

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

November 29, 1983

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. RYBCHUK: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure, again, to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, some 30 students from Glen Elm School that are seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their principal, Don McDougall, and teacher is Doug Bolander. I would like to commend Glen Elm School for the keen interest they have shown in the Saskatchewan legislature. This is the second or third visit we have had from them. We hope that this grade 8 class will find this visit both educational and, perhaps entertaining, and I would ask all the members to give them a warm welcome.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. MARTENS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to introduce three gentlemen here from a town in my seat: the mayor, Mr. John Thomson; Councillor Tom Lyster . . . And in that town they've had a unique pioneering experience — they've had a major amount of disasters within a short time, and they worked together to provide some rebuilding in the town, and to build a brand new rink down there. The rink project manager's name is Harold Baldwin, and I want to introduce them to you, and I want you to welcome them here.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Derek Bedson's Salary

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. As you will remember, last spring you demoted your deputy minister, Mr. Derek Bedson, after he provided some inaccurate information to you. Yesterday your government finally confirmed what we had said in the House months ago, that Derek Bedson will be the manager of the government's new trade office in Vienna, Austria. My question to the Premier is very specific. What will Derek Bedson be paid to fill this here plum position that you have created for him overseas?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the Deputy Premier said in a telephone conversation to the media that he would provide the information with respect to salaries in crown corporations, and I believe that Mr. Bedson is working for Agdevco, but he'd provide that information during crown corporations.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a new appointment, I would like to remind the minister. And we do not talk about the current year's review of the crown corporations. In the interest of the people of Saskatchewan, a very recent appointment was made of Mr. Bedson, and I'm asking you can you advise us and the people of the province what you are paying this man for his appointment in Vienna?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I can't add any more than what the Deputy Premier said to the media, that he would be glad to answer the questions, provide the information during crown corporations?

MR. KOSKIE: — I'd like to ask a supplement, Mr. Speaker. Can the Premier advise the House whether he is receiving the \$85,000 that he received as deputy, and whether or not he is, in fact, receiving other fringe benefits under the contract in Vienna?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it's the same question he asked before, and the answer is the same. The Deputy Premier responded to the question from the media, and he will be answering.

Notification of Current Appointments to Public Service

MR. KOSKIE: — I'd like to ask the Premier a question. Is it the position of the Premier that any current appointments which are made, that the opposition and the people of Saskatchewan are going to have to wait for one year or two years, as it has been the case in the review of crown corporations, to find out information which is of vital importance because of the political pork barrelling that you have been demonstrating in your government? Are we going to have to wait for a year, or two years, in order to review it in the crown corporations? Is that the new position of this government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, we are following similar practices to the former administration, and we are providing . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's not true.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — It's not true because we're providing more information, in fact, than they did. If we want to get into the whole question of pork barrelling, I'll bring out a list of names that I can read, that is about that deep, of people that were employed by the former administration. Mr. Speaker, they added 10,000 people to the public service in the province of Saskatchewan from 1971 to '81. And if you want to talk about pork barrelling, we can get into it in detail.

Appointment of Agent General in London

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier about a matter, presumably about which he is informed, since it reports to his officer, and I speak of the agent general's office in London. The order in council appointing Mr. Larter to that position appointed him for a term to July 31, 1983, and I find no succeeding order in council. I ask the Premier: has Mr. Larter been appointed agent general, or agent general designate, or any similar title? Is he now serving under an order in council appointment, or has he some contract of personal service?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — As far as I can recall, Mr. Larter is serving as agent general for the province of Saskatchewan. With respect to the order in council and the date, I don't recall, but I'd be glad to take notice and look it up.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Could the Premier advise whether or not Mr. Larter's salary, plus his representation allowance, plus his medical allowance, plus the housing accommodation would exceed a figure of \$100,000 a year?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of the question and provide the answer.

Women's Secretariat

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I have a question to the minister in charge of the women's secretariat. It has to do with the government's public relations play of yesterday, disguised as a bill to create a women's secretariat. I'm going to ask the minister the same questions as she refused to answer yesterday and hope that she'll be a bit more forthright today.

My first question is . . . Bill 1 claims that the women's secretariat will co-ordinate legislation, policies, programs to ensure that women's views and interests are fully represented. My question is: does that include authority to comment on the government's decision to freeze the minimum wage for two full years, which is obviously detrimental to thousands of working women across this province.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, I can really understand why the member from Regina Centre keeps thinking that this is strictly public relations. And I go back to 1979, and you could have taken a lesson when it came to public relations and the women. And I go back to a few articles. When it was suggested that there was going to be some budget cuts, it wasn't only suggested, it was by an order in council by the then government of the day that said, "We're going to cut off the Status of Women Advisory Council, and we're going to phase you out in two years."

And then the headlines started appearing: "Advisory Council Requests Meeting:" "Five Members Resign in Anger Over Announcement of Government." I suggest that you take a lesson when it comes to public relations and dealing with the women of this province.

In reply to your question on the minimum wage . . . Do you want to hear the answer or not? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Nothing of what I had said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was irrelevant, as he said, in regards to the question that he put forth.

The minimum wage is a concern not only to women, but to men. Maybe we should start calling it the starting wage. If more people started to do that, perhaps a few more doors would open, so that women will not be caught in the rut of having to stay in a job that pays minimum wage. And that is the purpose of the secretariat, to try and improve the status of the women and open some doors when it comes to educational opportunity and job training.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. I would remind the minister that she was quoted in the *Leader-Post* as having admitted something that we had been claiming, and that is that the minimum wage freeze impacts primarily on women. But my question, Madam Minister, was not a request for you to comment on the freeze on the minimum wage. My question was whether or not the new women's secretariat will have the freedom, and the authority, and I suppose most important, the autonomy to oppose that kind of government decision. Will the women's secretariat be free to say publicly what it thinks about an issue like the minimum wage freeze which impacts primarily on women, as you yourself admitted?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the secretariat will be no different than what a department is, and I'm not too sure if the departments were even autonomous under the past administration. I would guess that they are not. They are one vehicle within a very large wheel to do with government, and they are accountable to government for what they say inside government and outside. The secretariat will be no different in those terms.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Madam Minister. You mentioned your concern about the violence against women. Will you tell this House if the women's secretariat is to be muzzled. Precisely what role is the women's secretariat going to play in dealing with an issue in dealing with an issue like violence against women if it is not to have the freedom to comment on things like the role that alcohol plays in violence against women? Precisely what contribution is this women's secretariat going to play in an issue such as that, which is violence against women?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, it's interesting that the member would use the word "muzzled." I guess if there's any indication when it comes to being muzzled that perhaps the time is over, because the secretariat is going to be in place, and this government has given an indication that

women, instead of being on the outside looking in, it's time that they were also taking part on the inside in setting policies. No, we're not going to be muzzled, as you put it.

When it comes to the issue of violence, we have indicated already as a government, and so have several of the ministers, that that is indeed one of our top priorities, and that will be the top priority of the secretariat in co-ordinating several departments, in order to address the issue, that will have a voice in this — the Attorney General's department, the Department of Social Services, and perhaps even, to a degree, you may find Sask Housing involved if it means building another transition house. And perhaps down the road you could see the Department of Health. It is a co-ordinating factor, and it will be a proactive factor in bringing forth issues to cabinet.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Madam Minister. New question, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, when you took office, there were at least two women employed as permanent heads by the government. You have had an unparalleled opportunity to promote women to senior positions because you've sacked all the ones that were in place when you took office. Why, Madam Minister . . . Madam Minister, I would remind you that you have not appointed a single woman as a permanent head in the Government of Saskatchewan. Will the women's secretariat do something about that deplorable situation?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, I find it extremely odd that someone takes notice of only and mentions two women, at least two women, that were in what he calls permanent positions. And the reason I find it odd is when I count the number of females on this side of the House, as opposed to that side of the House, and if you can count I suggest you take a count. That's a good place to start. When it comes to affirmative action, whether it be voluntary or mandatory, yes, indeed, that will be an issue that the secretariat will be talking with in various departments.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Supplementary. Permanent heads . . . New question, I gather. Sorry, Mr. Speaker. New question. Permanent heads are appointed, not by the public service, but by the cabinet. This is a kind of affirmative action which must direct itself to the cabinet. And I suggest to you, Madam Minister, that if the secretariat doesn't have the freedom to comment on the appointment of permanent heads publicly, it isn't going to have any role to play. I ask you again, Madam Minister, will you give the secretariat the freedom to comment publicly on issues such as the appointment of permanent heads, which it cannot deal with through the bureaucratic means?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you know how government operates? No wonder you were dropped.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — You were dropped on your head . . . (inaudible) . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Makes no difference. You got the concussion.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Will you give the Minister the opportunity to answer? I just called for order and the member for Regina Centre is out speaking again, and I would ask you to refrain from blurting out when the Minister is answering.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find the member's question displays an amazing lack of understanding of how government works, and you really haven't been gone from government that long. It's amazing. Let me state the secretariat is not intended to be autonomous. I believe that is the world you used. The Department of Justice is not autonomous. It is not an entity unto itself. Neither is the Department of Social Services, the Department of Health. They are not autonomous. They work as a group. They bring forth whether it be justice issues, health issues, to cabinet, where the policy decision are made. That is what the secretariat will do in terms of are we free to speak out, as much as, and no less as, the Attorney General or the Minister of health, or any of the other ministers. That's how government works.

Head of Secretariat

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister at least, if she is not going to give this secretariat any freedom or autonomy or authority, can you at least assure this House that you are searching for a high quality woman to head up the secretariat, someone who has an established reputation in the women's movement, someone who has a bit of independence. Can you assure us, Madam Minister, that you will break precedent with the other appointments which this government has made, and appoint someone for some other reason than his Conservative Party card membership?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to hire a very well-qualified person, and need I say more than that?

Financial Assistance for Hudson Bay Farmers

MR. LUSNEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Minister, I have a news release issued by your department here that announces an emergency financial assistance program for the province's sheep farmers or producers. I have an interesting point in here that caught my eye, and that is, it says, just because the sheep industry represents only a small segment of our agricultural industry, it doesn't mean its difficulties should be ignored.

Well, Mr. Minister, are you aware of the fact that in the Hudson Bay area, and in the area along that forest fringe, that there are some 250 farmers out there that have had two years of natural disasters, and today face losing their farms, and those that won't lose their farms may not be able to put their crops in because they will not have the finances to buy the fuel, the fertilizer, and the seed. Are you aware of that situation there?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation that exists in Hudson Bay as it relates to the sheep producers of Saskatchewan. I was only too happy to provide them with some emergency aid.

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I'm not sure if I heard him right, and I'm not aware of the sheep farmers, or sheep producers in the Hudson Bay area that have a problem. I am talking about grain producers in that area. Are you aware of the problem that the 250 farmers that produce grain in that area have a problem?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation in Hudson Bay as it relates to the flooding.

MR. LUSNEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister met with those farmers from Hudson Bay, and have you decided on a program of assistance for those farmers?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Mr. Speaker, I have met with a number of delegations. In fact, at least representatives from three rural municipalities were in to see me in regards to the problems that had occurred in their area this past summer, and as well I've been in close contact with the MLAs from the area. I will be communicating directly with the member representatives of those RMs as to my decision relative to the problem there. I will report directly to them, and not through the press and the TV and the radio, so that they know exactly where they stand, and it will be coming directly from myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. I am not saying that you should be saying what you're going to do through the press. Just for background information, Mr. Minister, I understand that, as of about 10 days ago, neither you nor the Minister of the Environment, the MLA for Kelsey-Tisdale, has brought that problem before your cabinet.

Have you had that problem that those farmers discussed before cabinet, and have you come up with a proposal for those farmers?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I have assessed their problem, and I will be making known my decision to them in due course.

MR. LUSNEY: — Supplementary. Has the minister discussed that problem with his cabinet?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I've discussed that issue with many farmers, including some of my colleagues.

MR. LUSNEY: — When could those farmers of Hudson Bay expect an answer or some assistance from you? Are you going to wait till they go broke or lose their farms to the banks, or are you prepared to do something within the next week or so?

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — I intend to notify those farmers of my findings very shortly, Mr. Speaker. And I would just remind the hon. member that since those RMs were in to see me that a number of things have changed in that area, including some of the input data that we've obtained.

First of all, when they came in to see me, they were very concerned about frost at that point in time because the crops were not yet off. Secondly, they were also concerned about the effect of them not being able to work their summer fallow lands and what implication that might have for the next year. Thirdly, they were even concerned about the prices they received for their commodity at that time when they came in to see me, and as well, of course, the yields, not only on the land that they had been able to seed and harvest, but as well, of course, the fact that there was going to be no crop on the land that was flooded.

