

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**

**EVENING SESSION**

**SPECIAL ORDER**

**ADJOURNED DEBATES**

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Andrew that the Assembly resolve itself into the committee of finance and the amendment thereto moved by Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that I am pleased to address the House during this budget debate. I have listened to a wonderful budget speech.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — But, Mr. Speaker, this, unfortunately, wasn't it. For this I do not criticize the Minister because this was the best political speech he ever made. There are even a few minutes at the start of this speech when I thought he was going to lapse into eloquence. The minister did his best to put a positive light on a disastrous economic policies of his government. He did his best to conceal the real significance of this document. But as each succeeding day reveals the real truth about this government's policies, and the minister's efforts are becoming totally discredited.

Mr. Speaker, as the member after member opposite stood up to extol the virtues of this budget, I am tempted to paraphrase Winston Churchill: "Never have so many said so much about so little." Or, perhaps it brings to mind William Shakespeare's play, *Much Ado about Nothing*. Or, perhaps, the government's chorus of praise brings to mind the courtiers in Hans Christian Andersen's, *The Emperor's New Clothes*.

But, I will say one thing, Mr. Speaker, what this budget lacked in depth, the Tories opposite have given us hollow remarks of praise. But then, vessels never give so great a sound as when they are empty.

This budget reminds me of a very bad restaurant where the customer said, "I can't find any chicken in the chicken pie." And the waiter said, "Do you expect to find a dog in a dog biscuit?" What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is baloney. The sky, the sky is the food for thought. What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is the finance minister, who has a combination of Milton Friedman, and Tinker Bell. There is comfort in evasion. There is security in abdicating responsibility. There is relief in irresponsibility. The people of Saskatchewan can rest assured that, with the policies and the philosophy of this government, man's destiny will be settled in the market-place, Mr. Speaker, and that market-place will be one based on greed, selfishness, and ruthless competition. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this budget and the philosophy underlying it will reap tragic harvest of economic and social insecurity in our province.

This budget and its treatment of the poor and needy reminds me of the wealthy woman who dropped a nickel into the beggar's hand. "Now my poor man," she said, "tell me how you lost all your money."

"Well, I was like you, ma'am," he said. "I was always giving away large sums of money to the needy."

Mr. Speaker, people live on hope. In its absence, people and, therefore, their society, their economy, falter and then decline. We must be careful about hope. We must guard it and nurture

it. It is through hope that motivation is fuelled. It is through hope that dreams become reality. Hope is our defence against despair. Hope gives us the patience to be reasonable. Hope gives us the courage to persevere against those persons and policies which are unreasonable.

But today my hope is tempered with sorrow. I would much prefer to be standing here in praise of a positive budget. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this is a hopeless budget, and there is no solace for me in seeing my province and its people suffer. I cannot turn my face, Mr. Speaker, away from the anguish of the unemployed and the bankrupt. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I cannot hide my sorrow for the welfare poor. I cannot justify your shabby treatment of our pensioners and our senior citizens. I cannot live with the kind of future you hold in store for our young people. I cannot accept your views as to the role of women in society. I cannot sanction your confrontation approach to working people. I cannot disguise my disgust at a document that creates so much misery for so many, in order to line the pockets of a few.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not asked, I am forced to ask the members opposite: how long must we wait? How long? Must we wait, Mr. Speaker, until our economy is in ruins before you admit that there are tragic flaws in your budget, your policies, and your philosophy?

Mr. Speaker, for two years the Tories have based their policies on their perceived ability to manage the provincial economy. This managerial approach, superbly marketed by public funds in a balance, in a barrage of government advertising, slogans, and meetings, was designed to persuade people inside and outside of Saskatchewan that our province was now open for business. It was an industrial strategy boiled down to two words: foreign investment. Mr. Speaker, open for business is the war cry of a dodo. Mr. Speaker, the basic reality of our time is that neither people nor industries want the insecurity, the inequality, or the irrationality of old-fashioned capitalism. To harken back to that is to attempt to roll back the major social and economic achievements of the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, one of the phoney issues raised by the defenders of the budget opposite is the big government versus little government argument. Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard a politician say he or she believes in big government? Of course not. The real issue before us is effective government or ineffective government.

There is a tendency today in this country, and particularly with this government, both in analysis and approach, to make an absolute separation between private sector and the public sector. It is fashionable for members opposite, it is trendy, to attack the public sector and to praise the private sector, to see the private sector capable of satisfying every need and every grievance with all of the solutions lying within its prerogative.

The members opposite affirmed touchingly that they are economic conservatives. They talked feelingly of profit and free enterprise, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that most of those members opposite probably live their entire lives and never quite find their way into the 20th century. But even some of the old economic fundamentalists, I'm sure, would blush at the sweet innocence with which members opposite talk about free enterprise, profit, and the public sector.

It is a . . . I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is a mixed economy. It's a profoundly interdependent economy, and by establishing the rigid separation of the two, private and public sectors, they're simply compounding the economic malaise of our society, Robert Heilbroner, in the *New Yorker*, analysed contemporary North American capitalism. And, he pointed out the tremendous need for regulatory and interventionist activity by the state. Not through benevolence, or authoritarianism, but simply because for reasons of resource scarcity and environmental considerations, the desperate need for economic planning.

I want to say that, unless we begin to understand that we live in a mixed economy, that the

public sector has a role to play, and that it is absurd to criticize it just because it is fashionable, ours will be an economy in enormous trouble.

The question is not whether government should, or should not intervene, but when and how. On whose terms; in whose interests; and for what purposes? The members opposite have answered those questions. Their government will intervene. First, to support the wealth, to support the oil companies, to support the banks.

Mr. Speaker, as this government vents its spleen, it seems to have lost sight of what government does and does not do. They have failed to distinguish the two parts of the role of government. One part is its leading contribution to decisions that should be taken by, and for, society as a whole. And this function they seem determined to remove in its entirety.

The other part is the role of government and men managing and administering and providing services. Here, they have emasculated services and bungled the management of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, speaking before the Canadian Society in New York, Premier Devine charmed the American businessmen with the lucid analysis of the Saskatchewan economy. Saskatchewan, he said, and I quote, “. . . has so much going for it, it can afford to mismanage it and still break even.” Well, let’s look at the record of Premier Devine and his government.

In 1982-83, there was a deficit in excess of \$220 million. In 1983-84, there was a deficit of over \$335 million. In 1984-85, \$267 million. The total amount of deficit to date, in two years of this administration, is \$829 million.

And let’s look at the cost of servicing that debt: In 1982-83, it cost the province, the taxpayers, just to service the debt to pay the interest, \$41.5 million. In 1983-84, \$65.8 million. In 1984-85, \$92.6 million. \$200 million we have paid out, or will have paid out by the end of the year, just in servicing the debt that they have accumulated in this province in two short years.

That is the total of a billion dollars of debt, part of it made up, over \$1 billion worth of debt accumulated over just two years — \$829 million we still owe as a principal debt, and we’ve paid over \$200 million, in interest, to servicing. If, as Premier Devine says, you can afford to mismanage Saskatchewan and still break even, what does this say about him and his members opposite?

Mr. Speaker, he said it, and he did it. The record is there for all to see. And what we have here is the failure of a dream. But unfortunately it’s a nightmare for a vast majority of Saskatchewan residents.

This is truly a Progressive Conservative budget. Things will get progressively worse for the vast majority of Saskatchewan residents, and that’s a conservative estimate.

Mr. Speaker, the range of decisions that society should take collectively, not only has increased, but is bound to go on increasing. That is the inevitable consequences of technological change, which increases the sophistication and the power of the tools we use. In doing so, it makes each of us even less an island, and more as a part of the main.

As we become interdependent, there are more and more things, from the rules of the road to pollution standards, from health standards to world peace, on which we must somehow agree. Or else we must oppose our wills in ways that are truly destructive of individual liberty and creativity as well as the productivity and the pleasantness of our society.

This agreement may come in a variety of ways, but it cannot come at all unless government plays a leading role in decision making. Because of this, the idea that government can be significantly contracted may be either an innocent illusion or a self-motivated sham.

But there is another part to this story. The distinction is between the role of government in leading the society into consensus decision and its role in doing things. This government has ignored the role of government in leading society to a consensus decisions. Rather it has chosen confrontation as the vehicle by which it will reorganize our society. Surely any government that truly cares about the people must uphold the concept of a social contract, which ensures that the rights of workers and the protection of social security and health benefits will be not eroded.

Yes, we have been conditioned by the present recession to believe that massive unemployment is somehow acceptable. And perhaps there are those who would in fact tolerate a high level of unemployment accompanied by safety nets of social insurance and welfare, which secure modest living standards for most of the employed. The loss is the sense of having a useful place in an essentially benign society.

The policies of this government in the past two years have created not only the sense that society is a haven for the privileged and the profit, but has done so by alienating those whom the society has no productive place. The requirement for sound economic policy is not, therefore, as this government has done, which is to slash expenditures. On the contrary, many of the programs that are being destroyed by this government are the necessary conditions for policy of encouraging productivity and economic growth. But perhaps the strongest indictment of this government is not what it has done. That is reprehensible. I want to say it's callous and it's uncaring, but worse, Mr. Speaker, is how it goes about doing these things.

This government's managerial style of which it is so proud of, is based on a number of factors. Inefficiency – and the record proves it. Deceit – this budget proves it. Delusion – their speakers illustrate it. Discord – their actions cause this.

What kind of society are they trying to achieve, Mr. Speaker? What is their goal and what are their ends?

Of one thing we can be sure. There is not a society . . . it is not a society of compromise, caring, compassion. No, Mr. Speaker, theirs is a cruel, a callous, uncaring, deceitful society.

How else, Mr. Speaker, can you explain the members opposite, as they talk glowingly about the opportunities they have created in this budget, when in reality, just to give one example, 400 men and women in Saskatchewan lost their livelihood the day after the budget.

I have searched elsewhere in the PC election program for that promise that they would, in fact, fire hundreds and hundreds of people. But I can't wait to say, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to find any of that in their literature. Why not, Mr. Speaker? Because they are following John Crosbie's political map. You know what John Crosbie said to the people of Canada. He said, "We won't tell you our policies, because if we did, we wouldn't get elected."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite may have fooled the people of Saskatchewan once, but they will have to go back to the people; and the members opposite, take a long look at your neighbour, because most of you won't be back after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the members opposite towards people, and towards public servants in particular, runs and seems to me counter to any philosophy of enlighten management participated and practised today.

How can you increase productivity, when your actions cause widespread paranoia and fear; when workers can only think, "Who's next?" What does that do to achieve satisfaction in a job well done in the workplace? When most enlightened managers are encouraging participation, discussion groups, consisting of both management and labour, you make your decisions in the veil of secrecy. You don't consult – you confront. You don't care – you fire. Where most people see their workplace as a long-term investment in human capital, you see them as a cost, a cost that can be reduced. And so you freeze the minimum wage, you freeze the workers' salaries, and you fire them.

Where most enlightened managers try to have company goals accepted as labour goals, where most enlightened managers see their workers as an essence of the firm, where regular social occasions serve to develop a deeper involvement and a sense of communication with the firm, your government, when it communicates, does so to chastise workers, to coerce workers, and to fire workers.

When decisions are . . . When decisions are everyone's concern, and not just the sole responsibility of management, such joint decision making reduces internal conflicts. In short, management should go to great lengths to maintain high levels of morale. And such a commitment by management to workers would then be reciprocated by productivity.

How does your government operate? Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, they don't consult. You don't have job decision making, you don't have high morale among the workers in the civil service. But then you don't care, because your solution is simply to fire them. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I should say, fire. I shouldn't say fire these people, because they aren't really fire. They are given an opportunity to serve a new boss. They could have freedom of choice in the private sector, they say. Freedom to choose a non-existent job is the choice that they have, freedom to join the long lines of the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, such a freedom should be granted to most of the members opposite. Perhaps then they would be able to comprehend the results of their actions. Compassion, caring, consideration, openness, trust, these words are foreign to this government's vocabulary. The words that describe their managerial philosophy are cruel, inconsiderate, closed, secretive and deceitful. Well, I've had some unpleasant things to say about this government, and surely no government would do things, do the kinds of things that I have outlined, just to vent their spite on a defenceless part of society.

Surely there must have been a rationale, a reason, why they are imposing so much hardship on so many, to benefit so few. Surely they must be achieving something.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the record, and it is available for all, produced for this government and paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. And I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I was somewhat surprised that they would provide us with the vehicle that condemns their actions in such a direct manner. But here it is, Mr. Speaker. They titled it *The Saskatchewan Promise*. This is the booklet produced by taxpayers' money, with the blue cover of the Tories, a document which they can send outside of Saskatchewan to tell us how good Saskatchewan is.

And I want to take a look at this. And I want to draw it to the attention of the members opposite, because obviously they haven't read it. And in here they have a section, "Growth – We Outperform." It says: —

The Canadian West has outperformed the rest of the country during the past decade, and has become a major North American growth centres continues to have a leading role in that regional industrial expansion. The province's compound annual rate of growth was 4.2 per cent between 1972 and 1982 . . . (the province's compound annual rate of growth was 4.2 per cent between 1972 and 1982) . . . compared to 2.7 per cent for Canada as a whole.

And it goes on and tells from 1972 until 1982. It says: —

The gross domestic product rose strongly from 3.4 billion in real terms in 1972 to 5.2 billion in 1982. Total personal income (it goes on to say) rose rapidly in the 10-year period from 2.8 billion to 12 billion, and per capita incomes have grown similarly, exceeding the national average.

“The value of commodity exports expanded four times to 6.5 billion by 1982.” And it says – you know what I says about population? The population jumped by almost 10 per cent in eight years to just under 1 million people by 1982. I want to say this is what we have been saying all along: that the strength of the economy of this province was developed during the 10, 11 years under Allan Blakeney.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — The evidence is being used by the Progressive Conservatives in documents they send out in Saskatchewan. Outside of Saskatchewan the Tories tell the truth. Inside Saskatchewan they paint a different picture.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, from 1972 to 1982 we were a leader in Saskatchewan. The economy grew. It grew faster than Canada as a whole. This is the record, this is the document they send outside of Saskatchewan. That's called *The Saskatchewan Promise* and, as I say, in *The Saskatchewan Promise* we find that between '72 and '82 there were years of steady growth.

Where were the members opposite while this steady growth was taking place? I guess they were still dwelling in obscurity, the same obscurity, Mr. Speaker, that they will be returned to when they are forced to call the next election.

But there is more, Mr. Speaker, that *Saskatchewan Promise* has to say about the cost of living. In this document here it indicates again that we had a lower cost of living than almost anywhere in Canada during the years 1972 to '82 – not a bad place to live in under an NDP government. But there is more. What does *Saskatchewan Promise* have to say about responsible government and provincial debt? It says, and I quote: “The provincial government has long-standing reputation of fiscal responsibility and business-like management.” And those were the Blakeney years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — But there is more. And this is what it goes on to say: “Saskatchewan residents carry one of the lowest per capita debts in Canada and still enjoy an exceptional range of services.” Those were the years of 1972-82. What government had that reputation, Mr. Speaker? It was the NDP government. What government delivered that exceptional range of services? That was the NDP government.

But there's more in this document; much more. What does it say . . . What does *The Saskatchewan Promise* say about taxes? Well I'm going to quote what it says. It says, “Saskatchewan's tax level is competitive with other jurisdictions in North America.” And I ask, invite the members to take the budget address, to take the budget address, and if you look at the 1984 interprovincial comparison of personal taxes and charges, and I want to make it clear to everyone in Saskatchewan that the new government, the Tory government, has not altered in any shape or form the income tax structure of this province since they assumed office.

