than the welfare figures. The number of people looking for jobs at Canada Employment Centres across this province tells a dramatic story. In October 1981, under the previous government, the number was 18,000 . . . (etc.)

Well, let me tell you something. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker. When the leader of the . . . And in question period yesterday, as well, he stands there in front of this Legislative Assembly and says the Saskatchewan unemployment rate was up by 11 per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition refers to 11 per cent increase in the past year in the unemployment rate, there is no other way to describe it, Mr. Speaker, than he is misleading this House, misleading the public, and nothing could be further from the truth. He's playing with the figures, Mr. Speaker.

I have in front of me, Mr. Speaker, the latest numbers from StatsCanada, and the facts are this: in April of '82, Saskatchewan's unemployment rate was 6.3 per cent. Today, as of October '83, the unemployment rate is 6.4 per cent. But the real story here is, Mr. Speaker, the number of people employed today in Saskatchewan compared to April of '82, when you dudes were here, Mr. Speaker, again for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition and his party, we have 25,000 more jobs today in Saskatchewan than when your government was in power. So who has the better record? And I invite you to look at the facts and quite misleading the people of Saskatchewan.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, is: what about the number of registrants at Canada Employment and Immigration? It says they're up 75 per cent from a year ago. well, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that's not all bad. The reason they're up — if in fact it's 75 per cent; I don't accept that figure, but I accept that they're up. But the reason they're up is because this is where the opportunity is. Melfort alone has an increase in 10,000 registrants. This increase, Mr. Speaker, is credited to the Nipawin project, and we have people from all over Canada — people from Montreal and Halifax and Toronto — registering in the Melfort employment office. So, you know, the point he makes, Mr. Speaker, is to say the least, fuzzy. To say the least, very fuzzy.

Well, one . . . No, I won't even get into this one, Mr. Speaker. I've said it. I've said it a thousand times . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, okay. And the members opposite, they've talked and talked and talked about . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you want to talk about open for business? Let's talk about open for business then, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about open for business.

My friends opposite tell us, Mr. Speaker, that it's not working . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people of Saskatchewan would far sooner listen to me than the prattle that's going on over there. But, Mr. Speaker, the NDP, the members opposite, have told us that the open for business philosophy hasn't worked. The fact of the matter is: when we came into office, Mr. Speaker, the business climate in Saskatchewan was the poorest in all of Canada — the absolute poorest in all of Canada. The previous government, Mr. Speaker, had built a wall around Saskatchewan, and it wasn't a wall of bricks and mortar; it was a wall of mistrust.

I take you back to 1972 when members opposite choked out a thriving oil industry with the introduction of Bill 42. And only today, only today, Mr. Speaker, is the oil industry thriving again due to the efforts of my colleagues in cabinet, and this government.

Another wall, another brick in that wall of mistrust, put up around this province by members opposite. We saw Tommy Douglas travelling the world saying, "People, we have this wonderful resource called potash. Great markets; come and develop it for us." And they did. Then in 1975 the current Leader of the Opposition, when he was sitting here said, "Well, boys, thank you, but we'll have that now." And in comes Bill 1 and 2. Now that doesn't set a very good stage for a positive business climate.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, why they had . . . I'll tell you how they had economic growth. Everything is relative, Mr. Speaker. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, why they had economic growth at all. They had it because they borrowed to the hilt; they put us so far in debt that you had to pump sunshine to us, and they went and bought holes in the ground. They built these wonderful fine family of crown corporations which are now a burden to us, costing us money as opposed to generating money. And they say, "How did we have economic growth?" I'll tell you how we had economic growth. We had economic growth because we made New York look better. That's how we had economic growth. Their resource policy, Mr. Speaker, was to take over the potash industry, preferential treatment for crown corporations and build the wall to keep investment out.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, even today, Mr. Speaker, business people form around the province from across Canada, and from around the world raise the question: what will happen if they get back in? What will happen if they get

back in? Can we trust the business climate in Saskatchewan yet? Well, they believe me, Mr. Speaker. They believe me when I tell them that they are finished. They will never see this side of the House ever again. They are anti-business; they are anti-farmer; they are even anti-labour. They are pro-radical, Mr. Speaker.

I assure them, Mr. Speaker, I assure them, that as long as we are government — and we're going to be here for a very long time, Mr. Speaker — they are welcome in Saskatchewan. And while they are here they will be free to run their business without the threat . . . They will be here without the threat of expropriation by government.

One example of that, Mr. Speaker, is since we removed the requirement for SMDC participation — joint venture participation in mining in the North — we have had more inquiries for joint venture participation than you guys had the whole time you were in office. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the private sector is the key to economic strength and diversity in our province. The government has taken action to improve the business climate in the province.

First, number one, we repealed the requirement for compulsory Crown participation in mineral development — and you weren't paying attention a while ago so I'm going to repeat it again — that resulted in more inquiries as to joint venture participation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm going to get to that.

We have initiated without strikes, with the support of the workers and union members, new labour legislation. We have removed 1,000 obsolete regulations. We have abolished the sales tax on gasoline, giving us the lowest in the country. We have begun, Mr. Speaker, to reduce the burden of government on the people of Saskatchewan by reducing the size of the bureaucracy significantly.

We have the lowest interest rates for home owners. We have the lowest unemployment rate in the country, and we are the only province in Canada to create jobs — a net positive during a recession — the only province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — And, Mr. Speaker, we lead the nation, Mr. Speaker, in growth. Mr. Blakeney, the Leader of the Opposition, has said that we should call it “open for big business,” that we aren't really helping the little guy. Well, let me say this: the amendments to the petroleum royalty structure have resulted in record land sales. There are three times as many active rigs as last year. This turn-around has happened as well in natural gas with 147 wells drilled this year compared to four in 1982 when you guys were calling the shot. This will generate 150 million in tax revenue for the province. More than 1,000 jobs have been created in drilling and associated activities in the oil patch.