As the member may well know, since that time a number of things have changed. Number one, there was no frost. Number two is conditions have improved dramatically insofar as it relates to the summer fallow situation, and of course that's a next year situation anyways, and it's hard to look into the future with any degree of certainty. Thirdly, as the member will also know, rape — canola — prices have improved substantially. I would never say that they've gone up too much, and as well so has the barley.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the yield data that has come in would suggest that in terms of long-term averages it may not be as bad as one might suspect. That does not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not empathize to any small degree. I empathize totally with those farmers up there who have suffered flood damage.

I would most like to point out — the most important I'd like to point out — that the main vehicle in this province for assistance in those kinds of cases, the main vehicle, and one I would suggest has worked very well, is the crop insurance program. Once again, I would not suggest that the crop insurance program is a program that's not without faults. Under the direction of the minister in charge . . . I know he's been holding meetings across the province with his board with a view to improving that crop insurance scheme and making it even better. But that is the main vehicle in this province today, Mr. Speaker, for helping out those farmers all over Saskatchewan.

And I would just remind the hon. member, as well, that I empathize as much with those Hudson Bay farmers as I do with those farmers that have been hit with glume blotch. And I empathize with those farmers as much as I do with those who have been hit with wheat midge, and with drought, and with grasshoppers.

Now if you are suggesting for one moment that I should single out one group over another, one group that paid into crop insurance and another that didn't, and put in some kind of ad hoc program in place, when we already have programs in place in Saskatchewan, I would suggest to

you that that would be a double standard.

Insofar as helping the farmers of this province, we wrote the book on helping farmers reduce their input costs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — Mr. Speaker, I am aware I'm not allowed to get into debate with the minister, which I would like to do, but I will ask a question of the minister responsible for the crop insurance board.

Is it not true, Mr. Minister, that many of these farmers who have had problems of frost last year, and had crop insurance, would receive less payment this year because of having received some assistance last year? Is it not true that they will be getting that much less this year because of having another bad year?

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — In answer to the hon. member's question, that is absolutely right. There has been a diminishing program, that's always been in place, by the Crop Insurance Corporation. If you've had a crop loss, you'll definitely diminish in what you'll collect.

But, we are now looking, Mr. Speaker, at a new program for crop insurance. We are looking into individual rates we have now put in place, which will be in place for the 1984-85 crop, winter wheat. We are looking for a different rate of diminishing the hail and the frost, spot hail and frost, so for the future it will definitely be much more of a suitable program for the farmers in that direction. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LUSNEY: — A question to the minister of the crop insurance board. Is it not true, Mr. Minister, contrary to what the Minister of Agriculture says, that if you have stubble crop that you were not able to seed because of an excessive amount of moisture this spring, that you would not qualify for any assistance on that land? So if you got to seed 50 acres out of 500 because the rest was flooded, you would have no assistance from crop insurance whatsoever? Is that not true?

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely not true.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 2 — An Act respecting the Department of Science and Technology

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of an Act respecting the Department of Science and Technology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

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

Bill No. 3 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Department of Science and Technology Act

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of The Department of Science and Technology Consequential Amendment Act.

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

Bill No. 4 — An Act to repeal The Science Council Act

HON. MR. CURRIE: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of the science council repeal act.

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

Bill No. 5 — An Act to Provide for the Taxation of Minerals

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill to provide for the taxation of minerals.

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

Bill No. 6 — An Act respecting the Consequential Amendments resulting from the enactment of The Mineral Taxation Act, 1983

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, I move first reading of a bill respecting the consequential amendments resulting from the enactment of The Mineral Taxation Act, 1983.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been looking forward to entering into the throne speech debate. I would like to join the other speakers in congratulating His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, Frederick Johnson, on his appointment as the Queen's representative in our province of Saskatchewan. I would also like to compliment His Honour on the delivery of the throne speech.

And at this time I would like to particularly compliment the new ministers in the cabinet in the province of Saskatchewan, and the new legislative secretaries. I'm proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that they are the brightest men and women in the legislature in any province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, today I want to elaborate on two themes. The first theme is that presented in our Speech from the Throne — a theme that reflects, I suppose, something like growing during a recession. And then I want to comment briefly on a second theme — a theme that I would think would be in a Speech from the Throne by the opposition if they were to present one.

And the second theme is simply this: close the uranium mines in Saskatchewan. Now there's two themes, Mr. Speaker. One is: growing during a recession and creating jobs because we care. And the second theme is: close the uranium mines in the province of Saskatchewan. I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, because we've heard much of the debate about our Speech from the Throne, to reflect a moment on this second theme, because if it wasn't for the 1982 election, it could very well have been the Speech from the Throne.

Let's take a few minutes to think about the Lieutenant Governor, sitting where you are, Mr.

Speaker, and saying the following: “My government will close all the uranium mines in the province of Saskatchewan.” Consider, Mr. Speaker, if that was the leading statement in the Speech from the Throne if the former people were in government. Let’s examine this opening line of an NDP Speech from the Throne from several vantage points. In other word: let’s judge it for a few minutes.

Let’s judge it on several accounts. Let’s take the first account. Let’s judge it on the basis of public trust. Here’s a party that took over \$600 million of Saskatchewan money, the peoples’ money, and bought into and invested and built the uranium industry in the province of Saskatchewan. Over half the heritage fund in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker — over half of it, of the so-called \$1 billion in the heritage fund.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 there was only one, small, underground mine in Saskatchewan when the NDP took over — one, small, underground uranium mine. Today, for example, Key Lake will be the largest open pit mine in the free world, with SMDC being a key player. Over \$600 million of the taxpayers’ money into an industry; hundreds and hundreds of joint ventures by the government; investment in northern Saskatchewan with taxpayers’ money; heritage fund money to develop northern Saskatchewan; and the opening line is, “Close the mine.” After all those expenditures, years and years and years and years of telling us they’re going to take the heritage fund, the taxpayers’ dollars, and they are going to develop the resources for the people of Saskatchewan, and the opening line of the new Speech from the Throne would be: “Close the mines.”

Mr. Speaker, I think it’s only fair to ask some questions. If people would hear that opening line, what would they believe? On hearing that statement, “We are now going to close the mines,” — \$600 million is down the tubes. What would they believe? What did the NDP do it for? What were their motives? Why did they do this, and why are they closing it? Where is all the money today? Whose money was it, anyway? Who owned the money? What families, what heritage, what children, what people, what communities are responsible for that money, that made that money/ And what would people get out of it if it was closed today? I suppose a final question would be; and what’s next?

Mr. Speaker, to me this is the best single solitary example of why the NDP lost in 1982. And they will lose again here, and will lose again in Manitoba. They will lose again in B.C.; they will lose again across this country from coast to coast because ordinary people now know they can’t be trusted.

Mr. Speaker, my grandfathers, my grandparents, my grandmothers and my grandfathers homesteaded here in this province, and they came into this province when there was nothing here but prairie. And people like them all across this province worked very, very, very hard to create communities, to build, to raise families, to have a heritage. And they worked too hard and too long to have some half-baked, radical, left-wing clique squander \$600 million of their heritage on a political partisan whim that now they don’t believe is any longer relevant. Six hundred million dollars of my heritage, and my family’s heritage, and my children’s heritage is nothing to play with, and it is not up for grabs because of a political whim.

I don’t trust them, Mr. Speaker. My parents don’t trust them; the community that I live in don’t trust them; my children don’t trust them. And what’s more, Mr. Speaker, I don’t forgive them, and my parents won’t forgive them, and the people of Saskatchewan are not going to forgive them — not for a long, long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, they have gambled. They played in a very, very large poker game. They have gambled with the heritage fund of Saskatchewan — \$600 million at least, at a minimum. Thousands and thousands and thousands of jobs. And they gambled with people’s

lives, not only in northern Saskatchewan, but all over Saskatchewan — indeed Canadian lives. And they lost, and they lost badly, because there's no return, and it's an investment, and they don't know what they believe.

Well I'm not going to forget, Mr. Speaker, that they robbed my generation and my children's generation of hospitals, and of roads, and of homes, and of farms, and of schools, and of jobs, and of education, and of resources, and most of all, they've robbed them of potential. It won't be forgotten, Mr. Speaker.

How many hospitals, Mr. Speaker, how many hospitals do you think \$600 million would build? Just add it up, Mr. Speaker. How many hospitals would \$600 million build? How many schools? How many power projects? I mean, we know that government could have been the regulator. It's our position; it always has been our position. Government the regulator, the referee; not both the player and the referee. And it wouldn't ' have cost us a cent —not a single, solitary cent. We could have had \$600 million in the heritage fund if we'd just saved the money, let alone let other people invest.

Six hundred million dollars, Mr. Speaker, at 10 per cent interest over 10 years, Mr. Speaker, is \$1.5 billion at a minimum, in our heritage fund today, and gone, zero. The NDP, Mr. Speaker, took my family's heritage, my children's heritage and blew it — \$600 million gone.

And then when they say, Mr. Speaker . . . I ask the question: what is it worth today; what" the worst thing they could have said to value the resources in the province of Saskatchewan today? That the people that created it have done a flip-flop. They don't think they should have done it, and they're going to close the mines. You know what it does to the value of the mines? Do you know what that does to the value of our heritage? It's the worst possible economic, political decision that has ever been made in the history of Saskatchewan by any political party. They have no concern for our economic heritage. It's strictly political, partisan propaganda, and it's serious, Mr. Speaker. It is very, very serious. People in Saskatchewan are not going to forget overnight about \$600 million, and \$1.5 billion that could have been accumulated if you'd just put it in the bank. It's lost.

Mr. Speaker, I say on the first point, they'll be judged in terms of trust — whether people trust them or not.

Second — and I've touched on it, Mr. Speaker — is the economic return. They'll be judged in terms of economic return. What could you get for \$600 million? Mines that they now want to close? Mines that they're going to scare investors off from all over the world? The cost of putting that money in there with no return . . . \$1.5 billion is pretty valuable during a recession, Mr. Speaker. It adds up to a lot of money. It means not just balanced budgets. It means schools, and hospitals, and roads, and all kinds of opportunities — lost. So when it's judged, Mr. Speaker, on the second important category — the first is trust, the second is economic rationality — it will fail.

Third, Mr. Speaker, I think it'll be judged on the basis of confidence. In other words, people are going to have to take a look at the NDP and say, "What do they really believe? Could anybody ever have any confidence in the NDP? If they did in the past, could they in the future?"

Yesterday they said they believed in uranium mining. Today they say they don't believe in it. Yesterday they said they believed in the family farm. What will their position be tomorrow, Mr. Speaker? Yesterday they said they believed in job creation in northern Saskatchewan. Today they say they believe in closing the main source of employment. Yesterday they said they believed in medicare. What will their position be tomorrow, Mr. Speaker? Yesterday they said they believed in private life insurance. What will their position be tomorrow?

What does the leader believe, Mr. Speaker? What does the NDP leader really believe? What

does the party believe? Are they the same? You can't have major differences worth \$600 million between the leader of a party and the party itself, and expect to have confidence from people of Saskatchewan.

What do we believe about them, Mr. Speaker? What do they believe about themselves? Well frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe anybody believes in the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, if we go into an NDP convention . . . And this is important, Mr. Speaker. If you go into an NDP convention and you ask an NDPer, "What do you believe?" — and if you give him a list of a dozen questions, you would get different answers from virtually everybody on the floor.

They say they believe in more government spending, and we hear the members opposite say, "More government spending." But they say they don't believe in deficits, when they don't even understand the difference.

Mr. Speaker, they say they believe in the Crow rate; they believe in the Crow. Well, Mr. Speaker, in the past they said they didn't believe in a prime minister from western Canada that would defend it, and they defeated him.

Mr. Speaker, they say they're open for business. They say they're open for business, Mr. Speaker, and then they say they don't support free enterprise. They say that they believe in creating jobs. On the other hand, they don't believe in uranium mining, which is a key source of income and jobs in northern Saskatchewan.

They say that they believe in lower utility rates, but they don't believe in the public utilities review commission, which all over North America is used to keep the rates responsible, which means keeping them as low as possible.

They say they believe in packing plants, and then they say they don't believe in keeping them open, either.

They say they believe in positive international image for the province of Saskatchewan. And then they say, well, they don't really believe in the American flag, and they burn it.