And if you look at the interprovincial comparison of personal taxes and charges, do you know what you find for a taxpayer with a total income of \$15,000 per annum? Do you know what you find? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm going to tell you. British Columbia, that right-winged, neo-conservative government of Mr. Bennett – well, a 15,000 income person in British Columbia pays \$329. If you go to Ontario, you pay \$357. If you go to Quebec, it's \$454. If

you go to New Brunswick, it's \$418; Nova Scotia, \$407; Prince Edward Island, \$378; Newfoundland, \$342; Saskatchewan, the lowest tax for those on the lower economic ladder. You know how much they pay? \$139. \$139. The lowest income tax for that wage earner anywhere in Canada and that occurred under the government of the NDP.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — They have grouped together in these tables provincial income tax, and then they have tax credits and rebates, and then they have health premiums, retail sales tax, and gasoline tax. And I want to say that Saskatchewan, there are no health premiums. And so, obviously, in Alberta, they have to pay a health premium there of \$336. That same person, on a 15,000 total income would have to pay \$170 in income tax in Alberta, plus he'd have to pay health premiums of \$336, for a total of \$506 as compared to \$84 here in Saskatchewan. Now, that's performance. And that occurred. And it occurred under an NDP government.

We can go on in these tables similarly for total income of 25,000, and if you take in the items of provincial income tax, the tax credit and rebates, health premiums, retail sales, gasoline tax, again you find, for the 25,000 a year earnings per annum, that Saskatchewan is second only to Alberta. And that was the structure of reasonable taxation that was built up in this province. Saskatchewan was indeed a pretty good place to live from 1977 to 1982. And your brochure, this here, that's *The Saskatchewan Promise*, clearly illustrates the benefits of the NDP administration.

I want to say that during those years there was high growth. There was increasing population. There was a low cost of living. There was a low provincial debt. There was a competitive tax level.

Mr. Speaker, two years have passed. *The Saskatchewan Promise* is but a memory now. There is a new message. Perhaps you would put out a new issue of *The Saskatchewan Promise*. And, perhaps, with apologies to John Milton, you could call it "Saskatchewan's Paradise Lost."

Because, what would it say about our province under the Tory administration? Well, first of all, growth declined 4.6 per cent in 1982. There was a sharp decline in investment in 1982. Employment and manufacturing fell in 1982. But not everything went down. There has been a sharp increase in unemployment; there has been a sharp increase in bankruptcies; there has been a tragically large increase in the welfare load; and we know how the government has reacted to this. The cost of living went up, Mr. Speaker, and this, of course, in large part was due to the huge utility rate increases imposed by the Tory government. "Not so," say the members opposite, "we have reduced your costs by removing the sales tax from the utility bills."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, first they raised the utility bills three or four times the size of the E&H tax, and then they turned around and give a tiny reduction. This is the Progressive Conservative approach – progressively larger increases, followed by a small conservative refund. The members think the best way to make friends is to do something terrible, and then to make a small amend.

Well, Mr. Speaker, surely there is something good we can say about their performance. Surely something hasn't gone up. What about taxes? They say they haven't raised taxes, and I ask, is this true? Well, let's look at one area and examine how they have performed in the area of tax relief. Let's take a look at education. Let's look at issues of concern in the area of education.

We know that some of the members opposite are concerned, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the member of Regina North West is concerned – concerned enough to put a large advertisement in the *Leader-Post* saying he was concerned, but unfortunately, although he is concerned, truly concerned, he seems unable to do anything about these concerns.

Mr. Speaker, how does this government hold down taxes? Well, it doesn't. It merely transfers the

March 29, 1984

burden to other members of society and the municipal governments. Its tax policies are designed to shield the wealthy, to expand privileges at the expense of the ordinary Saskatchewan citizens.

This budget speaks in glowing terms of its commitment to education, and I want to say that the stark reality is a message of great contrast. For over 30 per cent of the people in this province, in the two major cities of Saskatoon and Regina, this budget means massive tax increases for education at the local level.

Is there an increase in the Saskatoon public school grant? The answer – no, there is not. Is there an increase in Saskatoon separate school grant? No, there is not. Is there an increase in the Regina public school grant? No, there is not. Is there an increase in the Regina separate school grant? No, there is not. The public schools in both Saskatoon and Regina are getting less in real dollars this year, over last year, of about \$1.3 million to \$1.4 million. The respective separate schools are down almost \$1 million, in respect to the revenue that they had the previous year.

I want to say that it's not even a hold-the-line budget. These school boards will have less funds, as they indicate, this year than last. And even though they face higher bills for utilities imposed by this government, and other items caused by government policies, so much for this government's commitment to the quality of education.

We find throughout this province that school after school is being closed in the cities. Where school-boards have indicated that they would not, in fact, have closed the school if, indeed, they had sufficient funding. I want to say that they have cut back in maintenance. They have cut back in resource material. Education has been cut to the bone in this province. There's been no – they say no tax increase. Well the only way that the quality of education can be maintained is for to pass the tax to the local cities, towns, and villages, and farms throughout this province.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what the budget says the record of this government, the actions of this government are there for all to see. Power rates up 25 per cent, and another increase coming. Natural gas costs up 13 per cent. Telephone rates up 19 per cent. Bus fares and express charges up 18 per cent. Nursing home rates up 15 per cent, and now they increase automatically every three months. SGI deductible up \$500, to \$500 – a 43 per cent increase. And SGI premiums up by over 8 per cent.

This is restraint, Tory style restraint. But it's not our idea of restraint, Mr. Speaker. Our idea of restraint is equal sacrifice by all. Not the many, sacrificing for the benefits of the few.

I, for one, do not believe that the era of the pioneer is at an end. I only believe that the era for pioneering has changed. The period of geographical pioneering is largely finished. But, Mr. Speaker, the period of social pioneering is only at its beginning. And, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. The same qualities of heroism, and faith, and vision that were required to bring the forces of nature into subjection will be required in even more measure to bring under proper control the forces of modern society. Mr. Speaker, governments have a responsibility for this pioneering, and consequently the proper use of the complex forces of modern society.

When we talk of forces in modern society, Mr. Speaker, what are we talking about? And what we are really, in fact, talking about is power. There's an old truism about power. First you get power, then you use it, then you abuse it, and then, finally, you lose it. The members opposite might reflect on what level they have reached.

Mr. Speaker, our success or failure in whatever office we hold will be determined by how we applied that power – that is, the application of the power that has been entrusted to us. I think we have to ask, as politicians: were we truly men of courage? Were we truly men of judgement? Were we truly men of integrity? Were we truly men of dedication? Or have we become the servants in thought or in action of the power we created to serve us? Have we become the victims, not the masters of our history, allowing blind suspicion and emotion to control our



destiny? Have we abandoned the truth in favour of the myth – the persistent myth, the persuasive myth, the unrealistic myth? Have we chosen to hold fast to the clichés and the slogans of the past? Do we now enjoy the comfort of opinion to the vigours of thought? Do we believe that destiny is not a matter of choice, but should be left to chance – that we should wait on destiny rather than to go out and to achieve it?

Mr. Speaker, this budget has illustrated profoundly how the members opposite see the future of this province. It is not a pleasant picture they paint. It is a society that exploits the many to benefit a few, a society that seeks to pit neighbour against neighbour, city against farm, labour against management. We ask: why? Because, and I quote again from *The Saskatchewan Promise*, and it says there, “We are determined to prove that Saskatchewan is one of the most attractive business locations in North America.” So little for people, so little for society. Those lines, I think, say it all.

And then they have the nerve to recite the litany, Mr. Speaker. They have the nerve to say that they are creating freedoms here in Saskatchewan – preserving freedoms from the NDP. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only freedom the NDP would destroy is the freedom of the few to exploit the many.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — The only people who need to fear the New Democratic Party are those who live by exploiting the misery of others. The people of Saskatchewan are already talking about the pre-election days. They’re talking about the golden era of prosperity that is so eloquently set out in *The Saskatchewan Promise*. I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan who, out of their hardships and suffering, have learned to work together for their mutual advantage; the people of Saskatchewan who have created the great province through individual initiative and mutual co-operation; these people, I predict . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I must caution members who are not in their seats that they cannot participate in debate. Proceed.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — These people, Mr. Speaker, will reject the politics of misery, the politics of confrontation, as your prescription for their future. They will look once again for a new deal for people. They will look for another decade of progress from ’72 to ’82 – a new dimension of purpose with an NDP government.

The people of Saskatchewan believe that the real measure of individual and social progress is the quality of life of all – what we do for the least fortunate of our fellow citizens and what opportunities we provide for all of our people to live useful and meaningful lives. The people of Saskatchewan will weigh this budget and find it wanting in its sensitivity to the rights and the needs of others.

The people of Saskatchewan know that the manner of giving shows the character of the giver, more than the gift itself. The people of Saskatchewan know that he who is not generous with that which he gives deceives himself when he thinks he would be more generous if he indeed had more. The people of Saskatchewan know that it is not what we give, but what we share, for the gift without the giver is indeed bare. The people of Saskatchewan know that there is a better way than the exploitation of man by man. They seek a way of life that would firmly teach that we are indeed our brothers’ keepers.

The future has two faces. The members opposite choose to face the future with confrontation; we chose compromise. The members opposite choose to face the future with fear; we choose co-operation. We know, Mr. Speaker, what the people will choose. The people of Saskatchewan will choose men who are not blinkered by blind traditions of the past, the men who rely on old fears, old rivalries, all wrapped up in the same old tired slogans.

The people of -Saskatchewan will reject this budget and its attempt to return to the past that never was. They will reject the motto emblazoned on this budget of "every man for himself." Rather, people of Saskatchewan will choose to look to the future: a future of unknown opportunities; a future of unfulfilled hopes; a future of new challenges; a future of unresolved problems; — a future in which the slogan will be: "All for the common cause, the brotherhood of man," and where we will find light in health and human kindness.

The people of Saskatchewan will choose to join their hands, their hearts, and their minds to work together to solve these problems, and with that common purpose we will build a future that will be better than today — and a future that will be even better for our children.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this budget serves only to mortgage the future, and accordingly, I will support the amendment and vote against the original motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please.

I'd just like to advise the Assembly that I've authorized the government services photographer — photo arts photographer, rather — to be in the Chamber for a brief time this evening.

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed a pleasure to rise in this budget debate that I believe will be setting down . . . History will be made in the province of Saskatchewan because of this budget. It's with a great deal of satisfaction that I join in this historic debate on the budget presented to this Assembly by the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Bob Andrew.

Before I present the details of Highways and Transportation budget, a few comments on the budget address, I believe, Mr. Speaker, are in order.

First of all, I would like to refer to the Leader of the Opposition claim that nowhere in the budget speech is there any reference to highways. Well, tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about highways, and I would really appreciate if the Leader of the Opposition would pay very, very close attention. He may be surprised at what I will be announcing, because he has implied, by his comments after the Minister of Finance's speech the other night, that nothing is to happen in highways. Well, believe me, Mr. Speaker, we have some information for the Leader of the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan tonight.

In his speech on the budget debate, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition even went so far as to call me the Minister of Pot-holes. Well, that's his prerogative, Mr. Speaker.

Contrary to the Leader of the Opposition's stereotyped approach to government, the riding quality — and I know this will be hard for them to understand, Mr. Speaker — on Saskatchewan highways has improved in the last two years. He even stated to the media that there was a freeze on highway construction. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, the only freeze on highway construction is in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition and the NDP party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — The announcements that I will make tonight will prove the opposite. There is plenty of action in Highways, and in the coming months our program will help fuel the economy of the province of Saskatchewan. The only heat loss that will be experienced will be most likely, Mr. Speaker, from members opposite.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, to the budget itself, I would like to say that this budget can be

described as prudent, practical, and forward-looking. Probably an even better way to describe this budget is to say that it is brilliant. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the budget put forth by the Hon. Robert Andrew is brilliant in its own right. There are those that have tried to tarnish the quality of this budget by claiming its direction comes from polling the population. For those that think this is bad, I have some news that I would relate to them. The Minister of Finance in the province of Saskatchewan has pioneered the pre-budget consultation process, not only in this province, but in Canada.

The budget is a direct result of asking the people of Saskatchewan what they think is needed from their government. This is a philosophy that we practise every day in Highways and Transportation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — To say this budget is a product of some pollster's crystal ball is misleading. What really is being said is that this budget speaks to the needs and aspirations of Saskatchewan people. Cannot think of a better way to lead government than to tap the resources of ideas that Saskatchewan people can offer. After all, I believe the finest people in the world live in our province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — The Hon. Robert Andrew has lived up the saying, and he has . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I would caution the minister that he call the minister as the Minister of Finance, or the member from Kindersley, but not use names in the assembly.

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, then the Minister of Finance, I believe, has displayed leadership and forward planning in presenting this budget to the people of Saskatchewan.

I would now like to turn my comments to the theme of my speech tonight, that being: new transportation leadership for the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, this is a theme that I first introduced to Western Canada Roadbuilders Convention in February. It was well received then, and I would like to touch on a few major points now.

Over one year ago, my department started in a new direction. At that time, the Highways and Transportation function had just been centralized. The Crow debate was at a fever pitch. The Minister of Finance had just introduced a budget that would guide us through our first full financial year. My department was getting ready to introduce major legislation regarding the new Vehicles Act, 1983. Well, it has been one full year now, Mr. Speaker, and needless to say, much has been accomplished.

But I should add that there is a new set of challenges on the horizon. As a people, we stand ready to capitalize on the future by expanding on our natural resource advantages. As a government, we have set realistic goals, and Highways and Transportation is now prepared to challenge the aftermath of Bill C-155 that did away with the Crow rate.

Mr. Speaker, I should just, maybe, stray from my prepared text there for a minute just to clarify to the people of Saskatchewan, to the members of this Assembly, who really did away with the Crow rate. I think we have to clarify this. This is very important, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to point out that we had, under the Joe Clark government, a minister of transportation, from western Canada, Mr. Don Mazankowski. If Mr. Don Mazankowski would have been in Ottawa in the last couple of years, the Crow rate wouldn't have died. But . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, we hear the member from Pelly saying that he was the author of that. Well, I have to disagree, Mr. Speaker, because after all it

was the NDP that defeated the Clark government and that elected Pierre Elliott Trudeau as Prime Minister of Canada. Without a doubt, without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, that is where the fault lies. It wasn't the Devine government that elected a Liberal government in Ottawa. It wasn't the Devine government at all. We have tried to fight it. But after all, it was the NDP that brought down the Joe Clark government; it was the NDP that destroyed the Crow rate for the farmers in western Canada. And we have to clarify that record here tonight, Mr. Speaker.

In the field of transportation, now is the time, I believe, Mr. Speaker, to be aggressive. Now is the time to review our commitment to delivering the best possible transportation system. In order to succeed, this new transportation leadership that I speak of must recognize that there are a few ingredients necessary for success. First, we must realize that people expect government to get back to basics. People expect government to be a partner in growth and development, not the lone player. Second, we must realize, that people, Mr. Speaker, want smarter government, not bigger government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Third, people want their options to be listened to and acted upon. No longer, Mr. Speaker, do people feel the experts have all the answers. People rightly feel that the strong sense of community that prevails in Saskatchewan is the best resource in dealing with the challenge of the 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, as my comments progress tonight, this common theme of new transportation leadership will show itself in many ways. I'm sure that members of this Assembly will appreciate the commitment to a new transportation leadership that I pledge in this budget address tonight.

Before, Mr. Speaker, I would like to review some of the accomplishments of the department over the last year. From the onset I made a commitment last year to start every construction project that I announced. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to tell this Assembly that the construction project listing I tabled one year ago can be considered a starting list of well over 80 grading, surfacing, oil treatment, and grovelling projects announced. Work has commenced on them all. A promise made, Mr. Speaker, by this government, and a promise kept. That is very important to the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Just to continue on a bit on that point, Mr. Speaker: when I became the Minister of Transportation in this province, I inherited a project array, and it was undoubtedly another smoke-screen by the previous government in power. Seven out of any 10 roads that they tabled in the Assembly that spring for construction projects, there was not funding for them. The map which I still have in my office, Mr. Speaker, which I ask anyone in the province of Saskatchewan to come in and see, many of these roads – some of the roads that I will be announcing tonight – there was zero per cent completion. And what this means, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP, when they were government, got up and announced a great project array – pages and pages of roads. But in reality, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't funding in place, number one, to build the roads. They had no intentions of building the roads; they just were trying to lead the people down the garden path.

