

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

March 30, 1984

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

ORAL QUESTIONS

School Grant Formula

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education, and that's in respect to the shortfall of the operating grants that her government has provided to the four school boards in Regina and Saskatoon. I have here, Madam Minister, a news release that was issued this morning by the union representing 250 clerical workers in the Saskatoon public school. Their negotiations for 1984, apparently, had been progressing well up until yesterday. But yesterday the negotiations broke off because of the uncertainty and the confusion that has been created by your government's cutback in providing operating grants to the school boards. My question to you then: Will you, in fact, quit hiding behind the formulas, which you use as an excuse, and agree to provide to the four school boards in Regina and Saskatoon at least sufficient money, at least the amount of money that you transferred to them last year?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, there has been a 5 per cent increase on the operating grants. That's a provincial average, the same as every other year. That's how the increases are based — 5 per cent on the operating grants. They're just spread out over the province. Now that's based on a system that is supposed to be fair and equal across the province, based on a system of a defined need and the ability to pay. What we have this year in Saskatoon and Regina is the reassessment that was started several years ago under a government that was then NDP. That reassessment has slowly taken place, and Saskatoon and Regina are feeling the effects of the equalization this year.

The member for Quill Lakes suggests that I'm hiding behind the formula. I suggest that the member from Quill Lake is asking me to play some politics for the formula. The formula is not meant to be played with when it comes to politics.

MR. KOSKIE: — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member whether she agrees with the contents of the news release of the 250 clerical workers of the Saskatoon public school wherein they state, and I quote:

This would appear to be one more situation where the provincial government is abdicating their responsibilities to the people of Saskatchewan by not providing sufficient funds to provide for necessary services.

This is the feeling of the clerical workers. It's the expression of the school boards and the chairman of the school boards.

I want to ask you: is it your opinion that cutting back millions of dollars to these individual school boards, do you feel that that is equitable, and will, in fact, maintain a proper quality of education in those cities?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, I think it would be totally unfair for me to comment on a news release that I haven't seen, and a news release while a union is in the bargaining process. I don't think that's proper at all.

The member talks about insufficient funds. I want to remind the member, two provinces in

March 30, 1984

Canada this year have got an increase of 5 per cent on operating budgets to school boards, two provinces, out of the whole of Canada – Ontario and Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. SMITH: — B.C. looking at a cut-back; Alberta froze their education budget – zero to operating grants to school boards in Alberta; Manitoba looking at 2 to 3 per cent – not 5 per cent on the operating grants, Mr. Speaker, but 2 to 3; and on and on it goes across the country to the East. So I suggest, that when it comes to sufficient funds, Saskatchewan has held its own this year by allowing 5 per cent province-wide on the operating grants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Further supplemental Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister: Does the minister not realize that if she continues with this very arrogant and stubborn approach to the city, of funding of education to Regina and Saskatoon school boards, that they will have only two alternatives, that is, double-digit education tax increases to property owners, or alternatively, a slashing of the quality of education? Are you, in fact, prepared to transfer millions of dollars over to local taxpayers, or the other consequence of decreasing the quality of education in this province?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, the member is still asking me to play politics with the formula. He keeps talking about decreases. Maybe it's time we talked about increase and how that affects equity and the ability to pay. For instance, I don't hear the member saying that Prince Albert city got 6.68 per cent increase – increase. We also have some school boards that will get a double-digit increase – not decrease. What the member has to understand is that there has been a formula put in place, based on a defined need, and the ability to pay.

Now, when the reassessment went through, there were some assumptions made, even by the opposition who was then in government, that perhaps things were not equitable. So they came up with the equalization factor on the reassessment. What the reassessment is showing is that maybe things weren't equitable, and there was a catch-up phase. We have said to the boards, "We realize the tough position you are in, and we will help you with a three-year, phase-in period."

When I met with the Regina separate board last night they understand fully, and they support the formula. What they wanted to talk about was the severe pressure that the reassessment has – particularly in a time of restraint, when they are very well aware of their taxpayers – in keeping that at a 5 per cent level. And they said, "Can we at least talk about it?" Not the formula. They said, "We support the formula, but let's talk about the reassessment, and the pressure that it is creating." We did that. The boards will be meeting again, and then we will be discussing some more about possibilities of alleviating pressure on boards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary to the Minister of Education. She spoke with disapproval of the freeze by the Government of Alberta on school grants. Would she be good enough to agree to freeze the school grants to the Regina and Saskatoon public and separate school systems?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. SMITH: — The Leader of the Opposition fantasizes. I never used the word "disapprove." I was merely making a statement in reply to the member from Quill Lakes. He talks about cut-backs. He ignores the 5 per cent increase on operating grants. Alberta froze theirs. What they do with theirs is their business, but if you compare what Alberta did to what

Saskatchewan did, there is an increase. It's not my business to approve or disapprove what Alberta does. We run the government here, not Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — New question to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Education with respect to the funding of school systems in Regina and Saskatoon, and the relationship of that funding to the reassessment of which she has spoken. Members will be aware that the reassessment affects not only the school systems, but also the municipal systems. And members will know that the revenue-sharing formula also has an equalization factor in it. I refer hon. members to the fact that the Minister of Urban Affairs has said in this House:

Reintroduction of the distribution formula means that the percentage grant increase received by each community will vary, depending on its need and its ability to pay.

And that sounds like what the Minister of Education has said.

That is the underlying basis of revenue sharing. But, Mr. Speaker, our government is guaranteeing that no community will receive less this year than it received last year under revenue sharing.

And that's what the Minister of Urban Affairs says.

My question to the Minister of Education is: will you do as well for the school boards, as the Minister of Urban Affairs is doing for the cities, towns, and villages? Will you see that no school board receives less this year than it received last year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. SMITH: — You are still asking me to play politics with that formula.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. Give the minister an opportunity to answer.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Thank you. I don't run Urban Affairs, and I'm not sure what the formula is for revenue sharing, that it's based on . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's a debatable point, and we'll get into that another time.

The formula, Mr. Speaker, is one that is based on a defined need, minus the ability to pay. Now school boards have said, including Regina and Saskatoon boards, their argument is not with the formula. The formula is fair. They said, "Let's talk about the reassessment and the effect." You know, the member from Quill Lake says, "Get her off the formula." I just finished telling him boards support the formula. They support the formula, so I'm not going to get off of the formula. It's fair. It's equitable. And it's based on an ability to pay in order to support the public school system.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister: will she show the same measure of statesmanship, compassion, and flexibility in dealing with a formula with respect to school matters that the Minister of Urban Affairs has shown with respect to municipal matters? That's all we ask.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, we have had some discussions with the school boards, and there will be some further discussions after they have all the information in.

For instance, the Regina separate board, nor does the Regina public board know exactly what that one mill has changed. They do not have those figures yet. We will get a better idea once

they do, of what happens to that mill rate when they get it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — A brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Whatever the value of the mill rate may be, will the minister agree that the current level of school grants promised by her department means a very substantial mill rate increase for both the public school boards and the separate school boards if they are to maintain the same expenditure per student as they had last year, and accordingly maintain the quality of education?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition says “the expenditure per pupil.” I will remind him that one of those divisions had a fairly large decline in “per pupil,” which has an effect on it, too. Plus the other factors that come into it, such as the change in the capital requirements and the capital debt. Those have a very major impact, and they are included in on the formula. The boards are aware of the various factors that affect this.

You know, you talk about decrease, again, in percentages. You know, let’s talk about the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. For instance, the Assiniboia school division is going to get a 15 per cent increase this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please. If you ask questions and they are worthy of answers, then I would expect the minister to have the opportunity to be heard.

HON. MRS. SMITH: — So, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the member on the opposite side, Assiniboia will continue to get that increase – 15 per cent this year. Borderland School Division, south of here – everyone’s familiar with Borderland – 41 per cent increase – 41 per cent increase.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MRS. SMITH: — And why 41 per cent? Because of some of the factors that I’ve already relayed to you. Now it isn’t decreases. It’s a 5 per cent operating, spread out across the province, based on those factors.

Some of those divisions have gone through some changes on reassessment. Obviously, because of several factors with Regina and Saskatoon, reassessment is a problem, and I’m willing to talk about it with them. And I was willing to say, “Let’s talk about spreading out over three years. Is there any room for further discussion?” The answer is yes, there is. And we will be having those discussions with the boards when we have more information from them.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Final supplementary, Mr. Deputy. The minister makes clear that there are variations in the amount of grants. This would have happened under the municipal formula as well. The Minister of Municipal Affairs put in a floor, no less money next year than this year. My question to the minister, again . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please! Order, please! The rules of our Assembly state that you cannot ask the same question time and time and merely rephrase it. And that’s what I hear happening. If you have a different question, we’ll take that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — My question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please! Give the member an opportunity to ask his question.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Has the Minister of Education considered adopting a policy wherein she would ensure that no school district got less money in 1984 than they got in 1983?

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Mr. Speaker, to this date I have not considered a policy that would change the formula that is based on equity, because boards have said the formula is fair. What the opposition are asking me to do at this time, because of a reassessment, are two things: you play some politics with that formula, and you take from the rural in order to give to the urban. I don't consider that equitable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Accessibility Legislation

MR. SHILLINGTON: — I want to return the Minister of Labour to one of his many successes, the accessibility legislation. I would remind the minister that two years ago the former administration introduced a bill applauded by accessibility groups and the then opposition. You came to office, sir, and sat for 18 months and did nothing and then introduced a very badly botched job.

My question has to do with the fact that Bill 19 had to be tabled and delayed until the spring, and you, sir, promised this Assembly there would be widespread public dialogue on Bill 19. We find now that we have been misinformed. In fact, you've refused to meet with groups such as the provincial accessibility committee of Saskatchewan, since a series of hastily called meetings in January exposed this bill's shortcomings. My simple question is, Mr. Minister: why have you stubbornly refused to meet and discuss the legislation with the people who will be most seriously affected by it?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have not refused to meet with the various groups interested in accessibility. We came with our draft . . . or tabled our first reading of the bill. During the month of January we held hearings all around the province, where all groups were able to come and express their concerns or criticisms or complimenting the bill, or whatever they wanted to talk to us about. That was done. Since that point in time, we have been getting some amendments that we are making changes in the act. That is being drafted now, and the bill will be presented to the House, or the amendments will be presented to the House in the next few days.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Well, new question, Mr. Speaker. They had some opportunity at the public hearings to express their views, but they were naïve enough to think that your view might count for something, and they wanted to meet with you personally.

Your broad circle of admirers has come to include the provincial accessibility committee, and I want to remind you of what they said in a letter to you, dated March 1:

Our constant plea for co-operation and communication has been met by yourself and your staff with rejection and defensiveness. Your response has been inadequate and insulting.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, is this your definition of public by-laws?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have met with that particular group two or three times over the last two years, and we got to the point in having our hearings in January — that group was at the hearings. We heard their briefs, and we have to get on with the job. And I can't have meetings forever and be able to come with amendments to place before the House. That is being done, and we've listened to the groups many, many times.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the provincial accessibility committee pointed out a number of deficiencies, and I'm only going to refer you to three, in the interest of time. It drastically reduces any potential for improved access to employment, housing, or community living in Saskatchewan for disabled persons. It ensures that accessibility for the disabled is the exception rather than the rule. And it's so poorly drafted, it likely contravenes the

March 30, 1984

Canadian Bill of Rights and Freedoms and the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code.