They say they believe in labour, and they are pro-labour. Then they say they don't believe in unions any more. Then they say they don't believe in unions any more.

They say they don't believe in private . . . They do believe in private investment; they encourage it. Then they say they don't believe in it and they're going to expropriate businesses for a dollar.

They say they believe in families, Mr. Speaker. They say they believe in families. Then they say they don't believe in life for everybody; just for some.

They say, Mr. Speaker, that they believe in promoting Saskatchewan business — Saskatchewan business. And then they say they don't believe in it. They don't believe in small business for things like the Cornwall Centre, because they gave \$45 million at nine and five-eighths to big business outside the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, you can go on and on and on in terms of what an NDP believes.

Mr. Speaker, I've made my point. The average NDPer today doesn't know what he or she believes because the leader doesn't know what they believe, the party doesn't know what they believe, and, worst of all and most important of all, people now know that they don't 'know what they believe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I believe the editorial today in the local newspaper does a fair amount to summarize the frustration that a lot of Saskatchewan people must feel about the flip-flop in the position taken by the NDP with respect to uranium mining — the fact that they would invest hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in the whole future and heritage of this province, and then cancel it with a whim and say that it's closed.

I might quote, and I concur: "Depending on one's point of view, projects such as Key Lake and Cluff Lake mines have become monuments to the Blakeney years in power or a ball and chain dragging down the party."

Mr. Speaker, the editorial speaks for itself. The feeling of frustration and anger across Saskatchewan will speak for itself in the communities that I am familiar with in every single solitary riding in this province.

The people of Saskatchewan can judge the NDP Speech from the Throne, which says, "We're going to close the mines." That Speech from the Throne is selfish; it is hypocritical; it is radical; it's uneconomic; and it cannot be trusted. And, most of all, it's a waste of my time.

The people of Saskatchewan can count their blessings, Mr. Speaker, that this little Speech from the Throne is only hypothetical. But, Mr. Speaker, the reality is not. The \$600 million lost is not hypothetical; it's a nightmare. It's an NDP nightmare imposed upon the people of Saskatchewan, because these people fooled the people — they didn't believe it at any time — that would support policies like that, that would waste \$600 million because of some political partisan whim.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, before I go on to comment on some of the things about our Speech from the Throne, there's a question that needs to be answered as a result of the recent policy statements by the NDP.

Before we put together our Speech from the Throne, we asked ourselves a question, and the Minister of Finance has asked himself this many times: what in the world did they do with all the money, anyway? We heard of years and years and years of the best income, the highest revenues in the history of Saskatchewan ever — ever, ever, ever. Boom times — oil prices, potash prices. What happened to all the money?

The 1970s and early '80s record record revenues, and any finance department in Canada will tell you that. No money now in the heritage fund. No money in the crowns. No money coming in from burgeoning new businesses. Where did it all go? What did they do with all the money? They spent, Mr. Speaker, they spent the money on buildings and buses and bathtubs and mines and a whole combination of things that weren't worth the powder to blow them from here to kingdom-come. With no return, Mr. Speaker. How many dollars did we get out of \$600 million in uranium mines? How many? Nothing. \$600 million in the bank would have made 1.5 billion in 10 years.

Well, I just want everybody to know and I want the media to know and the world to know that we started this government in 1982, and we started the Speech from the Throne with three things that are evident. Number one, the cupboard was bare. There was no cash. No cash. Lots of debt in the crown corporations, and the crowns are losing money. I want that to be well known — that we started from there: no cash, no heritage fund, no debt, lots of debt, towns losing money.

Mr. Speaker, that's number one. Mr. Speaker, I'll ask anybody. I'll challenge anybody, any finance

person anywhere in the world to come in and look at the books when we opened the books in April of 1982, and the cupboard was bare. The cupboard was bare.

Number two, Mr. Speaker. What did we realize? The income to the province of Saskatchewan, the revenue coming in in '82-83, in '83-84 was \$300 million to \$400 million less than it had been for those individuals when they were here. Less. Oil prices dropped. Potash prices dropped. And those two alone account for \$300 million to \$400 million. Mr. Speaker, one, the cupboard was bare; the crows were in debt, and the government didn't have any source of revenue. Number two, \$300 million to \$400 million less coming into this province just from the export market alone — alone. Three, we started 1982 when we took over government with a recession. That's what we started with — a recession . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And we didn't. Mr. Speaker, I set the stage. Mr. Speaker, I want anybody to check any financial records (and anybody can check any books they want to check because the books are open) that we started 1982 with the cupboard bare, with a lack of revenue from export markets, and during the recession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we never said, we never said, one, the heritage fund was real. We never said that. We never said there was a whole bunch of money in the heritage fund. Mr. Speaker, number two, we never said that the crown corporations were big payers, big contributors. Three, we never said that the savings were real. And fourth, we never said that potash prices and oil prices would stay high forever. We didn't say those things. Somebody said that there was a lot of money in the heritage fund. It wasn't us. Somebody said that the crown corporations, the Saskatchewan family of crown corporations, were the best thing that man ever created. It wasn't us. Somebody said that the savings and the revues coming in would be phenomenal.

What did we say, Mr. Speaker, is the following. We said that they took in so much money you could afford to mismanage and still break even. That's what we said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, do you know what? They didn't even do that — they put us n the hole; they put us in debt. They got lots, they received lots, and they blew it.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to get into some very, very specific comments, for the record — on jobs and unemployment, and on economic activity — that reflect to our Speech from the Throne and the kinds of things that we're trying to do in this province that practically aren't being done any place else in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to talk about the facts. Today, the facts are that there are 25,000 more people working in the province of Saskatchewan than there was of April last year. That's a fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Sixty thousand are looking for work.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I'll get to that. Twenty-five thousand more people working today than there was last April — that's a fact. Why? Because we really and sincerely care about people working, about people's jobs, and about their families. Now, the facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker. Statistics Canada reported that in April of 1982 there were 427,000 people with jobs in Saskatchewan. This October, Statistics Canada reported 452,000 jobs in Saskatchewan — 25,000 more . . .

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — . . . which is almost a 6 per cent increase in the number of jobs in Saskatchewan, and this was done in the midst, Mr. Speaker, of a national recession.

Members opposite — and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg just mentioned it — have been misleading the public and the members by talking about 60,000 people unemployed and looking for work. I'm going to challenge that, Mr. Speaker. First off, I should like to suggest that since people have found 25,000 jobs since last April, and that even if it were true that there were still 60,000 looking for jobs, either there was 85,000 looking for jobs in April 1982 when the NDP were in power, given their own figures, or there must have been a sudden influx of people into the province. However, the members opposite, and the leader particularly, deny that anyone has come into the province. In fact, he suggest they are leaving. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, conditions in April of his term must have been awfully, awfully bad.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will grant the Leader of the Opposition the fact that two individuals have left the service of this province — Jack Messer and David Dombowsky — and they're both serving Socialists International from the depths of a Manitoba potash mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I want to talk about the oppositions' credibility when it comes to numbers, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about the soundness of their figures. Let's talk about how relevant they are, and let's talk about the opposition's record, particularly from 1971 to 1982.

The Leader of the Opposition is fond of reminiscing about the sound management of his government, and the deep thought that went into their decisions, based on reliable data. So we called Canada Employment and said, "Canada Employment, someone is using your name and throwing around some information that we think is pretty outlandish." And they said, "You're right, and it is." So they explained. They said they have two administrative series of data and they recommend that no one use any of it. They recommend Statistics Canada. They don't trust the figures, and consequently I don't trust anybody that uses them. The series of data used by the members opposite consist of a list of clients registered with manpower offices in the province. And here is why it is not reliable, and the members opposite know this.

One, many people register when they are passing through the province in order to keep their UIC benefits intact. Number two, people are not required to notify the centres if they find a job. Probably the first person they call is their wife. Three, Canada Manpower says that the programs like those announced in our budget encourage people to register in huge numbers. And they did, because they were the first meaningful jobs encouraged by the provincial government in a long, long time, and the people felt their chances of finding a job were better under this administration than anything else in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Number four, there are many employed people, Mr. Speaker, employed people, who look for better jobs through manpower, and they are on this list. Five, many people register with more than one manpower office, Mr. Speaker. It is not uncommon, particularly for students, for people to register in Saskatoon and then register in Moose Jaw before finding a job back home in Brownlee or Carievale or someplace else. Six, finally, Canada Manpower cautions that their data is administrative only, and not a good measure at the best of times, and particularly now, as they are moving from a manual system to a computer system, and their efforts are going into that process. Manpower says, and I quote, "Our figures are much higher now because of the change-over in our administrative procedures." Fancy anybody using those numbers, Mr. Speaker.

Canada Employment has a two-page letter explaining the pitfalls of using their data, and that letter is available, and I'm sure they will supply it to any members of this legislature, particularly to the NDP. So, Mr. Speaker, members opposite have used an authoritative source, data from an organization that says, one, it denies the significance of its own information; two, warns against the use of their data; and three, recommends Statistics Canada be used instead.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are this. The facts, Mr. Speaker. One, from September to October, the unemployment rate in Canada dipped one-tenth of 1 per cent and that is good news for the rest of Canada. However, here in Saskatchewan, the news was better. Our employment rate dropped twice as much — two-tenths of 1 per cent.

Number two, the national unemployment rate dropped at a rate of less than 1 per cent, while our rate dropped at a rate exceeding 3 per cent, or three times the national average.

Three, currently our unemployment rate is about 2 percentage points lower than Manitoba's, where their unemployment rate is about 30 per cent higher than ours. Unemployment in Saskatchewan is almost two and a half percentage points better than Alberta, whose rate is 38 per cent higher than ours. Comparing our unemployment rate with the rest of Canada's, we're almost 4 percentage points better than the national average, which is 60 per cent higher than the province of Saskatchewan.

Four, during the first 18 months of our administration, 25,000 new jobs have been added to the Saskatchewan economy, while some months many thousands of jobs have been created from time to time. On average, 1,400 new jobs have been available each and every month since April of 1982. During the last 18 months of the NDP administration, only 1,000 jobs were created. However, to be fair, we should compare our performance with the last April-October 18-month period under the previous administration. And when we do, we find that, on average, only 800 jobs per month were created during the 1980-81 boom years. Our rate of job creation is 175 per cent higher than that — higher than the previous administration's — during a time of international recession.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, let's take a closer look at Alberta, the land of milk and honey, and particularly when the NDP were in power. For the last four or five years of NDP rule, unemployment in Saskatchewan was consistently higher than in Alberta, and in 1981 it was indeed 20 per cent higher than in the province of Alberta. Well, for the year 1982, and for the first time in a long time, the unemployment rate of Saskatchewan was below the rate in Alberta, as their rate was 21 per cent higher than ours. And as I mentioned, the Alberta unemployment rate is currently running 60 per cent higher than ours. Mr. Speaker, the romance is moving from the Alberta border east. Only in 1982, Mr. Speaker, did the province of Saskatchewan do better than Alberta.

In reviewing the latest labour force statistics, I am pleased to point out that there were in October 1,000 less men and 1,000 less women unemployed compared to September in the province of Saskatchewan. Overall, non-agricultural employment increased a further 2,000 from September to October. I was pleased to hear of some of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks on the Macdonald commission, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the Leader of the Opposition shares with us the joy of knowing that this October there are 4,000, or roughly 20 per cent, more jobs in the Saskatchewan manufacturing sector than there were in October of 1982. However, the manufacturing sector is not the only area of -Saskatchewan economy that has new life. Almost every industry in the province is showing increased employment over the last year. I'll give you some examples.

One, more people are working in the construction industry this October than were working in the construction industry last October. Two, another 1,000 people making their living in trade than they did a year ago September. Three, there are over 4,000 people in finance, insurance, and real estate industries that are working now, and over 1,000 more than there were last September. In the past month, 4,000 more jobs exist in the service industry than they did before, and more people can earn their livelihood in other primary industries than they could a year ago in terms of last October.