Mr. Speaker, on April 26, 1982, Mr. Speaker, something else was proved. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time, and the people beat the NDP party in the province of Saskatchewan that night.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, we did complete every project we announced last year, and when I table this project array after my remarks here tonight, I make that commitment to the

people of Saskatchewan. Every project that is announced in there, the funding is in place for it, and those projects will be started in 1984. No misleading the people of Saskatchewan by the Devine administration.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — In keeping with the same commitment, Mr. Speaker, we did rewrite the new Vehicles Act for the people of Saskatchewan, only after we had consulted with them first. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that with the introduction of the new Vehicles Act, and the increased awareness that it has created, accidents and deaths in Saskatchewan showed an encouraging decline. Less people died on our roads in Saskatchewan. This is an undeniable fact – one in which we can all be proud of.

In the fields of weights and measures and dimensions, we extended winter weights to the grid road system – a request made by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. Once again, another indication of our government listening to the needs of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we commenced construction of the new Borden bridge, a facility that has been sadly needed – that will be a great asset to Highway 16, otherwise known as the Yellowhead Route. Our internal privatization measures resulted in savings, Mr. Speaker, of up to 25 per cent last year. Mr. Speaker, that was money that we ploughed right back into road construction for the people of Saskatchewan.

We also introduced triple-trailer truck hauls between Saskatoon and Regina that resulted in savings to the trucking industry and also to the Saskatchewan consumer.

In response to the transportation needs of the North, Mr. Speaker, we once again constructed the winter road to Uranium City, and I will say it was a very successful venture, and over 400 vehicles did go in or out of Uranium City to assist those people from the North.

For the first time in history of the department, I introduced a new winter maintenance policy, Mr. Speaker. This policy has standardized winter road surveillance and snow removal on a seven-day a week, 24-hour basis. Prior to this policy, winter maintenance was based on the five-day work week, and we all know, Mr. Speaker, that with Mother Nature it doesn't just snow or it doesn't just rain or the winds don't just blow Monday through to Friday.

I can say that by introducing this, we went to seven-day road surveillance in the province of Saskatchewan, and we're still within our budget limitations – just one more indication of the employees and the type of people that work for the Department of Highways and Transportation, and their care about the road system in the province of Saskatchewan.

Another progressive step was realized this year when VIA Rail service was reinstated between Winnipeg, Melville, and Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker. This time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the members of Transport 2000 for their tireless efforts in creating this change in federal policy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to work with this group and assist them in finally having this necessary service once again in operation, not only for Saskatchewan, but for all Canadian citizens.

This past year, Mr. Speaker, I chaired the school bus safety review committee, in conjunction with the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association. Mr. Speaker, this committee was born of tragedy. However, the efforts of this committee has raised the level of awareness in

March 29, 1984

Saskatchewan regarding school bus safety and the movement of our children in this province. In our first interim report, a number of recommendations have been put forward, and the fruits of our efforts will soon come to bear with the province's first school bus driver training book. As well, we introduced for the first time a school bus warning sign, telling motorists they must stop when school bus lights are flashing, no matter what direction you are approaching the bus.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer back again to what the Leader of the Opposition has to say about signs. This is a poor sign to me, that the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we not warn motorists that they must stop when school buses are flashing. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to certain sections of the Leader of the Opposition's speech.

In keeping with first for Canada, Mr. Speaker, we recently introduced personalized farm plates for farm vehicles. Now, it maybe doesn't sound like much of an issue, but it was the year before that we introduced personalized licence plates for the people of Saskatchewan, giving them the opportunity to identify their own vehicle. This spring we have gone one step further and, I am very proud to say, we have the first personalized farm licence plate, not only in Saskatchewan, not only in western Canada, but in Canada as a whole –just another step of letting people do what they want to do in a province without a government, a socialist attitude of total suppression.

This past year, Mr. Speaker, we honoured seat belt survivor number 2,000. The government is committed to the principle of seat belts, Mr. Speaker, and I am very pleased that this program, when it was introduced, we have continued along. And it has saved many lives in the province of Saskatchewan.

On the construction side, I participated, on behalf of the province, in the opening of the Circle Drive Bridge in Saskatoon, and the opening of the final leg of the Lewvan Drive in Regina, late this fall.

Mr. Speaker, up grading of No. 11 Highway was started, and we completed dust-free surfacing on the Red Coat Trail from border to border. We completed the extension of four lanes from Swift Current to west of Webb on the Trans-Canada. Four-laning between Indian Head and Qu'Appelle started last year on the Trans-Canada and the last section of shoulder widening on the Yellowhead Route between Maidstone and Paynton was also started. You can understand, Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a busy year for Highways and Transportation, despite what the critics would like the people of Saskatchewan to believe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now to talk about some new initiatives for 1984. Before I get into the program highlights of the department, there are several new initiatives that I would briefly like to touch upon. The first is the proposed legislation regarding all-terrain vehicles and the recently released white paper on that.

Mr. Speaker, the vehicles in question have been growing in popularity in recent years, and the result of that has been an alarming increase in deaths associated with these vehicles and, especially, with our young people. On March 15, I released a white paper that is looking for ideas from the people of Saskatchewan on how we can ensure that the recreational value of these vehicles is not ruined by loss of life. In the last three years, Mr. Speaker,, we have had 14 deaths. These deaths occurred in the age of children under 16 years of age. This is a threat, Mr. Speaker, I believe, to our greatest resource – that resource being our children in the province of Saskatchewan.

It is not the intent, Mr. Speaker, of this government to strangle people's right to enjoy all-terrain vehicles. What we ask of people is that respect for property and life be maintained and honoured. It is my hope that the public consultation process we are employing with this white paper will establish certain ground rules that we can all agree upon. Hopefully we will stem this tragic loss of life we have witnessed it he past few years and, at the same time, allow the full

recreational value of these vehicles to be enjoyed.

Another major initiative that will result in legislation before this Assembly has to do with the transportation of dangerous goods. Recently I released a discussion paper on this matter, again, with a view to stimulating people's comments and opinions on how best to designate and mark the routes where dangerous goods will be transported in our province. There is federal legislation, Mr. Speaker, that is in place, that we will adopt to suit our needs. Still it is important that the industry and the people of Saskatchewan have the opportunity to openly discuss just exactly how they interpret this legislation.

Another working committee that will be canvassing the province for ideas is the truck advisory committee on equipment standards and inspections. This committee will be holding public meetings throughout the province in the coming months to examine how truck equipment and inspections can be upgraded.

This committee, Mr. Speaker, will be chaired by my able Legislative Secretary, the member from Rosthern, and includes many members from the trucking industry. These people are not, Mr. Speaker – and I would emphasize that – not political appointments. They are experts in the trucking business and the trucking field.

In the area of driver safety, a pilot project is under way with driver education students in Saskatoon. This program allows those students who complete a driver education course to receive a valid driver's licence without taking the traditional written and driving examination administered by the government. If this pilot project is successful, Mr. Speaker, we will consider the possibility of offering this province wide.

In the area of re-regulation in the trucking industry, I look forward to more re-regulation measures that will streamline the current body of regulations, and better assist the trucking industry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we hear the member opposite talk about, it's going to put some truckers out of business. I have yet to have a trucker in the province of Saskatchewan contact myself, and or any of my colleagues, regarding going out of business in the province of Saskatchewan.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, that I have had some communication with not only trucking firms, but construction firms, road building firms, and Mr. Speaker, guess where they're from: the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the truckers aren't going broke in the province of Saskatchewan with a Conservative government. But, let me tell you, not only the trucking industry has problems in Manitoba; the road building industry has problems in Manitoba, and it's because of their socialist government, and their socialist attitude that they don't believe in private enterprise working with government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — In the past year, Mr. Speaker, we have already made significant improvements in speeding up the process of granting operating authorities. This fact alone indicates that we are making progress in this area, and further productive measures are being planned by the board now.

In terms of aviation in the province, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to offer our support to Norcanair in their bid to provide better air service to north-west Saskatchewan. This growing part of the province needs to be linked to the hub of the Saskatchewan aviation scene.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that what has been done represents a

March 29, 1984

restructuring of the highways and transportation function in the province of Saskatchewan. The co-ordination of transportation services in Saskatchewan rests with our department. We have decided to shift the emphasis from public sector to the private sector.

In truth this represents a clear and distinctive difference in philosophy from the previous government. We are prepared to accept responsibility, and I defend this action based on our responsibility, and my responsibility as the Minister of Transportation in the Saskatchewan, to the taxpayers in the province of Saskatchewan.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Irresponsibility.

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — “Irresponsibility,” Mr. Speaker, the critic for Highways and Transportation, the MLA from Pelly, says: “irresponsibility.” Well, Mr. Speaker, I noticed we have a few guests in the gallery tonight, and he would maybe like to tell them. And I notice we have some road builders and road construction operators in the province of Saskatchewan in the galleries tonight. Maybe the member would like to tell them that we should spend more of their tax dollars to build that same mile of road. That’s the NDP way, not this way that we are doing it right now. You tell that . . . Mr. Speaker, the member opposite can tell that also to the road builders. Tell that to them, that they can’t build the roads cheaper than the public sector. You tell them, don’t tell me.

Mr. Speaker, tonight by the time we finish the project array, you will see an increase in the transportation budget, an increase in grading projects, and part of that comes about because of turning work over to the private sector. And instead of spending \$100,000 to build a certain section of road, it can now be built for \$75,000. Mr. Speaker, that represents saving \$25,000, a 25 per cent average cost.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to run the government like a business . . . Not political patronage – running the Department of Highways and Transportation like a business – something that members opposite will not agree with. But I think it was very clear that on April 26, 1982, the people of Saskatchewan opted for a political party, a government, that will run this operation like a business, not as something that is just to give it away and continue it on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, we hear the members opposite complaining about a deficit. You know, on one hand they say, “Big deficit,” but they say, “Don’t cut any programs.” Well, the money just doesn’t fall out of the sky, Mr. Speaker, it has to come from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. We have a deficit that is lower than the deficit of last year.

We have, Mr. Speaker . . . And that brings me to another point. My good friend, the Minister of Labour . . . In April ’82 to September of ’83, Mr. Speaker, there were 45,000 more people in the work-force in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, the opposition would claim doom and gloom, 45,000 more people came into the work-force in that period; more than any period under the NDP administration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, back to the . . . I guess we have a difference in philosophy. The savings that we generated so far amount to \$2.5 million, and, Mr. Speaker, we have ploughed that money right back into the highway system in the province of Saskatchewan. Now, that will build approximately – approximately – 25 kilometres more road with these type of savings. I think the people of Saskatchewan want to see more roads being built, and more efficient use of their tax dollar. Well, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite said there wasn’t any built last year; it’s quite obvious that he was riding round in the same car as the former minister of highways that I don’t think even left his farm, because . . . I could read you the project array from last year, but once again, Mr. Speaker, I believe we have to be positive. We will let the opposition deal with the doom and gloom.



Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan, I believe, deserve a well-run government, and Highways and Transportation is no exception. I believe it is well run. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my department staff for their professional and dignified manner in which they have accepted and understood this fundamental decision.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, along with my Deputy Minister, and his staff, and the district engineers, that we have one of the best group of people serving the needs of the people of Saskatchewan, bar none. The realignment . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the expertise and talent that is over at Humford House is known throughout the province of Saskatchewan, and throughout Canada. I'm confident that in coming years, the major realignment, Mr. Speaker, that we undertook in Highways, will be of benefit to all concerned. We have completed that final realignment, and I'm looking forward to working with that department's staff in the future.

Mr. Speaker, there have been rumours about other major realignments in the department. I would like to put those to rest right now. There will be no further realignments in the Department of Highways and Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on a matter of great importance to our province and to our country. Since losing the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker, the efforts of the government of Saskatchewan will continue to push the federal government for assistance to build roads. Whether that assistance comes forward or not, Mr. Speaker, we will pick up the challenge as the province of Saskatchewan, and make sure that those roads are in place.

Mr. Speaker, at no time in our history have we been faced with such an unknown. The rail and road relationship is the primary transportation system that serves our economic well-being. Messing around with this relationship is like playing with fire. The more you stoke it, Mr. Speaker, the hotter it gets and the greater chance you have of getting burned. It is not the intention of this government, Mr. Speaker, to let the people of Saskatchewan get burnt by not providing them with an efficient transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch a bit on traffic safety tonight. Before I close, I think it is important to mention the need for continuing traffic safety measures in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we have brought in a new Vehicles Act, introduced a white paper on all-terrain vehicles, introduced discussion papers on transportation of dangerous goods, and legislation will be following this spring.

Mr. Speaker, in 1983, as I have said earlier, we have witnessed an encouraging decline in accident statistics. There were five less deaths in the province of Saskatchewan in 1983 compared to 1982, Mr. Speaker. I believe this suggests the direction we are going with safety-related issues is very important, and is working.

We must continue, Mr. Speaker, with new and innovative programs that will emphasize that driving is a right, not a privilege, and I would like to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan, that this accident statistic and fatal reports are going in the right direction, and that is down.

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to turn to announcing to this Assembly the construction projects planned for the upcoming year. I will table a list of this construction projects for this Assembly. I should add, when detailing these highlights, that compared to last year, total surfacing projects are listened at 47 for a total distance of 562 kilometres. This is up by 23 projects, and combined with oil treatment there will be a 22.5 per cent increase over last year.

This overall increase in total kilometres compared to last year is a 15 per cent increase in grading, paving, and oil treatment projects. I should also add that we have increased the rural surface transportation budget from 91.275 million to 99.050 million, or an 8 per cent increase.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — The total budget for the department, Mr. Speaker, is \$222,400,030 with \$79,588,650 allotted to maintenance and \$110 million for capital programs. Mr. Speaker, you and the people of Saskatchewan will note that there is no decrease in our overall budget and no decrease in maintenance, or on the capital program as some of the members opposite would have us believe.

These allocations demonstrate this government's commitment to the role of transportation and the economic development of this province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a respectable budget. Last year British Columbia's budget was down 23 per cent, Alberta's budget was down, Manitoba's budget was down. Once again this year, British Columbia's budget is down in transportation, Alberta's budget is down in transportation, and I imagine as soon as the Manitoba budget is tabled in the legislature, you will notice from that . . . The transportation budget in western Canada — Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, will have the number one transportation budget in western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, specific projects now: I would like to announce that the people of Lloydminster and area will be pleased to learn that we will be proceeding with the construction of the meridian bridge this year. This project has . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, we are getting a reaction from the opposition already, you know, said no highway construction, no bridge construction. Minute we announce one program, now they start laughing, Mr. Speaker. Well, we'll have a few more for them to laugh at tonight and I'll proceed to those right away.

This project, Mr. Speaker, on the meridian bridge, did give us some difficulty in certain engineering aspects. But Mr. Speaker, the announcement tonight is evidence that the meridian bridge will soon become a reality. Mr. Speaker, grading and surfacing will commence on Highway 363 west of Moose Jaw, at a total cost of over \$2 million, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say thank you to Mr. Keith Parker . . . MLAs from Moose Jaw, and just some people that I believe, Mr. Speaker, this road means an awful lot to. You know, we have people here from Moose Jaw. I will just read out some of the names, Mr. Speaker. You know, the members opposite may still laugh when we announce some of these roads. These aren't roads, Mr. Speaker, that Jim Garner selected or that the department selected. Once again we have them laughing, Mr. Speaker. That's how serious, that's how concerned they are, about people and roads. Well Mr. Speaker, there's a bit of difference, there's a bit of difference.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Get on with it.