Can you give this Assembly your word that you'll meet with the provincial accessibility committee and take into account their concerns before you proceed with Bill 19?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, we have already met. We are coming with some amendments which we have heard from the various groups that you have been mentioning in your remarks this morning. We will be carrying on with Bill 19, with the amendments. We have offered the groups the opportunity to participate in the regulation writing, following the passage of the bill, and they will have their opportunity, at that time, to help us with regulations.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Minister, the circle of people applauding your efforts continues to expand and include the Chief Commissioner of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission who says that Bill 19 will limit, rather than expand access to buildings for Saskatchewan's disabled people, and he says that it conflicts with the human rights code, and the Saskatchewan charter of rights. My question is: has the minister agreed with this common-sense suggestion, and will you give us your undertaking that these comments will be incorporated in the amendments which you present to the House?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the human rights commission. We have listened to the provincial accessibility committee. We have listened to the Voice of the Handicapped all over the province. I've told you that we are coming with some amendments. That's exactly what the hearings were for, and I'm sure that the various groups, including the human rights commission, are going to be happy with what they see in the amendments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question. Well, Mr. Minister, that would be a startling break for precedent for them to approve it. Mr. Minister, since you have refused to avail yourself of the opportunity to discuss it with the groups, you might, perhaps discuss, it here now. Mr. Minister, do you agree . . . Mr. Minister, do you agree that it is unacceptable that Bill 19 requires only the entrance doors of multi-storey buildings to be accessible, to be accessible to handicapped people?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, the member will see the amendments when I table them in the House, and that probably will cover his concerns.

New Building for College of Agriculture

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a short question. It should possibly be directed to the Minister of Agriculture, but I'm going to ask the Premier because of the importance of it, and because of a statement he's made in a recent article in the paper. Just for background information:

Funding of the University of Saskatchewan's College of Agriculture will likely remain on the government's waiting list, according to Premier Grant Devine . . .

It was reported in the *Star-Phoenix* just recently.

Mr. Premier, do you feel that the College of Agriculture's new building can wait, and that it is not a priority item in this budget?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, certainly the College of Agriculture is a priority for this administration, for the province of Saskatchewan. We have been working with the Dean of Agriculture, several people involved in the agricultural industry, in estimating the cost of a new building, talking about how it can be built, who can be financed, who to share it with the federal

government, the provincial government, the agricultural sectors, the farm community, agribusiness, and so forth. Those discussions are ongoing. I discussed it as probably as early as 3 or 4 days ago, along with the Dean of Agriculture and prospective new dean of Agriculture, so it certainly is a priority, Mr. Speaker. We just want to make sure that we got everybody involved, so that we don't miss any opportunities to use the money wisely.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

The Young Offenders Act

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise this Assembly and the public of Saskatchewan that yesterday afternoon the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada came to a tentative agreement regarding the implementation of the Young Offenders Act, which is scheduled to be proclaimed April 2.

The general results of the agreement are a 50-50 cost-sharing of custodial and non-custodial activities resulting from the implementation of the Young Offenders Act. I background that by indicating that the initial federal position was roughly 84 per cent provincial funding. Non-custodial services are generally described but will include alternative sentencing, diversion, interim release, assessment, supervision, community services, etc., and those are by way of description and are not the final services to be supplied.

Secondly, the Government of Canada will be sharing, on a 50-50 cost-share basis, leasing of facilities necessary under the program. The cost to the province, additional cost, will be slightly less than 50 per cent . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm sorry the hon. members don't want to hear this — slightly less than 50 per cent of the annual costs, operating costs of \$14 million. In addition, Saskatchewan will receive an implementation grant of an additional \$1.5 million. Secondly, the legal aid for young offenders will be cost-shared on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to co-operation with the Government of Canada on implementation of the Young Offenders Act. We think it a fair and reasonable deal for the people of Saskatchewan, and we look forward to working for the implementation of the Young Offenders Act on behalf of the youth of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the comments of the Minister of Justice in respect to the announcement made today, in respect to the agreement with the federal government for the implementation of the Young Offenders Act. I would be interested . . . He has indicated the arrangements and the cost funding and sharing as between the federal and provincial government. I would be interested to know whether the deal that has been worked out between Saskatchewan and the federal government is consistent with what is worked out with other provinces throughout the Dominion of Canada, in so far as the sharing.

But certainly I think that the implementation of this act can, in fact, go a long way in dealing with young offenders. And certainly I would also hope that the Minister of Justice would get down to the basic task of providing justice in this province by more appointments of judges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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 this Assembly do now resolve itself into the committee of finance and the amendment thereto moved by Hon. Mr. Blakeney.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to become involved in the final day of debate on the 1984 budget which, a week ago, was brought into the Assembly, and that night, in front of the TV lights, looked, I suppose you could say, impressive. I think a week later, Mr. Speaker, the wheels are coming off the 1984 Tory budget. It's a little tattered around the edges, and I suppose the thing that many people are saying is, "What a difference a week can make."

I was out in the constituency last weekend. We were having coffee at the Shaunavon Co-op. They have a little cafeteria, and we were sitting around and a couple of farmers were asking about the PC arithmetic on balanced budgets and reducing the deficit. And they say, "We watched with interest as the minister got to his feet, and the deficit was at 560 million. And by the time he sat down he had reduced it to 830 million." And they were wondering how that reduction plan worked.

The irony is, is that today we get a press release. It's called, "All-Out National Campaign to Rid Nation of Debt Called For." You'd never believe who's calling for that. The news release reads like this:

Premier Grant Devine today said raising government deficits threatens the economic health and stability of the nation, and he called on the provincial governments and the federal government to unite in an all-out campaign to reduce them.

It goes on to say that:

Devine pointed out that its March 21 budget in Saskatchewan reduced its provincial deficit by 20 per cent, and plans to go on reducing the deficit in a similar manner in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to reduce our deficit in the manner we started and continued in this government, we will indeed be broke and bankrupt – the things that many people in Saskatchewan are now saying, the thing that the bond market and the bond people in New York are looking at very closely, and watching with a great deal of interest.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest as my colleagues on this side used up at least half of the time during the past week making solid arguments as to why this budget was not good for Saskatchewan – Mr. Speaker, telling the people of Saskatchewan not only what was wrong with the budget, but yesterday, in particular, I was proud of my colleague from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, who set out an agricultural policy which would deal with the problems facing the farmers of Saskatchewan in light of the neglect by the Conservative government.

I was disappointed, as well, in the Minister of Health. And I have listened to his speeches for the last six years, and I think it is not unfair to say that his speeches have not improved. In fact, I think that this speech was probably the weakest speech I have seen that minister give since he ran for the leadership. And I would have liked to have seen him leader at that time, and he knows that very well. But in his speech, a billion-dollar speech, in terms of the amount of money that he's spending now that he's rolled part of the Department of Social Services into it, now that he's spending now that he's rolled part of the Department of Social Services into it, now that he's taken ambulances out of Urban Affairs and put into Health, and I don't know whether vet medicine in the next one on the list or not, to increase the Health budget to over a billion dollars. But in that speech, where most ministers would outline in detail a plan for the future of health in

Saskatchewan, this Minister of Health spent 20 minutes on a political harangue and 10 minutes on the health department. And later on I'll go into the reasons why he spent so little time on health.

I think the biggest disappointment, though, was last night when the Minister of Highways got to his feet to outline the highway array for 1984. The least amount of money, in terms of what it will do in terms of putting asphalt on the road, and in terms of moving earth, was announced by the minister last night. And with great fanfare he stood here, and he had cameras in the Assembly to take his picture, and he had brought people in from around the province to listen to this great announcement.

Mr. Speaker, he stood in this Assembly, and he said, "I'm going to build the road at Eastend, and there has not been anyone asking me to except the mayor of Eastend." Well, it's interesting that in 1981 the deputy minister of highways of that day met in Eastend with 150 people in the Eastend hall to design that very highway you announced last night. Not only did the community plan that highway, Mr. Minister, without your help, because at that time you were over on his side doing nothing – at that time when that road was being planned, Mr. Minister, you were nowhere around.

I would like to tell you, as well, Mr. Minister, that that road west of Eastend was planned and in the budget in 1982. It has been staked for two years. It was cancelled by the same minister in his budget in 1982. He cancelled that road; he took it away. And last night, sanctimoniously, he stands up and takes credit for what the community did. And I say that that is unfair, Mr. Minister, and you owe the people of Eastend and south-west Saskatchewan an apology.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to say that the member for Shaunavon had not contacted my office; he had not let me know that they needed a road at Eastend. Well, isn't it interesting that on the front page of the *Shaunavon Standard* of this past July, 1983, an open letter to the Minister of Highways appeared, and who should have signed that letter but the MLA from Shaunavon. He said that he had not received any requests for the highways between Eastend and Robsart, and I'll read the letter.

Dear Mr. Garner: I write to bring to your attention to a number of highways projects in southwestern Saskatchewan which should be attended to immediately.

And that was writing this after having a constituency tour after the people in Robsart and Eastend asked for this road.

I refer to No. 13 Highway between Admiral and the junction of 37, Highway No. 13 between Robsart and Eastend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the road that he announced last night. That is the road that the minister announced last night that no one in the community had asked him for, that no one had talked to him about, that no one had met with him about. I think, Mr. Speaker, what this proves is the Minister of Highways is a blow-hard, and a braggart, and is insincere, and I think the people of the province and the workers he has fired over the last two years will prove out that this minister is not honourable enough to be a minister of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Highways went on to say what a great job he's doing in the department. Well, I want to tell you, on the Trans-Canada Highway, west of Regina, do you know how many miles he has built since he became minister? All of that road from Regina to Swift Current and 14 miles west of Swift Current was built by the New Democratic Party, or by the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan.

In three years, do you know how much road he has built, dirt he has moved into that road in three years? One kilometre. He has built one kilometre. This is the minister who, in opposition,

March 30, 1984

bragged about if he ever could get to be the Minister of Highways, he would pave, and he would build every mile of the Trans-Canada from one border to the other. How much has he built?

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. GARNER: — Well, yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will behave myself. I would like to introduce a guest to this Assembly, the Mayor from Eastend, Saskatchewan, and one of the councillors. Mr. Ted Gleim. Mr. Deputy Speaker, to all members of this Assembly, it's a very lovely community in southwest Saskatchewan, and because of their very strong representation, we're building some roads down in that country, and I'd just like to thank them for coming all the way in to watch the proceedings of last night and the show of today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, through you, welcome them to the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I too would like to join with the Minister of Highways in welcoming my good friend, Ted Gleim and Brian VanSandt from Eastend. Ted will know very well he was at the meeting in 1981 — I'm not sure whether Brian was there or not — when we were planning that stretch of highway that the minister is bragging about today in this Assembly. And the one person who was not at the meeting in 1981 — and I think Ted will agree with me — was the member from Wilkie. He was nowhere to be seen when the highway was planned.

So I join with the member in greeting the people from Eastend.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — The debate continues.

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

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

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when I was interrupted by the member from Wilkie, he had nothing to do with planning that stretch of highway. The reason he's getting up today, having introduced the same people he introduced last night, is because the minister is hurting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — He's suffering today. The guy with the big ego. The guy with the big ego and the rubber boots got caught. He got caught attempting to mislead the House. He got caught saying that he didn't get a letter, and he was misrepresenting the Assembly, and I challenge the minister, who is not honourable enough to be a member of the Crown, to get up and apologize publicly for having misled the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I challenge him. I challenge that minister to get up and apologize or resign, because he misinformed the House on this letter, which is a public document. And I'll tell you why he's acting so insecure today, is because he knows he's wrong.

Mr. Speaker, there was a rumour going around a while ago that that minister was going to come to Shaunavon and run for the Tories. He was down there hunting, and he was down there

meeting with the executive, and he was at the fowl supper, and he'd stand, and he tried and tested the water. And do you know what he decided, Mr. Minister? He decided that he wouldn't have a chance of winning that seat. And he's right. And do you know why? Because the people of Shaunavon have never elected a Conservative to this Assembly, and they never will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Shaunavon constituency has a long heritage of electing representatives who represent them and do a good job of it, and that makes me proud to be part of that group of people, and that doesn't include the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister should look at building more than seven miles in my constituency, which he announced last night with great fanfare — seven miles in three years, in a constituency that is the third largest in the province. I think, Mr. Minister, to stand up and brag in this Assembly that you're going to build a total of seven miles in the third largest constituency in three years leaves whether or not you're doing a good job in that department up in the air. And I think people will judge you on that.