Why are there more jobs in Saskatchewan today? Why, Mr. Speaker? Because of the Speech from the Throne, because of the budget, because of this government, because of a nine-point job creation package introduced in the spring. And it has worked, Mr. Speaker, and it is still working, because we care, because we care enough to put our reputations on the line. We care enough to say that we will fight recession. We care enough to say that we will not even participate in the recession. As long as we have an ounce of energy left to fight against that recession, we will not participate. And, Mr. Speaker, we had the courage to say that and we had the courage to fight for it. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say that we won.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — In 1981, members opposite, Mr. Speaker, brought in a spring budget, and from April to October the number of jobs increased by 8,000. In the spring of 1982 we all know what happened. We didn't have a budget. We had a better feeling, and from April to October jobs increased by 11,000 — an increase of over 37 per cent than the year previous. This year we came in with a spring budget, and the Minister of finance went through it in detail with a whole complement of job-creation measures designed to respond to the times. And, Mr. Speaker, the facts are from April to October jobs increased by 22,000 — double the number for the year before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, why are there so many jobs being created in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? It's because we created hundreds of jobs with our rural gas distribution system. We created 3,800 new jobs with the tax credit system. We created 4,200 jobs through Opportunities '83. We created over 1,000 new jobs because of record oil drilling, and I believe that's a very, very conservative estimate. We created jobs because of enthusiasm associated with us now believing that we will build the heavy oil upgrader, with a potential for 2,500 new jobs, and people are excited about it.

We're building jobs and created jobs because we're building a cancer clinic and a new geological sciences building and a new Wascana technical institute. And because of our Build-A-Home program we created thousands of jobs, because of the new expanded P.A. technical institute, and because, by eliminating the sales tax on gasoline and introducing mortgage protection, we have left more and more money in the hands of people so they can invest and create jobs for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — So far, on an accumulative basis, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to report for the first 10 months of 1983 Saskatchewan unemployment is running at 2.3 percentage points lower than Manitoba, and 3.3 percentage points lower than Alberta. It's the best in the West and the best in the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to give you a few more facts. I want to look a little bit at the last 10 years records. A good measure of growth, Mr. Speaker, in the economy is the increase in economic activity, and particularly the growth in the labour force. I've got some bad news and I've got some good news, Mr. Speaker. The bad news. In 1978, Saskatchewan lagged a good 30 per cent behind the national labour force rate of growth. 1978. In 1979, we lagged behind it again. In 1980, we remained behind the national rate and the gap grew. And, Mr. Speaker, in 1981 we were still behind the national rate and the gap was just as large. Now, the good news, Mr. Speaker. In 1982, we pulled well past the national rate of

growth in the labour force for the first time in many, many years. And in 1983 so far, for the first 120 months, the growth rate in the labour force is running at more than double the national rate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — As good as that might seem, an even better indication of our dynamic market is the growth rate in the number of people who have jobs in the labour force, Mr. Speaker. The turnaround has been startling. First the bad news. In 1978, the rate of job creation for the country was over 50 per cent higher than the province of Saskatchewan. We lagged behind other provinces. Our rate of job creation was lower than Prince Edward Island, lower than Newfoundland, lower than Manitoba's. In fact, it was lower than any other province in the nation except Quebec, and we were running neck and neck for last. In 1979, the national rate was again higher than Saskatchewan. In 1980, the national growth rate was once more about 50 per cent higher than our province, and in 1981 Saskatchewan continued to lag behind the rest of the country in job creation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1982 Saskatchewan people said enough is enough, and we know what happened. We changed the government, and in 1982 Saskatchewan — Saskatchewan — in this province, we were the only place in Canada to create jobs, and our rate was well above the national average, and we were creating jobs when the rest of the nation was losing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, in one month we went from tied for last to number one. In one month, in April of 1982, this province did a 180 degree flip-flop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I am pleased to note this year, after our first full budget that contained meaningful job creation programs, that for the first 10 months of the year the rate of Saskatchewan job creation is running eleven and one-half times the national average.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I think that record speaks for itself. The Leader of the Opposition talked of priorities during his comments the other day. There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, about the priorities of this government. It's job creation, and the record speaks for itself.

As an economist, it is hard to believe that the facts could be as they are, particularly when we look at the history of the last 10 years of the former administration: world markets were buoyant; demand for potash was high; oil prices were high; farmers were selling their wheat; and the government was reaping windfall profits from the energy industry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I go back to the question: what do they do with all the money? Where did all the people go? What happened to the population? What happened to the towns and the village and the farms?

Mr. Speaker, we know what happened on April 26, 1982 because people had heard the rubbish long enough. The records of today — of this administration, of this Minister of Finance, the Minister of Economic Development, the Minister of Energy, and Minister of Agriculture — speak for themselves in job creation, leading every solid economic indicator in the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to go back even a little further. In 1973, Saskatchewan's job creation rate was the lowest in Canada. The next closest province had a rate almost twice as great as Saskatchewan, while the nation as a whole created jobs at a rate two and one-half times faster than this province. The difference would have been far greater, except our rate was so low and so far down the barrel that it actually pulled the average down across the country.

In 1974, the picture was again the same. Saskatchewan created jobs at a rate less than half of the rest of the rest of the country. In a direct comparison, the record shows that if Saskatchewan created one job, Manitoba created two and then some.

If we're talking about a year or two years, or perhaps three, the record would not be so damning, but we're talking year after year after year after year of NDP administration that we in this province lagged behind the creation of economic activity related directly to job creation and the increase in the labour force — behind everybody else in the country.

We could feel it in the communities, Mr. Speaker. As we travelled around Saskatchewan — and still do — towns getting older and older and older because the young people were leaving. Because the jobs were not being created here, they left to go to Alberta and B.C., and I don't have to go on with it. But they all know that, and they knew it in their heart of hearts that something was haywire.

Well, last April the people of Saskatchewan decided to change things, Mr. Speaker. They changed the government. What a dramatic change that made in job creation. Since we have taken over, we have reversed the trend of the past and we have led the nation in job creation in every category. We have stated the priority. We have met the challenge. We have produced, and the record proves it. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because we sincerely care. Let there be no doubt in this Chamber, ever, Mr. Speaker, that job creation and economic growth has been, is, and will be the priority of this Progressive Conservative government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, just a couple more facts. From the word go, after the election of 1971, the population of the province, in the province of Saskatchewan, declined under the NDP for four consecutive years. It was only in the middle of their sixth year, the beginning of 1977, that the province's population returned to the level it was when the NDP were first elected.

Put another way, the population at the beginning of 1977 was the same as it was when the NDP were elected in 1971. Talk about excitement. And they do talk about "what we had — low unemployment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the facts. If your population isn't changing, and you are not creating jobs — in fact you're at the bottom of the barrel — and your labour force isn't increasing, and you have low unemployment, there's only one way to justify it. The children leave. They leave.

There's no other way to explain it. The birth rate in the province of Saskatchewan is higher than the national average. The creation of jobs was at the bottom of the barrel. The growth rate in employment was at the bottom of the barrel, and they had low unemployment.

People didn't come here to look for jobs. They went to other places. Why? With the largest supply of potash in the world, and oil, and uranium, and timber, and half the farmland in the country, and all the potential you could think of, and they'd leave. They didn't leave because of me. They didn't leave because of Bob Andrew. They didn't leave because of Gord Currie. They didn't leave because of Harold Martens. Mr. Speaker, they left because there was a psychology in the province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan that was doomed to failure — doomed to fail.

The record, Mr. Speaker, if you go back and look at it statistically, you go back and look at the employment, you look at the economic activity, and all the rest of it, the only growth you saw in the province of Saskatchewan was in government — \$600 million into mines, 10,000 more

people in the public service. That was the only place there was growth, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have reversed the trend. Now the people will be first and the government second; not the government first and the people second.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, during the first few years of NDP rule in the province of Saskatchewan, this was the only province in our country that lost population. Consistently under the NDP, any population growth we did have was at a rate well below the national average. In 1978, our population grew at a rate below the national average. The same situation existed in 1979 and again in 1980. In 1981, Saskatchewan population growth again lagged behind the national average, which was 33 per cent above the province of Saskatchewan.

In 1982, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan underwent a dramatic turnaround — it was magic — and its growth rate was the third highest of all the provinces in our country. There was a dramatic change in April of 1982. Years and years of falling behind the national average, or in fact declining, and in 1982, Mr. Speaker, we were the third highest in all of Canada in growth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — In 1983, Mr. Speaker, the growth rate is 40 per cent above the national average, and the highest in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — One qualification: save for Newfoundland which beat us by a hair.

During the 10 years of NDP rule, from July of 1971 to June of 1981, the population increased by an average of 4,210 people per year, Mr. Speaker. Since we assumed office, the population has increased by an average of 14,000 per year which is three and one-half times the rate of the NDP administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear. All the figures that I have just used are from Statistics Canada and in light of that, it is hard to believe that the opposition leader would actually try to convince this House or the public that we have been losing families and young people in the province of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member opposite has quoted the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan records as the definitive source of population growth. I believe he knows better. So we called them up, Mr. Speaker, and they said there's no great precision to their figures and, like Canada Manpower, they cautioned against using them as an accurate measure of population growth anywhere. SHSP figures are not a reliable measure of population because:

1. SHSP has no real way of knowing who has left the province until they attempt to communicate it with them. And when they do try and communicate with them, and the mail is returned marked "moved" or "no longer at this address," SHSP may drop them from their list. Yet, the person has only moved within the province and has not had any reason to use hospital services, and therefore may not have updated their registration.

2. Many newcomers to the province do not even register with our hospital services plan until they find the services are necessary. Newcomers may go for months and even years without requiring the use of hospitalization cards. The Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan has a system designed to keep a record of those who have applied for health services cards.

While the Leader of the Opposition was rummaging around in the Department of Health, he should have stopped by vital statistics. It is a legal requirement that all births and deaths that occur in the province be registered with the department. He would have been able to find more reliable and more revealing information than that supplied by SHSP. However, the information he would find would not be as revealing for his purposes as it is for mine.

The natural increase, Mr. Speaker, in the population is calculated by subtracting the number of deaths from the number of births. From April 1, 1982 to October 1, 1983, the natural increase in the province's population was 14,399. Yet, during the same period of time the population increased by over 20,000. That leaves over 5,600 people who, I guess, crept into Saskatchewan without the opposition noticing them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I know this is hard; it's hard for some of the members to believe. Since 1981, the natural increase in the population was 9,686, while the total population increased by only 10,000, which means only 314 people were bold enough to venture in in spite of the government of the day. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is a classic example of people voting with their feet.

In the early days of the NDP government's term, people left the province in droves, Mr. Speaker. In the final days of the previous government, a few started to trickle back in spite of the government, because they believed the government would change.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of comments with respect to social assistance, because I want to make sure that it's accurate on the record. The Leader of the Opposition, in addressing the throne speech, made reference to the social assistance plan. But I have good news and bad news again.

The good news is, yes, from September 1981 to September 1982, welfare cases increased 29.3 per cent. The bad news is, for two-thirds of the year he was premier. In April of this year, we introduced a budget which responded to the times and met the needs of the people of Saskatchewan. Job creation programs were included, and they have worked. Since April, there has been a steady decline in the number of welfare cases, so that from April to September, 1,600 welfare recipients have found jobs in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — And they have been dropped from the welfare rolls. We have been working against the flow, and the Minister of Finance's budget has been steadily shrinking the welfare roll. The staff in the Department of Social Services is to be commended for dealing with the huge increase in welfare cases, and we inherited these from the previous administration. The department has handled the increased work-load without an increase in staff, and the department has increased its efficiency and is showing strong leadership in the productivity drive. And I congratulate each and every one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention a recent study of welfare benefits across Canada that was completed by the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

In their thorough report, the council prepared comparative tables. And I will briefly touch upon the results. I'm going to make some interesting comparisons between the province of Saskatchewan and the province of Manitoba which is, for the time being, administered by the NDP.

For one adult with a child, age four, for short-term assistance, Saskatchewan is ranked number one in Canada. The opposition's friends in Manitoba are ranked eighth. And they've been in there for some time, Mr. Speaker. For long-term assistance, Saskatchewan is also ranked number one, while Manitoba is ranked number nine. Compassionate. For two adults, with children aged 10 and 13, both short-term and long-term assistance provided by Saskatchewan is ranked the best in Canada.

Another table prepared by the council compares monthly after-shelter incomes of families on social assistance, and for one adult with a child aged four, Saskatchewan ranks first; and for two adults with children aged 10 and 13 Saskatchewan also ranks first.

Another table prepared by the council lists supplemented annual income of families on social assistance, measured against poverty lines, and again the one adult and one child, Saskatchewan was ranked number one, while Manitoba is ranked number eight. And for two adults and two children, Saskatchewan is also ranked number one. Mr. Speaker, I use that as an example of the kind of compassion and caring that the Minister of finance reflects in his budget. It was reflected in the Speech from the Throne, and it is reflected in the administration of all the departments in our administration.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in summary that we made many promises to the people in the province of Saskatchewan before we were elected. We promised that we would change the image of this province and encourage people to come back home. We promised that we would do some financial things that would encourage investment. We promised that we would do some specific things like help on mortgages, help farmers, remove taxes, create economic activity, provide natural gas, and on and on and on.