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — "Get on with it," yes, well we're going to get on with it, Mr. Speaker. We've had people, Mr. Speaker, drive in a 150, 250, 300 miles, to hear the transportation speech and find out about roads that are being built. Roads, Mr. Speaker, that they requested, the people requested. Now, I can see why it upsets the opposition, because I'll be announcing a road here shortly, a stretch of road that they wanted to build — the NDP — by a certain cabinet minister's farm. But when I announce it, you're going to notice . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, that former NDP cabinet minister isn't going to get that road built by his farm. The road is going to be built, Mr. Speaker, where the people want the road to be built, not where some political persuasion, some cabinet minister wants a road built by his farm.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to just another road: that's Highway 13 — it's the highway known as the Red Coat Trail. Paving and grading will take place south-west, Mr. Speaker, of Eastend, at a cost of over \$2 million. You know, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could identify an MLA that needed and requested this road. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, where the request come from, and I should mention them all, but I notice the mayor of Eastend, my good friend Ted Gleim . . . He called me about the problems they were having on that road down there; went down to meet with him; took a look at the road. Took a look at that road, Mr. Speaker, and it needs rebuilding, Mr. Speaker, this road is going to be constructed, Mr. Speaker, at a cost of \$2,100,000.

Now, once again, Mr. Speaker, this just proves my point. Members opposite can laugh. I didn't want this road. The department didn't want this road. Mr. Speaker, the people wanted this road. Mr. Speaker, tonight, the people from Eastend, and the people from the Red Coat Trail are getting this road constructed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, I also notice, you know, it was in the Leader of the Opposition's speech the other day, and I will quote: —

I invite anyone to drive on Highway 13. That's the one in which the Minister of Highways, with great fanfare, put signs all along, calling it the Red Coat Trail. And all I wish is that he would understand that this doesn't mean that he has to keep it a trail.

And believe you me, that's all it is in some of these parts, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I didn't want to put the signs up on the Red Coat Trail. It was the executive and the Red Coat Trail, themselves. And I think of another member, Mr. Levesque, Mr. Shields from the Red Coat Trail, they came in and asked for the signs to be put up.

Let me just tell you one other thing, Mr. Speaker. I said, "Sure, you can call it the Red Coat Trail," but guess which province hasn't got their signs up yet, Mr. Speaker? Just guess . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The province of Manitoba, because they are still going the socialist way. Unless it's their idea, don't listen to the people, Mr. Speaker — another example.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue upgrading the old lanes of Highway No. 11 with a 15-kilometre section between Findlater and Disley, starting this year at a cost of \$2,450,000. Mr. Speaker, just another commitment, another commitment for this government in twinning highways, rebuilding old highways, roads that people requested, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to turn now to another one. I guess we could call this the "Reggie Gross Show" — we might as well call it what it is. But this here is the section, Highway 43 between Vanguard and Pambrun. A 17-kilometre stretch will be reconstructed at a cost of \$1,770,000, Mr. Speaker, once again by the MLA from Morse, our MLA, a working MLA that has worked with the people from Morse. I'm very pleased to announce that road for them here tonight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the road that I referred to before with the former minister of tourism wanted to have a little jog in it. Bring it down two miles and have it run by his farm. Why, I don't know. And, Mr. Speaker, I received petitions and letters from the people saying, "No, we don't want the road there." When, I said, you've got no problems because I'm not going to build a road where the people don't want it. Tonight they have their road. It's not by Mr

March 29, 1984

Gross's farm. I'm sorry Mr. Gross. But it's going where the people want the roads, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, we have Highway 38 from Greenwater Provincial Park to Chelan. A 26-kilometre section will be reconstructed at a cost of \$2,720,000. On Highway 3, from Erwood to Hudson Bay, a 13.4-kilometre section will be reconstructed at a \$1.9 million expenditure, you know. Well, Mr. Speaker, once again these people have come in to hear about roads; roads that they requested, Mr. Speaker, roads that they've asked for, roads that we will build. I make that commitment to you here tonight.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, Highway 12, from Shell Lake south, a 20.71-kilometre section will be graded at a cost of \$1.8 million. Once again, representation from people in that area to their MLAs, to myself, and that section of road will cost \$1.8 million. Mr. Speaker, we also have another road. Well, we even have a few more than one or two more roads, Mr. Speaker. Highway 15, Mr. Speaker, east of Punnichy, a 19-kilometre section will be graded at a cost of \$1,900,000. Once again, the mayor, the R.M. have requested this road to their MLA, to myself. Road asked for, government providing them with the funds. The road builders will be here to build it. A promise made, Mr. Speaker, another promise kept.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, we have on Highway No. 8, a 17-kilometre section from the junction of Highway 22 south, be graded at a cost of \$1.3 million. Highway No. 38, south of Kelvington, a 14-kilometre section will be graded at a cost of \$900,000.

Mr. Speaker, I turn to a road that isn't there yet, but I've received an awful lot of letters and an awful lot of input from the people of Saskatchewan. And it's kind of a little unique tonight, Mr. Speaker, because one of the MLA's up there tells me that he's celebrating his 31st birthday.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am quite proud to announce tonight, to the people of Saskatchewan: in 1984 a 10-mile section east of Wakaw, at a cost of \$1.6 million will be started, and will be built. Once again, I've received in the area of about 800-900 letters from the people of Saskatchewan, from the people from that area, requesting the road. It's been surveyed I don't know how many times by the previous government. I mean, if I've had one person in my office telling me, you know just before every election, Jim, they'd go out there and pound a bunch of stakes in with flags on.

Mr. Speaker, we're not going to go out there and punch a – pound a bunch of stakes in and put a bunch of flags up. Mr. Speaker, we're going to build that road for the people this year.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, as I've said, these are just a few highlights of our program. I should add that we will be completing the paving of the four-lane extension of the Trans-Canada between Indian Head and Qu'Appelle. It is estimated this new portion will be opened in late August of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make one more important fact known regarding the extension of the four-lane highway system. In our three years, Mr. Speaker, we have averaged nine miles per year of completed four-lane extension. This compares to six miles per year average by the previous administration. Now, they tell us we're not building any roads. We're ahead of them in four-laning. But the big thing is, Mr. Speaker, the one big factor that we have, and that we will continue to have . . . We are building roads for people, not for politicians, but for people, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, in wrapping up this budget address of mine, I would like to first pay a tribute to some very hard-working people in the province of Saskatchewan, and that being the road builders of the province of Saskatchewan. They have made a significant contribution in building the economic foundation of this province, in bringing us to where we are today with transportation needs.

Their efforts are being recognized by this government, and we will continue to respect their very valuable contribution to the transportation system in our province. Their competitive spirit must not be suffocated, it must be harnessed and given the rein to be the real engine of growth in our province. And our province welcomes the Saskatchewan road building industry very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, in preparing this speech, many thoughts crossed my mind as to how I would bring to a successful close. In many ways this speech is an extension of the Minister of Finance's, given last week. Therefore, I think it is appropriate that I close with a quote from the Minister of Finance's speech: —  
 . . . now is the time for new ideas. At the national and international levels, economies are in a period of accelerated change. The boundaries of competitive advantage are being redrawn daily, with the scales tipping in favour of those who can accept and harness change. As a nation, the imminent change we face in our political leadership may provide the necessary stimulus to seek new approaches.

As a province, Mr. Speaker, we began this process two years ago, on April 26, '82, and the budget presented describes new ideas in the constant challenge to stay one step ahead. Mr. Speaker, this is the heart of what I mean, when I say of a new transportation leadership, this is where I, as the Minister of Highways and Transportation, am coming from in this province, along with my colleagues, and, very more important, the people of Saskatchewan. I'm firmly convinced that the leadership demonstrated by this budget is an accurate reflection of the needs and aspirations of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the doom and gloom days of the NDP are over for the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan want smarter government, the people of Saskatchewan want government to get back to basics, the people of Saskatchewan want the chance to make it on their own. Mr. Speaker, another big difference between the NDP and the Conservative government in power is that the NDP put government first, people second. Mr. Speaker, this administration puts people first, government second, and I will be supporting the motion and rejecting the amendment suggested. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOUTIN:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with pleasure that I am able to stand here representing the Kinistino constituency in this House, even if the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg says that we in the back row . . . I just want to say that I would rather be in this back row than the front row on that side of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOUTIN:** — I would, Mr. Speaker, first like to add to my congratulations, to those . . . (inaudible) . . . I would, Mr. Speaker, first like to add to my congratulations to those of my

March 29, 1984

colleagues . . . (inaudible) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. It's impossible to hear the member that's on his feet and has the floor, and I would ask members to have some decorum.

**MR. BOUTIN:** — I would, Mr. Speaker, first like to add my congratulations to those of my colleagues, to the member for Kindersley and the Finance Minister, the Hon. Bob Andrew . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. I would caution the member not to use names of other members, but rather to use their constituency or their position.

**MR. BOUTIN:** — I just thought, Mr. Speaker, I would use his name because he's our Finance Minister of so long. I'm sorry for that.

It is with a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker, that I am able to stand on this side of the House and be a part of this government — a government that cares about its residents; one that believes in promoting this province, rather than demoting it, as was done in the past by the prior administration; a government that saw a job that needed to be done, and went ahead and did it; a government that has the foresight to take steps, Mr. Speaker, into making this one of the strongest provinces in Canada, assuring a strong economic growth through our programs and initiatives, rather than give-aways to select political friends.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that these words are uncharacteristic of me, but since budget night, a feeling of pride, of excitement, has filled me, and it's partly due, Mr. Speaker, to the overwhelming support and acceptance of my colleague's budget by the people of my constituency — an excitement, Mr. Speaker, which is widespread in this province, and which will no doubt induce a stimulating effect on private investment, while promoting investors' confidence for years to come.

I mentioned programs and initiatives previously, Mr. Speaker, and my constituency, Kinistino, will join with the rest of this province, receiving the benefits offered through the sound policies and excellent stimulus this budget will provide. The Hon. Minister of Finance is truly . . . (inaudible) . . . of Saskatchewan.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to share some of the benefits in which my constituency will obtain. I mention this first capital project specifically for the Leader of the Opposition, who is not here with us, Mr. Speaker, who seems to be preoccupied with the fact that highways weren't mentioned in the budget speech; that he must be looking for a smooth road in the order to redeem his party. He will not, Mr. Speaker, find one at the expense of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Highways announced this evening in this House, capital project for my constituency for Highway No. 41; \$1.6 million, the long-awaited road the NDP were playing politics with.

This only would provide a substantial boost to our economy, because we have farmers in areas in that community which will help our municipalities rebuild these roads, instead of building municipal roads. They will have the roads to bring further progress to the community.

But we did not stop there. In addition, our government is planning a major bridge renovation on Highway No. 3, the Muskoday bridge, which will cost about \$490,000. These projects, Mr. Speaker, have been required for a number of years when members opposite were in power. And that is probably the contributing reason why they are in opposition now, because of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. They were tired of being ignored and misled by the members opposite.

Rural development, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Louis Domotor — sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'll recorrect

myself – the Minister of Rural Development – is another area in which my constituency will benefit, a benefit of 6.5 per cent increase in maintenance. Grants for the Rural Municipality of 372, Rural Municipality of 400, Rural Municipality of 401, rural Municipality of 402, 430, 431, and also, R M of 460, Mr. Speaker – a total of \$1.2 million has been committed to assist these municipalities, a commitment which they should have received from the prior administration.

But we did not stop there. No, Mr. Speaker, our government, they made a commitment to Saskatchewan people, a commitment which is just beginning to be realized, a brighter and more prosperous future for this province. In addition to the projects I have previously mentioned, Mr. Speaker, our government has committed well over \$750,000 to projects under newly-formed water corporation of Saskatchewan. Some of these projects will be located in Wakaw, Weldon, and Cudworth, and will greatly assist these communities both through a service aspect and an economic aspect.

Commerce development programs, much needed in my constituency, will see over \$313,000 spent with a substantial commitment made by our government for flood and drainage control. Pelican Lake, a project that has been needed for a lengthy period of time. But, Mr. Speaker, as with many other things, they were ignored by the previous administration which seems to be the only thing they did well – is to ignore things. Ignore not only projects in communities, but ignore the people of Saskatchewan, and the people that elected them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOUTIN:** — The final point that I wish to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is on housing. While my constituency has numerous limited amount of home care homes and related facilities, our government saw a need for an increase in rural housing and prairie housing units. And again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government has reacted. It has planned, Mr. Speaker, to spend an estimated \$210,000 on projects of this nature in my constituency alone. This will also assist in boosting our local economy through increased revenue for our area business. This means that Saskatchewan benefits, and what happens when Saskatchewan benefits? The community benefits and we all benefit then.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I could go on for the rest of the day praising this budget, outlining possible job creation which will no doubt take place due mainly to grants and investment incentives offered, and will, no doubt, occur in my constituency along with others. But I believe that these measures speak for themselves in promoting our province – something the opposition could never quite accomplish, Mr. Speaker.

My constituency do not seem alarmed over the claims made by the opposition and their leader. They view a 20 per cent reduction in the deficit as favourable step acknowledging that a deficit is a much more favourable way to assist economic growth while regaining investors' confidence in this province.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, when I was elected, I promised my people from my constituency of Kinistino that I would represent them to the best of my ability, and with the government of the day, Mr. Speaker, our cabinet ministers has proven itself to be a very much easier task to accomplish such goals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOUTIN:** — I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, wish to give my full endorsement to the budget as presented by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, while registering my opposition to the amendment as proposed by the members opposite.

I would also like to add, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Finance has performed admirably, in view of the total misery our government inherited from the members of the opposition.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BOUTIN:** — Again, I also want to thank all the members of this House that has supported our Minister of Finance, and also my people from our Kinistino constituency. I want to thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MARTENS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's always a privilege for me to speak to this group of people here — fellow legislators — and I want to just express some of my delight at some of the things that the Minister of Finance discussed with us last Wednesday. I want to speak a little bit about my constituency, and a little bit about how I feel about the role of our government in relation to that.

There's a quote that I read the other day: "The door of opportunity swings on four hinges: initiative, industry, energy, and integrity." I believe that what you have to do is open that door and walk through it; and as it swings, we have the opportunity to do just that.

We've had outlined here today some of the initiatives that are being placed before us in the Department of Highways. I want to outline a couple of things that I appreciate about the Minister of Highways providing some of the initiative to certain areas of my constituency in his budget.

I, first of all, want to compliment him in taking the view of the people to heart in construction of the highway from east of Vanguard to the town of Pambrun, which is the No. 43 Highway. There's about 17 kilometres that are going to be rebuilt. I am just really happy that the people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I want to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

I want to explain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the development of the highway was in response to the voice of the people. It wasn't in response to the minister of tourism at that time . . . [inaudible interjection] . . .

n

On the other things that are being dealt with there, I just want to outline them. You can just keep on listening, keep on talking, because I've got a lot more to go. Did the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'd like to know whether the member from the seat of Shaunavon, whether he was there representing Eastend in the development of the No. 13 Highway. And I'd like to suggest, I'd like to suggest to them that perhaps the hundreds of people . . . (inaudible) . . .

### POINT OF PRIVILEGE

**MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . . Tonight when the Minister of Highways was giving his speech, he referred to the member from Shaunavon not contacting him about building the stretch of highway west of Eastend. I have here a letter to the Minister of Highways, dated July of this year, which outlines on the front page of the *Shaunavon Standard*, on the front page of the *Shaunavon Standard*, which says, in part: —

Dear. Mr. Garner: I write to you to bring to your attention to a number of highway projects in south-western Saskatchewan which should be attended to immediately. I refer to Highway 13 between Admiral and the junction of Highway 37, and Highway 13 between Robsart and Eastend.

