

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Monday, March 26, 1984

EVENING SESSION

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE) (continued)

Debate continues concurrent.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to ask leave of the Assembly to introduce some guests who are sitting in the Speaker's gallery.

I would like to introduce to you, and through you, on behalf of the hon. member from Qu'Appelle, the Hon. Gary Lane, seven Scout troops from Gray, Saskatchewan, which is very close to my home town of Milestone. They are accompanied here by Mr. Larry Levsen and Bob Whiteman. I am supposed to speak in response to the budget this evening and I am not too sure if I'm going to be able to meet with them afterwards, but certainly I will have somebody meet with them at 7:30 to answer any questions they may have.

I would like all members to join with me in welcoming them to the Assembly. And I hope you have a pleasant stay and enjoy the proceedings, and have a safe journey back home. Thank you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE) (continued)

MR. GLAUSER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me and an honour to rise in my seat this evening, for two reasons. The first, of course, is to represent the fine constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — And secondly, to enter into the budget debate — a budget, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. And listen to this. It is bright, and certainly one for our times — not just for today; not for tomorrow; not for next year; but for years to come. And I want to commend the Minister of Finance for the obvious in-depth analysis that went into its composition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — We all know that it is not easy — these are not easy times — but we all know it is a responsible budget. There is a linkage between the elements that constitute economic leadership: restraint, controlling deficits, productivity, and getting off the backs of the public sector. This budget, Mr. Speaker, clearly focuses on all these elements. It has pulled them together in a document in such a manner that, in my view, the Minister of Finance, has trail-blazed a course, the like of which this House has not ever, in a good long time, been accustomed to. It is years — in fact, it is decades.

Let us, therefore, Mr. Speaker, examine the elements referred to.

March 26, 1984

Restraint – we all know what that is. It is belt tightening; holding back a little; making do with less; sharing; helping one another; volunteer work, and not relying on the public purse to do everything.

I think our Minister of Finance has dispelled the myths of cradle to the grave security, and I thank him for that. The kind of restraint in the public and private sector wage settlements that we experienced in 1983, and is continuing into 1984, is desirable. Without that, inflation could no longer continue to decline. And if that doesn't happen, there is no way that Canada, and most particularly Saskatchewan, would be able to remain competitive in the world markets.

It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, that, on the question of restraint, as it relates to wages settlements, the Leader of the Opposition, when appearing before the Macdonald Commission in November past . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Shaunavon should listen to this.

When the Leader of the Opposition appeared before the Macdonald Commission, he embraced the popular theme of big business that workers wage increases contribute to inflation. He stated that wage restraint is necessary for economic recovery.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, the Leader of the Opposition. But there's more to this. The foregoing is a quote from the publication *Briarpatch*. Well, what's the *Briarpatch*? January/February of '84 issue, written by one Howard Brown. And who's Howard Brown? A member of your party.

The very next day following his appearance before the commission, the Leader of the Opposition found himself in attendance at the NDP convention in Saskatoon. He did not, and dared not, express his views, and why? Mr. Brown goes on to say, and I quote:

In line with the SFL policy, the delegates resolved the NDP stands opposed to any and all forms of restraint or controls on workers' wages.

End of quote. Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition finds himself in a most untenable position, knowing full well that wages, albeit only one element that contributes to inflation, requires restraint to achieve economic recovery. But he does not have the support of his caucus, nor indeed the party.

Well, what about controlling deficits? We are slowly moving out of recession, that fortunately we in Saskatchewan did not feel the brunt to the extent that other provinces experienced. Many initiatives have been taken and they've had a profound positive effect on our citizens and our economy. And I'll just remind you of a few of these. The removal of the gas tax. You don't want to hear that. You wanted us to put it back on.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They want to put it back on, not us.

MR. GLAUSER: — They want us to put it back on.

The Mortgage Interest Reduction Program, the farm purchase program, job creations resulting in the lowest unemployment in Canada, rent stabilization program, rural gasification, 104 rural projects, oil industry recovery. The revenue of land sales alone returned \$108 million, and at the same time reduced considerably the size of the bureaucracy. There were other measures too, and too numerous to mention in the time available.

Mr. Speaker, those programs, combined with the many new initiatives in the present budget, have enabled the Minister of Finance to not only hold the line on a government deficit, but indeed move towards its elimination. Mr. Speaker, through solid efforts of the Premier, the

Minister of Finance, and all our colleagues, a team . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Boy, I struck a nerve over there, eh? . . . And all our colleagues, a team approach, we are determined that we will not be saddling one generation with the burdens of the past.

But what about this past? A past, Mr. Speaker, where we saw previous administrations spending us into oblivion. We did not cause the situation we're in right now.

Mr. Speaker, no person, no household, no corporation, no municipality, no government goes into insolvency over a period of one, two years. It is rather an accumulation of debt and bad management of affairs over a span of much longer curation before the impact is felt. Mr. Speaker, the day of reckoning has come. There is some light at the end of the tunnel, and with the proven dexterity of our Minister of Finance at the helm, the ship has been righted, the course altered toward the harbour of a balanced budget.

And what about productivity? It's common sense. Work a little harder; work a little longer; work a little smarter; and produce more at less cost, if we are to become competitive in the world market-place and protect and enhance job opportunities. If that kind of work ethic is considered to be emanations of the devil, I think you can count the Saskatchewan Conservative Party, and by far the majority of the Saskatchewan people, one of its lieutenants.

Finally, on this theme of elements, Mr. Speaker, cutting red tape and getting off the back of the private sector. To begin, we have removed in excess of 1,000 regulations from the statutes, but there is still more to be done. Eliminating unnecessary bureaucracy, and you've heard about it today. Letting the private sector do what it can do best. This is the route this government is taking. It has served the province well in the last two years, and it will enhance our road to recovery in the years ahead.

Recovery, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is based on the performance of four elements I have referred to, and follows upon the heels of the previous budget that I termed "a correction with direction." That set the course through the budget – a budget I would call a blueprint for the '80s.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to that blueprint for the '80s. Particularly, I would like to mention those things in my constituency as it relates to education. The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon said there is nothing in the budget for education. There are two new high schools in my constituency, for a total of 17.5 million, both to open in 1984. One new elementary school, an expansion of another, plus 13 relocatable class-rooms for another \$5 million. That, Mr. Speaker, is a total of \$22.5 million in class-rooms for students in my constituency, and a fast-growing one. I want to thank the Minister of Education, on behalf of my constituents, for that.

Turning now to health, I want to say at the outset that it was indeed a pleasure and an honour for me in 1983 to have served in the capacity of Legislative Secretary to our hard-working, dedicated, sincerely compassionate Minister of Health. And I found another adjective this afternoon, and that was modest. He is a modest, humble man and was giving credit to everybody else behind him for the work that he has done in the health field and brought it to its excellence that it is today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GLAUSER: — Furthermore, he did such a terrific job in refuting statements by the Leader of the Opposition in the debate, I find I am unable to add anything to what he said, and as well, with his capable assistance of his Legislative Secretary from the constituency of Moosomin. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere desire to make it clear to the people of the province that, in spite of having to overcome the handicap of a moratorium – and we heard that word before today, too – putting a moratorium that the NDP placed on capital projects for continuing care; no heritage

fund to draw from; and depressed revenues since taking office – in spite of all this, we are now making progress, with capital works projects, not only for continuing care, but also hospitals.

The Leader of the Opposition, in this debate, talked about the staff cuts in the Department of Health. Everyone who works in an knows that a large administration doesn't necessarily mean more efficient operations. As a matter of fact, the opposite is more often true. It is typical of the NDP, Mr. Speaker, build, build, build bureaucracy, but no buildings; and neglect to people they were suppose to serve for lack of funding. Now, I just want to . . . I came across some things this afternoon which prompted my attention when the minister was speaking – the Minister of Health – and I would like to refer to . . . this is a brochure, or something that the NDP put out, and it goes like this:

It is alleged that the previous administration approved new construction projects at city hall, at City Hospital, a complete new facility; and at St. Paul's, a major renovation. When will these projects be allowed to proceed?

Well, I think I have an answer to that, Mr. Speaker. The allegation, in the first place, is incorrect. Although a modest amount of funding was approved for planning at City, and St. Paul's, by the former government, there was no approval for these projects to proceed. The initial planning efforts in the City Hospital project date back to 1977. The previous administration had ample time to initiate work on City Hospital, but chose to defer all new activities in Saskatoon.

Number two, the cost-sharing formula in place for major urban hospital construction – and I'd like the opposition to listen particularly to this: 60 per cent provincial versus 40 per cent local, when the former administration left office – was woefully inadequate. Serious construction projects could not have proceeded on the basis of such limited provincial support. Negotiations have, therefore, been initiated with both hospitals to establish a more appropriate formula. In the interim, however, pending finalization of these discussions, the province has provided 80 per cent cost-sharing on any renovation projects that have been submitted and approved subsequent to April 1, 1982. Saskatoon hospitals' planning council is currently identifying appropriate alternatives for improving patient access to upgraded diagnostic medical and surgical services, both in-patient and out-patient, in the city of Saskatoon.