Mr. Speaker, worse than that, this minister is spending any amount of money in Shaunavon because he's still slightly interested in running down there. And I'll tell you Mr. Minister, the reason I know that is because my friend from Assiniboia who's in the fourth largest constituency . . . Do you know how many dollars out of the hundred million he got in the wealthiest constituency where most tax comes from per capita? Do you know how many miles of road they got in the past three years? Do you know how many roads were built? Talk about political politics with roads. This member from the wealthiest constituency in the province per capita has got zero taxes back for his taxpayers, and I challenge you, Mr. Minister, to quit playing politics with the taxpayers of this province. I say that when you spend . . . I say, Mr. Speaker, when you spend \$8 million in Tory constituencies; when you spend \$8 million of taxpayers money in Tory constituencies; and you spend zero in the fourth largest one in the province, you are, indeed, playing politics with the taxpayers money.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I talked for a moment about the deficit, and I would like to expand a little bit on what the deficit will mean to the people of Saskatchewan over the coming year. The deficit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has gone from 560 to \$830 million. This is part of the new recovery and debt reduction program initiated by the Minister of Finance over a week ago. He has announced to the world, and publicly, that he wants everyone in Canada to follow him along down this road of deficits. He's going to reduce, and continue to reduce his deficit the way he has for the past three years.

Well, what does that mean? That Minister of Finance started out three years ago with no debt in the consolidated fund. It had been balanced for 11 years; it's public record. Members on that side will have been at public accounts, and will have had a chance to check that record if they understand a financial statement. And I don't think the member from Wilkie would know a financial statement from another pair of rubber boots.

And I tell you that if we are going to go on continuing to build the deficit, from zero to 830 in three years, then I would challenge the members opposite to get out of the habit of doublespeak. And thank goodness 1984 only comes once in our lifetime.

The deficit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, mentioned and talked about by all members on this side, was not to be heard once by members opposite. Not one of them mentioned the largest deficit in the province's history — \$830 million. Not one of them mentioned how we intend to repay that money. Not one said that this is a heritage fund of a different type being built up for our children, that they will have to pay, just as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow. This \$830 million is debt that hasn't been collected. These are taxes that someone will have to pay. Whether you pay your bills today, or tomorrow, they have to be paid, unless you plan to be bankrupt and out of

March 30, 1984

business. And I'll challenge the members that I have the key – they plan to declare bankruptcy at the next election—they don't plan to be around to pay the bills, because I believe they're here for a good time, not a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I think the members are on the way out. I followed with interest, over the last six months, a change in the political wind in North America. I've seen a change in the political wind all across the western world. And I would like to go through a little bit of the litany how that change is occurring.

Six months ago in the United States Gerald Ford was at least 15 percentage points ahead in the public polls. No one will argue with that. I would have bet a thousand dollars in a minute that Ronald Reagan, pardon me, that Ronald Reagan would have won the election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Ronald Reagan was running 15 percentage points ahead of Walter Mondale in the race for the presidential election. Who would have had realized, or ever thought, that someone by the name of Gary Hart would, in six months, would in six months be leading the polls in the United States against the warmongering Ronald Reagan, the right-wing politician of the United States?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, who would have thought that the new Labour leader in Great Britain, for the first time in three or four years, would be leading Margaret Thatcher in the opinion polls in Great Britain; a Labour leader by the name of Kinnock, who won the leadership last summer, or early spring, and is now leading Margaret Thatcher in the opinion polls.

Who would have thought that, in the Democratic elections which are occurring at the present time, that Gary Hart would have won every delegate from the State of Montana, considered to be a right-wing part of the United States?

Who would have believed that, when one person named Mulroney, who won the leadership of the Conservative Party six months ago, would . . . (inaudible) . . . and with 57 per cent in the opinion polls, would manage to drop by 7 percentage points in the first six months? Who would have believed that? And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that that slide has only just begun. That's based on some pretty impressive statistics that have just happened over the last couple of days.

Last night there were two meetings on, simultaneously, in Canada; two very important, historic meetings. One was being held in Manitoba, where the leader of the federal party was present with a thousand PC members. The one person missing, which will start this story, is Gary Filmon, the leader of the PC Party in Manitoba, who had chosen to go skiing – not by accident – but had chosen to go skiing.

There was another meeting being held in Calgary, a Tory stronghold of Calgary, where there were 800 Liberals out to meet the heir apparent to the Liberal Party, John Turner.

Now those meetings are of similar size; they're in similar cities, but I would think that Calgary is not a stronghold of the Liberal Party, John Turner.

Now those meetings are of similar size; they're in similar cities, but I would think that Calgary is not a stronghold of the Liberal Party. But I think what is most proving in this point, is the reception that each of them got.

Mr. Mulroney, in giving his speech, attempted to go to the official language, the second official language of this country. And do you know what happened when he did that? Do you know what happened when he did that? The members in that audience booed your leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — No, I don't. I think it's a disgrace. I think that it's a disgrace that

leader who has worked hard would be booed by the members in Manitoba on an issue such as that.

The other side of this Tory is: what was John Turner doing in Calgary? How was he being received? How was John Turner being received in Calgary, the heartland of the Tory party? Well, I'll tell you, I'll tell you, that in Calgary, that in Calgary, John Turner got a much better reception than Mulroney did in Manitoba.

Another party: at that meeting in Winnipeg, members of the Conservative Party, when Mulroney switched to the second official language of this country, do you know what they did? Do you know what they did, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They took out their PC plastic cards, and they ripped them in half and threw them on the floor and walked out of that meeting. I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a party that has that little discipline, that has that little respect for their leader, is not worthy of being the government in Ottawa, and I don't believe they ever will be.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few moments about agriculture and some of the things that are being done, and not being done, at the present time in agriculture in Saskatchewan. I can say that the budget, as it affects young farmers in Saskatchewan, will do nothing to keep the wolf away from the door. The minister has announced two basic programs in this budget, one which is a tax incentive for people who grow livestock, and the other one is the school tax off the home quarter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, everyone will know, and the member for Morse especially will know, that farmers who need help right now are not paying income tax. Does the member from Morse know whether or not young farmers are paying income tax at the present time? Not very many. The member for Morse knows full well that the young farmers who are in trouble are not paying income tax and, therefore, will not be helped one iota by a tax incentive on their tax forms when they sell their beef.

I'll tell you who this will help. This tax credit program will help those people who have lots of money. If you are a doctor, or a lawyer, or a politician, perhaps you will be able to go out and buy 200 or 300 head of cattle. You'll be able to go out and buy 200 or 300 head of cattle, put them in a feedlot for 75 days. Not do it as a living. Not struggle year around through the winter and cold and hauling the bales. For 75 days you can put those cattle in a feedlot and sell them, and use this tax incentive that's for the farmers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that kind of a scam that's being put over on the farmers will not be accepted, and I'll tell you that my member and friend from Assiniboia yesterday announced a meaningful plan here in the legislature, which would be meaningful, and which would help the farmers of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, what I think that is, is positive, constructive criticism, where you outline what is wrong with the program of the government, but not stopping there, coming up with a program which would help the young farmer.

I want to just run through that program which he outlined. It had about six points that he brought out, and I'll just run through them, not probably in the proper order or as eloquently as my friend, but he talked about providing a legislation which would protect farmers for 19 months against foreclosure. This would give a change for the world wheat economy to turn around, and if, after 19 months, they were still in trouble, we could look at other alternatives to protect them and keep the banks away from the door. He talked about implementing a 32-cent-a-gallon fuel rebate on fuel, which is already in place in Alberta, which has already been accepted in Saskatchewan in another hard time when there was a downturn in the grain economy. We used to have a fuel rebate program, and then, when the farm economy came back, it was taken off.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we see now is circumstances in the agricultural field that we haven't seen since the late 1960s and 1970. Farmers, at record numbers, are going bankrupt, and that is only the tip of iceberg. Far more are simply selling out and leaving the farm.

A 32-cent-a-gallon rebate would not solve all the problems of the farmers. We know that. But it would mean, when they went to fill their fuel tanks this spring, when they filled their 2,000 gallons of diesel fuel and thousand gallons of gasoline, that it would cost them \$1,000 less. And I'll tell you, that would be meaningful help for the young farmer. And I'll tell you to try to make it easier for the young farmer, so that he can compete with the farmer from Alberta who is able to get his fuel for 32 cents less, who pays less on the freight rate because the Crow rate affects him less, I'll tell you, would do something for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

The provincial government could also do something about the increase of \$500 in utility rates that it has put on the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the amount of property taxes that goes towards education could be much more equitable. There could be a \$500 grant, for example, or \$1,000 grant, on that part of the taxes. Because the program to relieve the school taxes on the home quarter, as my friend has outlined, is not equitable. For some farmers it will mean six times as much rebate as it will for others on poorer quality of land. And you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be well aware that in some areas assessments are \$500, and land taxes would be \$75 or possibly \$100 rebate that you'll get, and in other areas the rebate could be as high as \$500 or \$600.

Another plank in this program, which was outlined by the member for Assiniboia, was to investigate way of reducing fertilizer in the province of Saskatchewan because, very simply, farmers are not going to be using fertilizer this year because they can't afford it. And I believe it's short-sighted of the government to allow that to happen. Even in the most crass terms, to allow farmers, or to perpetuate farmers not using fertilizer, which will reduce the crops, which will reduce the income, which will reduce their own tax income and increase the deficit, I believe, is very short-sighted.

Also he talked about implementing a meaningful operating loan program. This would not be a program to expand farms the way all of the programs of this government have been. They have not been to stabilize the farm at the size they are – young farmers who are in trouble for the past two years. Every program they have brought in has been to help farmers expand. But what does that mean? If you're going to help farmer expand, what does that mean to the number of farmers, my friend from Weyburn? It simply means that there'll be less farmers, there'll be less people, there'll be less communities. The problems we're seeing with rural education will be worse. Rail line abandonment will increase. I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, you have to get a program to help those young farmers who are struggling, who this budget has missed its target . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — As I travelled around last weekend talking to young farmers about what they would like to see, they talked about two main things that they need, going into the seeding program. One of them was cheap fuel. They say if the oil wells are booming – if they are, in fact, booming – and we produce the oil, why are we paying 32 cents a gallon more than Alberta residents? What sense does it make, that if the oil wells are booming in the South-east and the South-west, the farmers driving along the top of the ground seeding their crops are using fuel that is 32 cents a gallon more expensive than the farmers in Alberta? I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that kind of a commitment to farmers is not going to go unnoticed.

The other thing that the farmers are telling me is this: that when the Crow rate was allowed to slide by the Minister of Agriculture in the Devine government – when it was allowed to disappear – they made one commitment. They made one commitment to the farmers that would help them out when the Crow rate went. They said, "Don't worry about the Crow rate going. It's no problem. We'll help you out. Well tell you, when the Crow rate goes, we'll open the public purse to help you with your freight rates." Well, I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the purse has not been opened, or, if it was opened, it looked in and there was an \$830 million deficit. But

there was no help for freight rates, promised by the Conservative government at the time they let the Crow rate go.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I close my part on agriculture by quoting from a paper that the members opposite will well know. It's called *Grainews* – not an NDP paper, but I would think a middle-of-the-road paper, probably even considered to be a right-wing paper. When you read the guy's name who wrote this article, you will be considerably impressed that it is not a left-wing author. The guy's name is Pat O'Dwyer, who talks on Saskatchewan politics for many, many years. And I respect the guy, because I read him every week.