This is the letter sent to the minister in July, and I believe that the Minister of Highways misled the House tonight, and I ask for a withdrawal of that statement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order. A dispute arising between two members as allegations of facts does not fulfill the conditions of the Parliamentary Privilege. The failure of the Minister of the Crown to answer a question may not be raised as a question of privilege.

**MR. ENGEL:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to that. The minister made a statement charging that my colleague didn't do something, and I think on that point, that is not what is at question. That is not what is at question.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order.

## **SPECIAL ORDER**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

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

**MR. MARTENS:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to outline a couple of more things that the Minister of Highways has suggested that are going to be part of the development of the highway system in the south-west. And I'd like to suggest to the members in the House that there's quite an extensive array of development, not only in the south-west but also in other parts of the province.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Is any of it true? How much is true?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order.

**MR. MARTENS:** — I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether truth is a part of their vocabulary, or whether it's part of ours, at times . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the message came through the member from Shaunavon only, or whether it also came through the member from Morse, who went down there and visited with the mayor and the people from the community, who also sent me a list.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You just said a minute ago I didn't say anything to the Minister.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You said he didn't say it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order.

**MR. MARTENS:** — Well, well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I said anything about them not saying anything at all. I said that I had . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to continue on this in a way . . . (inaudible) . . .

I would like to indicate to you and to the House that there are a number of areas in the south-west that are going to be addressed. For example, there's going to be resurfacing to the north of Swift Current on the No. 4 Highway; there's going to be some additional paving being done to the No. 1 Highway going west; and there's going to be some resurfacing on the No. 32 Highway going to the town of Cabri and beyond. And I'm happy to have the opportunity to be a part of the government that promotes development of the highway system.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MARTENS:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the total volume in the south-west is fairly substantial when it comes to where the development is going, and the volume of dollars that are being

March 29, 1984

represented there. And I have roughly about roughly about \$7, \$8 million coming into my seat, and I'm kind of appreciative of the Minister of Highways and the Minister of Finance for providing some of that initiative into the seat.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, outline another initiative that has taken place that I find also a little interesting. There was a discussion here the other day, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in relation to parks and development of Diefenbaker Lake. And, through the past year we've had discussion with the people from the community who have been on a committee that has been participating in the development of a kind of a philosophy to develop the Sask. Landing Park and other parks along the Diefenbaker Lake. And I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's a good thing.

We have, from people in the community, had suggestions as to what is going to be done there. Rental accommodations, marinas, houseboat rentals, boat services, and other things – campground areas being expanded. And I would like to say to the House and the legislature here today that I appreciate that, and the people from the constituency appreciate that.

We have contributed, I believe, in many ways to the development of the province. And I want to outline some of the things that we have done and I think that they are strengths to the economic viability of the province, and they're strengths to the people who I represent, and that they have shown what I suggested to you at the beginning about the intensity and the drive that these people have. They show integrity, and I'm proud of it.

I want to go into a little bit about the budget on agriculture. And I want to give the Minister of Agriculture a good deal of credit together with my seat-mate, his Legislative Secretary, from the constituency of Saltcoats.

There are a number of things that I think are extremely important for agriculture. And he talked today about the safety net that has been placed around the people in the province, in agriculture, who have difficult times, and they're looking at difficulties in the very near future. One of the things that we have suggested, and are putting into place is the \$11 million program for farm cost relief. I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is a beginning. We plan on doing this, and in addition to that, we have another \$4 million being put to use by people of Saskatchewan, farmers in the province who are going to work together with the people who have financial difficulties. I think that that's a very commendable type of review for these people who have a problem.

The thing that I believe is very innovative, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the livestock tax credit. I believe that for the people who have traditionally held the belief that livestock in a diversified agriculture is important in Saskatchewan . . . I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that those people are the ones that are going to benefit an awful lot on the capacity that they have to move ahead in developing the diversified agriculture in our province.

We have this tax credit going to livestock that are fed for at least 75 days; we have it going to the hog people; and also to those that have lambs. And I think that's a beginning of a setting up a place where we can find a dimension for growth in our province. And I believe the tone of the most important features that we have is the development of the livestock industry, whether it's cattle, hogs, or lambs, or poultry, or whatever, but I think that that is a beginning.

Well, it's been a special opportunity for me, as a part of this government, to give direction in developing some of the decisions that we have had in the water crown. I'm pleased that the Department of Agriculture has worked and co-operated together with the people who have been delegated the responsibility of providing initiative and direction in the water crown. I want to also say that the people from Supply and Services, the people from the Department of Environment and Urban Affairs are also to be commended for their work and for their willingness to participate in a change of direction for this government.

Now, we've had a stabilization program here for a while and we want to acknowledge that we have put some more money into that, and the Minister of Agriculture has continued to support that program. Farm purchase program has been said to be only for those who are wealthy and those that are expanding their farms, but I'd like to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when the people have done an assessment on the realistic fact that these 2,500 farmers that are new (and lots of them are new, at least 60 per cent are brand-new farmers). We have an average age of 26. Half of them are single. I think this represents the people we want to touch. More than half of the people are first-timers, and more than half of the people have less than a half section. And I think that that's significant to the fact that we're establishing farmers and farm people in the province. And I think it's commendable.

We have, I believe, begun something that is not unique, but is perhaps unique for Saskatchewan, and that's establishment of a research fund for the chair of the late Mr. Van Vliet. And I think it's significant that the people in our government took the opportunity to do that. I think it represents something as a beginning for agricultural research in the province.

The Agricultural Credit Corporation has been expanded for irrigation, for feeders, and the likes of that. There's some other things I want to talk about, and one of those things is the feed grain marketing agency. I think that's a step in the right direction, the feeder associations. And I want to say that Alberta has dealt with this for 40 years and they started in 1938, and they have had less than 1 per cent loss in those years of development. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that's an indication of the viability. We want to follow some of the patterns that they followed, some of the controls and direction that they've been able to implement because of the will of the government to do those kinds of things.

We have other things I want to talk about, too. I think that the removal of the sales tax in this province has been . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from the government side and colleague of mine has said, "It's dramatic." I think it's significant and I recall a question being asked here about the high cost of electrical power to skating rinks and community rinks and those sorts of things, and it's going to be reducing the cost of those. And I think the member from Saskatoon, the Minister of Culture and Recreation, I think that he is to be commended for his contribution in this area. I want to thank him, and I think the people from the Morse constituency want to give you a vote of thanks for that.

Rural Development. Rural development is a part of my background, and I really appreciate the fact that the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) and the people from the rural municipalities have been together working in developing a better program and a better relationship.

The senior citizens' home care grants are up to, are going to be put up to \$1,000, and that's a little higher than the former grants were, and I think that's commendable. The payments to the seniors are going to be up a little bit. I think that's commendable.

We have research and development in this province. It's unique. We have small on-farm businesses that have developed because the people have the initiative and imagination and the creativity to go ahead and put some of their ideas into practical use. And here we have a tax credit to allow them to develop, and I think that's credible. There's new opportunity for people in Saskatchewan to buy into the crown corporations, Sask Power and Saskoil. Now I think that's commendable. We've taken and done some major . . . we've addressed these in a major way and I think that that's credible. We have placed Saskoil in a very better position than it was when we took over, and I want to think that that's a commendable situation to be in.

I want to talk a little bit about energy. Energy is a part of my constituency, and I'd like to talk about it because it's a vital part of it, and the development of the oil field and the gas fields is significant. I want to outline, Mr. Deputy Speaker, last year for example the oil industry and the drilling industry set a record. Eighteen hundred-plus wells and I think that's commendable.

We have, I believe, something that's happening, and we can watch it happen and I'm going to tell you about it. Here, in the province of Saskatchewan, last year we had a record. This year – let's compare week for week what we did this year over last year. Up till March 16 we had 510 wells drilled this year. Last year it was 263. We're almost doubled this year what we were last year, and I think that that's commendable.

Here's what it spells out in licences issued. Last year, licences issued were 242 – that's the licences that were issued for drilling. And this year was 517, almost double. And the licences – it's more than double. And I think Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan we owe a mound of congratulations. We need to congratulate the people who have done this, and I think that's in the oil patch.

I also think that some of the initiatives in developing the situation that came about because of the change in policy ought to be placed . . . and the compliments ought to be placed on these people who did it. And they were people from the oil industry who suggested to us that this is the direction you need to go, and you do it.

Now, I want to outline a couple of things here and I'm going to read this so that people here in this House can understand it. It deals with the oil industry recovery program.

First, let's consider the impact that the former government's program, if it had remained in place, what it would be like today. Production in the oil patch was at 75 per cent, drilling activity was at 600 wells per year, and land sale, \$4 to \$6 million per sale. What did we have in the last sale? We have over \$30 million in the last sale.

With production at 75 per cent, 47 million barrels of oil would have been produced in '84-85. This is dealing with what would have been if we would have had the same philosophy that the former administration had. And, through that, we would have had roughly \$1.3 million worth of revenue.

Adding other oil revenue income and subtracting payments to oil companies under the NDP incentives grant program, we would have generated last year, \$429 worth of oil. Now, if we compare this revenue total to our estimate of oil revenue for '84-85, our revenue is expected to be over \$600 million, and that's a difference of \$185 million. And that goes right to the people of Saskatchewan – right to the people who need home care, who need nursing homes (and my seat-mate's nursing home in Saltcoats is an example of that) — \$185 million.

The story of the millions of taxpayers' dollars poured in Saskatchewan oil to drill wells is now drilling without subsidy and at a profit. When they and their program were doing it, they were subsidizing. Just listen to this. The story of the \$4 million in grants paid to our oil service and supply companies to subsidize them in the depressed oil industry conditions spawned by the NDP, the same companies that are now busy adding new employees to service our strengthening oil industry, the story of \$300 million in earned but unpaid grants – the oil companies had earned \$300 million in unpaid grants.

Now, we hear the Leader of the Opposition talking about the \$100 million that has gone down the drain because we changed the policy.

We had \$300 million that we owed to the oil companies in earned unpaid grants left over from the NDP. We abolished that program in '82. This program paid 75 per cent of the cost of drilling a well, even if it was dry, with grants paid out at 80 cents a barrel of oil produced – clearly, a costly, ineffective program rewarding the larger oil companies, not the little ones. Not the little ones that people in the towns and villages and our cities can buy into. It was the big oil companies that they were providing incentives to.

The NDP incentive grants program left \$300 million in unpaid liability, after paying out \$60

million in its last year of operation. To minimize this large liability, we were able to negotiate this \$300 million. We negotiated that liability from 300 million down to one-third of its book value, as we introduced our recovery program. So we not only saved the people of Saskatchewan money, we negotiated it so that they could improve the productivity, and I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's the direction that this government wants to go and it needs to go, and I think it's . . . I'm pleased to be a part of it.

As a matter of fact, I would like to suggest to the House here, that some of the oil that is new, is not only from the fields that have been there for years, some of the oil that is new, is oil that has not been discovered before. Fields are being opened up and our total oil base is expanding, not contracting. We are discovering more and more new oil and, as a matter of fact, if you were to go down into the South-West, just north of Shaunavon, you would find a well that hit, when it was drilled, hit 600-plus barrels a day, and it was capped and they are holding it down to 300, little bit more than 200. Now a good well runs at 50 to 100 barrels. Now we've got one in the South-West that is 300 barrels a day and, not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's medium crude. Now that's fairly significant in an area that's developed mainly sour crude through the years, and I think that that's a real plus. We've developed the energy field in a very significant way.

I want to take the opportunity just to say one thing about the Sask Power Corporation. You want to hear a little bit about Sask Power? Okay, I'll tell you a little bit. Now, I want to say something about the rates and things like that. We heard about these massive increases in rates, and how do you justify them in the long term, and how do you make them go? Well, it seems to me that when I was a candidate in the '75 election we were talking about a number of things, and energy didn't seem to be a significant issue. But right after the election what happened? What happened?

Residential rates in gas went up 47 per cent, commercial 51 per cent, large industrial went up 100 per cent — always going up and up and up. Now you just taken and calculate on residences from '74 to '82. You have 47 per cent in 1975, 20 per cent in '76, 15 per cent in '77, nothing in '78. I wonder what happened. What was '78? Must have been pretty close to an election year, yes, there it is. But they hit big business. You got to do it in the big business. They gave them 20 per cent. But to the people of Saskatchewan we'll just cool it, because we got to do it because of election year. In '79 it went up twice, 7 and 3, that's 10 per cent in 1979. Now 1980, 4.6, 8.7, 13.3 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, 3 times. 1981 went up twice; 1982, before the government changed, it went up 18.17 times . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Yes, that's the kind of initiatives that create growth and stimulus, and I want to just say one more thing, about how pleased I am that the Minister of Finance has brought in this kind of budget.

I think it demonstrates clearly to me, initiative, a sense of well-being for the people of Saskatchewan, and I heard a comment yesterday in Saskatoon in speaking to the C&D convention, that I thought was unique. A fellow came to me from the constituency of Humboldt, and he said: "You know, we would just be appreciative of any government that allows us to make profit." And that is coming from the farming people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased not only to go to my constituents with this budget, but I am also pleased to be a part of the people that put it together. Thank you very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GERICH:** — Thank you, and good evening, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin this evening on a sad note. As tradition dictates we, the members of the legislature, are often called upon to pay tribute to many politicians and leaders when they pass on, a tradition I would to expand on this evening, Mr. Speaker, not only paying tribute to just one man, but a whole political party which realized the end was here on budget night last week. I am, of course, referring to the

March 29, 1984

members opposite, Mr. Speaker, whose leader was threatening to cut his wrists in this House, when he found out what a real budget could do to this province to get it back on its feet. It could be accomplished with sound economic policies, and what a real financier – finance minister – can do when he puts his budget together.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to members opposite, for if it hadn't been for their incompetence in their limp economic policies, and a total distrust for the people of this province, the taxpayers probably wouldn't be able to feel the excitement this budget is generating, feel the revitalization and growth this province is now experiencing, or see investor confidence regained with each passing day. April 26, 1982, was the day the people of this province sent a message to a previous administration, a message which clearly stated they were tired of all the hidden increases, that they were tired of foolish and non-existent economic policies, and they were being tired of being ignored. But I can see that few of them never did get the message, and who will, no doubt, get the message the next time they go to the polls.

I would like to join with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in praising the hon. member from Kindersley. I've heard him called everything from Rembrandt to Michael Jackson, which leaves very little else to be compared to. I would, therefore, like to offer my heartfelt congratulations to him on a job well done in an excellent fashion as usual.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from the members opposite who continue to cite the electrical rate increase as a prime concern for the taxpayers of this province. I wonder if the taxpayers are aware how their rates were increased through orders in councils by the previous administration, how the average increase for the years 1975 to 1981 for residential use was 12.3 compared to the average increase, while our government has been in power, of 7.5.

I am wonder if they're aware of the general service 2 rates receiving average increases of 9.4 for the years of the NDP incompetence, while the increase has been limited to 6.3 while our government has been in power. And a general service 3 rates suffering in an average increase of 11.4 for every year that the NDP mismanaged this province, while we the government have increased rates on an average of 6.25 for a period of just under two years.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to see one of the gentleman opposite tell the taxpayers how some of the increases went through. By order in council, without public discussion and not with public knowledge, and definitely not with public support. I would like one of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to see one of the members opposite do this. But I won't because, Mr. Speaker, members of the opposition still think they can get away with following the Saskatchewan public. And they did that for many years. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the public will not be fooled by these people again.

The message was clear on election night April 26, 1982, and for the members opposite that didn't hear the message, I invite them to read my lips. The Saskatchewan people will not be fooled by your kind anymore. Do you want to know why, Mr. Speaker? Because the public has learned that there is no money in the heritage fund claimed by the opposition members. They've learned about the hidden increases in the utility rates which seem to be frequent practice of their previous administration. They've heard all the claims by the members opposite before.