Revitalize industries, Mr. Speaker, we did that knowing full well that the cupboard may be bare. We did that knowing full well that the crown corporations may be big losers. We did that knowing full well, Mr. Speaker, that we have had 10 years, and indeed 33 of the last 40 years, of an NDP-CCF administration that really did have so much that they could afford to mismanage and still break even.

Mr. Speaker, during this time of recession I want to say that I am proud of the record that I presented here today from StatsCanada, and it speaks for itself. I am proud of the ministers and the kinds of programs that they've implemented, and I will be very, very proud to stand up and support the motion that endorses the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise at this time and take part in this throne speech debate. It gives me pleasure, particularly because the throne speech is a statement of a continuation of the programs and policies and legislation that has been going on in this province for the last 18 or 19 months, and as was just indicated by the Premier, legislation and programs that have led to a complete turnaround in this province.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, deal specifically with that turnaround and with the throne speech as it applies to the areas of responsibility that I have been privileged to carry in this government, and a few words about he constituency that I'm proud to represent.

Before I do that, I would like to say a few words of congratulations, add my words to those that have already been tendered. First of all, to the Lieutenant Governor on his first throne speech — I'm sure it will be one of many. I'd like to congratulate the member from Melville and the member from Nutana South on the excellent job they did in moving and seconding the throne speech. And I would like to congratulate as well the new cabinet minister who have joined us since we met last.

I would like to add the opposition has been rather critical of the size of the cabinet. The only concern I have is that it's impossible to have 56 members in our cabinet because, as the member from Saskatoon Eastview indicated yesterday, in this government everyone is on the A team; everyone is involved in making decisions and developing the policy that makes this government work.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his acclamation last weekend in maintaining his position. I'm not sure if the fact that he was returned by acclamation is an indication of a great deal of confidence that his party has, or whether they simply looked at the alternatives and decided to with what they had. However, I would very seriously like to say that I hope he is the Leader of the Opposition for many, many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition has been very critical of our open for business policy as it applies to the oil industry. I want you to know that this is one time that I must agree with the opposition when they blame this government's open for business policy for conditions in the Saskatchewan economy. I want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to humbly submit to the NDP opposition that this government is fully prepared to accept the full blame for breaking all their records in the oil industry and putting the people of Saskatchewan back to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a few very simple and fundamental facts. In Saskatchewan today, the oil industry is booming. Drilling is setting records; land sale revues are setting records; our rigs are working; and we're producing at capacity. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to emphasize the point. We're not saying we're doing a little better than last year. We're not saying we're doing almost as good as it had before. We're setting records at a time when the rest of the industry in North America is, to say the least, not healthy.

When you compare that to the stagnant oil industry we inherited 19 months ago, this turnaround has been nothing short of dramatic. The folks in the oilfield tell us that it's all a direct result of our oil industry recovery program. Today our oil industry is leading economic recovery in Saskatchewan. Still, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opposition pretend they're not impressed. They say our recovery program is a give-away to the oil companies. They say it's costing the government millions of dollars a year. They say we're neglecting the little guys, the ordinary people. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they say it's part of a general turnaround in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, for a party that acts like it invented high moral standards, its numbers that the members are reading are very incredible. I would like to take the opportunity to expose the truth about some of the numbers and some of the claims. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say that in the short time I've been in this House it's become very obvious that it's not that difficult to sit on the opposition benches. You don't need to have all the facts. Sometimes you don't need to have any facts. Sometimes you don't need to know what you're talking about. You polish up your rhetoric. You get a little indignation in your voice and you're ready to go. If you need a number, you grab it out of the air. If that number doesn't work, you get another one. It's not important that the facts are correct. I think our Premier has just spent some time indicating the attempts that were made to mislead the people of this province and the members of this House. And I'd like to do a little bit of the same.

The Leader of the Opposition likes to say everywhere except in this House that our oil recovery program is costing the province \$100 million per year in foregone revenue. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we took a look at that number. We studied it from all ways. We analysed it, and the only thing we can say about that number, Mr. Speaker, is that it is wrong. It is totally incorrect. The recovery program that we instituted costs somewhere in the area of \$40 million per year, plain and simple. The \$100 million price tag is pure fancy. There is no way to substantiate it.

I think I should emphasize the point that my colleague from Moosomin made last night, though. It doesn't matter what the royalty rate, 90 per cent of zero is zero; 10 per cent of zero is zero; and if we'd left their program in place we'd have had an awful lot of zeros. What's more interesting though, had very seldom mentioned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the previous government's cash incentive program cost this province \$60 million a year. That's not a figure that was plucked out of the air. It's a figure that was plucked out of the blue book, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Not only does our program represent a net saving, it is also successful. Their program did nothing to get the industry moving again, but cost us bundles in the process.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's fairly easy for the Leader of the Opposition to stand across there and say that it cost \$100 million, that it was effective. It's easy for me to say that no, it cost 40 and ours is more effective. Possibly we could read into the record a neutral source — from the *Alberta Report* of October 24, 1983, the first paragraph of an article entitled, "Premier Devine's Royalty Holiday":

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

Mr. Speaker, a neutral opinion that assesses the performance of that government when it came to getting the oil industry moving. Last week, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan set a drilling record — 1,537 wells so far this year, compared with the year-end figure of 1,498 wells in 1980, 1980 being accepted as a boom year everywhere in North America in the oil industry. In September, Saskatchewan set a land sale record of 28.9 million compared with the previous high of 22.5 million, again set in the boom times of 1980. Revenue from this year has already doubled the 1982 figure, and we still have one sale left to go. That will take place next week, and it will give me considerable pleasure to rise in this House some day next week and announce the results of that land sale.

Production is already responding. Over the next five years, production should be up 15 per cent. That's 15 per cent higher than it would have been under the previous government's grant scheme, and royalties and taxes as a result should increase by something like \$270 million.

Most importantly, our program will create 1,100 additional permanent, direct jobs and encourage \$550 million worth of new investment over the next five years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, once again, that's 1,100 permanent, direct jobs and over half a billion dollars of direct investment. All this at a time when other producing areas in Canada and the U.S. are in a slump. All this from Saskatchewan, which used to be a very minor player in the oil patch. Without exaggeration, we can say that Saskatchewan today is the envy of the oil industry. Had we pursued the old government's policy of punitive royalties, there would have been no turnaround, no increased activity, less revenue from land sales, more cash grants to pay out, little prospect of future increases in productions and royalties, and none of the jobs and income that have been generated by our policies.

In other words, for \$40 million in foregone revenue, an essential industry is working again, creating jobs, investment, and income for Saskatchewan, not just for this year, but for the years to come. We've invested a little to get a lot back. I believe you would call that good financial management, and we've invested in our future and the future of our children. I believe that could be defined as good government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a second line of rhetoric says that our recovery program benefits the major foreign oil companies or, as the opposition calls it, big oil. I'm always interested to hear them talk about big oil or big business. They never quite define exactly what they're talking about. That's another one of the benefits, I guess, of being in opposition. But let's set the record straight. Our recovery program benefits all oil companies — small, medium, large, juniors, seniors. It's a

democratic program.

Here are the facts. Canadian firms account for 80 per cent of the wells completed in this province since our recovery program was introduced — that's 80 per cent of the wells completed. Some 50 new companies have come into the province since that time, the majority of them Canadian, the majority of them small and medium-sized operations. Not so under the old government's regime. Not only was their grant program expensive and ineffective, it paid for dry holes, and the only ones who could afford the NDP hand-outs were the major oil companies, big oil.

If you think about it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, under their program you drilled a hole, you got rewarded down the road sometime when you drilled another one. You had to have cash on hand; you had to have capital, in order to get involved in the oil industry in this province. Obviously, only the major companies could take part.

Under our program, you go out and drill a hole. If you strike oil, it produces, you are given an opportunity to realize your capital, to get it back — or at least most of it back — prior to the time when you start paying royalties. You then take it and invest it again. It's a democratic program that works for everyone.

It's rather ironic, possibly you could even say it's a double standard. The NDP, who suggest to the public that they are the party of the little people, had a program in place benefiting only the major oil companies. Our program benefits all major oil companies — large and small.

The NDP also talk a great deal of supporting co-ops, small business, having them take the lead. I would make one short note on that, Mr. Speaker. When you look around, who in Saskatchewan is in fact building the upgrader, that same upgrader that the old government never quite got past the paper stage? The Federated Co-ops, Mr. Speaker. I think that tells something about our attitude towards small business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Mr. Speaker, as well, who's working in the oil patch today? Those small and medium-sized Canadian firms I mentioned earlier, many of them Saskatchewan, companies the opposition calls big oil, companies like J.C. International, Scurry-Rainbow, Aberford Resources, Poplar Developments, Pirate Drilling, Border Oils. I don't imagine very many of the members of the House have heard of those companies. They're not big; they're not major, but they're all involved in the recovery program in Saskatchewan.

And, also, Mr. Speaker, don't forget the service and supply companies, many of them Saskatchewan firms that have come back to life since the upsurge in activity.

The leftovers from the old government claim we're neglecting the ordinary guy, again, Mr. Speaker, a term that I've never heard very well defined. Who's the ordinary guy in their eyes? Is it the guy that works for the companies I just mentioned? Is the guy that works for Esso not an ordinary guy? Is the ordinary guy a guy that works for a major crown, like PCS? I'd suggest that if you care about the ordinary guy you don't spend your time going around misleading him, telling him falsehoods, as the opposition have done.

I've travelled to every oil producing area in this province. I've met with the people, with the folks, with the ordinary guys — those people who own the drilling and service companies, who work the rigs, who make the oilfields hum. These ordinary people told me in Estevan, in Kindersley, Swift Current, and in The Battlefords, and in Lloydminster, that our recovery program is the reason they are working today.

Mr. Speaker, it goes beyond the areas where the oil is actually produced. The ordinary people that work at Ipsco are busy producing pipe for this recovery. There are ordinary people drilling

mud in Avonlea, road contractors, surveyors, people that sell work boots and fuel — all ordinary people, all benefiting from the program that we've put in place.

Not only are the oil men working; as well, are the seismic crews, the truckers, the hotel and restaurant owners, the retailers. Housing starts and retail sales are setting records, and it's all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, benefiting the ordinary guy.

Further to that point about ordinary people, I'd like to refer to a page that appeared yesterday in the *Leader-Post*, headed "Estevan is Smiling Again Now that the Oil boom is Back."

AN HON. MEMBER: — Weyburn, too.

HON. MR. SCHOENHALS: — Weyburn, too. I'd like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to quote a couple of paragraphs that indicate what this has meant, once again, to the ordinary guy. And I quote:

Listen to Marv Seimons, the co-owner of The Beefeater Inn, if you can catch him between taking orders in his restaurant during a busy noon hour: "We had a guy in here from Manitoba the other day looking for a room. We were booked up at the time, so I helped him call around. He phoned all over — Estevan, Weyburn, Midale, Bienfait, Stoughton, Carnduff — before he finally he got a room across the border in Crosby."

Or sit for a moment with Duncan Cook, manager of Schindle and Bazin Oilfield Construction Ltd.: "In January you could go to a hardware store downtown and not have to wait for a cashier. But in the last little while, just out of curiosity, I counted and found myself seventh in line once and 13th in line the second time."

Hundreds of similar stories abound in "the Energy and Sunshine Capital" these days as the rigs return and pumpjacks bob constantly in a oil patch that's seen too little action.

At best, these tales are only rough indications of recovery. But to hotel owners, suppliers and contractors who serve the industry, those tales are pure poetry.

And further in the article, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

The boost in activity has brought increased employment and a strain on Estevan housing. Realtors report a tight housing market, landlords say waiting lists for vacancies are growing and motels are doing as much as 50 per cent more business than they did last year.

Back at the Beefeater Inn, Seimons offers another anecdote: "Down by where I live, there's been at least nine houses sold in the last little while. And not many of the people who sold them moved out of Estevan."

Mr. Speaker, I think that article indicates the impact that the recovery program is having on the ordinary people in the province.

Simply put, we are creating jobs for Saskatchewan folk, as the Premier indicated, because we care. It's because we care that we act. And I think both the fact of the caring and the fact of the acting are more than the old government did when they had the chance.

What about the oil industry in the rest of the country? What about the general recovery that the opposition talks about?