He reads this . . . he writes this in his report, and I would quote from *Grainews*, dated March 19 (a few days ago), 1984. And he's talking about one of the caucus members, one of the members who has stood up in the agricultural section of their caucus and said that the Department of Agriculture is a mess. It's full of corruption. The leased land policy of this government now has it so there's 1,000 quarters of land waiting to be leased, and no policy to let it be allowed to be permanently transferred to farmers. There are people who are getting land from this government . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll challenge . . . You stand up whenever you like, Mr. Minister, and challenge me on this one. There are people with 30 quarters of deeded land – that there are people with 30 quarters of deeded land – who are getting land from our government. And young farmers, who have two and three quarters, struggling to get started, can't get it. And I'll tell you, Mr. Minister, before this session is over, we're going to take you on on this.

And I'll quote you from one Mr. Pat O'Dwyer, who also talks about the Minister of Agriculture and the department. And this is what he said:

Mr. Thatcher called a meeting of his riding supporters recently, and there he found voters thought the Devine government was losing touch with those who elected it. He said it came up several times that the present government is little different from the previous government. Colin Thatcher is brewing up a storm. The honey moon between the Devine Tories and the people, and between the Devine cabinet and his back-benchers, is at an end. Whether or not the Saskatchewan electors will march down the aisle along with the present government to alter the power remains to be seen.

And he concludes by saying, "I would guess the voting support for Grant Devine will be reduced."

This is one of the supporters of the Conservative Party who wrote glowing remarks for three years before this government was elected, and for a year after.

Well this tells you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, exactly what is going on in the minds of farmers in Saskatchewan. They're not impressed with this government. Nor they should be.

I want to turn, for a moment, to talk about the small minister of business's department, to talk about some of the things that we would like to have seen done in the area of small business as opposed to helping out, continually, big business in the province of Saskatchewan.

What has happened since this government has come to power, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is, unemployment rates are at unprecedented highs. The unemployment rate in Saskatchewan, the number of people unemployed, is now 40,000. The number of people on welfare in the province of Saskatchewan has gone from 46,000, when they took office, to 62,000.

The cheer-leading that was done last year, the hype that even the Premier was able to get going in his budget speech last year, rang hollow this year, even with his own members. They don't believe the cheer-leading of the middle-aged cheer-leading troupe in the front two rows is having much success. And I want to go through a reasoning that I have figured out as to why

March 30, 1984

that cheer-leading hasn't worked.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that they're doing the cheer-leading in the wrong place. I think that you don't cheer-lead in Saskatchewan to get business in Toyko, in Germany, in Vienna, in San Francisco, in New York, in Houston, in Denver. I think you do as other leaders in the province have done in the past. You cheer-lead in the Frontiers, in the Yorktons, and you help establish business.

I would like to know how many new manufacturing of machinery operations have been set up under the Conservative government. I would like to know of a list of four or five cultivator manufacturers, or auger, or . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you don't need any more.

See, this is the whole thing, Mr. Minister of Labour. You say you don't need any more. And I'll tell you, you're dealing with the wrong people when you're talking about dealing with the hucksters from Bay Street and from other places in New York and Montreal. He says that he doesn't need any more small businesses from Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you, that is the very point that I started out to prove. That is the attitude of the government, that you can't do it in Saskatchewan.

Well, I would challenge the Minister of Labour, who has made that statement from his seat, to get to his feet and publicly say that we don't need any more manufacture in Saskatchewan. I know it's true, that that's what you think. I have an example in my constituency of a rafter constructing company – Cheemo Lumber in Shaunavon – which had a loan with Sedco, and had employed 10 people. They had 10 people employed, building houses, pre-fabbing houses, and building rafters.

After the election, when the interest rates started to fall, they had a 19 per cent mortgage with Sedco. They came in and pleaded with this government to rewrite that mortgage down to the bank level – not a reduction, not a grant, to a handout, but to write it from 19 per cent down to the bank rate of 15.

Do you know what the government told them? You know what you people did to those folks out there in Shaunavon? You wouldn't do it. They closed the bloody doors. They laid off the 10 people. And about five of those people are now on welfare. This is the commitment, this is the commitment to small business of this government.

But in a positive note, what I want to say to you is that we shouldn't be shopping for big business on the big world market, because that is never where the production in Saskatchewan has come from. The initiative in the labour force in Saskatchewan is abased on Saskatchewan people, done with public investment, and help and faith by the politicians of the province.

I remember very well when Olaf Friggstad, in the early '70s, was changing his farm shop and building his first cultivator. Ollie Friggstad, at that time, was a farmer. He had five quarters of land. He was a minister in his church and had five quarters of land. And what he did is he borrowed money at the bank and the credit union and started building two or three cultivators for the neighbours and, as he went along, he got money from banks. Yes, we do need banks, and we do borrow from banks.

He came to the crow corporation, Sedco, needed a loan, and it's public documents, and Olaf would be the first to admit that he came here and got money from the Government of Saskatchewan to help him set up his business. Nor did the government demand an interest in the plant, but what he has done is built a plant to build cultivators which employs about 200 people in the town of Frontier, a town that before he started up has had 150 or 200 people in it. And this man, on his own initiative, with confidence from his government, and support from others in the area, has been able to build up and create an industry in a small town in Saskatchewan.

I have a note here that says that the Minister of Co-ops would like to introduce some quests, and

I will give way to that.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. SANDBERG: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with great pleasure I stand up today to introduce a large number of guests who have just arrived in this Assembly, and they, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are from the Saskatoon Community College which is in the heart of beautiful, downtown Saskatoon, which is also in the centre of the Saskatoon Centre constituency, and it is with great pleasure that I welcome you here today. I see that many of them are brand new Canadians. I hope that you enjoy your visit to this Assembly, and you'll learn from the operations going on in this democratic institution.

They are accompanied by their teacher-chaperones, Maria Silveira, Judith Nordness, Elsie Heinrichs, Victoria O'Grady, and Fran Wroblewski. I know you'll enjoy your visit to the Assembly here today. I might add that this community college fills a vital need in Saskatoon and Saskatchewan, and I know that the Ministers of Social Services and Advanced Education will be calling on the college in future to take on even more students and more responsibilities.

So, once again, welcome to this Assembly. I'll be meeting with you, along with the member for Saskatoon Eastview, at about 11:30 for pictures and refreshments. So would you stand up and be recognized, and would my fellow colleagues welcome them here, please.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

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

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Before I get back into my speech, I would like, too, to welcome the people who are in the gallery.

Just before I leave the issue of small business, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to reiterate that I believe that what we should be doing in order to create jobs and business in Saskatchewan is to take a different position in regards to manufacturing of local firms, like Friggstad Manufacturing, because under the 10 years, 11 years that Allan Blakeney was in government, it saw uncomparable growth in that area of small manufacturing, which will not be compared under these three-year term of this Conservative government, because they haven't started yet, because I don't feel that they believe that the people of Saskatchewan are capable and able to do that kind of work.

I would like to spend a few minutes dealing with the health department, and I mentioned earlier that I was disappointed in the quality of the minister's speech in terms of laying out a design and a plan for the billion dollars he was going to spend over the coming year. I thought 10 minutes wasn't quite adequate to outline all of the areas that he should be concerned about, but then, when I started to go through the estimates and looking line by line what he could talk about – increasing, or the positive side of the programs – then I came to the point, and I could see . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will talk about nursing homes. Then I came to the point where I could see why he spent 10 minutes on health.

Mr. Speaker, he has done a good job of getting the budget of health over a billion dollars, which is the intention of the government to have a number that they can pat themselves on the back about. A billion dollars. But they've got it in three ways. They've got it basically in three ways. One: by disbanding northern Saskatchewan, taking the health areas out of northern Saskatchewan and moving it into the other departments. He took ambulances out of urban

March 30, 1984

affairs and moved that money into health. They took continuing care, and nursing homes, and home care out of social services and put it into health, and said that that was an increase.

But one thing they are misjudging is the intelligence of the Saskatchewan people. Do you really think people believe you've increased, overall, the budget of health to \$1 billion without rolling other things into it? Well, the member from Maple Creek says, "Yes, she thinks she's got the public tricked." Well, I'll tell you, you haven't, because they're smarter than that. They know that when you roll in three other departments into the Department of Health, there is no new money. They know that in psych services when they read the estimates that there is a reduction. They know when you look at the dental plan for children, there's a reduction. So I can understand, well understand, why the Minister of Health took 10 minutes to whip through his budget speech. He had very little to say about increased funding in the Department of Health.

I think there's a couple of areas, one in Saskatoon, which is getting out of hand, and I think a couple of news clips that are taken from the *Star-Phoenix* would indicate how great the problem is in Saskatoon. The *Star-Phoenix* clipping is from January 21 of this year, and is titled:

St. Paul's raps hospital funding by government.

And it says:

The province intends to spend \$50 million upgrading and expanding the city's three hospitals over the next five years.

That's \$10 million a year.

Gerald Fraser, chairman of the St. Paul's hospital, views the commitment with considerable disappointment. To respond to the pressure we are under at the moment, virtually all of the \$50 million would have to be sent at St. Paul's alone. Fraser's major concern is the 2,000-name list of people waiting up to nine months for beds at St. Paul's hospital. All that can be done with the existing staff, with the present facilities, has been done to reduce the waiting period, he said. However, demand for beds has increased at a same time, and the waiting list has grown even longer despite those efforts.

He goes on to say that:

Fraser said hospital authorities were under the impression that the reward for going the extra mile to increase the number of patients treated in existing facilities would be the money for expansion and improvement . . .

. . . the \$250 million. And what they got for that great effort that they did in the hospitals in Saskatoon, I think, would lead one to believe that the commitment is not there to regenerate the hospitals in Saskatoon or in Regina.

I would like to say, too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we in Saskatchewan, which the government will tell you we have no deterrent fees and no doctor fees, in some ways what they have done here by making people wait for elective surgery for cancer treatment, is even worse than what is being done in other provinces. In other provinces, the mean-minded Tory governments have put on \$300 and \$400 and \$500 deterrent fees and hospitalization charges. And that does hurt the poor, because the poor people can't afford it. But in this government, nobody can afford it, nobody can use it, because when you wait nine months for surgery, it's often too late.

I tell you that this government has failed in its commitment to make health number one. Simply putting money out of Urban Affairs and out of Northern Saskatchewan and out of Social Services

does not fool the people of Saskatchewan when they're waiting on a waiting list up to nine months for surgery at the hospital in Saskatoon.

And I say, not only should we be looking at maintaining the health care program in Saskatchewan – I believe that that is the urgent crisis at the present time – but I would have hoped that the minister would have laid out a vision for the future of health care in Saskatchewan, a vision that would have looked at moving into an area where professionals, like nurses, would have had a greater role; where prevention would have had a greater role; where we would have had talk about prevention rather than fix-up cures; where the doctors would not be allowed to get 10 per cent increases while programs were being cut and nurses were offered 2 per cent. I think that kind of a system does not give much vision to what is in store for health in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would have hoped that the dental program would have been outlined, that maybe giving a commitment that, if you can't afford it today, then over the next five years we would be moving to a full-fledged dental program, utilizing the dental nurses in that progression to a greater degree.

And I think that I would have hoped that the home care program, which does two basic things: one, keep people at home and out of the nursing homes, which reduces the lists waiting to get into nursing homes – but in a more humane way deals with people when they're aging – that he would have expanded the home care program and given new direction. But what we see there as well is a cut-back, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of 5 per cent, and I think the health care people and the health care promoters in Saskatchewan are going to be disappointed when they find out exactly what is in store for them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that in the area of nursing homes, the minister has proven to us that he is not playing fair with those people who are using the nursing homes. We have seen a 17 per cent increase since this government has come to power . . . We have seen a 17 per cent increase since the government has come to power, and we have a commitment from the minister that he intends to raise nursing home rates, not once a year, but four times a year – every three months. So what he has planned is a devious ploy to take exactly the amount of money that they get from the federal government and increase every three months, that the federal government would put into those seniors' pocket – Graham Taylor will be there the next day to take it out. And nursing home rates will be increased every three months, like clockwork, for those people who can't defend themselves or fight back.