Hospital boards, a realistic group. There is a general realization that all construction projects cannot proceed simultaneously, and that the careful management of priorities is essential. Immediate priorities for Saskatoon have been identified in the last several months, and I would just like to expound a little further on what the minister had to say today.

Mr. Speaker, the immediate priorities for Saskatoon have been identified in the last several months. Establish a new childrens' rehabilitation centre. Responding to the innovative Brunskill School proposal developed by the Kinsmen foundation. Construction of this 4 million centre has begun, and the rehabilitation centres should be relocated from the converted airport hangar, where it is currently housed, by early 1985. Move as quickly as possible towards the development of a cancer clinic. Funding new accommodations for the current clinic which has not been significantly expanded or upgraded since its establishment in early 1950s. Move as quickly as possible towards a new 238-bed extended care level 4 facility providing badly needed new extended care services. Seriously look for interim space for additional level 4 patients while the new facility is under construction, again with a view to freeing up, at least, some acute care beds, and continued efforts to cope with the Saskatoon waiting list problem. Work with planning council to the fullest possible extent. Ensure that construction activity in Saskatoon is directed towards the waiting list issue as a foremost priority. These are the things that are happening in the city of Saskatoon, and I'm sure my colleagues there will appreciate this, as well as all citizens of Saskatoon.

One more area I would like to touch on, Mr. Speaker, and that has to do with the dental plan, the drug plan, the personnel.

And here's another piece of literature that was put out recently by the NDP. NDP political literature claims that health programs and services have been savaged. I really don't know what that means: "savaged by cut-backs, including . . . " – and I'd like all opposition members to listen to this, because we heard of the cut-backs in the mental health care, and so on. This is what their brochure said:

23 people cut from childrens' dental plan staff; 32 staff cut from mental institutions; many products have been removed from drug plan coverage.

Well, what are the facts? Here are the facts: absolutely no people were cut from the dental plan. The previous government had supposedly planned an expansion of 23 positions, but they were never filled. In a successful measure, designed to strengthen small, rural dental practices, this government wisely transferred the work to the private sector, eliminating the need for the positions. Thank goodness there was a private sector left. If we'd given you people much more time, there wouldn't have been none of them around.

Of the 32 psychiatric service positions deleted by this government in two years, seven were – and had been – vacant for some time. Half were from the Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford, where the staffing ratios remain higher today than at any time during the NDP term of office.

Oh, we've got one more here: only four of the psychiatric services cuts by this government were direct service delivery positions. By contrast, between 1973 and 1982, the NDP reduced the number of psychiatrist positions by 19 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . by 19. But there's more. In 1976, 43 psychiatric service positions were deleted by the NDP – 30, or 69.8 per cent of which were in nursing.

Since January 1982, 174 products have been deleted from the SDP formula, most because the pharmaceutical companies no longer manufacture them – redundant medications sitting on the shelves. During the same period, 213 products have been added to the formulary, for a net increase of 39. These include drugs representing significant advances in the treatment of heart disease, diabetics, high blood pressure, arthritis, etc. This government stands committed to making Saskatchewan number one in health care.

Before I take my seat, I would like to make one more comment, and that is as it relates to being in my constituency last Friday evening, accompanied by the good Minister of Supply and Services and who, with my help, I think we answered some very good questions. And the people are very well satisfied with the budget that has been brought down in this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I definitely support this budget as well as the citizenry of this province, and indeed, the people of my constituency. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a great pleasure for me, on behalf of the constituents of Bengough-Milestone, to arise this evening and participate in the budget speech debate delivered last week by my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Finance.

I would first like to congratulate the member for Kindersley on the budget he has brought down. It is a budget in which all of us in the government take pride. If you view this document as a blueprint of the coming year, then the economic House being constructed in Saskatchewan will be of strong and of superior craftsmanship indeed.

It is said that one of the least-loved jobs in government is the Minister of Finance. It is often hard to produce a budget that is fiscally responsible and still bears good news. The member for

Kindersley continues to do both. In planning our finances he has managed to be both prudent and daring, cautious and creative. His budget of new ideas, new economic tools, is being applauded in nearly every quarter, except perhaps the ones occupied by the "eight preachers of doom and gloom" opposite, on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Chamber and the public witnessed an amazing spectacle here the other night. In fact, it was nothing short of bizarre. We saw the former premier of this province, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, shedding "crocodile tears" over the deficit. The major reason this government has a deficit is because of the ruinous and devious policies and tactics of the former administration, practised for an entire decade. Members of the opposition know this, and so they are trying to erect a smoke screen in an attempt to prevent the Saskatchewan public from becoming fully aware of the financial . . . (inaudible) . . . their administration left the people of Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are too smart to be fooled on the issue. That fact was shown in the election, two years ago, when Saskatchewan voters realized the former administration had almost ruined this province financially, and that's when voters refuse to allow members opposite to continue pulling the wool over their eyes. Such audacity . . . (inaudible) . . . opposite to talk about deficits. Members opposite ran hidden deficits for an entire decade.

How are these deficits hidden? How Mr. Speaker? They bled their crown corporation to give artificial transfusions to the government financial operations. Funds that rightfully belong to the crowns, hundreds of millions of dollars, were siphoned off and diverted to cover the financial irresponsibility as a previous administration, and to me, Mr. Speaker, that is a great disgrace. When this administration took over and discovered just how the Saskatchewan taxpayers and resident had been cheated, we found out just how much the former administration had betrayed the trust of the voters.

In politics we often talk slogan; the former administration had some slogans, such as, "Spend, spend, spend," was one of them; "Tax, tax, tax," was another; but their favorite slogan seemed to be, "Hide, hide, hide". Our government has been up-front with taxpayers and voters; we listen to them, and they place their trust in us. Our financial records, are an open book and above-board. We are not ashamed of how we handle the Saskatchewan taxpayers' affairs; we have nothing to hide. Members opposite are like stage magicians pulling rabbits out of hats and playing shell games with our tax dollars.

Pretty soon the scam became all too obvious; now the Saskatchewan residents have a government that knows the value of a dollar; now Saskatchewan residents have a government that is determined to clean up the mess left by the previous administration; now Saskatchewan residents know what fiscal responsibility is all about. There have been more tax decreases in the two years of this administration as a government than in an entire decade members opposite governed, or maybe I should say is governed. And there have been real tax decreases, not more and more shell games. The deficit is under control; it was cut by twenty per cent in this budget, and we are certainly proud of that. As a matter of fact, we are optimistic that it will be cut more and more in future budgets. And the Crown will not be bled to balance the books.

We can look the Saskatchewan taxpayer straight in the eye. We are true to the Saskatchewan public. We are faithful to the Saskatchewan taxpayer. You would think members opposite would have learned; they are still intent on playing the shell game. But I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker. They will only be able to play shell games with themselves for many years to come. Never will any voter, who saw how they wasted hundreds of millions of dollars of innocent taxpayers' money, allow them near the cash register again. Now they try to raise a song and dance to cover up their perfidious treachery. Well, it's too late, and they know it.

Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance noted last Wednesday, the first two years of our administration have been our province get back on Canada's business map. Investors and small

businessmen are once again looking with confidence to Saskatchewan as a land of unequalled economic opportunity, a land where risk and profit are not dirty words. The Minister of Finance has called for, and introduced new opportunities to build on this rejuvenated business climate. He has called for, and introduced, new approaches to build on our traditional strengths.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that a number of the new initiatives will be delivered by my department, the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources.

We will be bringing in programs that will see the private sector work with us to strengthen our parks system and provide greater tourism and recreation opportunities. We will be giving more opportunities to small operators in the forestry industry and, at the same time, we will be introducing measures that will safeguard our forests, our fisheries, and our wildlife habitats for generations to come, something it appears the former administration forgot about. I'll be speaking at more length, of course, on our specific initiatives later in this session. I'll give you some of them in a nutshell right now.

We have made a number of announcements recently concerning private investment in provincial parks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on that at this time. The people of Saskatchewan realize that the philosophy of the former administration was socialism, and the philosophy of this government is just the opposite. And they realized two years ago the fact that socialism is only a short step from communism. And I would like to express to all members of this Assembly that if communism is so great, why are the people living in those countries risking their lives to get out?

Going back to the private investment in parks, we are inviting proposals from developers for construction of major commercial facilities in seven provincial parks. In three parks, we will be spending over \$500,000 on the infrastructure to support these private sector developments.

Mr. Speaker, talk of private investment in our parks is nothing new. The general public has long wanted more commercial facilities in our parks, facilities like accommodation, restaurant complexes, general stores, and golf course. Why, Mr. Speaker, even the former government had planned for more commercial developments. The NDP would have had the money, but the members spent it on uranium instead of tourist development — \$600 million they spent. Then, if you can believe it, Mr. Speaker, they turned around at their fall convention, in the fall of 1983, passed a resolution that says, "When we get back into power, we would ban uranium mining in the province of Saskatchewan."