Mr. Speaker, the service industry is working again. So are the truckers. So are the seismic crews. Hotels and restaurants are full. Retail sales are up. The Laundromats are busy; hardware stores are busy; lumber yards are busy. You can't get a room in a hotel. And he says we're doing nothing for the little guy. I can't believe it, Mr. Speaker.

Shortly after the heavy oil upgrader agreement was announced two private sector firms announced that two office complexes worth approximately \$60 million will be built in Regina. The spin-off benefits and jobs created will be even higher. It isn't just big businesses that have benefited from our policies. As well, small business; bankruptcies were only two-thirds the national average — two-thirds the national average, Mr. Speaker. This will make them hang their heads, Mr. Speaker. There was an increase, there was an increase of 804 E&H tax licences issued to the end of October 1983 during a recession, compared to the 10-year average prior to April of '82 of 444, Mr. Speaker. Twice as many during the recession as compared to boom times, Mr. Speaker.

At the time of the open-for-business conference, Mr. Speaker, we said we weren't going to participate in the recession. The conference board, which members opposite have said in the legislature is a prestigious organization, said despite the recession Saskatchewan did not participate. There is still a lot more to be done, Mr. Speaker. We can't undo in 18 months what it took members 11 years to do, and take a great deal of comfort, Mr. Speaker, that through the consultative process that we have adopted, in staying in touch with the people of Saskatchewan, that we will be here for a very, very long time, and we will have ample opportunity to bring Saskatchewan to the potential that it has a right to enjoy. They will never see this side of the House again, Mr. Speaker. I take a great deal of delight in supporting the motion, and opposing what may or may not be an amendment. I wasn't here yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of seven gentlemen, a Chinese delegation from Sino-Chem which is a potash purchasing agency from the People's Republic of China. We would certainly like to welcome them to the province of Saskatchewan. They have been in the United States. They came today from Toronto. They will be meeting with officials in the Government of Saskatchewan. They'll be meeting with some people from the potash corporation, and as I understand, probably move on from here to meet with some people from the province of Manitoba.

I would like you and all members of this Assembly to welcome our friends from the People's Republic of China. We hope that the business that we have done with your country in the past, we will improve upon that in the future, and for generations to come we will be good trading partners and very good friends. Welcome to the province of Saskatchewan.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I would join with the member from Kindersley in welcoming to Saskatchewan, and to say have a pleasant visit in Saskatchewan, a great trading partner, both in the area of minerals as well as grain, and we look forward to that relationship continuing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATE

ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

MR. SMITH: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Thank you, MLA, Legislative Assembly. Mr. Deputy speaker, I rise with great pleasure today to speak on the throne speech, and I will be very brief, as I always say that a short speech is just as good as a long one. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I always remember what my father told me when I was first starting to work on my own. I was working with him one morning and I was doing quite a bit of talking and he said, "You know, son," he said, "if talking turned into music," he said, "you'd be a band master," he says. "The best thing you can do," he says, "is get your act in gear." And that's what the present government is doing now. They're getting the act in gear from the previous government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, being a junior MLA, the city of Moose Jaw in the south, my comments, as I said, will be very brief. Also, I am going to mainly deal with some of the shortfalls of the previous government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been a resident of this province for the full time of my life,

and I've always worked with the citizens of the province, and I certainly do so at all times regardless to who they might be. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we hear great cries from the opposition complaining continual about utility rates, insurance rates, etc. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the previous government, I believe, had no management in their government, and to manage crown corporations and a government you must have management. And that is why we are in such a deficit today. Mr. Deputy Speaker, those crowns must be managed by manager people, and I'm sure that in this government — the Progressive Conservatives — they have management in it, and this is why in the precious shortfall of our government was that the well was dry and we had to rejuvenate the well. And whenever we get the well rejuvenated you will see the disappearance of deficit budgets.

Mr. Speaker, what is not emphasized in the province: when we become government in April, there was no talk of what the debt was. Mr. Deputy Speaker, furthermore might I say that the previous administration — the opposition now — are accusing us of cutting, cutting, and cutting, but previous . . . (inaudible) . . . does not tell us what they cut in their years in office. Mr. Deputy Speaker, look at our health services. Did they put much money into it? Who tore out the fourth floor in the Union Hospital in Moose Jaw some several years ago? It wasn't our government. It was the NDP.

In the first two years of our government, we have committed over \$11 million for senior citizens' nursing homes. This is only \$3.5 million that the NDP spent in the last seven years of their administration. Mr. Deputy Speaker, did the previous government keep the services of senior citizens up to date and their nursing homes in reasonably good condition?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, after I become elected in April 1982, I made visits to all the nursing homes in my constituency and in the city of Moose Jaw, and to the hospitals. I had meetings with the boards to underline to them and find out what position they were in. And at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to cite one instance to you of one of the nursing homes in Moose Jaw, which is extendicare. St. Anthony's home is level 4 care. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other half of this building was in such a mess at that time, whenever I viewed it, that since then the fire department and the Department of Health have asked us to phase it out as quickly as we can as it's not in proper condition to keep elderly folks in. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what will this mean to the city of Moose Jaw? It'll mean 60 less beds for the nursing care home in Moose Jaw.