And I would say, at a time when the government is talking about restraint and taking about balancing the budget and this new program the Premier has outlined here, that he would take a look at home in the nursing homes before he goes outside the province and preaches about restraint and who should be restrained.

I think, as well, when you look at the nursing home bed program, which has been announced by this government, you would have to wonder about the priorities of this government.

In the city of Regina, for example, there are waiting lists in excess of 1,000 – a waiting list of more than 1,000. The administrator at one of them told me yesterday that there's a three-year wait – a three-year wait – to get into nursing homes in Regina.

Do you know how many beds are planned in this five-year program or in the program for the next year that was announced? Do you know how many beds? There were seven beds. Seven beds were announced, and the member from Maple Creek talks about a moratorium, and I want to talk about that moratorium. When that moratorium was mentioned, it was 1975 and 1976, and I tell you, if you go back and look at the records of the province at the waiting lists, look at the waiting lists, you would understand why there would be a moratorium, because we were a government that built nursing homes as they were needed.

March 30, 1984

You will know that the nursing home lists in Weyburn, that the nursing home waiting list in Regina, that the nursing home waiting list in Saskatoon has doubled, has doubled, my friend from Maple Creek, since you've come to government. It has doubled. I remember you asking the question. I remember your caucus asking the question when the number was 300 in Regina. Do you remember that – when the list was 300 in Regina, and you were going to solve the problem? Well, do you know what that list is now? Do you know what that list is now, my friend? It is 1,100 now, today, two years later.

So you have really solved the problem. And you can refer back to a moratorium in 1975 or '76 all you want. But I'll tell you, the people out there who are waiting for beds, the people who are on those waiting lists and their families, are not going to listen to your rhetoric and babbling about a moratorium back in 1975.

The other reason that there was a moratorium mentioned in 1975, it was the initiation of the home care program. We brought in a home care program that has kept thousands of people out of nursing homes. We had a plan that was too full. We instituted the home care program in Saskatchewan. We built a plan where people could stay at home, rather than moving into hospitals and nursing homes. And I'll tell you that we had a plan that would have worked. I'll tell you, that would have worked if you wouldn't continually cut back on the home care program. Because, how can you possibly keep people out of nursing homes, keep the waiting list down, if you continually cut back on the home care program?

Cancel the home repair program for senior citizens for a year. How do you expect senior citizens to stay at home? And then talk about how you have done so much for senior citizens.

There's one other program for seniors that has been mentioned a couple of times, and that's the Saskatchewan Income Plan which the Minister of Social Services went on yesterday, saying what a great job he was doing. For the record, how many people will get the maximum benefits of that increase? Any answers on the other side? Do any of you know how many will get the increase?

Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Minister. Two per cent will get an increase of 83 cents a day. That's the maximum. Two per cent will get 83 cents a day.

For the Minister of Social Services to get up in this House and make an announcement and brag about an 83-cent increase for 2 per cent of the seniors, when he earns \$250 a day, is an insult to the seniors of this province. Twenty per cent of the seniors get any money out of that program. Eighty per cent of the seniors get zero, get zero per cent increase, and they will not be very impressed with the Saskatchewan Income Plan.

I see they have a group of students here, and I will give the floor to the member from Swift Current.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MRS. SMITH: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. With leave, I would like to introduce some students. It's a pleasure to see them, even if they are late. They've had some bus problems today, and hopefully it doesn't take away from their educational experience in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the students are from a school called St. Josephs in Swift Current, one of two separate schools there. It's a small school. It's on the south side of the city, but it's a very active school. It probably has one of the best school patrols in the province. It has the reputation of school spirit but, more importantly, it has the reputation of community participation, particularly through its parents. In about one year from now it will have one of the better ukulele bands in the province, and we will look forward to hearing of their accomplishments in that area.

There are 36 of them, grade 6 and 7, and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Bill

Shumay, Miss Marlene Corey, and Dave Dielschneider. I'm sorry if the pronouncement is wrong. I'm sure you'll correct me after.

I look forward to meeting with them later, and I would hope that all members would welcome them and wish them a good bus trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

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

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I have a great number of other things to say on this budget. I will try to condense them down because we're quickly running out of time on this budget debate. But I want to spend a little while on the Department of Social Services, and, in particular, I want to talk about two particular programs, or possibly three – just touch on them.

First of all, I would like to say that about two weeks ago I had the opportunity to be at the Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw and talk to the administrator of the Valley View Centre and take a tour of the building. And in talking to them, I was concerned about the possible cut-back in staff at the centre. And the people who operate that centre are, in fact, doing a very excellent job under rather severe conditions. They're doing an excellent job under the present conditions and couldn't believe, and didn't believe, and didn't think there were going to be any cut-backs in Valley View. And I know that they were sincere when they said that. I think it will come as a shock to them – and did come as a shock – when they read the budget and found that there were 60 people let go, or positions not filled, at the Valley View Centre.

Now, as you know, the Valley View Centre in Moose Jaw and North Park Centre in Prince Albert are institutions for the severely mentally handicapped. These people are people, in many cases, who can't talk. They can't walk. They can't feed themselves. And I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that mean-minded kind of an attitude to those in those kind of conditions will come back to haunt this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a mean government, similar to the one which is in existence in B.C., the Bennett government; similar to Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan. I was in California three years ago when the Reagan cuts were going through, and I saw similar things happen at institutions in California. And they warned us against it. They say, "You elect a right-wing government like that in Canada or Saskatchewan and," they said, "you will see similar things."

I've got to say that I was surprised. I didn't believe that this government was that kind of a right-wing reactionary government. I thought the government we had elected here was some sort of a coalition of Liberals and Conservatives, but I didn't believe that they were this mean, that they would go into the mental institutions, the hospitals – where people are unable to protest or defend or come to this legislature and lobby on their own behalf – to go into those institutions and cut back the staff and programs the way they have.

And I say that we will make an issue of this, and we'll take it to the people. And it may not be politically popular, and the Tories may say, "But it's not on a poll. It doesn't say on this poll that you shouldn't cut back on help for those who are in mental institutions and mental hospitals."

But I think there's a thing that's more important than polls, and that's a basic belief in people. I think all the people of Saskatchewan are capable of good and evil. I think every one of us has good and evil within us. And I'll tell you what you people play on at the last election, and now, and in the future: right-wing politicians play on the evil in people and attempt to bring out that

side of their personality. They play on greed. They play on avarice. They play on the negative side of a person's emotion.

And I'll tell you that I'll take my chances. I'll take my chances on being on the wrong side of the polls because I know that in Saskatchewan . . . I'll tell you, in Saskatchewan, the people are not that kind. They didn't expect you to do some of the things you're doing. They didn't expect these welfare reforms that you brought in the other day. They didn't believe that you would, they didn't believe that you would cut 42 per cent of the income to someone who you had just thrown out of work. They don't believe that you should be firing people and putting them on welfare to start with. But then, when you come back and say, "Not only are we going to fire you and put you out of work, but we're going to take away 40 per cent of your income," the people of Saskatchewan are not that kind of people . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And the member from Prince Albert says, "They love it." Well, we'll see, because I told you earlier on, there's a different mood, there's a different wind in the politics of Saskatchewan. And I'll tell you, a member like you, right-wing as you are, who tends to want to beat up on those who are weak and vulnerable, will not last long in the province of Saskatchewan.

This is not a John Diefenbaker Tory government who wrote a bill of rights for the people of Saskatchewan. This is a right-wing reactionary government who will take the food out of the mouths of the Valley View people and not give money to people in nursing homes.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that at the first opportunity, at the first opportunity, the people of Saskatchewan, as they did in 1934 . . . I'll give you a little history lesson here. I know a friend who said the other day, "This is a two-term government." He said, "They had one term from '29 to '34, and they're going to get this one from '82 to '85." And they are a two-term government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — And he went on to say that this government is very similar to the Anderson government in the 1930s – the same vicious approach to people in need, the same tough attack on the handicapped. And he said, "The same thing will happen to them as happened to Anderson.

And that story went like this. In 1929 things were booming. The economy of Saskatchewan was hot. We had land in our area that was selling for \$8,000 a quarter that my grandfather bought and paid for in one year in 1928.

We got an Anderson government in 1929, and devastation came on this province like you will never believe . . . (inaudible) . . . history does repeat itself. I want to tell you that in 1929 there was a majority Conservative government elected in this province, the only one that was ever elected. And at the first opportunity – the first opportunity – the people of Saskatchewan rejected that government, and, not only did they reject it, they did not elect one member to the Saskatchewan legislature in 1931. And I say, with the political mood that is on in Saskatchewan at the present time, we are going to repeat history. And I'll take my chances on being on the wrong side of the poll on whether or not the people of Saskatchewan are good or evil, because I know that they are good.

I want to close my speech by quoting a quote that I made last year. And I believe that it's more relevant today than it was last year at this time, in 1983. It comes from the bishops of Canada – the *Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis*, and it says this:

In developing strategies for economic recovery, we firmly believe that the first priority must be given to the real victims of the current recession, namely, the unemployed, the welfare poor, the working poor, pensioners, native people, women, young people, and small farmers, fishermen, some factory workers, and some small-business men and women.

This option calls for economic policies which realize that the needs of the poor have priority over the wants of the rich; that the rights of workers are more important than the maximization of profits; that the participation of marginalized groups take precedence over the preservation of a system that excludes them.

And I say that this system has excluded large numbers of people and that this budget has excluded large numbers of people. And I'll take my chances on the good side of people. I will be voting against the motion and in favour of the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. KLEIN: — It's a good thing you're willing to take your chances. You've got two chances, member from Shaunavon — two: slim and none.

You talk about unemployment rates. I'd like to talk to you about that. Best in the country — the best in the country, and by a long shot too . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Don't ho-ho me. You tell me we're cheer-leading. You stop and listen to these programs that I'm going to talk about now. You talk about visiting small town Saskatchewan. Try to keep up to me; try to keep up listening to our small-business people. The member from Shaunavon, he should stick to agriculture. Your speeches are kind of like the horns of a steer: a dull point here, a dull point there, a lot of bull in between.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. KLEIN: — You talk about babbling. Let me tell you, when it comes to small business, they know how you guys are babbling. You're an insult, you're an insult to small business.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was hoping that some of the media would have stayed. I'm delighted to see that the Leader of the Opposition got back, because this has been my first opportunity to speak since budget day. And the members of your opposition should feel absolutely disgraced about that fact, and I'd like the media to hear why. Both the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Regina Elphinstone, as well as the member for Regina Centre, were quoted recently in the media, being critical of our government regarding small business.

I had no chance to respond to that criticism. All of the opposition members in their budget replies were critical of our announced economic development plans. Again, no chance to respond. And yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for seven days now during question period not one question about small business or economic development — not one. Imagine that, all the criticism when you know we have to remain silent, and yet when the very forum for the opportunity of discussion comes along, you still keep us silenced and go about your ugly criticism, knowing we can't respond. You either sit there in stunned ignorance . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — They're all leaving; they're all leaving.

HON. MR. KLEIN: — . . . or perhaps pure fear, and I guess you guys are afraid to hear what the rest of my talk is going to be. You claim to understand small business; you're a hypocrite. You should be absolutely ashamed of your record and your irresponsible criticism.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm extremely proud today to rise in this Assembly to join the debate on the excellent, innovative, and imaginative budget presented in the House last week by the Minister of Finance. Our minister and this budget will be remembered into the next decade. Other jurisdictions right across the country wondered what Saskatchewan was going to come up with next. Well, what our Minister of Finance did is a first in the history of our country, and he should be congratulated for that effort.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. KLEIN: — For the first time ever, a province has been allowed access to use the federal tax system as a specific purpose of provincial government business. As Minister of Tourism and Small Business, charged with the responsibility, of developing the tourism industry and providing opportunities for small business, I couldn't be happier with the budget, and also with my Minister of Finance.