Mr. Speaker, in the past week there's been growing excitement in the cities and in the towns and in the villages, an excitement which centres around the document tabled in this House last Wednesday night. That excitement stems from a new and innovative ideas that my colleague, the Minister of Finance included in this budget, a budget, Mr. Speaker, which places Saskatchewan firmly on top as an economic leader in this great country.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to what the budget will do for my home constituency for Redberry, which can be summed up by simply stating it will mean growth – growth for small business, growth for the agricultural base and growth for our tourism industry in my

constituency. It is not only going to occur in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, it'll occur province-wide. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it'll even occur in constituencies of Athabasca and Cumberland. And should the hon. members care to think about it, that's their home constituencies. Or are they just trying to prove to the residents in their constituencies that nothing has changed and that the NDP will never care?

Mr. Speaker, with measures taken in this last budget I can rest assured, along with other residents in this province, that there is relief for the financially troubled farmers. There are low-interest rate loans available, and there's help for an irrigation project. This will mean a 16,000-acre farmland will receive assistance in new acres come into production, which puts more money where it belongs, in the taxpayers' pockets.

With the revitalization of our tourism policies, also in this province, Mr. Speaker, I know that my constituents have a new hope – a new outlook on an industry that suffered through 11 years of neglect by the previous administration. This will mean areas such as Cochin and Jackfish, along with many regional parks, will start to receive the benefits from which they have waited for.

With \$26 million committed to the construction of a technical school in Prince Albert, which will assist 650 students in receiving vital training, I'm sure that my constituency of Redberry and the students there will benefit, along with other constituencies such as Cumberland and the Athabasca.

Small business will benefit through this budget package, Mr. Speaker, benefit through long-term, fixed-interest loans, and benefit through venture capital credit program, the elimination of corporate tax, in a benefit through a \$7,500 industrial incentive grant, for each new job created in processing in the manufacturing sector.

Our colleagues in the opposition keep saying that these measures are for big business. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, and to the people of Saskatchewan and to the hon. members opposite, that these measures are there for the people who need them, the people of Saskatchewan.

The people of this province are noted for their pride and adventure – tackling the small setbacks and striving forward, making the best out of a bad situation. After all, they had plenty of practice while the members opposite were in power. Communities are only as strong as the people who work together for a good cause. And to make Saskatchewan number one, and keep it there where it does belong.

]

On budget night, the Leader of the Opposition stated that he had not heard the word “highways” mentioned, a word, for some reason, that he was preoccupied with. Possibly, because he realizes that the next election he will have to take one in order to get out town. He did not hear the word “highways” mentioned, Mr. Speaker, because this is not the main industry in Saskatchewan. It's our job to provide incentives and programs which will benefit our agriculture industry, commerce, and tourism. But we did not forget highways, Mr. Speaker. The budget saw zero increase in the highways department, yet, this will show and allow projects such as the Borden Bridge approach grading, and the grading and paving of Highway No. 378 at Rabbit Lake, to go ahead, projects which will cost the government in excess of \$600,000, and which will boost the local economy while providing jobs for Saskatchewan people. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways will not go unnoticed in my constituency of Redberry.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens of this province were relieved to hear the measures we took to assist them – assist them with an increase in the Saskatchewan income benefit, which will double benefits for single people and see a 67 per cent increase in benefits for couples. This government took the initiative, took the home care repair program for senior citizens, and increased the benefits from \$650 to \$1,000 which will assist our pioneers with necessary home care. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why did the previous administration ignore our pioneers? Why didn't they help these people? Because, Mr. Speaker, they didn't care.

An increase in health spending of \$20 million will see an increase in the number of special-care beds available to our seniors. We will see improved hospital facilities in this province. We will see improved road ambulance funding, something the previous administration ignored.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition keeps complaining about a third deficit budget. But we know how his party balanced the books, and how they robbed the crown corporations and the heritage fund in order to deceive the public. And the public knows, and the public is not going to take it ever again.

I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, like to conclude my own and my constituents' approval to this budget as proposed, and go on record in voting not to the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. PETERSEN:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise tonight on a very important occasion, and that's for me to stand here in front of all of the members and all of Saskatchewan and go through a few of the budget items that are designed directly for agriculture.

As soon as the budget was announced, the biggest talk in the street was, "What's in it for agriculture? What's in it for agriculture?" People kept asking me that, and I kept telling them. I went through the programs.

We have a nine-point program, Mr. Speaker, that consists of \$26 million in new and enriched for farmers — \$26 million initiatives for farmers. That's besides all of the programs we had last year, Mr. Speaker. That really has to be something.

I'm also very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear about the initiatives in the development of our highway system, especially in my constituency with Highway No. 38 to be built south of Kelvington. It's been long needed, long overdue, and definitely will benefit the people in my constituency a great deal.

As I sat here earlier in the evening, Mr. Speaker, I had to listen to the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg carry on long and loud about a few of his pet subjects. He kept going on about a farm fuel rebate and how the NDP had a farm fuel rebate. Well that's fine, Mr. Speaker. It was an on-again, off-again thing. An election would be coming — bang! — in would go a fuel rebate program, the election would be over — bang! — program would come off. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not much of a program, that's called an election gimmick. We don't believe in those, Mr. Speaker. Instead we put in a program of tax relief that'll mean a benefit of \$11 million to the farmers of Saskatchewan. We'll be rebating the school tax from the home quarter, an average of \$256 per farmer, right in that old hip pocket, and that's pretty good.

In the area of SCIC (Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation), the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg also made some statements that were fairly interesting. And one of them was the fact that the previous administration had come up with matching grants for SCIC. Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that people make mistakes and errors are committed every day. To err is human; to forgive divine, and so on and so forth.

But I really wish that that member would clarify his statement. There's a certain lack of precision in some of the things he said, bordering on fiction, as a matter of fact. The member knows that at no time did the previous administration ever match dollar for dollar SCIC's contributions. They came close one year, but that was it. They, too, were under budgetary constraints. And yet earlier in the evening he stood up in this House and mistakenly said that they had matched it year after year. I think a little clarification would be necessary there.

He has a great preoccupation with SCIC and programs like that. As a matter of fact, on some of



his previous duties under the previous administration, he undertook the odd trip to take a look and see what was happening out there in the rest of the world, and I believe later on in the evening one of the other members will be speaking about a trip to South Africa which the hon. member took. I won't go into that, Mr. Speaker. I'll let the other members deal with it.

He also went on to say that our administration had not been very explicit in our demands of the federal government. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have called for the Western Grains Stabilization fund to be triggered, time and again. Time after time after time the federal liberal administration in that fund, farmers' money, and they won't trigger the program at a time when farmers could use that money. They desperately need that money. The federal Liberals won't do it.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, we've also called for the removal of the federal tax on farm fuels, over and over and over again. And over and over and over again they have refused to remove that fuel tax, Mr. Speaker. Refused – and who put those federal Liberals there? Who put those Liberals there? Five NDP MP's from Saskatchewan, from the West. That, Mr. Speaker, is a sorry, sorry record.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on to one of the many, many points in the budget which I find very, very interesting and informative and important, and that's in the area of research. Now, we have set up a half-million dollars for the University of Saskatchewan to establish an academic chair primarily aimed at research and, as we all know, research has been one of the keys for agricultural production that we have today – something that the previous administration tended to overlook, but we don't. We don't, Mr. Speaker.

In the area of research, Mr. Speaker, we have found that one dollar will sometimes regain a thousandfold. One dollar spent on research will gain a thousandfold and, in no area, Mr. Speaker, is that any greater or any more emphasis placed on that than in the area of canola production.

The members opposite seem to be having a good time there, laughing and joking and chatting with one another, back and forth. But I wish they would listen to this, because canola production is rather important, Mr. Speaker.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Not to them.

**MR. PETERSEN:** — Not to them, that's true. It may not be; they didn't seem to care too much about agriculture. In 1982-83, seed sales of canola to eight nations totalled 1,271,000 tonnes, with 89 per cent of it being purchased by the Japanese market. The value was over \$500 million, Mr. Speaker, and they sit there and chuckle and laugh and say, "See if you can get a cabinet minister to listen to you." The cabinet ministers on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, know the importance of it, and they reflected it in the budget that we came up with.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. PETERSEN:** — Canola oil sales to eight nations totalled over 111,000 tonnes, and the value of those oil sales was about 85 million. Meal exports, primarily to the United States, Norway, and Korea, were about 120,000 tonnes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And wild rice, Mr. Speaker, was mentioned by the member opposite. I'd like to go into that, but I'll save that for another time. I believe I've dwelt on that before.

Canola oil, Mr. Speaker, on world markets, is becoming increasingly important. Canola oil accounted for 52 per cent of the vegetable oil refined in Canada in 1982. There were 35,100 Canadian farmers growing canola in 1983. In Saskatchewan, there were 13,709 of them. That's important, Mr. Speaker. That's a large segment of our agricultural production, and they laugh about it; they chuckle about it.

And across western Canada, five crushing companies operate eight crushing plants, and they're spread across the prairie provinces. Obviously the members opposite may not know about them, but I'll tell them where they're at. Manitoba has two plants, Saskatchewan has two plants, and Alberta has four plants. The plants have a daily crush of over four and a half, pardon me, four thousand five hundred thousand tonnes, and an annual crush capacity of approximately 1.350 million tonnes.

Mr. Speaker, that is a significant part of our economy, and they laugh about it. They laugh about it. Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan alone – in Saskatchewan alone – we averaged about a million and a half acres through the '70s. It's going up. It went up to about one point . . . Pardon me, it went down to about 1.35 million acres in '81. And then it came back up to about 1.4 million acres in '82. And, Mr. Speaker, the projections for 1984 are even greater than that – over 3 million acres, perhaps 7 million acres in the western provinces. Mr. Speaker, that's significant; that's very significant.

Now, the main role of Saskatchewan agriculture in the canola industry has been to provide crop production information – research, Mr. Speaker, research to help farmers have this type of production levels. We have, Mr. Speaker, about 25 of the 42 provincial ag reps and four of the six provincial soils and crop specialists heavily involved in providing canola production information.

The plant industry branch, Mr. Speaker, puts out numerous publications providing recommendations on varieties, pest and weed control, and fertility. An initiative of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture is to increase the involvement with the organizations which are active in the development of the canola industry. In 1982, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture became a member of the Canola Council of Canada, and now has a representative on the board of directors of that organization, the director of the plant industry branch.

Mr. Speaker, that happened in 1982, after the administration changed. The previous administration's minister of agriculture refused to have a member on that board. He refused. That's what he thought of the canola production in Saskatchewan. He wanted no part of it. He wanted no part of it because he couldn't control it. He couldn't hang on to them. He couldn't squeeze them. He couldn't put this thumb on them. He didn't want anything to do with it. He ignored it. He ignored a \$500-million-a-year industry. And that's why he is not in this House today.

Now, most of the canola production research which has been conducted in Saskatchewan has been carried out at the agricultural research station in Saskatoon. Some variety evaluation and fertility work was done at the other Agricultural Canada Research Station in Melfort.

The past several years, zonation testing of licensed canola varieties have been carried out by the Crop Development Centre in the University of Saskatchewan under the FarmLab program. And, under this program, eight canola varieties per year have been evaluated at 16 locations.

Saskatchewan Agriculture has also provided considerable support for a canola research through the Saskatchewan agricultural research fund program. Through the years 1981 to '83, \$109,830 was provided by the Saskatchewan agricultural research fund program. And that was used for the investigation of the use of canola and canola by-products in feeds.

During the same period, \$56,000 was provided for investigation of the persistence of triazine herbicides in soils, and on-farm agronomic investigations of triazine technology. Now, in the area of triazine-resistant canola, Mr. Speaker, this work, this research, has resulted in a triazine-resistant canola being produced. And I'd just like to read from *Canola Ramblings*, March 1984.

It's a significant announcement, Mr. Speaker. Because triazine-resistant canola means you can

grow canola in areas where you have stinkweed and other weeds that can be killed by chemicals such as Bladex and Sencor, something that you could not do before, and which limited the production of canola in the prairie provinces, the land which was very, very free of that type of weed.

And I'd like to quote: —

Canadian canola growers will soon have a canola crop that provides the ability to clean out wild mustard and stinkweed in crop. The specially-bred canola variety is tolerant to the triazine herbicides, Bladex and Sencor. The variety did receive the support of the expert committees on grain breeding, grain quality, and grain diseases.

Although Agriculture Canada must formally approve the submission, it is felt that the biggest step was to receive the support of the three expert committees. It has further been indicated through recent discussions with government officials that registrations for the two triazine chemicals will occur at approximately the same time as formal licensing of the variety. In 1984, 15,000 acres will be seeded to the new triazine-tolerant canola. All seed will be contracted through CSP Foods Ltd., and United Oilseed Products Limited.

Mr. Speaker, 750,000 acres. That's pretty good. That's really good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with our attitude of research, we've also made some inquiries of the industry out there, as to what they would like us to do. Notably, Mr. Speaker, the industry has said to us that there is a shortage of funding for research, applied research, and promotion. Negotiations were entered into, discussions were entered into with varying groups, and we came out with a white paper. Well, that white paper would allow for a check-off legislation to be reviewed by the people of Saskatchewan.

I'd like to summarize that white paper, because it's very important for research, very, very important to research . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you want to see the actual copy of it, do you? I suppose you haven't seen one. That's right, I've forgotten, you haven't seen one yet. You wouldn't take the time, because agriculture doesn't mean that much to you.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, the white paper summary for check-off is as follows. The use of the funds. (Fairly simple) Funds collected will be used for research, promotion, market development. The funds will not be used to finance the commodity organizations. The scope of the fund: the check-off could be put into place for a single commodity, for example, canola, or a number of commodities, pulse crops.

Refund of the levies: the check-off would be voluntary, and the farmer could request a refund of his contribution. The amount of the levy: the amount of the levy or check-off would be based on a percentage of gross sales deducted by the buyer of the commodity, Mr. Speaker.

Establishment of the fund: the research and development fund would be established at the request — at the request, Mr. Speaker — of the growers of the commodity, providing a majority of the growers approve. Note those two words, Mr. Speaker: "at the request," and "majority." That's something the previous administration did not understand. They were apt to do things without people wanting it done, and ram it down their throats, and it didn't have to be the majority of people wanting it, either.

The administration of the fund: the fund would be administered by a producer-elected committee, consisting of up to seven farmers. Committee members would serve a three-year

March 29, 1984

term, and would be eligible to serve two terms.

Powers of the administrative committee: to carry out research and extension programs; carry out educational and promotional programs; to identify markets and carry out market development programs; require buyers and sellers of the farm commodity to deduct levies from payments made to farmers; invest any surplus of moneys in the fund; obtaining and distributing information relating to the commodity. The committee would not have the power to regulate marketing, and there would be several other administrative duties.

There was also an area in there which provided a penalty in the event of an offence. Furthermore, there would be a termination of the act. It would terminate 10 years from the date the act is put into force, so it could not go on and on and on, forever.

Limits on administration: the minister would restrict the amount of moneys which could be used for administering the fund. I don't think producers out there want to put money into a fund that would be used for somebody to take a lot of trips to South Africa, for example, at their expense.

Mr. Speaker, that particular program . . . In keeping with our policy of increased research funding, we as a province have increased our research funding, but the producers out there say there could be more, again in the area of applied research and promotion.

If the members opposite doubt the importance of canola, I'd like to quote from the March 8 edition of the *Western Producer*. The headline is, "Farmers Put Money On Canola This Spring." That comes out of the farmers' bible, the *Western Producer*. The article, by Adrian Ewins, goes on to say: —

The canola acreage roller-coaster is ready for another run to the top, according to the Canada Grains Council. In the annual spring outlook, the council said, "Prairie farmers will devote seven million acres to the oilseed in 1984, up 22 per cent from the last year, and the second biggest acreage ever."