Let us talk about promises for a minute, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I well remember in 1978. In the 1978 election, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member who was running in Moose Jaw North at that time had an announcement, a special announcement, he said one morning he was making at STI. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a candidate, I went up there and listened to his special announcement. Mr. Deputy Speaker, at that time he announced that there would be an extension to STI which would start in early 1979. What happened to that promise? Quite a lot worse than happened to a lot of our promises.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they succeeded in that election. They were re-elected. what did they do with their promise? They set it on the shelf till 1981, they make a big show. They come up to Moose Jaw. They do a sod turning for an addition to STI. Why did they do that? Because there was an election coming in the spring of '82. But they did not fool the people of Moose Jaw and the province of Saskatchewan in 1982. The people of the province fooled the NDP, and that is why today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a large crowd on this side and a very few over there.

I'm quite sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard a lot of harassment over the water situation in Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the water situation in Moose Jaw and Regina did not occur when we became government. I can remember many years ago the previous government saying, oh, they were going to do something to the water plant at Buffalo Pound for the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw. What did they do? They never done a thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the previous government knew about this long before we became government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what did we do shortly after we became government? We listened to the people of Saskatchewan. We set up a water review board and went to work on it. Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have not got much accomplished on it as yet, but at least there are hopes. When the federal government will decide on the issue, we will act accordingly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to mention a few things in regard to the throne speech. I am very pleased to see that we have indicated we'll amend The Workers' Compensation Act to improve benefits for dependent spouses of those killed in accidents.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are many more things I could work on and talk on, but I'm quite sure that the most of our members will be speaking on the Speech from the Throne. It don't look as though the opposition will be able to come up with much to speak on the throne speech, so I think at this time I will close and say that I will be supporting the motion.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate the member from Moose Jaw South for having given the first speech from government benches to comment on the throne speech. A man of some independence of mind, I may say, a man of some independence of mind.

I want to begin by congratulating the Hon. Frederick Johnson on his appointment as Lieutenant Governor. His appointment was preceded by a brilliant career as a jurist. Previous to his career as a jurist he had offered himself for public office. He had been a candidate for public office; he had been a successful lawyer.

During the years he served as a judge of the Queen's Bench he was the chief justice of the province, and during those years he set about to reform the rules and procedures of the court. The reforms that he instituted were important, not only to lawyers in facilitating their work, but to the public who come in contact with our court system. Very rarely does a court reform itself from within. Almost always judicial reforms come from without, and the Saskatchewan experience may well be unique in a series of reforms initiated, drawn up and passed by the courts themselves. I can only express the hope that his successor in office, Chief Justice Batten, will continue with those reforms.

To return to my original point, his appointment adds stature to the office of Lieutenant Governor and as such we should all welcome him.

I was informed yesterday that since we met last, our former Deputy Clerk was blessed with a child, and I want to wish her and her husband well. I want to express the hope as well that she makes an early return to our public accounts committee where she served so ably. Mr. Speaker gave me some degree of concern yesterday when he referred to the former Deputy Clerk. I am informed however that she is Deputy Clerk. I am informed, however, that she is only on maternal leave and will be returning.

I want to congratulate the cabinet ministers on their appointment. I wished I could have taken time, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate them individually, but there certainly is not enough time left in this debate. An appointment, let me say in general terms, an appointment to Executive Council is a unique opportunity to serve the province. At the same time it provides an opportunity to service, it provides a unique opportunity for personal growth and development. Few people have that experience, and I hope all find it as rewarding and interesting as I did.

I don't want anything I say to be construed as condoning the size of the present cabinet or the

number of appointments which were made. The size of the present cabinet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is absurd and should be a source of embarrassment to every member opposite. A province of a million people simply does not need a cabinet of 26 people. A province of a million people simply does not need three ministers without portfolio and a fourth minister in charge of telephones. That is patently a waste of public funds.

Having served in Executive Council I frankly don't know what some of the ministers opposite do to keep themselves busy all day. I just wonder what the Minister of Telephones and the minister of hailstones — I meant the minister in charge of the crop insurance board — I just wonder what they do with themselves.

The level of responsibility associated with many of the present ministries simply doesn't justify separate ministers. And I can't believe the powers of self-delusion of members opposite, as awesome as they are, really led them to believe that we need a separate minister of telephones, or a separate minister in charge of the crop insurance board, or a minister without portfolio from Prince Albert. I know the abilities of the minister are limited but I would have hoped that could have handled at one and the same time your present duties and that of the Minister of Telephones. I would have hoped your abilities would have extended that far. Apparently, in the Premier's view, your abilities were so limited that you couldn't do both.

It's apparent that the present size of the cabinet is an attempt (and I may say a very successful attempt) to maximize the number of Conservative members who feed at the public trough. No other sensible explanation has been offered to the public and if any other explanations were offered it wouldn't be believed.

These cabinet appointments are really in the same category and serve the same purpose as the firings of all the boards and commissions and the firings of all the public servants. These appointment to cabinet are like the appointments to the boards and commissions and the appointments to the public service, simply an attempt to see that as many Conservatives benefit as much as possible for whatever time this government may be in office. And these appointments defile and degrade the office of a minister of the Crown, just as the wholesale replacement of the boards and commissions brought into question their independence, and just as the firings of the public service bring into question their professionalism.

But there's an even more unfortunate aspect to these appointments. It's the continued failure of this government to provide any leadership in their frequent calls for restraint. One thing: this government seems to operate by the maxim, "do what I say not what I do." Once again they say one thing and do another.