Just stop and think, Mr. Speaker, what we could do with our parks and tourism, or agriculture, or anything else, if we had \$600 million to spend. Just think what we could say our deficit is. Our deficit would almost be even, because they were responsible for the first budget we brought down, the \$220 million budget. Add 600 to that, our deficit would be very little. I don't know how other people in the Assembly feel, but I know the members on this side of the House did not think that made much sense.

Mr. Speaker, by involving the private developers in our parks, we will be getting facilities that are both imaginative and cost-effective. Our intention is not to turn our parks into the Disneylands of the North. Government and the private sector, working together, will put developments into place that will enhance the many natural attractions for which our parks are noted. Mind you, when I talk about enhancing natural attractions, Mr. Speaker, I'd be remiss if I didn't mention the work we will be doing at Lake Diefenbaker.

Over the next three years, we will be spending \$3 million to transform Lake Diefenbaker into a major tourist attraction. We will finally tap the lake's great recreation potential by working with the private sector in building an 18-hole golf course, marinas, restaurants, and other facilities. This new construction will be initiated through the New Careers Corporation, which, I am proud to say, is being established by my department. The corporation will provide technical on-the-job

training and employment for 200 young people, every year over the next three years, on projects at Lake Diefenbaker, plus smaller projects at Meadow Lake and Regina Beach. The New Careers Corporation will not only provide needed upgrading of major recreational areas, it will also give our youth the chance to acquire meaningful skills – skills, Mr. Speaker, which will last them a lifetime.

I am obviously excited by these new initiatives in our provincial parks. I am excited too, that 1984-85 will see an increase of \$790,000 for regional parks' capital and maintenance projects, and that \$450,000 will be spent at Blackstrap to improve the ski hill and related facilities there.

In the '60s, this province had the finest system of parks in Canada. But in the '70s that system was allowed to deteriorate, to lag behind the times, because of the successive administrations which paid lip-service to tourism and recreation opportunities.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the pendulum has swung back now, hopefully for good. Thanks to this government's commitment, and the initiatives of Saskatchewan's private businessmen, we will have that system of top-notch parks again.

Let me move now from parks to forestry matters, Mr. Speaker. Negotiations are under way now on a new royalty system which will recognize the need for industry to shoulder more of the responsibility of the forest renewal. We are negotiating long-term agreements with the major companies that will provide equality of treatment, and balance throughout the industry, and at the same time will be allowing small independent operators to harvest merchantable timber where a surplus exists, and where it is more viable for a small operator to locate.

I will have more to say on our negotiations on these initiatives in the days ahead. For the moment, I would just like to note that they will give a major new stimulus to the industry and create a significant number of jobs in both forest-harvesting and forest-renewal operations. And above all, the new policies will mean that everyone in the industry will be more committed than ever before to reforestation measures that are efficient and effective in preserving this most precious resource.

For everyone's information, this is another thing that is long past due. Forest renewal is something again the NDP forgot about. It is unfortunate for the people of Saskatchewan that they did not have the same priority for the forest industry as they did for uranium.

Mr. Speaker, this theme of wise resource use, preservation, and protection extends to our wildlife and fisheries as well.

Members of this House are well aware that this government made a commitment to farmers that they could buy agricultural Crown lease lands. However, many wildlife enthusiasts, and for that matter many farmers, were concerned about the destruction of critical habitat land as it relates to wildlife. As I have said on other occasions, this loss of critical habitat, especially that for white-tailed deer, is reaching crisis proportions in Saskatchewan. In the south-east corner of our province 50 per cent of the critical deer habitat has been destroyed in the last two decades.

Therefore, in this session, I am pleased to announce that I will be introducing a critical wildlife habitat act that will address that problem. This act will provide for protection of critical wildlife habitat on Crown lands administered by the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture. Parcels designated as critical wildlife habitat cannot be sold nor developed in anyway that will jeopardize the wildlife resource.

At the same time, I can reaffirm that farmers will be able to purchase Crown lands which are best suited for agriculture. The act will thus ensure that both wildlife and agriculture interests remain protected of the benefit of future generations.

The final initiative I want to mention tonight Mr. Speaker, concerns fisheries. Our fisheries resource is also important to the Saskatchewan way of life, and our economy. This resource provides pleasure for over 230,000 anglers, and jobs for 3,400 people that depend on it in the sport and commercial fishing industry. However, for years, commercial fishermen, outfitters, anglers, and domestic users have been concerned about the strains on the resource. Fish supplies have been dwindling, and fish managers have identified that conditions will worsen unless corrective action is taken.

Mr. Speaker, the government is taking that corrective action. We announced recently a comprehensive fisheries policy to address the issues of supply, demand imbalance, allocation conflicts, and a lack of development of Saskatchewan fish products.

I will just mention one aspect of that policy, namely the establishment of the Fish and Wildlife Development Fund. The fund will provide about \$650,000 annually for additional fish enhancement programs – programs that are long past due.

We will be funding more natural rearing ponds, and we will be also undertaking habitat improvements as it relates to lake aeration projects. The money for the fund is coming from the pockets of our sports fishermen at their request. The fishermen asked us to increase the angling licence fee so that we could undertake these needed enhancement projects, projects which, Mr. Speaker, will ensure that our sport fishing industry remains a viable one for our residents, as well as for our visitors to the province. And like our wildlife initiatives, these projects will protect a vital resource for generations to come.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I've dealt tonight with only a few of my department's initiatives for the coming year. The 11 per cent increase in our budget will enable us to strengthen our existing programs and add some new ones. We are bringing our parks back up to the standard our residents and visitors used to enjoy. We're stimulating the forest industry and increasing our commitment to forest renewal, and we are taking steps to see that our wildlife and fish resources are protected for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the leader of the provincial Liberals has described our government's budget as a "pollster's budget" . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Pollster, pollster.

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Well, whatever you would like to call it. Well, in reply to the member from the public gallery, I'd like to say that is true in the sense that we are listening to the people and acting on their suggestions and concerns, something that hasn't happened for the last many years.

The public wanted our parks upgraded and more commercial facilities in them. We are doing that upgrading, and the private sector is helping to deliver new facilities and services. The public wanted more jobs for our young people and we're creating more jobs for our young people. Under the New Careers Corporation program we will provide those jobs. Farmers and wildlife enthusiasts wanted our wildlife protected. We're giving them that protection. Our sports fishermen asked for measures to increase our fish resource. We're doing just that with the introduction of our fund for fish enhancement.

All of our initiatives meet clearly identified public desires and needs, another example of us listening to the people, not the bureaucrats doing something the people don't want. Our initiatives provide for economic growth and resource protection. They conserve and strengthen our heritage, our parks, and our forests, our fish and wildlife, while meeting the business challenges and opportunities that a strong and vibrant Saskatchewan is bringing.

Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the Minister of Finance said, and I quote:

I believe this budget provides a further demonstration of the pledge we gave on assuming office: to keep what needed keeping, to change what needed changing, and above all to be responsive to the needs of the Saskatchewan people.

That, for me, says it all, Mr. Speaker, about the province's budget, and about the policies and programs of the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I will be supporting the motion, and definitely opposing the amendment. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAGHER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take a great deal of pride and pleasure to rise tonight in support of the Minister of Finance, and in support of this budget. I think that this budget should be described as an amazing document. It is a bench-mark for all the other jurisdictions in North America. The reason that I'm so particularly proud of this budget is because it meets our commitments that we made in 1983, our election commitments. And it's the spirit of this budget that we campaigned on, and it's the spirit of this budget that the NDP truly do not understand. I am inclined to believe that's one of the main reasons there's eight of them in here, and 56 of us, and I hope they don't ever understand the spirit of this budget.

I was looking over this annual report that was put on my desk today from the Saskatchewan Western Development Museums. They've got some magnificent facilities here in Saskatchewan. In some of those museums they've got some old tractors and old combines and old farm equipment – but nowhere, in any of those museums, have they got a place for the NDP and their old economic arguments. And I really believe that's where they should go, is in a museum. Your colleague, James Laxer, described them as out of date. And out of date they really and truly are. I think that, if a provision could be made in one of our museums for their ideas and for the NDP, I think that it would be an altogether fitting thing for us to do, because we must recognize that the NDP have made some sort of a contribution to the history of this province, and we mustn't forget that. But it is in a museum that they belong. Their ideas are old and outdated.

One of the reasons that this Tory budget is so incomprehensible to them, of course, is that, number one, it's exciting and innovative and has new ideas for job creation that doesn't involve the growth of government. They can't comprehend that. But even more importantly, it's honest. It's on top of the table. It doesn't involve sleight-of-hand and burying deficits and all over the place. That really gives them a problem. They don't understand that at all.

My seat-mate colleague from Saskatoon made mention of the Minister of Health being a humble man. And the thought occurred to me that that's the one thing that the Minister of Health probably shares with the Leader of the Opposition. They're both humble men. The difference is the Leader of the Opposition has got a lot more to be humble about. I listened to him this afternoon, and I made a discovery about the NDP that I wasn't aware of in the past. Underneath this, this sort of a rough exterior of hate and venom, and doom and gloom, there's a solid core of hate and venom, and doom and gloom.