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on, giving you examples of how our government puts its money where its mouth is. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that is self-evident. The Minister of Highways proved that in this House; the Minister of Agriculture proved it earlier today. I think the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan will realize that without me, or anyone else, going on and on and on and on.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say I'll be supporting the motion and opposing the amendment.

**MR. SAUDER:** — Mr. Speaker, once more it's an honour and a privilege for me to rise in this Assembly, and to participate in the budget debate for 1984. To start off, I must offer my congratulations to the Minister of Finance, his staff, and colleagues, who prepared such a fine budget — a budget that I believe is going to change the course and set a new direction for Saskatchewan in the future.

This budget's of particular interest to my electorate in the Nipawin constituency. As many of the hon. members in this House know, our local farming community has been severely depressed due to the climatic and natural causes far beyond the farmers' control. In 1979, the crops were frozen. In 1982, the farmers again saw a late frost destroy the grain crop. In 1983, farmers battled the extreme wet weather, only to find that what little wheat was left had been destroyed by a little insect called a midge. Somebody once suggested that it was something like . . . They called it Trudeau wheat — nothing in the head.

My constituents are proud people, Mr. Speaker. They not accustomed to asking for favours or handouts from the government. But they needed help to stay in operation, given the serious

economic setbacks of the last five years. The Progressive Conservative Government of Saskatchewan listened to their concerns, and took note of their problems. And, unlike past governments in this province, this government has taken action.

Approximately two weeks ago, on March 14, the Minister of Agriculture announced a \$300,000 program to combat the wheat midge and glume blotch, which have proven so destructive in that area. We looked at the wheat midge problem, and how it's developed was a problem in Manitoba in the 1950s. The federal government started out to monitor it, to look for some method of control. They felt that it was a problem that was not going to be of any consequence. They gave up even monitoring it in the late 1960s, and now we found it recurring to be a very serious problem in our province.

The finance minister, in this budget, announced the creation of a new \$400 million fund to assist financially troubled farmers. And, I would suspect there will be a number in my area of the province who will take advantage of that program. It's going to mean that those viable farm operators, who through no fault of their own, have found themselves financially strapped, will be able to continue their family farming operations without fear of foreclosure by their creditors.

This fund will be administered by a panel of farmers to ensure that there is reason and fairness in the decision-making process. To further assist in the reduction of operating costs, the budget contains a \$11 million tax cut to farmers in the form of the home quarter section tax rebate assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition have been critical of these programs which will help ease the financial burden of farmers in my constituency. The member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, the agriculture critic, in his usual inept manner, has tried to criticize this budget as being of little assistance to the farming community.

Mr. Speaker, only this afternoon in his address on this, in this debate, he was questioning what a viable farm operation was. He didn't understand it, or didn't know. Being a farmer himself, it somewhat surprised me. But there seems to be some other things he doesn't know.

He was explaining about a neighbour of his who needed \$500,000 to be able to continue on in farming. Mr. Speaker, in an input cost of approximately \$50 an acre to put a crop in his region of the province, that to me would translate into a farmer who is trying to seed approximately 10,000 acres, and I believe that that is somewhat out of line, and out of the realm of the average farm – family farm – in Saskatchewan.

And I don't believe that those are the farmers that this government is necessarily committed to giving all the assistance to. It's the farmers who, the average quarter section, or rather, section, six quarter farmers, who are going to be taking advantage of these programs of this government.

Mr. Speaker, as usual, it's only show how out of touch with reality he really is, and out of touch with what is really going on in rural Saskatchewan.

As Legislative Secretary to the Minister of rural Development, I have had the opportunity to talk to farmers all over the province recently. Two weeks ago, at the SARM Convention in Regina, I met with rural councillors from every area of Saskatchewan. They had a two-fold message for us.

First, they were pleased at how responsive this government was to their needs. Some of the reasons they outlined, was the fact that we got rid of the NDP's feudal system called the land bank, and introduced the farm purchase program, which to date has helped almost as many farmers in a little over a year of operation as the land bank system deal with in its eight or nine years of operation.

They know that we're listening because we eliminated the oppressive gas tax which the NDP

March 29, 1984

used to finance their nationalization schemes. And they know, once again, that we are listening because this budget address addresses the major areas of concern which they have today.

The second message I received from the grass roots of Saskatchewan was also loud and clear, Mr. Speaker, and that, once again, was: don't pay any attention to the NDP agriculture critic. He's lost touch with what's going on out in rural Saskatchewan, in the real world out there, the same way that they've lost touch in other areas, other issues in this province.

I submit to this Assembly that when members opposite vote against this budget, a forward-looking budget, a budget with vision for this province, that they will once again only prove this very point to all the people of the province, that they are out of touch.

As Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Rural Development, once again, I was most pleased with the announcements made by our hon. member from Humboldt at the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities convention. And I would like to put . . . I would like to put some of these announcements into perspective, and relate them to my constituency.

Increasing road maintenance costs have been a constant concern of our rural municipalities for the past 10 years. The minister's decision to shift his grant structures' priorities to accommodate this concern is just one further indication of this government's closeness and its responsive attitude to the grass roots of Saskatchewan — the real families, rural people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SAUDER:** — The new maintenance assistance program the minister has outlined will be great benefit to all ratepayers, as it represents the equivalent of almost a two-mill reduction, tax rates to every rural property owner in this province.

For example, maintenance grants in the Rural Municipality of Moose Range (that's my home municipality), No. 486, increased 120 per cent for 1984. The Rural Municipality of Torch River, another municipality in my constituency, received maintenance grants which are 179 per cent higher than last year, Mr. Speaker.

Total funds now available to the six municipalities that I represent under the unconditional grant and new maintenance assistance program, increased by almost \$120,000. That represents an overall increase of 21 per cent in our funding to them. And I congratulate that Minister of Rural Development on his innovative new policies that will undoubtedly be well received by all rural municipalities.

I'd like to turn now to something else which concerns my constituency, that being the Nipawin hydro project. My riding is very fortunate to have this project in it, and it's also fortunate to have virtually full employment of construction trades people, as a result of that hydro project. The Leader of the Opposition, in his speech during this budget debate, made reference to Nipawin hydro, and I'd like to quote from his remarks in *Hansard* on March 26, 1984. He said, and I quote: —

It's bad to have major jobs, like the Nipawin dam, constructed largely by out-of-province labour, supporting out-of-province business, rather than by Saskatchewan labour spending their pay cheques at Saskatchewan places of business.

End of quote. Perhaps the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should consult with the business community in Nipawin and surrounding communities, to see where the pay cheques are being spent. Many, many of them are being spent in Nipawin.

As I said, this project is in my constituency, and as it was a concern of mine in the election of 1982 to make sure that there was local employment on that project — which was something

that had not taken place to any extent up to that time in the work that had preceded the election – I've been closely monitoring both the project and its economic effect on the surrounding communities.

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition's comments. I believe that he is deliberately attempting to mislead the people of Saskatchewan. I have received weekly statistics from Saskatchewan Power Corporation, outlining exactly how many people are being employed and where they've come from.

Let's take a look at the facts. I'll just pick out a number of weeks at random throughout the last year. We'll go to April 30, 1983, there were 477 people employed in the work-force. Out of those 477, 21 were from out of province, or 4 per cent of the total labour force on that project. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that fits in with the Leader of the Opposition's comment that that's largely constructed by out-of-province people.

Another week, August 20, 1983, of 786 people in the labour force there, 82 were from out of province, or 10 per cent of the people on the site. On September 7 – by the way, this is the highest out-of-province percentage – of 790 people working, 101 people, or 13 per cent, were out-of-province labour. On November 12th, when the project was slowing down for the winter, of 614 people employed, 11 per cent or 68 people were from out of province.

Mr. Speaker, that does not look like a large percentage to me. I don't believe that it comes anywhere near the amount of people which his administration drove from Saskatchewan to find work in neighbouring provinces, and I think that many of us owe a debt to neighbouring provinces who provided employment for us, and the young people – the young farmers who had to leave Saskatchewan, find opportunity elsewhere – so they could come back to this province if they ever had the opportunity, and to their homes.

I ask this Assembly, if a project which has averaged more than 70 per cent local employment – by local employment I mean people from within a 100-kilometre radius – and over 90 per cent provincial employment, less than 10 per cent outside, can be classed as largely built by out-of-province labour.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is in fact an honourable member, he will stand up in this House and apologize to this Assembly and to the people of Saskatchewan – and especially the people of Nipawin and the workers on that site – for deliberately misleading this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this same hon. member has been crying about the horrendous size of the deficit. He seems to have a very short memory when it comes to provincial debt. When the Leader of the Opposition and the now-demised party which he leads were in party, in power, they created more than \$1.2 billion in public debt through Saskatchewan Power Corporation alone. Mr. Speaker, that is only one crown corporation. Now, I'm like the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, and I can't visualize \$1 billion, but I can visualize what that added burden has meant to the people of Saskatchewan. It means that the \$130 million in additional revenue must be raised through utility bills every year to carry that debt. It means that 356,000 extra dollars must be raised by increased power rates every day just to pay the interest on this debt. And it means that approximately 15,000 extra dollars must be raised in power and natural gas bills which our consumers must pay every hour of every day — \$15,000 an hour, Mr. Speaker.

This afternoon, as someone was speaking in this Assembly, the hon. member from Quill Lake made the comment that that isn't a debt, it's an asset. Mr. Speaker, I always thought that an asset was something that showed up on the credit side of the ledger, not on the debt side.

But then of course, maybe the opposition look at this the same way they seem to be looking at most things these days – through their smoked mirrors. They don't seem to mention how

March 29, 1984

they've bled \$100 million which, along with the accrued interest of approximately another \$100 million, out of Saskatchewan Power Corporation and put it into the consolidated fund or general revenues, to balance their budgets. They don't mention that rate increases averaged 15.2 per cent per year from 1975 to 1982. That, Mr. Speaker, compares with the projected 13.9 per cent increase from 1982 to July 1984 under this government.

I submit that if there had been decent management of finances in Saskatchewan Power Corporation from 1975 to 1982; that if the previous government had not bled off all the surpluses from Sask Power to the general fund; that if the now-demised party had not run up horrendous debts in the SPC which the consumers of this province must now pay for; and that all these bad decisions had not been made by the NDP when they were in power; then we could hold power and natural gas rates constant for the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, if the people of Nipawin constituency and area know this government's commitment to rural Saskatchewan, they know by the actions announced in this budget that the Progressive Conservative government under the Premier is in touch with their needs and their aspirations for the future.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able to support this budget which our Minister of Finance brought in, and, of course, I will not be able to vote for the ridiculous amendments proposed by the opposition. Thank you.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. KATZMAN:** — I wasn't planning to join the debate today, but after listening to the statements from the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, I decided that we'd better correct the facts. And I thought I would find the notes, and the brief notes, for his trip to Africa that he was presented with as he left, you know: —

A report on the trip of Allen Engel, MLA, Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. Participants — Mr. Allen Engel, MLA, the Legislative Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, province of Saskatchewan. In his capacity as Leg. Secretary, Mr. Engel is responsible for international development programs.

Who accompanied Mr. Engel? Sorry, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Mr. Dickson H. Bailey, Chief Electoral Officer. I don't know why the Chief Electoral Officer was on government business.

Now, the report is rather lengthy, Mr. Speaker. And I thought I would just correct some of the facts.

The trip was arranged by a memorandum July 31, 1981, from the acting deputy minister of internal government affairs, to the Hon. Gordon MacMurchy. And, in the covering note, they suggest that Mr. . . . who will be going on the trip, and the schedule.

Now, the schedule to me was very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because as I went through it from August 8 all the way through it to the 29th, I noticed more free days and unscheduled and unplanned days and not to be meeting with groups, then I noticed arrangements for meeting with groups. There was time to sit in Paris, there was time to sit in Lausanne, and other places. But we won't get into that. What we'll get into is some numbers Mr. Engel was complaining about not matching.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order, please. I would caution the member from Rosthern to use the member's constituency or his position only.

**MR. KATZMAN:** — Mr. Speaker, *Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation Annual*



*Report 1980-81*. In it it indicates . . . it says: "Actual the province of Saskatchewan gave 12.1 per cent."

The province of Saskatchewan only gave 12.1 per cent. Not 50 per cent – 12.1. Okay? That was '78-79. 1979-80, actual, 13.9 per cent. And this afternoon he was demanding equal dollar for dollar, but he didn't tell us that when he wasn't responsible, as the legislative secretary to the minister of agriculture, that they only put in 13.1 per cent in 1980-81. Now budgeted for 1981-82, it said 13.5 per cent.

I don't know where he gets his figures. Mine are quoted from the *Annual Report 1980-81, Saskatchewan Council for International Co-operation*. I would assume their figures are correct. It's produced by them. The members had some problems this afternoon with facts. Now. Us. You know . . .

I'd like to go to a report. Now because of the lateness of the hour I won't take a lot of time, but I think I should make a comment. We'll go to the confidential part of the report. I mean let's not go to the public part. What's item number one?

The province should look at amending the matching grant program to restrict the funding to specific . . . (inaudible) . . . areas and the types of program, agriculture and rural development only.

That was number one recommendation of a confidential report produced by Mr. – the legislative secretary to the minister of agriculture to the facts.

What I'm trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is this member this afternoon, in his righteous way of saying things, indicated that they should be matching. The report shows it wasn't matching while he was responsible, so let's get down to the facts.

I could read from other documents as it would available to me, indicating, you know, something like a \$3,000 cash advance before he left, and so forth, but I won't get into that, Mr. Speaker. I'll just get into some other things that he suggested this afternoon as he spoke from his feet.

Well, let's go to a document . . . Oh, just a minute, I just found the document I was looking for. The July 31, 1981 which was the request for the amount of advance, and the funds, and the cost, and I don't think we need to put how many thousands and thousands of dollars on the record that that trip cost. The only concern I had, is there was more time for leisure than working on behalf of the government.

Let me go to the other comments he made this afternoon. In his righteous method, that he likes to stand to his feet, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg talked about liquor. Well, I wonder where that member was coming from once again. The dining-rooms increased by the NDP government – licensed dining-rooms – increased from 111 while the NDP were government, to 416. Don't get so pious, Mr. Member, where were you stopping that in those days? Cocktail rooms increased from 84 to 218 licences. Where was the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg then? Club increases – you know, another place to drink – and I didn't hear the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg standing up and saying, "No, no, no!" They went from 50 to 91.

You know, once again, Mr. Speaker, the member stood to his feet this afternoon, and didn't talk facts – he's talked everything but the facts. What does all that mean, Mr. Speaker? The NDP as a government, from March 31, 1971 to March 31, 1982 – from 823 outlets of liquor to 1310. Where was that member then, standing to his feet, writing letters to everybody? You know, two sets of rules for that member.

And, when we talk about two sets of rules, I must go to *Hansard*, December 3, 1982. I believe the speaker was the Hon. Allan Blakeney, Leader of the Opposition, member from Elphinstone. In his

speech, he indicated we ought not to encourage the consumption of alcohol beverages at functions of which we are a part. The Leader of the Opposition says, "We shouldn't do that." Well, Mr. Speaker, I have another something here from the Maple Creek newspaper, and what is it? It's an NDP picnic. Come to Admiral, Saskatchewan, and what does it suggest? It says, "Cool off in the beer garden." Two sets of rules. One that they stand up in the House, and talk about, and they do the total opposite out there. They did the total opposite when they increased the liquor outlets. Okay.

Now talking about the liquor outlets, why did they increase the liquor outlets? Well I think that there must be some reason. They got paid off by the booze companies: Gilbeys of Canada Ltd.; House of Seagram; Labatt's Breweries; London Winery; Canadian Seager's distilleries; London Winery Ltd.; Hiram Walker. Now they paid that money to the New Democratic Party of Canada, which they know how it operates, because they look after it for that group of people.

Let's look at another list, another list – wines: Labatt's Breweries again; London Wineries again; Corby distributors; House of Seagram; Jonathan Wines; Hiram Walker; and Molson's.