I wonder how members opposite square this bloated cabinet with the firings of so many public servants. How do you ask public servants of departments such as social services, which is struggling with an inadequate staff as we've learned on the public accounts last year, how do you ask public servants in departments like public service who struggle with inadequate staff, when the Premier deals out the spoils of victory with such great generosity? How do you expect your calls for restraint to have any credibility? How do you square this naked greed with the freezing of the minimum wage? How do you ask for restraint on one hand from those at the bottom of the economic ladder, and at the same time, treat yourself with such largesse?

I may say as an aside I think this government is the only government that could really believe that those at the bottom of the economic ladder are fuelling inflation. I assume you believe that or you would not call upon them for restraint. Restraint makes no sense unless they are making some contribution to inflation. You seem to believe they are the chief cause of inflation. Their belts have been tightened more than anyone else. But leaving that aside, if they really need to endure this hardship in the name of restraint and economic recovery, is it really too much to ask that the cabinet exercise the same amount of restraint? Is it really too much to ask that you people scrape by with a single person who covers such vast empires as the department of

rapidly contracting grants to rural municipalities, the department of hailstones, the member from Arm River is in charge of?

Whatever they may have given the member from Prince Albert, is it too much to ask that one minister could have handled all these? In a caucus of 55 people, is there not one individual with sufficient ability to do all three? I would have thought there was in 55 people, but I bow to the Premier's superior judgement on that subject and only on that subject.

On a slightly different but a related topic, I want to congratulate the Lieutenant Governor in getting through the throne speech without collapsing from exhaustion. I've been a member since 1975, associated with this House as executive assistant to the House leader from '71 to '75, and that is the longest throne speech I'm certain since 1971, and I'm quite sure it's the longest one from before that, several years before that.

I really wonder why this government felt the need to repeat so much of your former throne speeches. Were those throne speeches so totally lacking in impact that you needed to repeat them in the hope that somebody would listen and somebody would hear them? Or were those former throne speeches like stories or jokes you felt, having lacked impact the first time, might improve with retelling? A more likely explanation was that the government was trying to make up with quantity what that throne speech clearly lacked in quality and substance. Nothing but the most trivial aspects of the throne speech could be, in any sense, described as new. Nothing about it would bring any relief to any of the Saskatchewan people who had hoped and looked to this government for relief from the problems they're facing. I'll admit that the throne speech did drone on for some period of time about unemployment. No doubt Allan Gregg and the pollsters from Decima whispered in this government's ear the exciting news that everybody else has known for months, and that is that unemployment is a serious problem, that the public expect and demand this government to do something about it and ask that they take action. And so the throne speech droned on about unemployment, but did this unemployment, did this throne speech, give comfort to the unemployed? I suggest it could not have. After watching this government in office for 19 months they cannot have been that gullible.

In the very portions of the throne speech which deal with unemployment, this government eschews any responsibility for dealing with it. For the throne speech says, with respect to unemployment, it's not a problem to be solved by the intervention of government, rather a problem to be left to the free market, to the forces of the free market. This government's slavish adherence to the unbridled free enterprise of the 17th century seems to prohibit any effective action.

I say to this government: in the throne speech, all you are doing is what you have done since the election. As you are standing on the sidelines and acting as a cheer leader, you'll proclaim the virtues of 19th century capitalism and do nothing else, and this government apparently believes that such a proclamation is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

I heard the Premier on radio this morning saying that we are number one in economic development, we are number one in creation of jobs. I say to the Premier that you are no longer playing ball with the Lakeview Lakers, as he and I did years ago. You are expected to do more than just serve as a cheer leader. What's being asked of you is more complex than being captain of the Lakeview Lakers. I say to the Premier that you will not be judged by what you proclaim this province to be. You will be judged by what it becomes. You will not be judged by what you say. You will be judged by what this government does. You will be judged not by the platitudes that you mouth, but by the results you produce.

It should be apparent, even to a government as self-satisfied as this one, that your performance in economic development is woefully inadequate. Indeed, members opposite have not dealt with the economy in any of their speeches and with very good reason. The members opposite cannot point to a single area of the economy that is not worse off now than it was when you took office.

I'm going to get to the problem. The member for Saskatoon Centre wants to talk about the 1,200 new businesses.

I'm going to talk about them in a moment. I will talk about your 1,200 new businesses. Not one of them employ more than five people, but I'll get to them in a moment.

In the past the centrepiece of this government's economic development policy was another bit of cheer-leading, the open-for-business approach. Do you remember that? I suggest that most members opposite would like to forget it. Not a single success can be credited to the open for business approach.

I was amused by a press release which lists some of those 1,200 new businesses — put out by the then minister for economic development, the member for Regina South — listed the accomplishments of the open for business approach. It was an eloquent testimony to the failure of that approach. Almost all of the businesses listed in that press release employed less than five people; all have been undoubtedly untouched by the open for business philosophy.

We were told in the press release of a barber-shop in a small Saskatchewan community, and that supposedly came about as the result of the open for business philosophy. I'm sure that the previous Conservative government in the '30s, had they been so insensitive and foolish, could have found economic development in the establishment of a barbershop somewhere in Saskatchewan. But the government of Premier Anderson had a little more class than this government. That government didn't look to the establishment of barbershops and other similarly sized businesses as a sign of economic development.

I ask the minister, the member from Saskatoon Centre, to rise in this throne speech and list the businesses established since you took office. you'll find that almost all of them employ less than five people.

Surely the public of Saskatchewan have a right to expect something saner from this government than that sort of nonsense. After 19 months in office, the public of Saskatchewan are asking of this government if even you, and there's nothing precipitous about this government when it comes to making a decision, if even you haven't come to the conclusion that it's time to try a different approach.

This government has an even worse record in the area of job creation. Far from spinning some equivalent to the foolish and pointless open for business philosophy, far from trying to create some harmless diversion, this government by their actions exacerbated the unemployment problems of this province.