In order for them to demonstrate the depth of his concern for our economic well-being and the development of Saskatchewan's economy and the creation of jobs, he talked about Tory nominating conventions, referred to us as "Mulroney high rollers" and, of course, going along with the presumption that his caucus is a caucus of the working party, of the average man, the working man.

It is interesting to make an observation about now that we've got more working people on our side of the House than they do. And the significant part of that is that I'm on the same side of the House as they are.

He did, on a couple of occasions, touch the budget, more by accident than by design, I think. He went into Highways, and I think his comments on Highways, as well, really demonstrates very

effectively the fundamental, basic difference between the Progressive Conservative philosophy and that of the socialist NDP. He made the comment that we cannot – there's no one can convince him that we can – build more highways with less money. And you know, when you think about that a little bit, that really is. It scares me a bit that he believes that. He honestly does. He can't, and any person who's ever worked on a construction project, or out there in the real world at all and believes that the private sector can't do something cheaper than the government, belongs in a museum for sure.

He made a comment, as well, that this government has made no commitment to education. Well, I think again that there's an illustration in Prince Albert. I think it demonstrates the fundamental difference, the basic difference in the thrust of this government and the thrust of the previous administration. We have a new \$26 million technical school under construction in the city of Prince Albert by this government. And we only have to look downtown at the 30-storey office high-rise built by the previous government as a monument to themselves. That, in the process, emptied out a lot of the private sector buildings in downtown Prince Albert and put a real burden on the taxpayers of Prince Albert, to see the basic difference in these two political parties. We build a school, they build an office tower and a monument to themselves, and charge it to the taxpayers.

He touched on the Key Lake spill, as well, in his comments this afternoon, and, you know, it amused me somewhat. He said a toilet valve would have solved the problem there, and the monitoring committee in place. Well, being a plumber by trade, I'm a little bit amused at this suggestion that a toilet valve would have solved the spill there; but, I don't think a pun would be altogether inappropriate right now, even though it's probably the lowest form of humour. I have to suggest to you that the NDP record is not very glowing when it comes to uranium mining. The Key Lake mine is their mine, they built it, they designed it, they installed it without asking the taxpayers of Saskatchewan if they wanted to make that kind of investment. The difference again is pretty dramatic. We're going to clean it up, we're going to operate it for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, particularly for the people of northern Saskatchewan. And that's in this budget as well.

He refers to the horror stories as well, as the lay-offs in the public sector. These are horror stories? Someone who gets an eight-week notice, an opportunity to work in the private sector, as well as an opportunity to bump, and all these other things. That's a horror story to the NDP? Again, it demonstrates the basic fundamental difference in our philosophy. We don't have that kind of lack of faith, if you like, in the people of Saskatchewan. They really and truly believe that once you've worked for big brother, you are incapable of holding a job in the real world any more. You are then unable to work. I don't share that view. I don't think members of this side of the House share that view. We believe that people who have worked for the big brother are also able to work in the private sector.

In some cases, some of these people, because the work is going to the private sector, they are obviously not needed in government. And I think we have a responsibility to the taxpayers, and the Minister of Finance is demonstrating it in this budget that responsibility will be met. I had an employee, for an example, in construction . . . In the real world, those that are outside of the cocoon of government are used to working when there is work, and on occasion may not be working. Being a contractor in the construction business, I often had jobs and employed large numbers of people, and as the work was completed they had to be laid off – it's an accepted fact. And in one job in particular – in fact, it was up North – we weren't able to get the crew out, so they worked for some time on-site with very little to do. In fact, they were just putting in the time.

Finally, the lay-off notices came, and one of my employees made a comment that I think could have come from an NDPer. As they were leaving the job site going to the aircraft, he said to me, "Why did you give a lay-off slip? I wasn't doing anything." That's right, he wasn't. They believe you just simply can't work for anyone else but Big Brother. Once you do work for them,

he's precluded any opportunities in the private sector. We don't share that belief. I have faith in those people. I am convinced that they are as capable of working for the private sector as they are for government.

This budget contains basically two sorts of messages. We've got good news and bad news. The good news is for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan, and the working people of this province, and the small businessmen of this province, and the farmers, and all of those people who are attempting to make an honest living. That's the good news.

The bad news, of course, is to the NDP who have to contend with this budget, some free-loaders who aren't too impressed with our changes in some of our social assistance scams that have been going on, and other people who have tried to rip off the taxpayers of Saskatchewan for years. They're not happy with it. It's bad news to them. But that's the main reason I am so proud to support this budget and vote against the amendment. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODGINS: — Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, when the Minister of Finance delivered his budget address to this Assembly, it simply was not a case of just another budget being introduced because tradition dictates that a budget be introduced in the spring. Absolutely not. Nor was this budget another fiscal document that, in time, would gather dust sitting on the shelves in the archives. Absolutely not.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that we have before us is a historic economic document that spells out in very clear terms the clear thinking and wise fiscal policy of the province of Saskatchewan government of this province.

The Hon. Minister of Finance has introduced a budget that clearly says to all the people in the province of Saskatchewan that the day and the age of big government – government intervention into every aspect of people's lives – the big governmentality is long over.

We all know that it died on April 26, 1982. Since that time, Saskatchewan has entered a new era. The budget, introduced last Wednesday, serves to reconfirm the commitment of the province of Saskatchewan government to sound economic policies. These policies work hand in hand with the free enterprise spirit to make Saskatchewan a prosperous place to live, in every sense of the word. The Saskatchewan promise is no longer just a promise. It is a reality.

This past weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was back home in my home constituency of Melfort, and of course I took the opportunity to visit with a number of my constituents. Tonight I would like to share with this Assembly the observations and the comments of the people from the Melfort constituency on our budget.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, over a dozen people made the comment: "Thank heavens, no tax increases. My responded thanks to your provincial government." Mr. Speaker, a lot of cynics and doomsayers such as the gang who sit in the opposition benches were predicting an increase in taxes. At a time in Canada's history, Mr. Speaker, when virtually every other provincial jurisdiction has been increasing taxes, we, in Saskatchewan, can proudly proclaim that since the government of Premier Grant Devine came to office there have been no major tax increases. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there have been taxes eliminated. A store owner in Melfort said to me, "That's good management." It certainly is good management, Mr. Speaker, and for the record I informed this man that Saskatchewan taxpayers, on an average, pay the lowest . . . yes, the lowest personal taxes and utility charges in all of Canada.

And speaking of utility charges, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note the sales tax is being removed from power bills for farmers and residential customers. That move, Mr. Speaker, is another example of promises being kept by this government.

Back in the summer of 1981 when interest rates were sky-rocketing and inflation rates were eating away at the pocket-books of the working men and women in this province, I would like to remind this House that it was the leader of the Progressive Conservatives in Saskatchewan, now our Premier, who called on the provincial government to remove the sales tax from electricity rates. What did the NDP government of the day do about that positive suggestion? They did nothing, absolutely nothing.

And I would like to take a few moments and quote from an article that appeared in the *Elrose Review*, dated August 27, 1981. And the headline read: "Devine urges: 'Take the tax off electricity bills.'" That same article went on to say:

Conservative leader Grant Devine has called on the provincial government to remove the sales tax from electricity bills. The sales tax on the electricity bills is a greedy form of gouging by the NDP government and is bleeding the working men and women of Saskatchewan.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is another example of vision and the wisdom of a man who is now Premier of this province. And we all know Saskatchewan's Premier is both a farmer and economist by profession. He had the foresight to call for the removal of this gouging tax, and he kept his word, just as the government kept its word on removing the tax on gasoline. The provincial tax on gasoline was removed within hours of this government coming into office – the single, largest tax cut in Saskatchewan's history.

Mr. Speaker, for 10 long years we had a government in this province who lived by the big government mentality, and the taxpayers of our province paid dearly for their philosophy. That day and age is over.

Let me continue with some of the many other positive comments I've heard around the Melfort riding about this budget. Conservatives believe that a job, and a man's dignity, are foundation stones in making a democratic society a good place to live. The working men and women believe the same thing. In short, this government is in tune with the hopes and goals of the people.

Young people are no longer leaving Saskatchewan in search of a better place to live. No, they are staying here, and many more are returning home. Saskatchewan Opportunities '84 and Access Youth Employment are two important parts of this government's commitment to jobs for the young people of this province. These programs respond to the needs of young adults who need jobs, and to students who wish to further their education at post-secondary institution. These combined programs will spend \$5.7 million to create nearly 4,000 jobs. And these jobs, Mr. Speaker, are being created because this government works hand in hand with the private sector. It is a commitment to private enterprise and its related respect for the freedom and dignity of individuals. It is the bedrock for building Saskatchewan's prosperity. Jobs, and more jobs, is a priority with this government.