Provisions to stimulate the provincial economy contained in the Minister of Finance presentation will be an important milestone in the economic development of Saskatchewan. I believe many of the measures contained in the budget will continue to give impetus to our economy for many years to come. The Minister of Finance has provided the people of this province with a new set of economic initiatives to take full advantage of our emerging economic opportunities. These measures will help business and industry to grow and to expand, encourage new industries to be established, and the bottom line – the bottom line – of these economic stimulants, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that these new programs will help generate employment for the citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I know when one talks of jobs, the only kind of jobs that the members opposite are familiar with creating are those on the public payrolls of provincial government departments and crown corporations. That's the only way that they knew how to create jobs, and they sure put those methods into practice as they padded the employee lists of government departments and crown corporations during their 11 years of power.

That's not the philosophy of those of us on this side of the House and, indeed, on most of the people of this province. The people of our province have had enough of big government. Since we assumed office nearly two years ago, we have worked, and with success I might add, to restrain the size of government and the number of employees on the payroll. And I can assume the members opposite – there's still a couple of them left over there – that there's overwhelming support from the public, right across the province, for our efforts in this regard.

On this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we look upon small business as the engine that drives our economy. Most of our citizens in this province are employed by small business and, as a matter of fact, most of them work for firms with 5 to 25 employees. Everybody doesn't work for government departments and crown corporations, as the members opposite would let us believe.

The opposition benches and their socialist friends keep referring to this budget as "a budget for big business." Whatever they mean by "big business," I don't have the foggiest. We know these new measures will help business and industry in Saskatchewan to grow, to expand, and that's what we want for the business community of this province, but in the process, Mr. Speaker, they'll be providing more jobs for our citizens.

Now maybe the NDP doesn't like creating jobs; I don't know, but that's the very point that the opposition misses. The opposition doesn't appear bright enough to realize that the more we can stimulate business and industry, the more opportunities there is to grow, to expand, then, therefore, the more employment we can generate for the people of our province. That's what we're working for with the economic measures contained in this budget.

Simply adding jobs to the public payroll, that only adds to the taxes that the people must pay, and it adds to the deficit, and I understand that the Leader of the Opposition wants to reduce that deficit. Indeed, the new stimulants of the provincial economy, which the Minister of Finance has introduced, will develop from the productive initiative and energy of the business community. Your provincial government will merely be the facilitator helping business and industry to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few months I'm amazed to see just who is trying to pass themselves off as the champions of small business – none other than the hon. members opposite – and the majority of them left after that heart-rendering political episode that we just witnessed by the member from Shaunavon. But just who does he and you think you're kidding? You're not kidding the business and industry people of our province. They know, first-hand, how the previous government tried for 11 years to put the shackles on free enterprise. And now the Leader of the Opposition wants to be known as a friend of the small business. How times have changed!

So what is the real motive behind this turnabout? Is this a new move towards the centre by the NDP that we are witnessing? Is, perhaps, the Leader of the Opposition afraid of losing his job? Is this an honest realization on their part that small business has some validity in our economy? I think not, Mr. Speaker. I think what we are witnessing is out-and-out hypocrisy, pure and simple. I understand, however – it's interesting too – that a few of their retired colleagues have joined our small business, free enterprise ranks recently, and that they are truly enjoying the climate that we are creating for them.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing on the part of the NDP is a dishonest attempt to make themselves appear to be the party of all peoples. Is this because their connections on the left are somewhat embarrassing to them at this time? And to balance this out they want to show, by speaking out supposedly on behalf of small business, that they are really a party of the centre? How could business have any faith in a political party that would have us believe through resolutions from their annual convention last fall, that it's the private sector that's responsible for inflation and for Canada's poor economic performance? Or another resolution that there should be an end to private enterprise development in provincial parks? Shame on you. I think that the members opposite, to be realistic, you're barking up the wrong tree.

From these hypocritical platitudes towards small business from the members opposite reminds me of the snake in the Garden of Eden, Mr. Speaker, telling Eve to "eat this fruit and it will make you wise." But despite the efforts of the opposition to appear all-wise to small business, the business community isn't biting. They're not going to be fooled. Let's all there is to it. You are simply trying to score cheap political points. Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we're not falling for it, and neither will the people of this province, and especially the business community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. KLEIN: — What did the old industry and commerce department of the former administration try to do for business? If you take a good hard look at the record of the NDP during their 11 years in power, all the things they did to promote and support small business, you'll find it. I had my research done and we looked and we found it. There it is. It's nothing. As the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg – zero. Zero is what you did for small business. Eleven years.

What did the old industry and commerce department of the former administration try to do for business? About all they did for business during 11 years in office was introduce a series of do-nothing grant programs.

I'd like to welcome the member from Quill Lakes back to the Assembly.

As a matter of fact, the old department of industry and commerce was so busy administering do-nothing grant programs that it had no time to attend to the real needs of business and industry. Mr. Speaker, business expects more from its business and economic departments than a series of grant programs. Business isn't interested in giveaways. Grants are a patchwork system of giving aid which, at best, is a weak method solution that provides no guarantee of success for any business.

March 30, 1984

So, Mr. Speaker, looking over the record of the NDP, I think in all fairness we can say there were not a friend of business. You could even say that they were the enemy of business. Their real interest always has been, and always will be, the insidious growth of the crown corporations and more and more intrusion into the market-place. They did just about everything they could to regulate business, to the point of choking day-to-day operations.

As a former businessman in Regina for 25 years, most of them under the NDP, I know how difficult it was to effectively work with government – a government that made us take two steps backwards for every step forward . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You bet, they're trying it now, and they're being successful. We've got programs out there. You listen to them.

I can say for myself, and on behalf of my former business colleagues, there was hardly a day when we didn't run into some useless, inhibiting, or obsolete rule or regulation. An ever growing paper blizzard that was comparable to a football team which would not only have to content with their competition, but would have to worry about being gang-tackled by the referees – the Blakeneyes, the Romanows, the Codys, the Shillingtons, the Tchorzewskis, MacMurchys, and all the rest of them.

Lately I've heard some comments from the opposition benches, and I wish the member from Regina Centre was here. He was particularly vocal about the problems faced by small business. Members of my department and myself, other members of our cabinet and our MLAs, meet regularly with representatives of the business and industrial community to hear their concerns and problems, and to listen to their suggestions as to how the economy of this province could be strengthened.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, this is in sharp contrast to the practice of the previous government. When they were in power, the message would come down from the top without any prior consultation with the business community on what they were going to do to business, and how they were going to do it. And Lord help the poor, struggling businessman that would try to buck their system.

You see, Mr. Speaker, you just can't pull business problems out of thin air, as the members opposite appear to be doing. To address the real needs of business, the members opposite should try to get involved with business people – by knowing them, by understanding their concerns. Maybe they should sit in on a chamber of commerce or board of trade meeting sometime. I'm sure they'd find it an enlightening new experience, meeting with business people in that fashion. Since being appointed Minister of Tourism and Small Business, I've probably met and spoken with more business people in any one week than the Leader of the Opposition and all his seven other members combined did during their 11 years of administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to outline two major new programs that will stimulate economic growth and job opportunities which were announced by the Minister of Finance.

Firstly, our venture capital program, which will bring a supply of Saskatchewan investment capital into Saskatchewan businesses. Through this program, those with capital to invest will assist those businesses and industries who need capital for growth and for expansion. These investment dollars would be put into eligible small businesses, engaged primarily, in manufacturing and processing, tourism, or research and development.

Investors will receive tax credit if they pay Saskatchewan income tax, or will receive cash incentives if the money is coming from tax-exempt pension funds. This tax credit program, as I mentioned, is the first of its kind in Canada, and our Minister of Finance is to be highly commended for the successful conclusion of these arrangements with the federal government.

The personal and corporate tax systems will be used to provide tax incentives to investors who supply capital to our growing industries. And for small Saskatchewan towns, that the members

opposite seem to be so concerned with and did nothing for, Mr. Speaker, for the benefits of people who live in communities of less than 5,000, because I am out there, week after week after week, in these smaller communities, talking to the business people, and I understand their concerns . . . I would like to tell you that these venture capital corporations can have a minimum equity capital of \$25,000, rather than the usual or normal \$100,000 minimum.

Also in the smaller communities, the VCC investments can apply to a wide array of small businesses. We don't share the doom-and-gloom philosophy adopted by the NDP during their 11 years, that small communities in Saskatchewan had to die. No, we don't believe that, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we believe just the opposite. We believe that small communities can grow, they can thrive, they can maintain the traditional rural way of life that this province has always enjoyed.

This department, this program, and others being undertaken by my department, will provide just the incentive the small communities need to make economic development in their areas become a reality. With these tools in the budget, it's up to the people of these communities to take advantage of those opportunities, and we have an abundant faith in their ability to make that happen.

We know that, historically, Saskatchewan residents have a high level of savings. And we know that there now are abundant investment opportunities in our expanding economy. And we also know there is an insufficient supply of formal investment money in this province. What we're doing, Mr. Speaker, is simply bringing all these factors together with the overall intention of expanding business and industrial growth in order to increase the number of job opportunities.

I'd also like to outline another new program, that being the fixed-rate financing program, to provide medium to long-term loans to small businesses at fixed interest rates. A strong consensus that has emerged from the small business community, which the opposition benches are totally unaware of, is that small business is not as concerned with the current level of interest rates as they are with the instability of those rates. And accordingly, the fixed rate financing program objectives are: firstly, to alleviate the burden of unstable interest rates on small business and thereby encourage businesses and industry to develop and expand; and secondly, to help the business community again generate jobs.

I want to emphasize that my department, Tourism and Small Business, will not become a lending institution, but rather our government will make term depositions in lending institutions who will in turn provide fixed rate loans to small businesses for a specific term. The final details of this program, Mr. Speaker, are subject to further finalization with the lending institutions. Present proposals, however, call for loans of not less than \$50,000, or more than one-half a million dollars, and interest rates would be in effect for five years.

Most small businesses in Saskatchewan will be eligible to apply for these loans, with the exception of farming, primary producers, financial services, and professional groups, such as doctors, lawyers, and the like. But getting away from the numbers, the bottom line is that the fixed rate financing program will create more economic growth in Saskatchewan, which in turn will help create a more secure and prosperous future for the people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major responsibilities of my portfolio is the development of the tourism industry. In the establishment of the new Department of Tourism and Small Business, tourism became a vital part of our new organization. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to advise this Assembly that this budget will give the long-neglected tourism industry its greatest expenditures in the province's history.

Mr. Speaker, this is the start of a new era for tourism in Saskatchewan. For the first time, we will begin participating in a serious way in the lucrative tourism industry. In previous years, the former administration only fooled around with tourism, and they should be condemned by all of

March 30, 1984

us for the tremendous loss of business opportunities and jobs that that fooling around cost our citizens. Let's face it, the old department of tourism and renewable resources simply did not work out. It was another of the prior government's costly mistakes. Leaders of the tourism industry recognized almost from the beginning that it would be a failure. And did you listen? No way. Its main problem was that it didn't treat tourism as a business.

And after all, what is tourism? Tourism, simply put, is the greatest collection of small businesses in the province of Saskatchewan. Henceforth tourism will be treated as a business. It will generate business opportunities and jobs for the people of this province. We're going to be very aggressive at promoting the tourism attractions of this province, something that the NDP never did.

Among the projects to be launched this year to encourage more people to visit our province will be a major promotional program to attract the general public from Ontario, from the western provinces, from North Dakota, from Montana, from Minnesota. There will be special programs to attract the outdoor adventure enthusiasts, both from this continent, and from Europe. We'll be making a strong bid to attract the convention and business-meeting market in North America.