I will at least say in defence of open for business that if it did nothing to encourage economic development, and it's obvious it didn't, it probably didn't retard it either. But in the area of job creation, this government aggravated the situation with its very first acts of office. With its very first acts of office it froze the public sector construction.

Ask any tradesman, ask any contractor, ask any architectural firm to compare pre-April '82 and post-April '82, and you find yourself involved in a nostalgic conversation about the good old days. The tradesmen, the contractors, the architectural firms well know what a powerful economic stimulus the public sector capital spending of the former government was, and what a vacuum was left by this government and your adherence to the outdated economic policies of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan.

The proof of the pudding, gentlemen, is in the eating. Our activist approach worked; your hands-off approach does not. It is the activist, interventionist approach of the former government which brought this province to a period of unprecedented prosperity. That fact, and not the frantic cheerleading of the Premier and the members of the cabinet, will be remembered at the next election. A day of reckoning will come.

The economic statistics tell the story. Over the past year the national employment rate, and the rate in eight provinces went down. The national employment rate and the rate in eight provinces went down. Over the past two months, two months in a row, Saskatchewan has been only one of two provinces with an increase in the rate of unemployment. Similarly, Saskatchewan is only one of two provinces to have more unemployed persons in October '83 than in October '82. Listen to this: across Canada there was an 11 per cent decrease in the number of unemployed people across Canada; Canada experienced an 11 per cent decrease in unemployed; Saskatchewan experienced an 11 per cent increase in unemployed. I can well imagine why members opposite would rather talk about something else. So we are doing relatively bad; we are doing relatively bad . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Yes, we are under your government; yes we are.

In October '83, Saskatchewan's unemployment rate was higher than in any October since StatsCanada began keeping statistics, so we are doing absolutely terrible in comparison with our history. Unemployment is especially serious among young people, and that may be the real tragedy. In October '83, the rate of unemployment for young people was 12.4 per cent, and there were actually fewer 15- to 24- year olds employed in October '83 than in October '82. There were fewer 15- to 24-year olds employed this October than last October.

The record of leading this province from prosperity to hardship in short 19 months is all the more inexcusable when you consider what you took over in April, 1982. You took over the most robust economy in Canada, and my source is none other than Canada's leading financial newspaper, the *Financial Post*. They ran a story in the fall of 1982 which stated just that, and I still have a copy of the newspaper if members opposite want it. I sometimes think we used to tire people by parading these financial papers around, which said how well Saskatchewan was doing. I notice members opposite haven't tried people by talking about how well the financial papers are treating Saskatchewan. I don't recall the last time I heard a Conservative member quote from any financial newspaper about how well this province is doing, because you're going down, and because there aren't any such articles — there aren't any such articles. And that financial strength in the late '80s represented a fair accomplishment for the former NDP government.

In 1971 the NDP government took over a province that was the weak sister of Confederation. We had been perennially the have-not province, seemingly unable to shake ourselves out of economic doldrums which had been our lot for decades . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . I'll leave the subject of leafy spurge to someone whose abilities extend to it. It had been our lot. The economic basement had been our lot for generations and decades, and that was the situation in 1971. And it was most assuredly not our situation in 1981. During the '70s, Saskatchewan went from being one of the weakest members of Confederation to one of the strongest. Some of that was good luck, Mr. Speaker. Resource prices did strengthen; so did markets. And as is now becoming painfully apparent, good management was also an essential part of that economic success, and that's what we seem to be lacking now.

We said in the '71 election that we were going to see Saskatchewan's resources developed to the maximum extent possible by Saskatchewan people, for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. the policies of the former government had a constant focus. They were aimed at that goal and they succeeded beyond our wildest dreams.

You took office and you foolishly tore down that structure without having any credible alternatives. I won't recite all of the things that you did but I'll give you a couple of for instances. You gave away the markets of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. You gave those away, and in doing so gave away not only a lot of Saskatchewan jobs, but a lot of income to the treasury. You ended Saskoil and Sask Mining's participations in resource developments. Ad so you destroyed a valuable window on the oil and mining . . . (inaudible) . . .

In hundreds of other ways you set about destroying the economic policies which had served this

province so well during the '70s. And the result, I may say, was sadly predictable. We see the beginnings of the destruction of Saskatchewan's once vital economy in these statistics.

My travels around the province lead me to believe that there is among the public a fear that Saskatchewan is going to return to the economic basement which it was in when the last right-wing government was in office, which the member from Qu'Appelle will no doubt remember.

As I was saying, these statistics speak for themselves. As I was digesting them the other morning I heard the Premier on the radio proclaiming Saskatchewan number one. We were first in economic development; we were first in the creation of jobs. I wondered what kind of a world the Premier lives in. It certainly isn't the same world as the unemployed, nor is it the same increasingly grim world the public of Saskatchewan live in.

I say again that you will not be judged on your ability as cheerleaders. You will be judged on your ability to produce results, and your record to date should be of serious concern to you. These economic statistics tell the story. In an unfortunate way I find them gratifying; gratifying because they confirm what we have predicted since you took office, and that is your economic policies will lead to stagnation. I find it disheartening because in these cold economic statistics there is a vast amount of human suffering.

The sad part of the economic failure that this throne speech highlights and perpetuates is that you haven't learned your lessons. Allan Gregg may well have told you that unemployment is a problem, but he doesn't seem to have told you that you ought to try something different; that what you've done over the last 19 months hasn't worked. But what the throne speech promises is more of the same. And that's the real tragedy; that you have failed to learn the obvious lesson in those statistics, and that is why the unemployed must feel a real sense of hopelessness. We have urged you, time and time again, to increase spending on public works, and your failure to act has been almost complete.