The Industrial Incentives program will provide one-time payments of \$7,500 for each new, permanent job created by manufacturing and processing firms. The program will create well over 1,500 permanent jobs. And there are those who would criticize assisting the small businesses, the small manufacturers, and ask: why? Why are we helping those in business?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reflect a bit about my constituency, and some of the manufacturers in my constituency. And I do not have to travel very far from my home to this little town of St. Brieux, Saskatchewan, home of Bourgault Industries, a manufacturing plant that employs probably some 70 or 75 people. And, Mr. Speaker, if you were to ask the residents of St. Brieux, Saskatchewan, or if you were to ask the residents of Frontier,

Saskatchewan, where they manufacture Friggstad cultivators, or if you were to ask the residents of St. Gregor, Saskatchewan, where they manufacture truck boxes at Western Industries, or if you were to ask the people of my home town, where they process livestock and have meat plants, if you were to ask those people why are we assisting manufacturers, I do believe that those people could answer by saying that their neighbour or their friend's daughter or son works in those industries, and they appreciate what businesses do in this province, Mr. Speaker. When a business is created, there is a valuation that is created, Mr. Speaker, and that valuation is taxed, and those taxes go to build our schools and to build our hospitals and to build our nursing homes.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason that we have helped the manufacturers and, Mr. Speaker, we have to understand that when the businessman wins, everybody wins. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind this Assembly that we, in Saskatchewan, can be proud of the fact that Saskatchewan's unemployment level continues to be the lowest in all of Canada. But, of course, we are constantly working to lower that rate, and our record of job creation is one of the best in all of Canada.

As many of you in this House know, Melfort constituency has a strong agricultural base. Farming is the main income of the vast majority of the people in Melfort, and that is why I receive such a positive response to the agricultural programs announced in the budget. Sir John A. MacDonald once said: "Attachment to the soil is the secret of the success of the Canadian people." The attachment to the soil by Saskatchewan's farmers has been the very economic backbone of this province. Back in Melfort I received an awful lot of congratulations because of this government's steps to encourage the growth of the family farm. The elimination of school property taxes on a farmer's home quarter is a very, very good example of that. The \$4 million fund to assist troubled, but viable farm operations is another example. The introduction of the Livestock Investment Tax Credit is a further example, Mr. Speaker. The increased financial assistance for farm irrigation.

These, Mr. Speaker, are just a few key examples of a government that can say, "For Saskatchewan farmers we have delivered." And those positive programs will guarantee that rural Saskatchewan will continue to support the government that is for farmers. The Progressive Conservative government of Premier Devine, the only Premier in Canada to hold a Canadian Wheat Board Permit Book. The greatness of any province, Mr. Speaker, is dependent on the willingness of people to take risks, and those risks must be rewarded, Mr. Speaker. All too often, governments in the past have tried to strangle the private businessman. This government, Mr. Speaker, believes in the right of the small businessman, the entrepreneur, to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, any person who risks his or her life savings, health, and hard work on a small business that creates new jobs and economic growth should be rewarded. And I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the risk-takers and the job-creators who have built this country. This is the Progressive Conservative philosophy. We believe that this separates us from socialism, Mr. Speaker, which Winston Churchill once described as, "The great equalizer of human misery."

For the reasons I have just cited, Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud to be associated as a member of a government that supports the small businessman. The Saskatchewan Tax Incentives Program will stimulate small business. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I could cite numerous reasons why every citizen of the province of Saskatchewan should be very optimistic about the economic future of Saskatchewan. The Conference Board of Canada, an independent group of highly-respected economists, has predicted that the outlook for this province is excellent. In the past, while credit ratings of other provinces have deteriorated, this province has been elevated to accept doubt A plus one – the only province in Canada whose credit rating went up in 1983.

And while speaking of economic indicators, Mr. Speaker, I should like to touch on the subject of bankruptcy – the subject of bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker, and that is the bankruptcy of the NDP opposition. They are bankrupt of new ideas; they are bankrupt of any positive economic policy; they are bankrupt of any realistic alternatives to our programs. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that

they will be bankrupt of seats the next time Saskatchewan goes to the polls because of the programs of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODGINS: — Mr. Speaker, continuing on with the feedback I got in Melfort on the budget, I sincerely believe that the people in my constituency are very pleased with the direction of this government. They are pleased with the fact that there were no tax increases to hit them hard in the pocket-book. They are pleased that there will be no rate increases to SGI and telephone services. They are pleased that we put job-creation as a number one priority. The residents of Melfort support our resource development policies, and senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, applaud the Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I remember my maiden speech in this Assembly, and I recall at that time I had said that, as a result of the election of a Progressive Conservative government in Saskatchewan, the whole direction, the whole philosophy, the whole approach to provincial government would be changed.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, nearly two years later, I am very proud to say that last weeks' budget proved my earlier observation to be right in every sense of the word. Mr. Speaker, these are exciting times in the history of Saskatchewan. We can hold our heads up with pride when we go down to Toronto, or Denver, or Albuquerque, or anywhere in North America. No longer are we looked upon as Alberta's poor neighbour. And that we were at one time, Mr. Speaker. I remember it very well. And I remember my graduating class, Mr. Speaker, of probably 135 or 142. And a very, very large majority of my friends and my colleagues in my high school years left this province under an NDP administration. They could not get a job in our province. They did not like the policies and the programs of the NDP administration. They did not like seeing their fathers' land taken over by the land bank, and they left this province, Mr. Speaker, and now they are coming home. That, Mr. Speaker, again, is a thing of the past.

Saskatchewan has entered an era of emerging economic opportunities. And that was what I heard back in Melfort. And I am sure that my colleagues heard very much of the same in their constituencies. For all of those reasons I have listed this evening, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very proud of our provincial budget. Mr. Speaker, that budget provided an opportunity for people. It provided an opportunity for senior citizens, and for investors, and for the unemployed youth. Mr. Speaker, the framework that our provincial government is building is a framework that provides an opportunity for all persons —an equality of opportunity, Mr. Speaker, whereby a person can climb upon that ladder of success. And he can climb that ladder just as far, and as high, as he wants. But, Mr. Speaker, we never said that everyone, and all persons, would climb to the same height. The only system that will guarantee that, Mr. Speaker, is socialism. And that system, Mr. Speaker, will guarantee that nobody gets past the first rung.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn for a minute to something that applies very, very specifically to my constituency, and I would like to commend the Minister of Parks and Recreation, the member from Bengough-Milestone, for his approach to the tourism sector. Mr. Speaker, that member, this evening, outlined some of his programs and some of his policies, and mentioned the direction that this government was taking. And I am very, very pleased to announce to this Assembly, and to my friends and constituents in the fine area of Melfort, that their ski hill, Wapiti Ski Hill, will receive funding from our provincial government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODGINS: — Mr. Speaker, Melfort constituency, and indeed all of Saskatchewan, will benefit by this budget. More and more people share my personal belief that the economic policies of this Progressive Conservative government will lead Saskatchewan on the road of unobstructed prosperity. And having said that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by telling

each and every member of this Legislative Assembly that after two years one can really see the difference in our province, and all because the people of Saskatchewan have continued faith in our programs.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I am proud to support the budget introduced by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and accordingly, I will be supporting the motion in favour of the budget, and I will be opposing the negative opposition amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HAMPTON: — The member opposite says, “The heavyweight from Canora.” I am on a diet.

Mr. Speaker, it’s a pleasure for me to address the House this evening and to join in the debate on the budget speech. Before I begin I would also like to extend my congratulations to the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Bob Andrew, on a job extremely well done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this budget is the most innovative that has been presented in this province, or for that matter perhaps, anywhere in Canada since as far back as I can remember.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that there are tremendous advantages to every corner of this province contained in this budget. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should speak on the advantages for the Canora constituency, and the people that live there. Because my constituency is part of rural Saskatchewan, I can be certain that we will have many additional advantages. The Canora constituency is primarily agricultural orientated, Mr. Speaker, although we do have some forestry operations across the northern part. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the most obvious advantages that my people will receive from this excellent budget.

I would like to start with agriculture and some of the direct benefits those involved may receive. One of the first benefits I see is the removal of the sales tax from their power bills. Next, I think of the removal of the school property tax from their home quarters, which, in itself, will be a substantial saving to the farmers facing rising costs. Mr. Speaker, then my attention turns to the exciting livestock investment credit for many of the livestock producers in my area — \$25 for every finished beef animal, \$3 for every hog, and \$2 for every lamb. Direct cash into their pockets. Mr. Speaker, another program which will benefit my constituents is our new Agricultural Credit Corporation, which will provide low interest rates and expanded loans to those who qualify. And I have heard, Mr. Speaker, directly from some of the farm persons that were involved with FarmStart, that they’re most excited about this new corporation and feel that this should have been done some time ago.

There is also the \$4 million fund to assist the financially troubled farmers, of which I must say that I have many in my area. They are looking forward to our government for assistance, and knowing that it’s coming. And, Mr. Speaker, these are all direct cash advantages to the people of agriculture in my constituency, but it doesn’t end there. The budget has incentives and advantages for people in small business in my constituency also. Some of the same advantages apply to all sectors, but, Mr. Speaker, of course some of them are more specifically designed.