Saskatchewan's drilling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is up 100 per cent over last year. By comparison,

Manitoba's has risen by 15 per cent to 20 per cent. Alberta's has remained static, or as it was described in the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post* the other day, it's in a holding pattern. Let's look at a few numbers.

In Alberta, the number of active drilling rigs is down by 12 per cent; ours is up by 123 per cent. Last week we had 52 active rigs in this province, Mr. Deputy. Alberta's drilling is down about 15 per cent; ours is up 127 per cent. Alberta's land sale revenue is up about 40 per cent; ours, however, is through the roof, at 218 per cent.

Once again now, the Leader of the Opposition can stand up and say: "It's part of a general recovery." I can stand up here and say, "No, it's unique to this province."

Again, some neutral opinions, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Here's a transcript from a CK radio news show, 5 p.m. on November 22, 1983. It says:

A wave of optimism pervades the oil services industry in south-eastern Saskatchewan. Renewed activity in the oil patch has seen many service supply companies more than double their number of employees. Spokesman for oil construction in Estevan, Dick Hood, credits the increased activity directly to the Tory government and its royalty holidays.

A quote from Mr. Hood:

See how it's improved in Alberta. It hasn't. See how it's improved anywhere else. It hasn't. It's improved simply because the PC government made the moves that they have made.

A headline, Mr. Speaker, in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, "Alberta Oil Drilling in Holding Pattern." The same article, Mr. Speaker, in the *Leader-Post*

Alberta drilling shows drop. They show oil activity in a general holding pattern. Gas activity collapsing under pressures of energy policies, weak markets, and high interest rates.:

As well, Mr. Speaker, especially for the member from Regina Centre, from the Calgary *Herald*, and I don't think the Calgary *Herald* has any reason to mislead this House, of November 5, 1983:

The economic condition of the oil industry in Alberta, particularly numerous small firms which are its backbone, has moved from critical to serious.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it doesn't sound to me like there's a general recovery in the rest of the industry in this country. Despite all of this, the Leader of the Opposition continues to tell us that there's nothing so special happening here.

At the same time — and this is an interesting comment, Mr. Speaker — there's gentleman in Alberta running around the province saying, "Look at the activity in Saskatchewan. We should have a royalty and tax program like that one." Mr. Deputy Speaker, that gentleman is Mr. Grant Notley, the Leader of the NDP opposition over there. It seems that that party can't get their act together in this province. They can't get their act interprovincially, and they certainly can't get their act together on a national level.

Mr. Deputy, what does a healthy oil industry mean to the people of Saskatchewan? Put very simply it means jobs, investment and income. Over 1,100 additional, permanent jobs will be created over the next five years. That does not include the hundreds and hundreds of indirect or spin-off jobs that I mentioned earlier. Capital expenditures by the Saskatchewan oil industry are forecast at close to \$2 billion over that same period. Construction of the heavy oil upgrader will

generate another \$600 million in investment, and create up to 1,500 new jobs during peak construction periods. This government is creating jobs and generating income to provide government services and reinvestment for the benefit of ourselves and our children. We are also contributing to the Canadian energy security over the long term.

And finally, this government is proving that its economic development strategy is working. By taking a smaller piece of a bigger pie and unshackling the private sector, this province's economy is moving again, not dancing to the tune of some government bureaucrat and not being eased out by some big crown corporation, rather, Mr. Deputy Speaker, working for the benefits of all of us. Nothing here is being given away. If anything, we're giving the economy back to the small businessman, to the entrepreneurs, to the little guys — giving it back so that through their initiative, hard work, and competitive spirit this province will move again.

Our philosophy is not empty rhetoric. It's a set of sound beliefs carried into policy, and it works. There's no double standard here.

I'd like to take a moment or two, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with a second area of responsibility and that is water. This government was given a mandate on April 26, 1982 to respond to the concerns of ordinary people. One of the many projects we undertook was a cabinet committee on water concerns. When you compare that to the quotes, once again, that my colleague from Moosomin read into the record yesterday, the quotes from Mr. Bowerman and what the NDP government thought about their responsibility toward water, the points are at a considerable difference.

That cabinet committee travelled throughout the province for two consecutive weeks talking to ordinary people. We listened to over 200 briefs. Hundreds of people turned out to address the committee, people who indicated that they certainly appreciated this government's willing to listen. They found it something that was rather new and different.

As a direct result of these hearings, and with the help of the people of this province in identifying those existing and emerging water-related issues, this government established a framework for comprehensive water resource management which would be crucial to any future development in the areas of domestic, agricultural, industrial, and recreational use of water, always bearing in mind Mr. Speaker, the broader environmental and wildlife conservation concerns.

As a result, our government announced earlier this year its intention to establish a provincial crown utility modelled after the utilities in natural gas, power, and telephones, but a unique organization then nevertheless to serve the growing water requirements of the Saskatchewan residents — Saskatchewan's ordinary people.

Following that announcement, a ministerial committee was put into place and a project staff group hired to examine all aspects of the creation of a water utility. The committee reported back in late September. As a result, we were able to announce in the throne speech our intention to introduce the Saskatchewan water corporation act. I need not say again how much this will mean to everyone in this province.

Just before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to take an opportunity to thank the residents of my constituency of Saskatoon Sutherland for their continuing confidence and support. The constituents in my riding have demonstrated their growing confidence in the vastly improved and improving the economy of this province. A great number of new homes have been built as a direct result of the Build-a-Home program that was first introduced by my colleague, the Hon. Neal Hardy, and later carried on by the Hon. Sid Dutchak, the ministers responsible for Sask Housing. My colleagues, the ministers of small business, the Hon. George McLeod, later the Hon. Jack Klein, introduced the small business employment program, and 23 small business firms in my riding of Saskatoon Sutherland took advantage, thereby creating a total of 62 jobs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very proud to be the MLA for Saskatoon Sutherland in the beautiful city of Saskatoon. It's a constituency that's made up of ordinary people, the type of people that are benefiting from our program. I like to think of myself as just an ordinary person like them trying to do a job to represent them. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think from my remarks it is obvious that I will definitely be supporting the motion in favour of the Speech from the Throne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I too want to join with others to extend a congratulation to the new Lieutenant Governor who assumed office. I want to say that the Lieutenant Governor brings a distinguished career of community activity and community service to the office, along with a wide range of experience. I want to extend our congratulations to the Lieutenant Governor and wish him best of luck in his new office. He certainly represents a man, I think, with a great love for his country and for this province.

I want also to take this opportunity to appoint the new members of cabinet which brings this cabinet to the largest cabinet in the history of this province. I want to say that I congratulate all of the new members to this very large cabinet, and I want to say to those of you who were left out, I sympathize with your future.

I wonder why this cabinet is so large, and the people of Saskatchewan have been asking me, "Why in a time of restraint would a Premier of a province who's indicating that he's committed to restraint and less government, increase this cabinet to that size?" I leave it to the people of Saskatchewan to decide and well they will, but I can think of three possible reasons why that cabinet is so large. The members that the Premier had to choose from were so incompetent that they could only take on a small area of responsibility, and I guess there is some examples or evidence of that because one minister is appointed only to look after crop insurance — over \$60,000 a year with a personal staff. So that's one reason.

Now the second reason that is possible is that there was an agreement, because you see before the last election the Tory party had difficulty in finding candidates, and someone could have got around and made a lot of commitments in order to get people to run in the various seats.

Now the third possibility why this government went forward — this Premier — to appoint such a large cabinet is that there's a total disrespect for the taxpayers and the taxpayers' money of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — I leave those for the consideration of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. We have been debating here the throne speech now for, I believe, six days. You know, what I have noticed is a loss of initial confidence that these members had when they came bouncing in here after the election. There seems to be . . . Each individual member that gets up to speak has sort of lost the confidence. I ask myself again: why have they lost their confidence so soon? Why have they become so sensitive? All the time, every speaker that we put up, they put up four or five, and the only thing they can talk about is the NDP in the past, or the Leader of the Opposition. I would have thought that if this great direction, this new Utopia built on their Tory party so to speak, is a reality, then I would have thought speaker after speaker would have got up and glorified the facts, and the evidence to the people of Saskatchewan.

But they couldn't do it, and they're sensitive. And I'll tell you they're sensitive on a number of grounds. But they're sensitive, first of all, in the attitude that is developing within the hierarchy of that party, the arrogance of the cabinet, the arrogance of the Premier. Because these people came and they said they were going to communicate with the people, and they went to their convention, and again they were told, "You know, we have to communicate with the people," And then they make a decision to remove a 58-year ban on liquor advertising — a 58-year ban

— and a I ask you, who did they communicate with?

Well, they didn't communicate with the trustees, because at their annual convention they opposed liquor advertising. They didn't communicate with the church groups, which one would have thought they would, because all the church groups are indicating their disapproval. And they haven't communicated with the educators, because the educators are opposing liquor advertising. So what is happening is that the Tories are saying one thing and are not following through in their actions.

But the other concern that is developing within the Tory caucus is what people are saying. People throughout this province are saying, "Why are you filling the pockets of high-paid Tory hacks, and at the same time refusing to give anything to the people lower in the economic ladder." They say, "Try to justify to me your double standard." And this Tory caucus is becoming sensitive. They're starting to lose confidence because the people of Saskatchewan are telling them they don't like their double standards, their hypocrisy in approaching the political scene in Saskatchewan.

But I want to say one other thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. These Tories are becoming very, very sensitive. They are sensitive for another very good reason. And this is the very good reason: because people in this province have something to compare now what they had under the NDP for 11 years, and they're starting to compare it with what is happening here in this province under the Tory government. And people that I talk to in Saskatchewan are saying, "You know what? You people really did do a lot in Saskatchewan." And they ran through some of the things that they remember us putting in to place.

You know, in 1971 there was no dental program. There was no drug program. There was no sale program. There was no revenue sharing. There were no recreational and facilities grants. There was no main street assistance. There was no Saskatchewan income program. There was no property improvement grant. There was no farm housing program. There was no FarmStart for 1971. There was no land bank. There was no SHARP program. There was no beef stabilization program. There was no family income program. There was no home care. There was no day care. And I could go on and on.

And the people of Saskatchewan are starting to compare what was there in the social and health fields. And they are asking, "Well, you had a dental program, Murray. Premier Blakeney gave us a dental program. What is this? Is it being expanded under the Tories?" And I have to say, "No." they cut off the four-year-olds that were going to be covered; \$600,000 it would have cost — \$600,000 — and they cut off the coverage for dental care.

Seniors come to me and they say, "Saskatchewan income program — that hasn't been increased under the Tories. I understood under your last budget that you proposed that you were going to increase it. Is that a fact?" I say, "Yes, it is." "But the Tories haven't increased it." I say, "No intentions."

The property improvement grant. They say, "What were you going to do?" We had it proposed to increase it substantially. What have the Tories done? No increase. Cut-backs.

I want to say that in the SHARP program which we put in respect and to protect hog producers . . . I talk to farmer after farmer and I have the greatest concentration of hog producers in any area in my constituency. And I talk to them and they say, "don't let a Tory come around here," because of what they're doing to the hog producers. They have cut back in a time when the hog prices are very low. They have cut back in the protection to the hog producers. The same is happening in respect to the beef stabilization program.

The home care program. I talked to two of my constituents, one old couple. They are both well up in their '80s. One is 87; one is 86. They had home care. They had it for five days in a week.

That's how often a lady came to provide home care. Do you know what has happened now? The word is that there are no more funds; they've cut back on the funds. And, as a consequence, the services to that old couple who have helped to build and homestead this province are being denied. I know of another gentleman in the town of Engelfeld who was getting assistance three times a week. Do you know what he gets today under the Tory new financing of programs? He doesn't get any assistance at all.

That's what people of this province are asking. They are starting to compare what we had before with what we have today, and how it's being eroded. And the other thing that the people of Saskatchewan are saying, "What about the economic policies under Allan Blakeney, premier of the province for 11 years?" And they say things were pretty good under Allen Blakeney. And I want to say that they say, we looked it up and we find that the economic growth when we left office was the highest in Canada. And so it was. They say, "What about employment?" And they look that up and they say, "Strange, unemployment was the lowest in Canada." And they say, "Well, what about running the financial affairs of this province?" and they say, "Well, we'll look it up. And your per capita debt under Allan Blakeney, the former premier, was the lowest in Canada." And they compare all the health and social programs, and they say, "You have the best in Canada." And they say also, "You were able to do all of that because we've checked back and you had a balanced budget for 11 years." And I say that there is a growing sensitivity, there's a growing concern among the Tory ranks because people now have had 18 months to compare the lousy record of this government with the outstanding years of 1971 to 1981.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I fully realize that these are very difficult facts for the members of the government to sit and to take, but that's what the people of Saskatchewan are saying, and all I intend to do is to put forward the facts as told to me by the people of this province. Now, I say that there was a group of speakers. They put up two big speakers the other day. The Deputy Premier. And I would have thought that if the Deputy Premier stood up in this House to speak that he would try to rally this group. But you know what he did? He spent three-quarters of an hour trying to defend his government's double standard. And then what they did is they got their next big speaker, and that was the Minister of Justice, and I say that he tied the Deputy Premier for the worst speech in this House. He tied, because all he could talk about . . . He had to have the resolutions to the New Democratic Party convention, and that's all he could speak about in the address to the Speech from the Throne.