I'm pleased that another \$300,000 in funding will go to our popular tourism marketing assistance program, bringing the total to \$694,000 for this new program. This program, Mr. Speaker, provides non-profit organizations with incentives to attract visitors. Also, I am pleased to say that the department's toll free travel industry, or travel inquiry telephone service, will be expanded across Canada, and a major tourist information centre will be constructed at the point of entry into Saskatchewan on the Trans-Canada Highway near the Manitoba border.

Nineteen eighty-four has been designated as the Year of Tourism in Canada. Indeed, 1984 has now become the Year of Tourism in Saskatchewan. After many, many long years of neglect under the NDP, tourism will now receive the attention it deserves, to generate business opportunities, and to generate jobs. I will be making several announcements over the next couple of months regarding important new tourism initiatives that will benefit this vital industry.

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to two popular province-wide programs of my department which have received a further boost in this budget. As I have indicated, we, in this administration, are working to ensure that the smaller communities of this province benefit from increased economic growth, too – not just the largest cities and towns. Accordingly, our community economic development program, which now consists of 31 communities, will be expanded to another additional 20 communities in the fiscal year '84-85. This, Mr. Speaker, will bring a total of 51 communities in all parts of our province – rural Saskatchewan – will into program. The thing that the members opposite have been hollering about, well-in-place, well-designed to keep rural Saskatchewan alive. Also, Mr. Speaker, our management assistance program which provides management consulting services to the small business operator across the province will have another 20 new communities added in the new fiscal year.

I want to give a thumb-nail sketch of the many measures this administration has taken to help small business grow and prosper in this province and help generate employment for our citizens. Criticism from the opposite benches have been clear but very, very misleading, and I would like to straighten that out right now.

Major revisions to the petroleum royalty structure has resulted in record drilling activity and put more than 1,000 people back to work. You don't like that over there! You don't like our people working? We do. The small business employment program, initiated last year to create jobs in the business community, produced 3,600 new jobs, and 2,800 of them, Mr. Speaker, have now become permanent new jobs in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. KLEIN: — Abolition of over 1,000 useless regulations which were choking the day-to-day operation of business. One thousand amendments to The Trade Union Act which clarified the roles and responsibilities of labour and management in the collective bargaining process. Abolition of the retail sales tax on gasoline. And you know, you don't like hearing that, you don't like talking about that, one of the biggest continuing programs that we've got. The single largest tax cut in the history of our province — over \$100 million in 1982, over \$100 million in 1983, and another \$100 million in 1984. You don't like those cuts either?

The community economic development program of my department to assist towns with populations from 700 to 5,000 to attract businesses and industries to rural Saskatchewan. My department's management assistance program to provide management consulting services to help business and industry improve their efficiency. My department's marketing benefits program which is charged with promoting replacements of goods made outside of the province with ones manufactured in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if we can direct even 1 per cent, just 1 per cent, that little bit . . . I don't use \$10 bills, and I don't 'use hourly figures; I just use little bits in my speeches. But if we can direct just 1 per cent of our province's purchases of imported goods and services to our own manufacturers and suppliers, the difference would mean an extra \$60 million to the Saskatchewan economy, or around 2,000 jobs. Do you understand that, members of the opposition?

And now, from this budget, Mr. Speaker, new programs announced for our business community . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are, just listen. I'll fire a few more programs from our . . . I'm not done yet, member from Pelly. Those are only some of our programs. I'm still going with other ones. Pay attention.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, the leader is leaving.

HON. MR. KLEIN: — Well, the Leader of the Opposition, I'm sure, is aware of our programs. He's looked at the budget but, none the less, I'll just talk briefly for a moment. The venture capital program to bring a supply of Saskatchewan investment capital to those businesses and industries who need capital for growth and for expansion. The fixed-rate financing program to provide medium to long-term loans to small businesses at fixed interest rates. A new industrial incentives program to provide one-time payments of \$7,500 for each permanent jobs created in manufacturing. Elimination of the provincial corporate tax on small manufacturing and processing firms. Elimination of the sales tax on research and development prototypes and finally, Mr. Speaker, record expenditures for the long-neglected tourism industry to help generate business opportunities and jobs.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but these are just a few of the measures that we've introduced to date to help generate economic growth in our province. It's a record to be proud of and certainly unmatched by anything done by the previous administration in their 11-year total.

Mr. Speaker, from my remarks I'm sure it's obvious to all that not only I, but thousands of small business people, their employees, and all of their families, support this budget. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to rise in the House to commend the Minister of Finance on the finest budget I have ever witnessed in my life as far as taking care of the folks goes. I think that it bodes well for our government, and bodes well for all of the people in Saskatoon.

I know the day after the budget came down, the Thursday night, I went back to my constituency. The House wasn't sitting that evening. And together with about 50 of good

March 30, 1984

workers in Saskatoon, we knocked in the budget highlights into my constituency, and we had nothing but positive remarks as a result of it. The people read it, and they were very happy with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — Members opposite suggest somehow that their constituency are not happy with the budget. Certainly, I cannot believe that there'd be that much diversity between various constituencies, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they have not done the leg work in their seat as a lot of Conservative MLAs have done in theirs, following the budget, to get a proper reading of what the people feel about the budget.

I could, Mr. Speaker, go through all of the positive things that happened to my constituency in Saskatoon, but my colleague, the Minister of Co-ops, has went through in his speech in some detail.

But briefly, Mr. Speaker, there's a 50-bed nursing home coming up at Circle Drive Alliance Church; there's renovations at Oliver Lodge; the Saskatoon Lutheran Sunset has a 78-bed facility coming in; our new home-care program is expanded; a giant 200-plus bed nursing home going up in the member for Fairview's constituency. And I could go on, and on . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — But I'd be ploughing pre-ploughed ground if I went into too much detail as to the benefits coming down to Saskatoon in the budget. And I will go on, Mr. Speaker, to some other aspects that I feel the members opposite have to be touched up upon, and that the folks out in my constituency, and across Saskatchewan, should be reminded of, some of the positive things that have taken place since we took office.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows in this House, and I want the people in my constituency in Saskatchewan to know, and make no mistake about the fact, that we have constructed more nursing home beds in our term of office so far than they constructed in seven years, and facts speak louder than rhetoric, members across.

We have a hard dollars and cents commitment to medicare. We are spending more on health services in this province than they ever spent, than they ever intended on spending — \$1,000 per man, women, and child. And certainly that's the type of commitment to health services that the people of this province deserve — not rhetoric — dollars and cents.

You give the money to the hospital administrators and the health care services, and they look after it properly. They don't need to be told. You just give them the bucks, and they know that you guys would not give them the funding they needed. You would not build nursing homes. You would not put additions on to hospitals. Saskatoon was stagnant in hospitals through your 11-year term — zippo — nothing happened. And I condemn you all for choking off the health care system in your 11 years of office.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a point that comes out in the budget, and came out in the Minister of Health's address, the integration of the small town hospitals with nursing homes is going to be very exciting. Lampman has been approved so far. There's going to be many other small towns. And, Mr. Speaker, this is going to take the heat off of the city hospitals who are now upwards to 16 per cent occupied by chronic geriatric-type patients who are using acute care beds, because of the lack of nursing homes, that, as a result of the 11 years of the NDP.

I feel that, together with our massive construction programs in nursing homes, is going to help out our hospital system through the back door, in that there are going to be beds freed up as a result of our programs, and thus, more hospital usable space.

I sat here, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday night, and watched the members opposite in the budget speech. I took note of some things that maybe other members didn't take note of, but I watched the NDP in their seats sink lower and lower, down and down, as the Minister of Finance went through the budget speech. Towards the end of the evening, Mr. Speaker, there was just little red, beady eyes sticking up over top of their desks. They had sunk right into the floor.

I got to thinking of the J.R. Ewing from Shaunavon and his new oil well drilling programs, and his farming operations, and his companies, and on and on, and I thought to myself, maybe this guy is sinking in his seat; he's maybe checking out oil underneath the floor of the legislature. He's been doing a lot in it lately, and I thought, well, maybe that's it.

And then I thought, well, that wouldn't account for the member from Gravelbourg, the former owner of Engel Construction. He was down pretty low in his seat too, and I thought, well, maybe it's because he's the agriculture critic, and he can't see anything that he can condemn the agriculture budget about. It was the best budget regarding agriculture for many, many years in this province, and I thought, well, maybe that's the problem. Maybe he's afraid that he's going to have nothing to say, or maybe he was just down there trembling, waiting to get back to his big farm and apply for some of the various problems – the cattle program, the irrigation program, or whatever. But one way or the other, he was just about through the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I thought that really spoke louder than words as to the devastation that those members opposite must have felt when we came out with our budget on Wednesday night of last, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to just point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that during the two days that followed the budget speech, it was very obvious that they couldn't do a darned thing with the budget. On the Friday, for instance, following, there was only one question in question period dealing with the budget. That was to my seat-mate, the Minister of Advanced Education, and of course he turned the question around and rammed it right down their throats, vis-à-vis the spending on our university budget. Certainly there has been very few questions lately regarding the budget.

The Leader of the Opposition is off in tangents in Manitoba, and they're talking about highways lay-offs and so on – nothing to do with the budget.

I guess while we're talking about those things and the deficit, which was the only really attempt that the opposition made at dealing with the budget, I would like to point out to my constituents, and to the people from Saskatchewan, the real truth about deficits in this province – the real truth, Mr. Member.

The NDP, in their 11-year term, Mr. Speaker, ran up deficits – big ones. On the crown side, what they did to avoid dealing with it on the consolidated fund is they borrowed against the assets of Sask Power, Sask Tel – they mortgaged the little orange Sask Power trucks. As I understand it, and I would ask that the Leader of the Opposition correct me, himself and Mr. Romanow flew to New York city – Wall Street – went in there and borrowed great wads of money from the pin-stripe bankers on Wall Street to buy potash mines, etc., etc., mortgaging what everyone believed to be their own Sask Power, Sask Tel crowns.

What we have today, Mr. Speaker, is Sask Power sitting with a debt of \$1.8 billion. Total crown side are dragging \$4 billion, thanks to the Blakeney administration. Heritage fund, dragging \$1 billion. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the debts ran up by the NDP against the crowns has to be repaid as surely as our deficit, which I would point out, Mr. Speaker, on the yearly average is about a third of what the NDP ran up on the crown side. In order to balance their budget then, Mr. Speaker, they would have Sask Power pay dividends to the consolidated fund. Here's this company, half mortgaged to death, paying dividends in the nature of \$100 million to the consolidated fund, just coincidentally enough to balance their budget. Certainly, we're left in a situation now, Mr. Speaker, where the crowns are mortgaged to the teeth, and that game could no longer – nor would it any longer – be played by our side. But certainly there's a lot of deceit

dealing with the deficit. I think it really must take a lot of gall for the members opposite to get up and start belly-aching about the deficit, having regard to the billions and billions and billions of dollars that they deficated, playing their shell game between the crowns, consolidated fund, and heritage fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would like touch up, so to speak, the agriculture critic, the former owner of Engel Construction, with respect to his continual ranting and raving and belly-aching about a gas rebate. He knows, and members of this House know, that our administration taxes a big zero on gasoline. There is no provincial gasoline tax to rebate.