And when I look at our job creation programs, our Venture Capital Tax Credit, the reduction of corporate income tax, and others, Mr. Speaker, I know that the small businesses in my constituency feel our government cares for their well-being.

I would like to turn now to resources if I may, Mr. Speaker, namely forestry, because I have several small forestry operators in my constituency, as I had mentioned before. It’s with pleasure that I am able to show these people that this government is coming forward with a new strategy to stimulate and increase economic development within their enterprises. This, in turn, will assist

and promote employment creation within this viable industry. This, Mr. Speaker, came as good news to the operators, because they had been neglected for so many years under the previous administration.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see an increased emphasis placed on tourism. In my constituency we have a provincial park, several recreational park sites, and other designated areas, resort sites, which will benefit from this program. And I can say, Mr. Speaker, I have already received inquiries from people in the business sector, asking for direction to get more information on this, as they would like to expand their businesses into these parks.

Another distinct advantage for my constituency, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the modifications we have introduced for our senior citizens. While my constituency will not be the only one to benefit from these changes, it will assist my seniors in their day-to-day lives. I am referring in part, Mr. Speaker, to the Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program, with benefits now up to \$1,000. This will greatly increase their capabilities of living independently of institutions, and provide the necessary repairs to their homes, allowing the senior citizens of this province to have a choice, should they wish to live in their own homes or move into other accommodation.

Another plan which I was very pleased to see receive the attention that it deserved, and not to the same neglect which it received under the previous administration, was the increase in the Saskatchewan Income Plan benefits. Mr. Speaker, this will allow seniors to enjoy a more comfortable life style, providing them with increases which they should have received long ago when the members opposite were in government. These increases will see a doubling in some cases, while in others cases it will amount to approximately 67 per cent to our seniors, and I know that they will find many ways to spend those extra few dollars.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, has introduced increased capital projects of which my constituency will be one of many to benefit, and I would like to say at this point that the people, in particular, of the town of Preeceville were most pleased with the announcement of the major renovation, in addition to the Preeceville school, which will enhance our local economy with about some \$800,000 investment. Also the community of Rama, Mr. Speaker, was every bit as pleased, and they know that their economy will also be stimulated with the addition and renovation to their school in excess of \$300,000. That's not to mention other things, such as their C and D Project, etc., one in particular which will be funded by approximately \$70,000 this year.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, constituents in my area can see a substantial increase in the quality of life in our area, and they are not worrying about fancy figures at \$11,000 an hour or any other hypocritical statements which may arise from the members opposite. My people are interested in action and result. Mr. Speaker, they tell me they can see them coming forth from this excellent masterpiece, referred to as the provincial budget for this fiscal year. They tell me, Mr. Speaker, that they know this administration is not responsible for the economic woes of this province at this time. They know that we inherited a mess, and that certain factors are out of our hands, but they have faith in us, Mr. Speaker, and so Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion and opposing the amendment.

MR. MYERS: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's always a pleasure to be in the House and be able to speak and be able to debate the budget. It's a good budget; as my colleague says, it is a great one. Well I just happened to spot a book on my colleague's desk and it says "What's the Good Word" by William Safire. Well, I will tell you what the good word is: the good word is the budget. I was out this last weekend talking to my constituents. They didn't have too many negative things to be said about it, all they could reiterate was the negative things that came from the hon. member who's the opposition leader. They could just reiterate the words; they didn't have anything of their own to say about it. That was bad . . . just echoing.

What's good about the budget? Well, we've got something in it for everyone. And it may have been a difficult pill for the opposition to swallow, but they know how to swallow pills.

March 26, 1984

There was economic development and investment strategy. There was agriculture. There was crown corporation reform, social policy strategy, financial management strategy, and a lot more – a very responsible budget.

It brought up health. We've made it number one in the country and we're proud of it. It's up over a billion dollars now – a billion dollars. And we've taken home care and put it back into health – not social services where you could hide it – but into health. You used to fudge figures. We see care for the elderly. We've seen the establishment of a chiropody program for the elderly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . “Do we see highways?” my colleague asks. I see them all the time. We just improved the stretch of highway between Saskatoon and Regina. I never saw it improved under their government.

But getting back to the care for the elderly. It's a subject I whole-heartedly support. I believe we needed more of it. We needed more of it, and I must make a correction at this time. On Thursday I said, “In three years the NDP were responsible for 192 hospital beds.” I stand to be corrected, because the figure is 142 beds over five years. Now that's a poor record.

In the last year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My colleague says, “Ask you about your task force that you were holding – one of four task . . . (inaudible) . . . that you're sending throughout the province. You're out there and you can't even get your own members to attend. You can't get your own members to attend your task force. The budget's so good they won't have to tell us what's wrong – we've been listening to them. You weren't. The only reason you've got to send a task force out there is you lost touch. You lost touch, and that showed it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MYERS: — You lost touch with the elderly. You put a moratorium on nursing beds – a moratorium. All day they're joking over there about the moratorium. I'd just like to read a letter, January 4th, 1976:

On December 1st, 1975, treasury board reviewed the request by social services, 1976-1977 budgetary request for construction grants to special care homes.

Do you remember this one? You should.

Treasury board is seriously concerned about the level of construction occurring in special care homes sector. The level of activity proposed in the 1976-77 budgetary request would result in a surplus of beds.

They said a surplus of beds six years ago. Today they're telling us we're short. There wasn't any surplus of beds. There was a surplus of hypocrisy, but there wasn't a surplus of beds. You just didn't want to build them. The great beholders of health care. And you say you have a surplus, so we don't build any more That doesn't wash. It went on:

Treasury Board deferred a decision on level of funding to be approved for this activity, pending the review of more detailed information on all committed projects, until such time as needed for additional beds can be clearly identified and a suitable construction policy defined. A moratorium on further commitments should be enforced.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Moratorium means nothing.

MR. MYERS: — You know what moratorium means. Dwayne? I'm sorry. You know what the meaning of the word “moratorium”, the member of Shaunavon? It means you don't do anything.

Don't build. And the 142 beds over five years – seven years – 20 beds a year. Twenty beds a year, that's what you built – 20 beds. Well, I'll tell you last year we built 101. One year, 101, and another 83 replacement beds over renovation periods.

This may have been written in 1976, and it didn't apply. We never did it. I go to a letter that was written in 1978, and it was to a member in the Canora constituency, in the town of Theodore. And they respond to it:

You recall that some time ago you inquired about the possibility of establishing a nursing home in Theodore. Your request, and similar requests from other communities, have been held in abeyance pending the carrying out of a number of studies both within and outside the department, and to determine the need for additional levels 1, 2, 3 special care homes throughout the province.

Well, the moratorium stayed in place. It must have. The first one was '76 and this is '78. The letter summed up by:

In brief, we appreciate the concern you share with us over the adequate care of senior citizens, but feel there would be little or no validity in pursuing your proposal at this time. We regret that we cannot give more favourable consideration to your proposal.

Well, this must have been a form letter. Seven years, 142 beds. They must have a letter like this from every town or city in the province. I will tell you how their concern was over this issue. I have a copy here of the *Shaunavon Standard*. It's the paper that services the member of Shaunavon and the former minister for social services. And the date of it, April 21, 1982. And it shows the member and two other persons from the constituency signing an agreement of intent between Shaunavon Union . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Who are the other two? I'm sure you would recognize it. I will read (as my fellow colleague says), I will read your name and leave theirs out of it.

What it states is they used to deal with home care beds the way they saw fit. To try to save their party during an election, they'd bring out contracts – five days before the date of the election . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . My colleagues are asking if he did that. And he clearly did it. It's there.

What we've done besides providing 101 new beds last year – we made staff increases equivalent to 84 full-time positions in 47 special care homes. This was done at a cost of \$1.7 million. That was an increase. Just here alone, that was greater than most of your budgets for home care were some years. We provided positions such as nurses, nurse's aides, and activity workers. We provided them. That was last year, and this year we have a larger commitment. Last year \$17 million for the cancer clinic, a \$17 million cancer clinic in Saskatoon, in addition to the present structure. And we're also providing \$1 million per year, over 5 years, for major new equipment. It wasn't provided before. The equipment they're using is 10, 12, 15 years old, and some of it's outdated. Last year we made a commitment of \$2.7 million for a new children's rehabilitation centre in Saskatoon, and I drove by that structure last week and it was well on its way to completion. And I was proud. It doesn't lie in my constituency. It lies in my fellow-member from University's constituency, but I'm proud because it helps everyone in Saskatoon, and everyone in the area.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You should drive through my riding some time.

MR. MYERS: — The member from Moosomin says I should drive through his riding. Well, I have driven through his riding, and quite frankly they appreciate the work that he's done for them in health care, and being the Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Health he's been able to make

March 26, 1984

a great input into this sector.

They also left behind some other information, and this is dated 1981, April 3. Another piece, as my fellow colleague says, that missed the shredder. A lot missed the shredder. They couldn't take it all out in garbage trucks, or store it in archives. What this is, it's for cabinet information. And it's from the minister of social services.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not the same minister!