More than economic stimulus is provided, however. Governments in this province, and others, need to engage in positive economic planning. The unbridled 19th century capitalism to which you people are slaves hasn't brought us prosperity. It has brought unemployment, business and farm failures, hardship, and suffering. It's time for you people to admit that the 19th century has passed into history, and that we need to use the tools available to us in the 1980s. We need to set aside some of the prejudices of the past, such as anti-trade unionism in which you people wallow, positively wallow; the unbridled faith in capitalism, and admit that a new approach is called for.

The former government had such an economic plan. It involved developing Saskatchewan resources by maximizing control by Saskatchewan people, and maximizing the benefits to Saskatchewan people from the development of Saskatchewan resources. It worked just as surely as yours has failed. Those policies ushered in a period of unprecedented prosperity. It brought Saskatchewan from the position of a have-not province to a have province. Saskatchewan arrived as an economic strength in the Canadian union, not under this government, but under the activist policies of the former government. It is not our intention to write your economic policy for you. You must do that for yourselves. We simply recommend to members opposite a policy born of the 20th century.

The Leader of the Opposition, in his remarks, correctly called the throne speech "a speech prepared by a government that has clearly run out of ideas." Last March, the throne speech became better known, and more appropriately known, as the drone speech. Well, Mr. Speaker, drone II is no improvement. The speech was in fact a masterful job of double-talk. For weeks in advance, the cabinet and caucus were said to be meeting, holding high-level, secret discussions on the province's number one concern — job creation and unemployment. whenever any reference was made by the Minister of Finance and others about the upcoming throne speech,

we were assured that jobs and the economy would be a number one priority. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I think many people, and many of us, looked forward to the speech with real anticipation. After all, unemployment is a serious problem in the province of Saskatchewan, one that this government hasn't yet addressed.

As I stated, Saskatchewan was only one of two provinces to have an increasing unemployment rate in October. In Regina, there were 13,283 people in October, 1983, who were formally registered with the Canada Employment Centre in Regina as seeking work. This compares with 5,800 in October, 1982 — a 128 per cent increase in the unemployed in the city of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the open for business slogans of the government opposite are not working, and when I heard comments made by various ministers in advance of the throne speech indicating that jobs was the number one priority. I was hopeful the government had finally realized that it had to address this very serious problem. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in November of 1983 we learned that all of this was nothing more than cynical double-talk from a callous and uncaring government. Surely . . . (inaudible) . . . indicated that job creation will continue to be a top priority, but no new initiatives were announced to deal with this very serious issue.

I was very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because this government, with its attitude that government cannot do anything to improve the situation — it's not government's role — has again decided to ignore the number one concern of the Regina people, in fact the concern of people throughout Saskatchewan.

The open for business approach of this government is creating unemployment, Mr. Speaker; it is not creating jobs. Open for business cost 125 workers at Intercom in Regina their jobs. I'm sorry the minister of whatever he has been relegated to at the moment — I forget — the member from Regina South . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — I'll take over.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, the member from Regina South and I had a mini-debate on CKCK television the day they closed Intercom. I didn't feel we had long enough and I'd like to continue that debate again, and I hereby challenge the member from Regina South to a debate on that subject, and we'll resume where we left off after only three minutes.

But let's, Mr. Speaker, review for a moment the sad tale of what open for business meant to 125 Intercom employees. Early June, the member for Regina South called the move to sell its shares in Intercon a shining example of the government's policy to return responsibility for economic activity to the private sector. It sold a 45 per cent interest in the company for a \$6 million loss — gave \$6 million to its friends.

On Friday, October 28, 125 employees lost their jobs as a result and a \$3 million payroll was lost to Regina. Most of the employees found out . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Well, we're going to find out how big the expansion in Saskatoon is in a moment, because the employees found out how big it was. Most of the employees found out that they'd lost their jobs when they got to the gates, when they showed up for work. Some of them heard about it in the media.

The day after the closing, the member for Regina South said it was strictly a management decision and that the government didn't know it would be closed when it sold its share in June. He went on to say, "I understand the employees are quite pleased with the way they have been treated with the company, concerning the severance arrangements." So quoted the *Leader-Post*, Saturday, October 29, 1983.

In contrast to the member from Regina South, John Culic, the past president of the union local speaking on behalf of the members, said, on November 12, '83, "The decision to close the plant

was probably made last summer, when the government sold the 45 per cent share it held in the company for roughly 10 years.” And, “Revenue and Financial Services Minister Paul Rousseau’s statement that employees were satisfied were just plain stupid,” Mr. Culic said. He went on to say: “I haven’t found anyone who says he talked to Rousseau that day, so how did he know how we felt?”

This government has developed a speciality of listening to people in an absolute vacuum. All this time the Tories have had Fred Mitchell telling everyone that there were jobs at the Saskatoon plant for the former Regina employees. And he’s indicating very few of them have expressed interest. However, the *Leader-Post* in the same issue, November 12th, 1983, indicates:

Even the company’s claims that some of the former Regina plant employees will find jobs in Intercom’s Saskatoon operation don’t stand up.

The *Leader-Post* went on to say:

While six people have been hired in Saskatoon most of those are related to someone in the company’s management. Others who have driven up to Saskatoon weren’t even allowed to fill out an application form.