The comment I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is, we seems to have . . . we seem to have two sets of rules – one that they want to stay and speak about, and one they don't want to admit that they actually did.

Now as I said, Mr. Speaker, when I stood earlier, I had not intended to get into this budget speech, though when the member had spoke this afternoon and couldn't recognize the facts from what is not factual, I thought I should stay and correct the record.

Now to get to the budget speech. I'd like to make a couple of comments before I take my seat, and they will be very short. The budget is new. It's different. It's not give-away. It's innovative. It's helpful to people who are willing to put forth an effort to better the province. And that's why this budget is good. There's things for farmers, things for small businessmen, and those are the backbone of this province. And that's why I'll support this budget, and I wouldn't dare support that amendment of yours.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. YEY:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, coming into the building this evening, coming to work, I saw a flock of, a flock of a couple of hundred cows, flying and circling the Legislative Building. I don't know whether I was first to see that flock of crows. However, it occurred to me that it may be a bad omen on the farmers – either a bad omen on the farmers, or a bad omen on the Tory government. I'd sooner like to think that it may be a bad omen on the Conservative government, or the way they straddled their position on the Crow rate. They were non-committal. They didn't state their position. They didn't really force the issue to keep the Crow rate. They just straddled the fence. And I hope that whenever they see a crow, whenever they spot a crow from now on, I hope that they'll stop and think that they're in trouble.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this budget speech debate – the debate of this Tory government's third budget, their third deficit budget, their third budget which totally and completely ignores the people and the communities of northern Saskatchewan.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were consistently misled by the Tory party. "There is so much more we can be," they promised. Well, the new line ought to be, Mr. Speaker, the new line, the new Tory line ought to be, "There is so much more that public utilities, unemployment, and budget deficits can be."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. YEY:** — Power rates, in terms of public utilities, power rates are up 25 per cent, telephone

rates are up 19 per cent, bus fares and express charges are up 18 per cent, nursing home rate are up by 50 per cent. The Tory line ought to be, "So much more they can be."

Elect us, they promise, and we promise you tax cuts, expanded public services, and no government deficits. That was the promise of the Tory party on the election campaign trail. But as this budget shows, Mr. Speaker, the Tory government now in power were not telling the truth. They misled the people of Saskatchewan.

And after 11 straight budget surpluses in this province under the Blakeney government, the New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, the Tories' first budget produced . . . Under the New Democratic Party, we had budget surpluses for 10, 11 consecutive years. But under the Tory government, we have had nothing but deficits. Their second budget produced a deficit budget, a huge deficit. Their deficit budgets have produced program cuts which affect the lives of tens of thousands of people in Saskatchewan.

Now, in this third consecutive deficit budget before us, what do we find? Another deficit! In less than two years, the combined Tory deficit is now more than \$800 million, Mr. Speaker, a huge deficit which is driving up interest rates for all of us.

Deficit budgets, Mr. Speaker, cause higher interest rates. The quality of education will be lowered. And still more, capital projects will be cancelled and abandoned —capital projects like hospitals and schools, university buildings, and highways — capital projects which would provide badly needed jobs today, and valuable public assets tomorrow. And still more severe, deletions and cutbacks in needed program services for ordinary people.

And in an area already suffering from years of slow development in northern Saskatchewan, we now find this government cutting back still further in programs and services for the people living in the northern administration district. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental basis of this Tory government's budgetary policies embodies in this bill are being rejected by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the issue of unemployment. Unemployment is the number one problem in northern Saskatchewan where we have over 90 per cent unemployment in many of their communities. According to research, Mr. Speaker, according to research done in the 1930s, and right up to the 1980s, it is very clear that unemployment is a devastating and inhumane experience.

The research shows that unemployment causes a loss of respect, self worth, dignity, and pride. It causes tremendous grief, not only to the individual, but also to the family and the community. In my observation, it also serves to perpetuate institutionalized racism in our society. Unemployment is therefore, discrimination of the highest order.

A specific aspect of the recent research of the Canadian Mental Health Association also shows that for every 1 per cent increase in unemployment, there is a corresponding 4 per cent increase in suicides. In northern Saskatchewan, in 1978, there were two recorded suicides in the whole North. However, with the drastic cut-backs in housing, construction, and jobs, the pressure on individuals, families, and communities rose. The lack of income to pay for the existing \$50 to \$60 mortgages, along with the government's threats to move them out of their houses, is causing a lot of grief and stress for Northerners. In one community in the recent past there were 10 suicides. In other communities where there was some economic development options and opportunities there were none. But it is recognized, it is recognized that there is a general increase of this outrageous statistic.

When you look at the historic background of this one community with 10 suicides, one recognizes the tremendous respect and pride that this community had always had. As a matter of fact, it is still fighting to get jobs in developments outside of their community.

If this 1 per cent suicide rate were applied to Regina, it would mean that during this same period of time Regina would have had 2,000 suicides. In Regina this would have meant a national emergency. In northern Saskatchewan we can only talk to deaf ears and a ridiculously backward budget, a budget that gives millions of dollars to the rich, and nothing to the unemployed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. YEOW:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, while a vast majority of our people are out of work, around \$700 million of economic value from our minerals and forests and wildlife are taken out from northern Saskatchewan every year. Couldn't some of these dollars be used for the promised jobs and training institutes that are so badly needed in northern Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, Deputy Speaker, I would invite some of the Tory members to come to northern Saskatchewan with me to visit the northern communities, to visit with families where no one has worked since this Tory government took office. Let them explain to my friends, Deputy Speaker, let them explain to my friends in Cumberland House how this budget will create jobs for them, jobs now, and jobs in the future. Let them explain to the young people in La Ronge, or Stanley Mission, Sandy Bay, Wollaston Lake, Southend, and Reindeer Lake, just how this depression budget, this job abolition budget, will create job opportunities for the people in northern Saskatchewan. Let the Tory members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, come with me to visit the families driven to depression by the Tory policies. The families are on welfare, whose number has increased by some 60 per cent since this Tory government took office.

Let them try to explain, Deputy Speaker, just how their hundreds of millions of dollars in oil royalty breaks for big oil companies is good for northern people. Let them try to explain to my constituents, Deputy Speaker, to my neighbours, why the salaries for cabinet ministers in this budget has increased by 57 per cent—a bloated cabinet, while services and funding for the North have been cut.

My constituents, Deputy Speaker, have learned a hard lesson over the course of the past two years. They have learned that a Tory budget is a bad news budget for them. And this budget is no exception.

Let me just note some of the budget cuts, Mr. Speaker: northern job training funds cut by 11.78 per cent; northern technical training institute that was promised for the North, slashed – eliminated; fire suppression funds cut by .045 per cent; northern parks services cut by 2.85 per cent; northern economic development services cut by 28.86 per cent; northern economic development grants for economic development, grants to third parties, cut by 85 per cent from 1.4 million down to 200,000. What can you do with 200,000? Absolutely nothing. And northern municipal services cut by half, a million dollars, cut by 25 per cent; Core funding for the Metis Society and other native groups, cut; core funding for AMNSIS (Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan) cut by 20 per cent. Community projects that were anticipated – the bridge to Cumberland House; being the oldest community in the province, is still inaccessible. The hospital that was slated for La Ronge – the nursing care home – that's been eliminated altogether.

There are many, many projects that were anticipated, but regretfully abolished by the Tory government. That's this Tory government's priority for the people in the communities of northern Saskatchewan at a time when unemployment is as high as 90 per cent in many of our communities, at a time when our people are in desperate circumstances. This budget does not even mention providing adequate services. All it has is cuts – less priority, less funds, less hope for the people in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government talks a lot about economic development policies. It talks about economic development for the big oil companies. It talks about tax breaks for the wealthy

doctors and lawyers of Regina. Economic development for the rich. But why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, does the government not even talk any more about economic development for Northerners?

More than a year and a half ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on July 16, 1982, the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan wrote a memo to his staff, and I have that letter with me today. He boasted that this Tory government was going to develop, in consultation with northern people, a long-term comprehensive economic strategy, a long-term comprehensive economic strategy. Pretty fancy boast, Mr. Deputy Speaker,

But where is that consultation? Where is the consultation of this government with the native leadership, the local community leadership, the trappers, the fishermen, the working people, and the young people who need training and jobs.

No economic development strategy, Mr. Speaker, no consultation. Just big bucks for the big oil companies, and they continue to ignore the developmental needs of northern people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, for generations our people have lived with the land, lived with the northern forests, made their living from the traditional occupations that are part of our culture —trapping, fishing, and hunting. But we are seeing this PC government undermine that traditional economic base.

We hear from many concerned trappers. For example, men like Albert Ross. They are worried, and they write with deep concern about the PC big-business policy of clear-cutting our forests, destroying the trappers' trails, and destroying the fur habitat, the wildlife habitat of northern Saskatchewan. And Northerners know that this government is abandoning the commercial fishermen of northern Saskatchewan.

They are trying to destroy or reduce the commercial fishing industry. They are destroying the livelihood of northern commercial fishermen, simply in order to boost the trophy hunters, the sports and recreation hunters, tourists from New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

I'd like to turn to housing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to make just a few brief comments about this Tory government's northern housing policy, or maybe I should say its northern eviction policy, its northern eviction notices policy.

People are asking, why won't this government build houses, provide construction jobs, build some houses in northern communities for northerners, build some houses and create jobs, create some industry? Why force families of 16 people to live in one small three-bedroom house? Why refuse to do the necessary repair and warranty work which Saskatchewan Housing is obligated to perform? Why evict families on welfare? Why not assist them to find jobs, hope, and a better future?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to mention just a few specific examples — examples of problems being faced by the residents of Cumberland House. All members will know of the great hope that these residents had for jobs at the Nipawin power project. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you know how many of them have jobs there? Where there are some 1,400 workers in that project, there are only seven employed there from Cumberland House. Cumberland House is downstream from the Nipawin hydro project development. A community that is going to be directly affected by that project is Cumberland House and Sturgeon Landing, and yet, there is no regard for their, for the environmental concerns, and no regard in terms of placing them, or giving them preference in terms of jobs. It's a disgrace that we only have, out of a population of 1,300, that we only have seven people employed in that major project.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sturgeon Landing, as I have mentioned, will be affected by this project. And yet we have no one working in Nipawin at that hydro project from Sturgeon Landing, none at all

March 29, 1984

from Pelican Narrows, and none from Sandy Bay. Oh, I visited those communities. I came right from the council of Cumberland House. Oh, there are lots of jobs for the friends of the Tories in the South, or jobs for the workers from Alberta and Ontario, but only seven jobs for the residents of Cumberland House, Sturgeon Landing, Sandy Bay and Pelican Narrows.

Some of the Tory members from Regina, Mr. Speaker, like to pretend that Regina has the worst drinking water in the world. I believe that's what the Premier said when he tried to defend installing water purifiers in cabinet ministers' offices. But I would invite the Premier and the ministers of Health and Environment to Cumberland House to test the drinking water there. The water is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, and it is potentially dangerous. I, therefore, call upon the government to undertake at once a thorough review of water quality throughout my constituency, and to spend a bit less on big oil companies, and a bit more on municipal services for northern Saskatchewan.

I would also urge government ministers to come to Cumberland House to listen to my neighbours' needs in terms of the weirs that they have been anticipating assistance on for the . . . for the rivers, the wildlife habitat, and the lake that was once abundant with wildlife. I would urge the government opposite to stop talking so much, and to give that community some positive action, and to assist the people in terms of their plight of high unemployment, high reliance on welfare; and get on with some meaningful economic development initiatives and options for the people in northern -Saskatchewan and the people in Cumberland House.

I should like to turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to this government's shameful record on environmental protection. For three years in a row now, for three budgets in a row, this Tory government has cut back services for occupational health and safety. They have eliminated all research funding into low-level radiation research. Now, in this budget they have eliminated all health research funding. They have cut back on the environmental protection services of the Department of Environment.

Hundreds of million dollars, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of million dollars for the big oil companies, but cuts – nothing but cuts – for environmental protection.

Every member of this Tory government knows, Mr. Speaker, that here was a firm, concrete obligation on them to maintain an effective, modern, monitoring committee under the terms of the Key Lake Surface Lease Agreement. But what happened to that committee, Mr. Speaker? Does it still exist to monitor the hiring and training performance of the Key Lake Mining Corporation? Does it still exist to monitor and review the reports of the Department of Environment? No, Mr. Speaker. That monitoring committee no longer exists because this Tory government scrapped it.

Mr. Speaker, this government's record of environmental protection has been shameful right from the beginning. But it reached its lowest point in January, when day after day, week after week, the government and the Key Lake Mining Corporation tried to hide the facts. They tried to confuse the public. There were many calls, Mr. Speaker, for a public inquiry into the Key Lake spill and the government's handling of it. Calls for an independent public inquiry from various church organizations, environmental groups, workers, Northerners, northern leaders, and the press. But did the Premier ever listen to those many voices calling for a public inquiry? No. Did the Premier ever listen to the concerns of the various church organizations, the environmental groups, the Northerners? Did he ever come up to northern Saskatchewan to meet with those directly affected? No. He hid, Mr. Speaker, he hid for more than a month until the people of Saskatchewan finally began to ask, "Where is the Premier? Why is he hiding? What is he afraid of?" No attempts were made by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, to defend or justify his cut-backs in environmental protection services. No attempts by the Premier to defend or justify his refusal to have a full, independent, public inquiry into this matter.

I would like to turn now, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to this Tory government's policies for Indian

and Metis people, its policy of undermining them, betraying them, and ignoring them, First, Mr. Speaker, let us note that in the budget a very interesting fact about the funds for the Indian and native affairs secretariat. The administration budget is increased. Funds for the bureaucrats, and the Tory political advisors in Regina, have increased. But funds directly for the Indian and native groups, funds for the people themselves, the communities, and their projects, those funds have been reduced. Another clear case, Mr. Speaker, of misplaced priorities. Another clear case of misplaced priorities.

A much more serious and fundamental concern, however, Mr. Speaker, is this Tory government's colonial approach to aboriginal people. If we searched the Indian and native affairs secretariat legislation, if we searched through the statements, the speeches, the policy pronouncements of this Tory government, never do we find any reference to the rights of aboriginal people. Never do we find any clear, simple, straightforward, Tory recognition that Indian and Metis people do have rights, and that those rights ought to be protected.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we find this government pursuing a policy of colonialism; a policy of divide and rule; a policy of ignoring the established Indian leadership, or ignoring the established Metis leaderships. That is what we find, Mr. Speaker. For many years there has been a genuine trust and respect between New Democrats and the native people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. YEW:** — Of course, there have been problems. There have been problems. And, of course, there have been disagreements. There always is. But there was always that basic sense of mutual trust and respect.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. YEW:** — This was evident, as we all know, in 1981, when Allan Blakeney and the New Democrats of Saskatchewan stood firm in their defence of the rights and interest of native people in the constitutional discussions.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What did you get from Devine? What did you get from Devine?

**MR. YEW:** — Nothing.

But now, Mr. Speaker, we have a different government. A different policy approach. And we no longer have that basic sense of trust and mutual respect.

In a final analysis, Mr. Speaker, we have a Tory government which stalls and obstructs, as shown in the recent constitutional talks.

One hundred years ago, a national Tory government established the Department of Indian Affairs. One hundred years ago. Today, a provincial Tory government continues the same stringent colonial policies with nothing but delays, betrayals, and promises. This is just another phase in the long history of betrayals to native people by Tory governments throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad news budget: a budget which undermines the quality of education services for our young people; a budget whose huge deficit is driving up higher interest rates; a budget which contains nothing for the people in the communities of northern Saskatchewan. Nothing for them but reduced services, more unemployment, higher reliance on welfare, and more broken lives.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I shall be opposing the motion of the Minister of Finance, and shall be supporting the amendment. Thank you.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:05 p.m.