But today they sent in yet another high-powered one, loaded with figures, and I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that figures don't lie. There's an old saying: figures don't lie, but liars figure. It's the old expression.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to take a look at a few of the statistics. You know, under the financial report of this brilliant new finance minister that's put us into debt, \$537 million in 18 months . . . Well, when he first arrived on the scene he acknowledged that there was a \$140 million surplus. There's no doubt about it; he did.

I want to take a look at some of the figures that the Premier forgot to use. I went to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, 1981. This was the last year in which the New Democratic Party was in office and the financial statement indicates that the new income to the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan was \$141,721,000 — \$141.7 million. These intellectual, managerial giants came along, and in less than 10 months the Potash Corporation, even after . . . They had to cook the books to do it. Do you know how much they made?

AN HON. MEMBER: — How much did they make?

MR. KOSKIE: — Would you believe \$130 million?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I don't believe that.

MR. KOSKIE: — Would you believe \$100 million?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I don't believe that.

MR. KOSKIE: — How about \$50 million?

AN HON. MEMBER: — I don't believe that.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, I'll tell you. Do you know what they made? Less than \$1 million — \$607,000. The Premier forgot. He forgot the reports, his record, our records.

I want to go a little further. I happen to have the Crown Investments Corporation. Now 1981, the Crown Investments Corporation, New Democratic Party, \$115.7 million for the people of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Say that again.

MR. KOSKIE: — 1981, under the New Democratic Party, last year in government, the Crown Investments Corporation made \$115.7 million. Last year, sound Tory management took over, the managerial giants from the other side. Do you know what they did in 1982?

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, what did they do?

MR. KOSKIE: — \$126 million in the hole. \$126 million, a loss. I wonder, taking a look at those figures, who will the people of Saskatchewan believe? The records . . .

Let me take one other example here. I'll take the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. You will find that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation over the past 10 years has made a profit. It has varied depending on the usage and the weather and so on, but it's from about \$40 million to \$16 million down to \$5 million or \$6 million, and we're in that range.

You know what? They have now indicated in their submission to PURC that there is going to be an \$18 million projected loss in the potash corporation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Power corporation, yes. Sask Power. So, if you take a look at just three items, three or four items, this managerial wizardry that is over on the other side, in 18 months they gave us a budget deficit of \$537 million. They have given us a deficit in CIC of \$126 million. They're going to give us yet another \$80 million in Sask Power. So, what I'm saying, there is an uneasiness growing. Today they sent in a magician of numbers to try to re-create a picture of the Tory prosperity.

Well, I want to tell you clear that . . . I want to say a few words about this throne speech. I don't intend to hide on total criticism of the performance of the government. I am certainly disappointed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that none of the back-benchers — and there's not a lot of them left — but what is left, none of them showed any pride in that . . . (inaudible) . . . I want to say that this throne speech has much in common with the Sahara Desert. It stretches far and wide, and it's completely barren — barren of ideas, barren of programs, barren of any economic direction. It's barren of anything for the poor, for the needy, for the working people, for the teachers, for the nurses, for the small business people, for farmers — nothing in this speech to meet the needs and the priorities of most people of this province.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in all deserts there is an oasis, a haven of hope for some. Yes, this document contains an oasis, an oasis for a few, Mr. Speaker. What this throne speech does is to contain a commitment to the dignity and the well-being of big business, a commitment to the continuing compassionate, loving care of their profits, a commitment to the continuing rewards to their Tory friends.

But what is there for the poor and the needy? Well, Marie Antoinette once said, "Let them eat cake." Pierre Trudeau says, "Let them eat crow." Premier Grant Devine says, "Let them watch the Grant."

Mr. Speaker, I have compared this speech to the Sahara Desert, a vast wasteland of sand. It reminds me of a riddle. The riddle is this: what is the difference between a Troy and an ostrich? The difference between a Tory and an ostrich is that one has his head in the sand; the other has sand in his head.

Mr. Speaker, 18 months after this government came to power, it has dramatically demonstrated that its programs, policies, and philosophies are so very, very limited. This throne speech lacks imagination and it sets out no concrete priorities. They refuse even to fulfil the promises which they made to the people of this province during their election. They promised to cut the E&H tax, and there's no mention. They indicated that they would indeed cut the income tax — no mention. They indicated during their election campaign that they would indeed give reduced-interest loans to the small business — no mention. They indicated throughout this province that they would bring in a fuel rebate program for the farmers — no mention. They indicated that they would give free telephones to the senior citizens, and no action.

So let us now examine three key areas of Saskatchewan life to see how they have fared after two years of Tory slogans. I want, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to turn to agriculture. Let us first examine how agriculture is treated in this throne speech. This speech may have been a disappointment to many, but to me, I think it is an outright insult to our farmers of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Now, as all members will know, Mr. Speaker, 1983 has produced some good news and some bad news for Saskatchewan farmers. First, it was certainly good news to all of us that the volume and the quantity of grain crop this year was at a very high level, or near a record level. The grain prices have firmed up and, certainly in respect to rape, the prices have improved fairly substantially, and that, too, is good news.

But unfortunately there was little good news for the livestock producers, the poultry producers, and the hog producers. For their costs, indeed, like the costs of all farmers, are increasing rapidly. And right across the province our farmers are increasingly worried about the fragility of the farm finances — increasingly worried by the cost-price squeeze. This government has implemented savage increases in electric power and natural gas prices. These are hitting all farmers hard, but especially those in intensive dairy, poultry, and hog production.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, farm fuel increases have been far greater than the average rate of inflation, and the present high interest rates charged by the big chartered banks have continued to gouge the farmers and the small businessmen of Saskatchewan, even though bank profits have increased dramatically in the past year. The cost-price squeeze, Mr. Speaker, that is not being addressed by the present government, that is not even being acknowledged by this government, and perhaps because they have been the major contributor to the cost-price squeeze.

On the weekend I was visiting with some neighbours, and there were about a half-a-dozen of us sitting around a table at a farm kitchen. These farmers began griping about the shortcomings of the Devine government. And they began to make a list, a list, Mr. Speaker, of the things the Devine government has done to them lately, and jotting them down one by one as they sat around the kitchen table. And I would like to share with this Assembly some of the items of this list, some of the things which the farmers and my neighbours are saying about the Devine government and what it has done for the farmers lately in Saskatchewan.

Well, here are a list of some of the things that they indicated that they aren't too happy with, because what the Devine government has done for them . . . First of all, they have abandoned and betrayed them in their hard-fought battle to preserve the Crow rate. That is the consensus of the farmers out there, that the Tories betrayed them. Secondly, they undermined the family farm improvement branch — got rid of it. And farmers are not happy about the dismantling of the farm improvement branch. Secondly, they are undermining the SHARP program for the hard-pressed hog producers.

They have increased utility rates three or four times the rate of inflation. They have abandoned any pretence of improving our highway system and super-grid roads throughout the municipalities. They have failed to address critical problems of orderly drainage and watershed management. And they have undermined and scrapped the rural housing program.

Without thinking of the farmers again, what they did is they eliminated the coverage on their package policies for farm vehicles with no insurance on broken glass. And certainly this is a very key item to the farming community because they travel so much on the gravel roads.

And then, Mr. Speaker, my neighbours asked me if it was really true that the Canadian Pacific Railway and its subsidiaries had contributed almost \$50,000 to the PC Party in 1982. Well, I had to tell them that they were mistaken. I had to tell them again that they were mistaken, for in 1982 the CPR and its subsidiaries contributed \$50,000 to the PC Party of Canada and a further \$14,000 to the PC Party of Saskatchewan. It was at this point that these neighbours of mine began to understand, began to understand the Devine government's economic policy. It's simple, they said, obviously he who pays the piper will call the tune. The new right's golden rule: he who has the gold rules.

Let us turn now, Mr. Speaker, to yet another area, to another aspect of Saskatchewan life. Let us examine what the throne speech had to say to universities. What did they have to say in the throne speech of interest to our universities? Well, Mr. Speaker, as I searched this document for a section on the future of universities, on the future of over 20,000 young people, young people by whom the future of this province will be determined, as I searched the throne speech to see how this government seeks the future of these young people, what did I find? I found not one word — not a single word. The throne speech is barren of even one word about Saskatchewan universities, not one word in a 4,000-word throne speech. The Conservatives' priorities are clear. The throne speech boasted about their generous royalty gifts and royalty holidays to the big oil companies — \$100 million in a year. That's obviously a priority, but not one word on universities.

But then perhaps that was the safest course for them to take: silence. Perhaps they were on safer grounds remaining totally silent than trying to have the minister responsible for universities explain his arbitrary, authoritarian views in this Assembly. He tried explaining his views once in the press. And I want to say that that was dismal, so much a failure that the University of Regina Faculty Association felt compelled to rebut the minister's foolish, narrow statements. The president of the faculty association felt it necessary to remind this government publicly that the universities exist only to serve the people of Saskatchewan through their three basic functions: basic or pure research, which is the major source of intellectual and scientific advance in our society; solid teaching in an environment truly conducive to learning in a community service. Three basic functions, Mr. Speaker, which have historically been performed very well by our two universities.

Now, however, they are alarmed. Students are alarmed, and we should all be alarmed, because the narrow attitude of the minister together with the severe financial and enrolment pressures which this government has perpetrated, perpetuate, do not bode well for the universities, for their students, indeed for our province.

Let us consider the University of Regina for a moment: 30 per cent increase in total credit hours over the past two years, 36 per cent increase in full-time enrolment in the same period — severe

enrolment pressures, Mr. Speaker. And at the University of Saskatchewan we have had an 8.5 per cent increase in the total day student enrolment in the last year alone, an increase of over 1,000 students. But what have we had? A decrease in the actual number of academic staff, a decrease in the number of non-academic staff — once again, Mr. Speaker, severe financial and enrolment pressures.

Perhaps we should not be surprised by the severe pressures on the university. After all, the Conservative government does not think that the university is sufficiently important to be included in the throne speech. Top priority for the big oil companies, but lowest priority for our universities. Top priority for an expanding cabinet to its record bloated size at an additional cost of \$3 million a year — \$3 million extra each year for cabinet ministers, but nothing to ease the financial and enrolment pressures at our universities. Small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the university students, the faculty members, all of the university community feel betrayed by this government.

Mr. Speaker, if there was indeed one group in Saskatchewan that thought that things would be better, it was the business community. At last, they said, they had a business oriented government. They were so right, Mr. Speaker. This is a business oriented government, but there are two kinds of businesses in this province and in this country. There are small businesses. They are found in every community across the length and breadth of Saskatchewan. They are the backbone of our local communities.

How, Mr. Speaker, have they fared in the past two years under the business government? I want to say, not very well. These cabinet ministers don't like to visit Coderre or Elbow or Wynyard or Humboldt or Morse, not when they can visit Cologne and Tokyo and London and Atlanta. No, this government wants to be a part of the big shakers, the high rollers. This is a big business government. But even here they have failed, and failed miserably.

We all remember the lavish and extravagant big business conference that they put on last fall for their big business friends from Toronto, New York, and abroad. "Now things will be different," they said. "Once big business learns that Saskatchewan has an elected Conservative government, it will be rushing in here to invest." To have believed this hype was to have believed that the secret to economic prosperity in Saskatchewan was to hold a flashy conference for big Toronto corporations, at which our province would be declared Conservative and open for business, and the rest would follow like magic. Really like magic — it would automatically happen. Well, I want to say, the magic hasn't worked. The promised flood of prosperity looks more like a drought.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government opposite has a nice problem. First they won an election on misleading the people of this province, then they promised the moon to their big-business friends, and in the result misled many of our small businessmen in Saskatchewan. Now they have a real problem, Mr. Speaker, because the people are beginning to make comparisons. Many of them are asking the simple question: "If the Conservatives' big-business policy is so great, how come we're doing so poorly?", they ask.