Mr. Speaker, the “open for business” government does not have a very good record. The facts tell a sad story. In fact, Mr. Speaker, from January, 1983 to October, 1983, there were 254 business bankruptcies in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, businesses are closing, not opening, as a result of lack of business. The employees of these companies know what open for business means, Mr. Speaker, and they are expecting, I rather expect, just more double talk from the government.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are some important capital projects that if initiated could mean construction jobs in the city of Regina this winter. The throne speech should have announced an early start-up date for the rehabilitation centre in Regina. The most the government appears to be willing to do is something it mastered very early in office — study, study, analyze and study.

In my opinion there have been delays in new school construction. There has been an announced delay in hospital construction, in a hospital that badly needs those renovations, which has been told by the Canada Hospital Association those renovations have to be made if it’s to remain certified.

Double talk, Mr. Speaker, is really what’s behind this government’s harsh and heartless minimum wage policies. The government says 60,000 working people, today, large young people — many of the rest of them are single parents, usually women — but those employees, almost all in the service sector, must accept a frozen minimum wage. The same government has justified boosting salaries of its 16 top government aides and senior bureaucrats earning \$60,000 to \$84,000 by as much as \$11,000. That’s 17 per cent.

Apparently it’s okay for those at the Tory trough, the Staff Barootes, and the Derek Bedsons. By the way, where is Derek Bedson? Where did he go to? Does anyone know where Derek Bedson is these days? We miss his appearance. I hear that he’s developed the original retirement scheme — opened up a trade office in Austria. Do I understand that correctly? I understand Austria has a booming trade with Saskatchewan, as well as with Holland, one of the smallest trading partners Saskatchewan has. I can say one thing: you’ve done something that the conservative governments in Manitoba and Ontario didn’t do. You got Derek Bedson out of your hair for good. You sent him to Austria to run a creamery. But apparently it’s okay for the Staff Barootes, the Derek Bedsons and the George Hills, and the Dennis Balls, the Harold Lanes to rip off the people, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, but never, never, never should those 60,000 little wage-earners dare to ask more. Double standards, Mr. Speaker.

Double-talk is the only way to describe this government's dealing with native organizations in Regina, Mr. Speaker. This government likes to assure native people they have a large voice, more independence, and yet this government has insulted those same native groups, Mr. Speaker. Native groups in Regina used to say before the last election, "The Conservatives have the ovens all ready for us." Grim humour, but I say that this government has exceeded their worst expectations. The open for business government needed a way of rewarding its good friend Adam Niesner when he came to the trough. Their answer was to stop working with organizations such as the Friendship Centre, the Regina Native women, when it came to managing and leasing public housing, and it was the native organizations who played a major role in the leasing of Regina public housing for native people.

Their answer, because Adam Niesner came to the trough, was to turn over the management of public housing units in Regina to their good friend, the same good friend of open for business whom they place their confidence in, the same good friend who came under deservedly heavy fire from Regina City Council and the community groups for attempting to demolish a potential heritage home in downtown Regina without a permit.

Mr. Speaker, the government opposite has made no secret of its approach to governing by Gregg. Its approach is to fly out the pollsters to ask for advice on what it should say. The failure of this government opposite will not be that Allan Gregg gave them the wrong advice of what to say. The failure is that they are responding to the concerns expressed to the public of Saskatchewan three weeks ago, and they are ignoring the opportunities of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, as simply as one can, the failure of this government is that it has neglected the real needs of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, the double-talk of the open for business government is also reflected in its attitude towards the women of Saskatchewan. As everyone knows the Devine government outraged a large cross-section of respected women's organizations when it abolished the women's division of the Department of Labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Women who are concerned about day-care, frozen minimum wage, social services, and The Matrimonial Property Act, have not been impressed by this government. I suspect the government opposite, in its government-by-Gregg approach, was told by the Decima polling organizations that they had lost the support of a lot of Saskatchewan women. I want to pay tribute to Saskatchewan women. They have done an admirable job in making themselves heard. Something very few groups have managed to do is to make this government listen to them. But Saskatchewan women managed that, and I congratulate them for their efforts.

Because this government was scared it has lost the support of Saskatchewan women and, because it refuses to raise minimum wage, a women's issue, to improve day care funding, a women's issue, the Devine government has announced a new agency. A new bureaucracy has been established: a women's secretariat.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, women in Saskatchewan are suspicious of this government. They're going to be watching very carefully to see how the women's secretariat is set up. Will it have the necessary financial resources? Most important, will it have program delivery responsibilities? Many women I've talked to in the last few days are concerned that the women's secretariat will simply be window-dressing, Mr. Speaker. Women's organizations and our caucus are going to be watching the legislation with some cynicism about the real motives of this government. They and we will suspect that your government is more interested in cosmetics than in substance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to what I consider to be a distressing tendency in this government with respect to legal actions. We dwelt on this at some time in the question period. For the benefit of the member for Regina South, who is now back, I want to go over this in some detail. It's the settling and compromising of disputes involving the public's assets, by agreements which are secret, for reasons which are not explained to the public, whose assets are being dealt with.

It is my 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 — which was done in the case of the former member for Moose Jaw North. While the Attorney General has great interest in the starting of that action, I say to members opposite if you have any legal memorandums which suggested to the former government that that action should be dropped, I say table them. I say to you, put up or shut up. If you've got it, let's see it, if you don't, stop referring to a document which you won't produce. You won't produce it because it doesn't exist. You won't produce it because it doesn't exist. In fact, the opposite exists; the opposite exists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — There is a memorandum which I saw at one point in time from John Green recommending the action take place. If you've got a memorandum produce it; if you've got something produce it. If you've got something produce it. I say the members opposite have no such document. They are making that up . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . I invite the Attorney General to leave his chair and go and get your memorandum to the former government. We'll table it. By all means table it. You can table it at any time.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you to explain to the member from Qu'Appelle, the Attorney General (he's never made a house leader; we may now understand why) that you can table something at any time. You don't need to have the floor to table something. I say to the members opposite, table it because it does not exist; it does not exist. It does not exist.