MR. MYERS: — Not the same person sitting across from me – I would have to say it is. And it was to the then premier of the province, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Because nursing home rates were increasing from 16 to 18 per cent on the average, we sought and received treasury board approval on March 25 to negotiate a package with the nursing homes, which accomplishes some of the following: (and it states what some of their objectives were). Greatly reduce the potential political criticisms of increased resident charges.

And they say, "Well, why should that be of political significance?" They were the ones, over there, that jacked up the prices for the occupants living in those nursing homes. They were the ones. Talk about our increases – 6 per cent in two years. Very little. Very little. It also states in here, "As a result of consultation process, the following will be proposed to treasury board for implementation." And it says, "Begin, begin phasing out level 1." Phasing it out, moratorium, phasing out. And these are from the people who said they support health care, and they support the elderly. Moratoriums and phasing out. Some support. I wouldn't want you behind me.

It also states, "... initiate a level 4 charge of \$390." \$390! Initiate! And they did it.

It also states "... being transfer of level 4 facilities from health to social services." That's so you could budget the books and hide the numbers.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's the shell game.

MR. MYERS: — The shell game. The old shell game. If you don't know where it lies, you don't know how to comment on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a pretty condemning statement.

MR. MYERS: — It's a statement, it's a statement that came from your administration.

Well, we don't have to wait. We don't have to wait like they did in the past. We've got a five-year, \$25 million program for social services. We've got projects that are approved two years in advance – two years in advance! And I'm not going to go through the numbers because the Minister of Health had mentioned them this afternoon when he was speaking, but I will go through the numbers for Saskatoon, because the people in Saskatoon should hear this. On Friday, last Friday, the Minister of Health announced that we would have 50-50 new beds for level 3 and 4 in Saskatoon. And this was to be carried out in conjunction with the Circle Drive Alliance Church. And I know they will take care of the people. It's just plain good news. Also announced with those 50 new beds was a major renovation for 1984-85 for the Lutheran Sunset Home, this is to take levels 1 and 2, and convert them into level 3 standard beds. There will be 78 – 78! – beds upgraded, and they tell me they appreciate that. I was talking to my minister, who happens to be on that board, and he says they had been negotiating – I don't know how he explained negotiating – but negotiating and talking with the former government, and they had

been doing that for several years. They didn't know if this was going to get tossed out with the water when the government changed, so they were delightfully surprised when they heard this had been approved.

Not only that, not only that in Saskatoon, but, we have major renovations to Oliver Lodge to upgrade the fire alarm system, and expansion of the dining hall facilities. Now that might not be of very much significance to the members across the way, but in my city that's of great significance. It's providing service to people, to people who need it – people who have needed it for a long time, but were denied it because of moratoriums and cutbacks. It's a portion of the budget, it's a portion of the budget that when the minister's committee came to Saskatoon some six weeks ago and asked what we could do with the sanatorium in Saskatoon, I made a presentation and stated that it should be enlarged upon. Renovations should be carried out on the two remaining floors. Presently, we have 65 citizens there; 65, and we should be able to enlarge that and alleviate some of the load that we have in our hospitals.

I'd like to go into what we've done in education, and what we're going to do.

We'll be providing \$120 million — \$120 million – to expand technical institutes by 60 per cent, the positions by 60 per cent. And that's going to be done over the next four years. Three thousand new positions in technical institutes. We're making a major new thrust into this area. And just to prove that, we're making a thrust, in 1982 the former government announced – February '82, just before an election – announced they were going to build a technical institute in Prince Albert, an institute that people had waited five and six years for, but only received it just prior – just prior to an election.

Well, what they were going to do was they were going to provide 384 training places at a capital cost of \$15.4 million. Now they may have done it. They had the money from cutting back on home care projects. In January '83 this government under a former minister, Mr. Currie, announced an expansion of over 60 per cent to the institution – over 60 per cent – and bringing the numbers up to 632 training positions. 632! That's good news. A further 150 training positions are being considered for four classes.

But what the major significance of building an institution in Prince Albert is, is it means educating the people who live in the North. And I hear from them, and the member for Athabasca, that they have high unemployment up there. And I believe him. But without training they don't stand a chance of improving themselves. And without a technical institute they didn't stand any chance at all. That's why, when we announce we're going to build something, it's positive. It's not during, or before an election. It's not before an election. It's there to aid the people who need it.

The tenders for the building will be let very shortly (and I'm told by April 5th next month) and they anticipate construction beginning July. July of this year – not any other year – this year. A 20-month construction period is expected And from what I'm told, so far it's on time, and it's on budget.

But to reinforce why this was such a major project, we have to go back to February 1980 and another memorandum that escaped their shredder. It states (and this is from the former premier, and now Leader of the Opposition, to the then minister of education and continuing education. I believe his name was Mr. McArthur.) But what it states, and he says it right in here:

I want the planning committee to take a look, at some point during the next several months, at the position the government intends to take in the longer term with respect to the universities and vocational institutes.

He goes on:

I am particularly interested in knowing how we intend to organize our relationship with the university, the manner in which we intend to reduce the rate of growth of university funding.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Crocodile tears.

MR. MYERS: — Crocodile tears and a lot of hypocrisy. This is how they intended to deal with the problem: they were doing a study all right, they were doing a study on how to wind it down, not improve it. That's why I'm very suspect, that if an election hadn't have come in April, that there may never have been an institute in Prince Albert. Another one that missed the shredder. I don't hear you commenting too much now.

I have a few more here . . . I don't have a rural seat, and people sometimes ask me "What's in it for agriculture?" Well, there's new financial assistance, \$15 million worth. This, in part, is covered by the \$11 million for the removal of school tax in the home quarter, an additional \$4 million for direct financial help in cash flow in keeping some of the farmers afloat.

Also states – what's in it for farmers" – a Livestock Investment Tax Credit, lowest income tax in Canada for red meat producers. Twenty-five dollars a head for beef, \$3 a head for hogs, and \$2 a head for sheep, and this can be carried over a seven-year period.

We also have incentives for the beef industry, feed grain commission, guaranteed operating loans for feedlots and producers, and feeder association loan guarantees. We have the farm purchase program this year. We have \$13 million subsidizing the loans that were let out last year, and an additional \$15 million for the loans that will be taken out this year. We've also got assistance for the agricultural credit corporation — \$1 million. This is for the 8, 12, and 13 per cent loans. We have regional extension, we have irrigation, and this was brought up in the throne speech last November. Now we have it — \$1.25 million for new grants, \$1.25 million for irrigation, and that's in grants. We have another \$1.45 million for new development capital. We also have the crop insurance corporation; we have sales tax reduction on all the electrical bills – and this applies more rightly to the farmers who operate quite a bit of their dryers, their barns, their storage sheds, their garages, and their homes on electrical heat. So it means a lot more to them than it may mean to someone who is in the city. We have rural revenue sharing – that's up 6.3 per cent. And for the farmers we have manufacturing and process, and as it says, this can apply to a person who has beehives and processes honey – so it can apply to the small guy as well as the one who is massively into it. We have a lot of programs that apply to everyone.

But, something I would like to take the time out now and to clarify some of the facts. Last Thursday in Saskatoon, as part of my constituency, the hon. member from Elphinstone, the opposition leader, spoke and said, and I'm quoting directly, and this is on an open-line show. He said, "They won't work directly in giving many individuals major tax cuts. " Well, I don't know what the removal off the electrical bill is, but I call it direct, and I don't know how you would classify the removal of school tax from the home quarter, except for being direct. Misleading the public . . . misleading the public.

He also said "There's a great number of services which will have to be cut back. There are fewer dollars and fewer people for somethings, which I think are pretty important, like home care." Well, he certainly changed his tune. In 1980 they spent less than \$1 million. He feels pretty good about these subjects when he's talking on an open-line show, but when it comes to action, we just have to consult his past record. We built more, we built more in a year and a half than you built in seven. He also said, "I believe them, it's a cutback." A million dollars. Day care grants are cut back a million dollars. He said that on the radio. A cutback of a million dollars in day care. Well, I'm not sure where he's getting his figures, but if there was an increase of 9.5 per cent for day care in the budget . . . And I know the Minister of Social Services will enlighten us to that fact when he rises to speak. No cutbacks, no cutbacks, a 9.5 per cent increase. Misleading the public again!

He also said, "No." (about the same subject), he said "No, this is a actual cutback," meaning that last year that they provided a million dollars, this year it's \$900,000. I don't even think he's talking about the same figures as we have. He's talking about cutbacks, and we're talking about a 9.5 per cent increase.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Fantasizing.

MR. MYERS: — Fantasizing, as one of my colleagues says. Well, if I were him, I wouldn't fantasize too long. I just don't know where that letter opener went that he was using the other night; but, I certainly hope it doesn't wind up in the back row. He may be doing more than fantasizing.

He also says this, he goes on — he's very good on nursing homes right now. "Everywhere I go they tell me there are waiting lists, longer than they have been in the hospitals for some time. Hospitals are jammed with people who should be in nursing homes, but can't find places in nursing homes." Well, you don't build a nursing home overnight. And quoting by your memorandum of 1976-77, you didn't intend to build any. You've left us, you've left us with that problem. But now, now the Leader of the Opposition is misleading the people. It's our fault, our fault, when, in fact, it was under his government that they instituted moratoriums.