In 1981, the last full year under our government, Saskatchewan had the fastest-growing economy in Canada. This year, Mr. Speaker, even the Royal Bank admits that the economic growth in Saskatchewan will lag behind that of British Columbia and the Atlantic provinces. In October there were about 60,000 people registered as looking for work in our province. That's an increase of 229 per cent from October of '81.

During our 11 years in office, Mr. Speaker, 100,000 new jobs were created by a growing Saskatchewan economy. Last year, under the Conservative big-business policy with Saskatchewan, there was 1,000 new jobs, the poorest performance in a decade — the poorest performance in 10 years. Also, for the first time in more than a decade, 1982 saw a drop in new

investment in our province, both public and private — a drop in new investment, Mr. Speaker. And during the Conservatives' first year in office, there were 12 per cent fewer new business registrations. There was 90 per cent more business and consumer bankruptcies in our province than during the last New Democratic Party government. But still the Conservatives stick to their big business policies.

The Conservative government's performance in the public sector has been even worse. These people came to office with the promise that they had a new managerial skill, an expertise, to make government more efficient, to cut costs, to boost performance, and I've mentioned the results of this managerial . . . and I want to mention it again, because the people of Saskatchewan are concerned. Two straight record deficits with a total of \$537 million. And, you know, the annual interest charges on the Troy deficit is \$66 million a year — \$5.5 million a week we pay on interest alone, \$330 a year, each and every year, for every Saskatchewan family. In order to save \$150 a year on their removal of gas tax, they have put Saskatchewan into a debt of over one-half a billion dollars. I want to say, so much, Mr. Speaker, for fiscal responsibility.

And last year again, as I indicated before, last year the Saskatchewan Crown Investment Corporation lost \$126 million. The previous year we had a \$115 million profit. It's little wonder why the people of this province are asking: where is all this managerial expertise that we were promised last year? Where are all the people who were going to cut the cost of government?

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservatives have no answer. They have put all of their eggs into the big business basket, and that policy has been a flop, a total flop for the people of this province. A flop, Mr. Speaker. It's a failure for the farmers; it's been a failure for small businessmen, a failure for working people, and a failure for Northerners, but not a complete flop for their big business friends like the big banks. The big Tory-based chartered banks have been doing quite nicely. And I note that the last 12 months, the chartered banks registered a 65 per cent increase in profits. The Royal Bank — you know, that's the one that Boyd Robertson works for — the Royal Bank did rather better than the 65 per cent average increase. The Royal Bank posted a 112 per cent increase in pre-tax profits, or a 32 per cent increase in after-tax profits.

And what about the trust companies? Well, they've done pretty well, too. Trust companies have posted an average increase in profits of 54 per cent over the past 12 months. So big business economic policies do seem to be working for some of the Conservative government's friends at least.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, what about the big corporations who produce beverages, the group that includes the breweries and the distillers which are so closely allied with the Conservative government and its policies? They have not done quite as well as the big banks and the trust companies. They have only pulled 28 per cent increase in their profits, so this government has come to their aid, allowing liquor advertising. And that's why all across Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, people are looking at this Tory government as big business policies, the big business agenda that was laid out in the throne speech. They look at this big business policy, they hear its hollow, empty promises, and then they see the stark reality around them.

And I want to say, what has happened is that there has been lay-offs, unemployment, insecurity for working people, severe financial pressure on consumers, farmers, and small businessmen, but big profits for the banks, the booze companies, and the railways.

I have examined three key areas of Saskatchewan life that have been poorly served in this throne speech — agriculture, the universities, and small business. But now I would like to examine another area that is perhaps more crucial, the area of moral values. There are many of us who measure the success of society, not in terms of material values alone, but in terms of a set of social values in which social, cultural, and spiritual needs of mankind are emphasized, rather than the material. Yet, there is abroad today a new cynicism about human values. The ideal of the survival of the fittest, once discredited by most, has re-emerged in Saskatchewan along with the

one generation, the me-first generation., I'm all right, Jack, attitudes. And this government has done much to purvey these values, based as they are on selfishness and cynicism and greed.

Mr. Speaker, this government has introduced in Saskatchewan a policy of double standards. Two years ago they promised a complete elimination of the 5 per cent E & H tax during their first term of office, removal of the E&H tax from power and electrical bills, 10 per cent across-the-board reduction in personal income tax, free telephones for senior citizens, farm fuel reduction program. Mr. Speaker, when was the last time you heard members opposite talk about fulfilling any of those commitments? If you said about two years ago, you'd be right. Since then, they have conveniently and deliberately forgotten those promises. In fact, the Minister of Finance is on record as ruling out any tax break for Saskatchewan residents until at least '85.

I want to say they've given their tax breaks to their friends, the oil companies. They've paid off their friends, the brewers and the distillers. There's been a stampede by their political friends and associates to be first at the public trough. The government opposite has given every break imaginable to big business and to big industry and to big Tories.

But, Mr. Speaker, what about the people of Saskatchewan? They have been lead by deceptive, seductive, and broken promises. Instead of tax breaks and reductions, they are paying more, Mr. Speaker. I've already mentioned the increases in SPC rates, Sask Tel, SGI, STC bus fares, that goes beyond. More and more costs are being passed on directly to the individual, which previously general revenues were able to pay for.

Let's take a look at them. The people of the province are now paying increased entrance fees into their parks — substantial increases in fees to the parks; increased fees for electrical and gas inspection; increased costs for basic vehicle insurance; increased fees for Sask Tel field calls. They're even charging the citizens now for wood that they use in the parks.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have seen their taxes increasing steadily. The government opposite has shifted the taxes from the oil companies and big business to the working men and women of this province. And I want to say that this shift is going to continue. This shift in costs of education is going to continue. And watch the mill rates go up this year when this budget comes down.

The government opposite, Mr. Speaker, has cut taxes for the oil companies, big business, and transferred them to the working people of this province. Under the deceptive promises of the members opposite, what is really happening here in this province is that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that people grow old when they desert their ideals, and if such is the case, then this government is old before its time. And this throne speech is a proof positive that all the Geritol and the Grecian Formula or wise words from Allan Gregg cannot hide this fact.

The inescapable fact, Mr. Speaker, is that when you seek to build a society based on greed and selfishness, and for the powerful, you reap a tragic harvest of economic and social insecurity. And surely, Mr. Speaker, the real measure of society is not what it can do for the wealthy few, but what it can in fact do for the least fortunate in our society, what opportunities it provides for all of our people to live useful and meaningful lives.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we would desire a society that would teach its people that there is a better way than the exploitation of man and man, that man's destiny cannot be settled alone in the market place, that we should seek a way of life that would firmly teach that we are indeed our brother's keeper.

I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the content of the Speech from the Throne. And I will accordingly be opposing the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HEPWORTH: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it does give me a great deal of pleasure to take part in this debate. I was greatly impressed by the initiatives put forward by the Saskatchewan government in the Speech from the Throne, and I would like to compliment all those involved who had foresight to institute such progressive policies and programs.

And as well, I would like to congratulate His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, Frederick W. Johnson, on the occasion of his first throne speech. And as well of course, it would follow that I would offer my congratulation in fact to his appointment as the Queen's representatives in our fair province.

I would also like to congratulate the mover, the hon. member from Melville, and the seconder, the hon. member for Saskatoon Nutana, for their excellent endeavours in the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

And also, I would like to offer my congratulations to all the Legislative Secretaries, especially, Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Saltcoats, who is just an absolutely hard-working member in that capacity.

And as well, I would like to acknowledge the various caucus chairmen. And as well, once again, the member for Kelvington-Wadena, the new chairman of the agricultural caucus committee.

Before I get into the major political part of my speech, Mr. speaker, I would like to spend a few minutes responding to the remarks of some days earlier by the agriculture critic. At least I think he's the agriculture critic — the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg — although he's being challenged, and I might say rather well, by the hon. member for Pelly. And in the member's speech — the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg — in the members' speech, he talked about everything else, but little about agriculture. And I would suggest that the farmers of Saskatchewan will be disappointed. They do expect him to play the role of opposition critic for agriculture, and I suspect they would be very disappointed in that speech, Mr. Speaker.

He talked about sleazy and slimy, not adjectives that befit this House, and certainly not fitting of agriculture. He talked about a bloated government. And I can tell you quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, I do have some knowledge of bloat and of what other ailments may affect the opposition members from time to time, and in fact may even be in a position to offer some cures for them. The other big issue he raised in his debate, Mr. speaker, was who was going to get into a canoe with the Minister of Justice. And that certainly is high on the farmers' minds in Saskatchewan, I can tell you. And he went on to talk about the Roughriders and keeping in touch, and that's another issue that's high on farmers' minds, I can assure you. And retired urologists — that's another issue that's high on farmers' minds. So in all, he went on for many, many pages, but only three or four paragraphs in fact dealt with agriculture, a great disappointment, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

However, before I do get into my more formal remarks, I would like to, as well, pay tribute to two outstanding Saskatchewan residents who sadly passed away in recent weeks. They are Dr. Ross Greenshields and Dr. Larry (or L.T.) Smith.

Dr. Greenshields, son of a pioneer farmer, earned degrees from the University of Saskatchewan and Iowa State University. From 1950 until 1979 he worked for the Government of Canada in Ottawa and Saskatoon as a plant breeder, administrator, research co-ordinator, and finally

director of the Agriculture Canada research station in Saskatoon. I might say, Mr. Speaker, he achieved world-wide recognition for canola and forage crop research conducted under his direction. He had recently acted as consultant to the Government of Saskatchewan on agricultural research projects. In 1982, Dr. Greenshields received a "Century Saskatoon" agricultural recognition award.

Dr. Greenshields was a great credit to his family, his community, his province, and this nation — a fine Christian gentleman, a great agriculturist, and a man whose opinion I valued greatly, and whose counsel I sought out often as MLA, and more recently in my role as Minister of Agriculture. He well deserves any tribute ever paid to him, and he will be a sad loss to our province.

As well, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Larry Smith was the founding dean of the Western College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Saskatchewan and died very suddenly earlier this month at the age of 69. He was a graduate of the Ontario Veterinary College at Guelph and after graduation there practiced in Kingston, Ontario.

After service in the Second World War, he undertook a Ph.D. degree from Cornell, taught there for a couple of years, joined the University of Saskatchewan in 1963, and that was before — I might remind the hon. members of the House — the veterinary college had a building, a curriculum, or a staff, and I might say he headed up the development of all three.

When he retired in 1974, the college was firmly established as a leading veterinary medical centre with an international reputation. When additions and renovations to the veterinary college were officially opened last year, I had the pleasure to attend. Mr. Smith was specially honoured by a separate room in the students' lounge that was named for him and for his father, John Cochrane Smith, who was also in fact a pioneer livestock commissioner in Saskatchewan.

In 1980 Dr. Smith led a team that visited Somalia, and in fact continued to work on that project up until the time of his death.

Dr. Smith was recognized internationally for his teaching and research in veterinary pathology, and sat on many boards, including the fact that he was chairman of the board of examiners of the American College of Veterinary Pathologists and the president of that association in 1964 and '65, and in fact was the first Canadian to ever hold these offices. Just three years ago I had the pleasure, the honour, to nominate in fact Dr. Smith for honorary life membership in the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association. It was awarded to him by his peers.

Again, this is one of Saskatchewan's finest sons who deserves every tribute paid to him. He was a friend, a teacher, a colleague, a statesman, a model that men and women could fashion their lives after, and he is a great loss to the city of Saskatoon, to Saskatchewan, and in fact to all of Canada, and for that matter, the world, Mr. Speaker.

It is with great sorrow that we acknowledge the passing of these two fine sons, these two fine agriculturists in Saskatchewan.

I would now like to turn to some recent happenings in the constituency of Weyburn, Mr. Speaker. I think, as easy a review of any . . . I must I listened with a great deal of interest today as the hon. member for Saskatoon, and the minister in charge of energy and miens, talked at great length about the activity in the oil patch in my area, and that's been the case in fact ever since the Devine administration took over as government. In fact as most recently as last November 23 in the *Weyburn Review*, a local newspaper, the headline read, "Accelerated oil industry southeast close to tripling 1982 drilled." I think that's just typical of the kind of activity in our part of the province, and that activity is putting a lot of people to work. And of course, as part of this newspaper article was the fact that PanCanadian, a major oil company, is in the process of constructing a \$5 million replacement of the Weyburn unit water flood plant near

Goodwater. And that is putting a lot of people to work in my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.