Action was initiated, and I ask members opposite to recall the history of Dick Collver, as much of the history of that action . . . The problem arose in '76-'77. The action was initiated in that time period. It was an election in which you people did terribly. You kicked him out. And politically the action became really no longer relevant. He was no longer your leader. He was no longer your leader after 1978 — that's 1979, actually. After 1979, he was no longer your leader. He was no longer your leader. So the suggestion that we kept this action frying around in the frying pan for six years because it would do some political good is nonsense. It was no longer relevant after he resigned to go and lead the Unionist Party. In fact, I suspect members opposite were as happy to see him driven out of the province as anyone else. Apparently, however, he left some friends behind in the Conservative Party, friends who owed him a million dollars, because that's what they've cancelled.

I say to members opposite that you are defying credibility, the public's ability to believe you to suggest that the action was dropped for good and valid reasons . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Oh well, if that's the case, I'll take your advice. We can stay on this subject till 5 o'clock and I'll continue at 7 p.m. when they're all comfortably planted in front of their televisions. It strikes me that if this is not a high audience that's not a good argument to rush through it. That wasn't intentional until the members opposite gave me that sterling advice. That wasn't intentional.

I say, though, your history of the fashion in which you have dealt with this matter stinks. No other word for it. It stinks — s-t-i-n-k-s. It stinks. The counsel was an eminent Saskatchewan lawyer, Si Halyk, a person who had nothing to do with the NDP — of eminent prestige within the Law Society of Saskatchewan, but certainly someone whose independence was unquestioned. What happened to that man of independence? The same thing that happened to Dennis Foley and all

the other people who didn't bend to your will — they're gone. Who do you replace them with? I'm not going to comment on the stature of the present lawyer, but I will tell you that he is not a person of independence. Mr. Shirkey's ties with the Conservative party are well known. He made a trip to Ottawa; he made a trip to Ottawa for the leadership convention. But you people don't even table a legal opinion which I assume you got from Mr. Shirkey. I say the fashion in which you handle this stinks, and this thing is going to plague you. Just as Gerald Ford was plagued with the pardon of Richard Nixon, so this thing is going to plague you. You will not be able to answer the allegations because there aren't any answers for them. You can concoct answers. I say to the member for Regina South, you can concoct answers, but if there is no evidence of them, and there doesn't appear to be a trace of evidence of what you're saying . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Ned, there's nothing worse than burning a U.S. flag with a Bic lighter made in Japan.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Oh, I can understand that the member for Moosomin might want to talk about something else. I can understand there are subjects he'd rather dwell on. I say to the member for Moosomin, this issue has a good deal more prominence in the public attention today than the burning of a flag in Manitoba many months ago. I can understand why the members opposite want to talk about Manitoba, and not what happened in Saskatchewan. Your handling of this thing leaves everything to be desired, everything to be desired. There's nothing about the way you handled the Collver case which leaves anything but cynicism and suspicion in the public mind. The manner in which you have dealt with this has no exonerating sides to it. At least when Gerald Ford pardoned Nixon, at least he had something in the nature of a reason for it. He said at that time that the problem was plaguing the American nation and he wanted to put it behind the American nation. I didn't know that this problem was plaguing the Saskatchewan society. It is now. You've certainly brought it back to public attention. But they had well forgotten about it before this incident, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the members opposite that you are going to have some questions to answer. You are not going to avoid them, and they are going to plague you. We will answer them in this House and we will probably go through the circus we went through in question period today with everyone trying to protect the member for Regina South by yelling so loud that neither the questions nor the answers could be heard. That's a new defence mechanism.

Last year they had him and the Attorney General sitting side by side and he was constantly coached on every word he said. This year Graham is sitting by his side. This year the member for Indian Head-Wolseley is sitting by his side. He doesn't seem to be as good a coach. So this year we have a new tactic. The members opposite are yelling at the tops of their voices so that we can't hear his questions. Frankly, they aren't very enlightening anyway, so you may be doing us a favour. But you are yelling pretty loud when we ask the questions so that the member from Regina South, who I'm not aware of has a hearing problem, has to ask that the question be repeated . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . Well, I don't know. It all depends; it all depends. You people have some questions to answer, and they are going to plague you . . . (inaudible interruption) . . . We did today and you made fools out of yourselves. You might try in the throne speech, you might try in your throne speech providing any credible reason for dropping the lawsuit — a simple straightforward case.

There are some law cases which are complicated; there are some which are not, and suing a guarantor after a debt has gone bad is not normally a complicated case. Either the debt was paid or it was not. Either the guarantor signed the guarantee or he did not. But they are, under normal circumstances, pretty straightforward cases. Under normal circumstances they are pretty straightforward cases. It's not easy to imagine how such a case could be so dubious that it wasn't worth pursuing for \$1 million.

It is not easy to understand, either, how a person of Mr. Collver's substance would have no assets upon which a debt could have been realized. And it is not easy to imagine how Mr.

Collver could be hard to find. I assume you could find him. He has always been a person of some substance, and the debt was fairly straightforward.

Now those sets of circumstances don't readily suggest to the member from Regina Centre why that case should be dropped. This case, Mr. Speaker, has a bad odour to it, a bad odour to it. It's going to plague you. If you don't answer the questions, and I suspect you're not, because I suspect there are simply no answers to the question you are asking, your day of reckoning is going to come at the time of the next general election.

Mr. Speaker, I have another subject I want to go into, and I beg leave to call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.