This one I really like, "The population of Saskatchewan is going up this year, just about as fast as it did in the previous years, and not a great deal faster, and for many years, not as fast."

Well, we know how fast it went up since the socialists came to power in 1944. We had net declines, net declines. When we came to power, the population of Saskatchewan was closer to that, than it was in 1934, than it was in 1972 when they came to power. So he's trying to tell the people that our population isn't rising, and for the first time in history we've exceeded a million people.

And the children are coming back. And why are they coming back? Because only 55 per cent, only 55 per cent of the people born in Saskatchewan since 1930 are still here. They used to say down east our greatest export were people. We would raise them, and educate them, and then ship them off, because there were no incentives in this province. Well, it's hard to have incentives under a socialist government.

He said quite a few other things. He speaks about the auditor. The auditors will report it, and if you were in government for 11 years and said you had a surplus, and the auditors did not find that budget deficit in 11 years, I think you can make up your own mind it wasn't there. Well, they had funny numbers. About \$80 million left Sask Power to subsidize their internal revenue. Over a period of 10 years they took out about \$80 million to try to hide an otherwise deficit. They increased the ratio of debt in Sask Power from 65 per cent to 82 per cent. If Sask Power were Dome Petroleum, they would have been placed in receivership a long time ago, because no corporation functions at that debt load. That didn't come under our government. That came from the \$80 million that was drawn out by Sask Power to finance their otherwise deficit budgets.

My colleagues tell me to mention the one and one-half billion dollars which was removed from the teachers superannuation fund. A one and one-half billion; that's half our present budget today. One and one-half billion. When teachers come to me and say, "Where's the money?" I say, "Well, the former government spent it. They needed money. They didn't want to have deficits so they took it from superannuation funds." One and one-half billion. One and one-half billion dollars. That didn't stop there. It went into the SGEU pension fund and took money out of it, too. Pretty well drained it dry. That's how they balanced their budget. They balanced it on the backs of superannuation funds and Sask Power and Sask Tel. They did it by driving the debt of those companies up. That's not responsible management.

He said, the Leader of the Opposition . . . Here's another comment.

Yes, I think the federal government is fair to all Canadians. It is not fair all the time.

But it must have been fair to him when he wanted property rights removed from the constitution – property rights that would have otherwise been in the constitution – but I can see why he wanted it removed. Property rights do not really function in a socialistic society. So the former premier took them out.

Mr. Blakeney said something about retiring, and he says (this is for all you who are left over there): Allan Blakeney has no plans for retiring, and accordingly his present intention is to lead the NDP into the next election.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Or into oblivion.

MR. MYERS: — Or into oblivion, as my colleague says. So he doesn't plan to retire. He stated it publicly on the talk show. So either you'd better trip him going down the stairs, or pull out the letter opener. He also said: "Nobody should say that 1971, 1972, 1973 were easy years for Saskatchewan." Well, I don't know what you would call a recession in 1982, '83 and '84 in Canada. He also said (and this one I really like, cause I've mentioned it):

I think we should be doing more at Kelsey Institute.

And there's a slight cutback in staff at Kelsey at a time when the government is saying they are doing so much more in technical education.

I don't know how he terms a cutback again, because we have an increase of three full-time positions, and that's over and above what we had last year. And we have 30 new seats. And in the future there will be additional seats. Misleading the public again. There are other words I could use, but I can't, so I'll say misleading, because that's what he was doing. He said "Cutbacks," and we have it on paper. In fact, three new positions, 30 new seats, and that's what he calls a cutback.

Well we've long known about his math. It sometimes goes backward, it sometimes goes forward, but it does whatever he wants it to do. It doesn't necessarily tell the truth, but it functions well with him.

He also stated:

It's a long climb back, as anybody in these provinces will tell you. Many provinces are spending 25 and 30 cents of every dollar taken in on interest payments, while it's not that bad here.

Very low, very low – and I'll let you figure that out because you seem to be the ones with the calculators that don't work, so I'll let you come to your own conclusion.

He also had something to say about Saskoil. The idea of Saskoil was to develop heavy oil and get quick profits in that. It is going to take 5 to 10 years to get profits from heavy oil. Well it would have, under his system, but under the incentive programs for drilling and exploration we've done quite well with our land sales – so well that last year we had record sales that amounted to over \$108 million. And the net payback for the incentives was approximately \$42 million. That's \$66 million in the treasury – not paid out – that's net gain. Now I'll agree with him, we had to provide incentives, nowhere near the amounts that they're telling us over there. \$42 million last year versus \$108 million taken in. \$66 million. Now if you call that bad financing, well, I can only go back to the former figures you used.

He also said there were very few people on welfare who were able to work when he was in government. And, I'll come to that later. He makes another statement:

Ask the Saskatoon hospitals whether they don't have more Level 4 patients in hospital beds now than they did two years ago.

Well, I just spoke on that. And we do have a high number. And that's why we have long waiting lists. But this goes back to 1976 when the former government placed a moratorium on them. So what else do they expect us to have? You don't build, you can't provide the beds. And you can't provide them in a year and a half because of these construction projects take two and three years from the planning stage.

He has a little to say about the Minister of Highways. He kind of states that people should go out with their shovels and fix the potholes. I would welcome that because it certainly would cut the cost of repair, and I think it's called "free enterprise."

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a good line for the campaign.

MR. MYERS: — My colleague across the floor, the member from Shaunavon, says it's a good line. Well, I believe that the former president, the late John Kennedy, stated, "Do not ask what government can do for you, but what you can do for government."

Not like socialism . . . I believe it's called free enterprise, and working with the government. And we have a lot of people out there who like working with the government, so much so that I couldn't find any real negative comments in over three hours of knocking doors, and all the people I met over the weekend. But to refresh their memory, to refresh their memory, I have a copy of the budget speech dated Friday, March 10th, 1972, Let's go back and see what they said about some of the same issues. They state, and this was delivered by the premier, who was then also the minister of finance:

In our election platform we reaffirmed our faith that agriculture is the foundation of Saskatchewan life, economically and socially. This budget underlines that faith.

Well, I don't know how it underlined the faith. They formed land bank. They bought up land. They made share-croppers out of farmers, and were on their way to buying up the whole province. They were on their way, and I guess that's what he meant by they're going to reaffirm their position. It also states:

We will be satisfied to be judged by the people of Saskatchewan on the basis of facts that are on the record.

Well, the facts are on the record. And they were judged. They deceived the public for 11 years, but they were judged. They were judged. It also states, and he talks about employment, talks about employment:

Employment, however, did not rise at the same rate. Much of the increase in output was achieved through greater production per person employed. This meant only modest increases in the number of people employed.

Well, I know where they employed them. They brought them into government. The government ranks swelled – swelled, 50 per cent increase in 11 years. It goes on:

In fact, new jobs did not keep pace with the increases in the labour force. The number of unemployed did not decline. The unemployment rate averaged over 6 per cent throughout 1971, and prospects for improvement are dim.

March 26, 1984

And we've got to remember we're talking about 1972, not 1983 or 1984. They didn't improve anything, at over six per cent then. There was no national recession on at the time. It states: "Expansion in private investment lagged during 1971 because of unused productive capacity, and because of uncertainties in markets."

Well, there certainly was an uncertain climate in 1971 and '72 because the former government did not encourage business, it preferred to take it over. It preferred to take over business. They expanded all right, they expanded on the backs of private enterprise. They bought potash mines, they got into uranium mines, and they foresaked home care beds. The '72 budget also stated:

In summary then, Mr. Speaker, let me say that while we can anticipate growth in Canadian output in 1972, the twin dangers of high unemployment and inflation must still be reckoned with.

That was 12 years ago – 12 years ago, and they knew the problem, but they didn't deal with it. They increased the debt load of the crown corporations to pursue potash mines and uranium mines to the point of bankruptcy. And if those were private companies, they would be bankrupt. They did it all on the backs of the citizens of Saskatchewan, and the businesses . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the member from Shaunavon says, "Are we going to sell bonds in that company?" Yes, yes we are going to, because we feel that we should be keeping Saskatchewan capital in Saskatchewan to work for the residents of Saskatchewan, not sending it out down East.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have too much more to say. What I'm going to tell them about uranium – well, I could tell a long story on uranium, and it goes something like this. They put \$600 million into uranium mine through a crown corporation which they had set up: SMDC. SMDC has slightly over 50 per cent of the shares of Key Lake Mining. They supported uranium mining then. They went in, and they built that mine on the premise that they were going to get \$45 a pound — \$45 a pound when that was designed. They tinkered and played around so much with the market that it now sells for about \$22 a pound, and on the stock market, \$17 a pound, U.S. Tinkering. They weren't just content to go out and own the industry, but they had to tinker with the mechanisms. Seeing that I will have much more to say at a later date, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:22 p.m.