Mr. Speaker, his good friends in Manitoba, they have, as the Blakeney administration had, a tax on gasoline. They tax 7.5 cents a litre on gasoline. Then they rebate it back to the farmers. They have something to rebate, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to, if I just might, read out of the dictionary, the *Webster's Dictionary*, as to the meaning of the word "rebate," and I read: "rebate – the return of part of the money paid, partial refund." Now, Mr. Speaker, from that it's clear to see that before you can have a rebate you must have something to return. Our tax on gas is zero. We have nothing to rebate, as do the NDP in Manitoba, who tax gas and then rebate it back. So I think, MR. Speaker, that the agriculture critic, the former owner of Engel Construction, doesn't understand the fact that there's nothing to rebate. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, after the rebate, it's 47 cents a gallon. We can drive to the pumps here, and a farmer can fuel up without rebates or nothing for 7 cents less than a Manitoba farmer pays for his fuel after the rebate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — I would also like to point out that our commitment to the voters was for less government. It wasn't for more government; it was for less government. Members opposite make great bones about the lay-offs in Highways, and the fact that we have kept up our commitment to reduce the size of government, Mr. Speaker. That was our commitment to the people. We're keeping our promises. We've reduced the civil service 2,000 people. Certainly the same sort of proper management practices have taken place on the crown side. Sask Power, for instance, has reduced its staff from 3,610 employees to 3,100 for a total staff reduction, Mr. Speaker, of 500 people. We still have power. Our electrical services are in good shape. I've been informed by the minister that management staff are working longer hours, and are happy to work longer hours. The whole thing is getting by on less people, and that, Mr. Speaker, is good stuff.

Members opposite, if they had their way from how they've been talking in this House as of lately, would have full employment, yes. They'd have everybody working for the government. Sask Power would man up; Sask Tel would man up; the government side would man up; and we'd have full unemployment. Certainly full employment . . . That is the case with their ideological bed partners. In Russia, in Cuba, in Poland, there's full employment. Now, Mr. Speaker, that may sound good that there's full employment in these countries, but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that's not what we want here. Go to Russia. Go to Poland, and see what benefits you get from full employment when the government picks up all of the slack. It can't be that way. Our standard of living is much better off in this country, Mr. Speaker, in our system.

A good friend of mine from my constituency, Mr. Speaker, Morris Cherneskey, went for a tour last year of Russia. He went to the small town in the Ukraine where he was born, and he saw how they lived. They had one – a town of about 3,000 people – they had one truck, one meeting hall. They had corrugated steel on the roof. Some of them had power. Some had radios. No sidewalks, no pavement, dirt floors, and lived pretty tough. Now this isn't Moscow. This is how the other people live.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, they had full employment. And I think the members opposite would just love it over there. There would be full employment. The former owner of Engel

Construction, he wouldn't have his fold-up gear, \$135,000 aeroplane – 180 miles an hour, 1,000-mile range. He wouldn't have his Engel Construction. The J.R. Ewing from Shaunavon, he wouldn't have his oil wells or his big farm. The member from Elphinstone . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, please.

MR. YOUNG: — Mr. Speaker, he'd be living in a corrugated steel building. He wouldn't have his 4,000-square-foot house up in his constituency – his castle. He wouldn't have that. He'd have full employment, Mr. Speaker. I submit that members opposite, if they had to live with the logical conclusion of the policies that they're promoting in this House, they wouldn't be living as good as they are now. They talk that way, but they don't believe it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: — They're capitalists, Mr. Speaker, in every sense of the word – big capitalists, the whole lot of them, talking socialism to other people. But if you look at their own lives, not so.

Mr. Speaker, I have here 24 pages of 8 by 14 paper that I could go through. I could go on and on about the hypocrisy in the statements from members opposite and all the good things in our budget, but there's others who have to speak. We have a vote at 12:30, and it's quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, I'll be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, I'm already looking at the clock. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with great pleasure I arise to speak on this budget debate. Firstly, I wish to thank my constituents of Arm River for their continuous support. The constituency of Arm River is a great constituency, and I am proud to serve them.

I wish to congratulate the hon. member from Kindersley for his great budget. (See, I'm already cutting pages, Mr. Speaker). How could the members opposite condemn this budget – the most popular in all Canada? No other province has answered to the needs of people like our government has in the contents of this budget. There is help for every person who resides in Saskatchewan, either directly or over the long term.

Mr. Speaker, we all know we are in troubled times in Saskatchewan. All of North America is in a recession. We have overspent. Our cost of living has risen, Mr. Speaker, I say there are many citizens of this great country who are now living under different conditions because of this recession. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is this happening in Saskatchewan? Because the past administration did not know how to handle the purse-strings.

When we're elected, our job is to scrutinize the Queen's money. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to remind the members opposite what they did with the handling of the taxpayers' money to put us in the situation that we are today, and mostly, Mr. Speaker, for once again, drill the opposition to what our government is doing to right the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall any one single item of the past government's budgets that would be remembered for more than 24 hours. Our budget will go down in history for being one of the best, especially considering the economy of this country. The budgets were only good for the government and not for the good of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Health, which I think has one of the most important portfolios in government, the hon. minister from Indian Head-Wolseley. In 1978 we could have won government, but the NDP said we would take away your medicare. In the 1982 election, the people did not quite believe that. But now in 1984, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan know who they can trust to protect their health care system, and that is the PC government.

March 30, 1984

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — I have been involved in politics, Mr. Speaker, plus very interested in the affairs of government, for the last 25 years. The members of the opposition are complaining that we're doing nothing for agriculture. Mr. Speaker, they should know very well all the great things the government did for the farmers of Saskatchewan from 1971 to 1982. It won't take long to cover their 11-year era.

In those years Saskatchewan farmers were blessed with three ministers of agriculture: Jack Messer, Edgar Kaeding, Gordon MacMurchy.

Jack Messer. Famous for messing up the hog industry. He dictated to the hog grower, and put them out of business. Otherwise, he ruined the hog industry in Saskatchewan.

Edgar Kaeding. This man did absolutely nothing in his time. The cattle industry began to fail. He did not listen, Mr. Speaker.

Gordon MacMurchy. He is a man that did it all, the member from Last Mountain-Touchwood. He will always be remembered in his era, Mr. Speaker. The farmers of Saskatchewan began falling into the clutches of the economy. Increases in all farm expenses: fuel, chemicals, machinery, etc. Decreases in all sales of farm products. Mr. Speaker, Gordon MacMurchy did this for the Saskatchewan farmer.

Through 11 years of the NDP reign, the government did this, when the going-broke hog man asked for help, the cattle man asked for help. Now in the latter years, this included the grain farmers.

This was their only stock answers for the going-broke farmer: if you are going broke, we will buy your farm, rent the land back to you. Mr. Speaker, this is what this really means: when their land was for sale, they would bid against your neighbours with the neighbour's tax dollars and pay you an inflated price.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the Saskatchewan farmer turned on the NDP and will never forgive them. Gordon MacMurchy tried his best, along with his cohorts, to turn this great province of Saskatchewan into a state-owned province. They wanted to own everything: potash mines, uranium mines, businesses, and all the land they could buy. Mr. Speaker, every budget, every budget contained millions and millions for the buying of Saskatchewan's heritage. The new member sitting in this legislature representing Last Mountain-Touchwood will go down in history and will always be remembered for his great defeat of the NDP agricultural policies under the administration of Gord MacMurchy.

Mr. Speaker, if our Minister of Finance had just a sprinkling of the money they spent investing in mines, farmland, etc., there would be no deficit budget today. There would be plenty for all. There would be plenty for all, but they blew it all, just as if they were playing with a deck of cards.

Mr. Speaker, let's say a few words that Saskatchewan people will always remember about the next two ministers of agriculture. The hon. member from Souris-Cannington – all people in Saskatchewan loves this man for making the statement as Minister of Agriculture in July of 1982, "There will be no more land purchases from the Government of Saskatchewan."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — "We will do everything in our power to help the farmer retain his own land. This province will be owned by the people, not the government."

Mr. Speaker, the now present Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member from Weyburn, will be remembered for the following that was just announced in the budget: the tax credit for fat cattle, elimination of school tax on the home quarter, his programs to assist farmers facing foreclosure, increased help for the irrigation farmer. Mr. Speaker, I have never in my seven years ever heckled the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg when he is on his feet, and I ask him to have the decency to do that for me, and also I ask him, as a Christian, to respect our Premier in this House as we respect the past premier of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — I would like to now quickly touch on a topic that has caused some comment in recent weeks. I'm referring to what can only be described as one of the sleaziest advertising campaigns the people of Saskatchewan have ever been subjected to. I'm referring to advertisements, apparently sponsored by two of the members of opposite, the member for Regina Elphinstone and the member for Regina Centre. The latest advertisements appeared in the Regina Leader on Saturday, March 17, and Monday, March 19. I have never seen such a misleading advertisement in any other publication by any company or association. Headlines: "Have you been touched yet?" The advertisement features a caricature of the Minister of Economic Development, the hon. member for Souris-Cannington. It is then followed by a litany of untruth. If the members opposite who sponsored this advertisement are not careful, they themselves will be touched by the Advertising Standards Council. I'm sure if they were trying to sell an actual product, they would be investigated by the federal Consumer Affairs Department and likely charged. No respectable company or organization would ever put its name and reputation to an advertisement that was so bluntly fraudulent in its claims.

Indeed, a lot of people of Saskatchewan's residents have been touched by this government. Forty-two thousand home owners who have received mortgage payment rebates were touched by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — The tens of thousands of car owners who are saving something like 10 cents a litre on gasoline have been touched by this government. The thousands of Saskatchewan residents who now have jobs have been touched by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — Students and senior citizens who are benefiting from our programs and policies — the very people whose needs were ignored by the former administration — have been touched by this government.

The previous administration left so many things undone, and so many things untouched, that someone had to start moving in the right direction. So we are glad we are touching people. And we intend, Mr. Speaker, to touch many more people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. MUIRHEAD: — It is the people you do not touch that lose you elections.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I have one comment that the . . . I have to do this very quickly. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that, if he'd just cut his arm with a letter opener, the blood would pour out. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote another man of the same philosophy as the Leader of the Opposition. He said, "I'll lay me down and bleed awhile," after being defeated in a federal election by a good Conservative. Is it possible that the Leader of the Opposition is going to follow that man's example and become the next national leader of the NDP? And I'm sure the member from Shaunavon will help him start the bleeding.

March 30, 1984

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all express the congratulations to all of my colleagues in the Assembly for the quality of their speeches during this debate, Mr. Speaker. For the first time since I have had a seat in this Assembly, which is now six or seven years, this is the first budget that we had to sit, and first budget speech that we had to sit beyond the clock at 10 o'clock at night. It's the first budget speech where people were lined up on the government side waiting their turn to speak, and many, Mr. Speaker, never had the opportunity to join into this debate. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker?

Also, in winding up the debate I think one has to ask the classical or the typical or the normal or the traditional question after a budget speech: what has been the response across the province? The response across the province, Mr. Speaker, has been this: the budget was innovative. The budget had new ideas. And this budget is a budget that we can use to build on in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — But what have our opponents said about it, Mr. Speaker? What's that response been? First, this is an election budget – in mid-term, Mr. Speaker; we haven't been in office two years – it's an election budget. Or their associates saying, it's a pollster's budget; it was a pollster that wrote it. There's no election, Mr. Speaker, and the pollster didn't write this budget.

The reason the budget is the way they see it is because, for the first time, we took the process to the people and asked the people what they would like to see in the budget. Here is what we have, folks. What would you do if you were in our position? How would you respond to the challenges that we see in this province today? And that's what we were looking for, Mr. Speaker. And what did they tell us? What did they tell us? Here is what they said. Number one, deal with power bills. Deal with the question of the chronic supply of nursing home beds. Health care must be preserved, Mr. Speaker. That was clear, and it was through – throughout all the meetings.

But on the other side, Mr. Speaker, they said deal with welfare – deal with welfare, Mr. Speaker. And I think down and beyond all, and most importantly, they said deal with the question of employment, but deal with it in a reasoned way, and deal with it in a way that has long-term potential. We've had enough of these short-term measures, these stop-gap measures. We must go beyond that. Mr. Speaker, that's what we heard. And the budget of seven or eight days ago was a response to what, in fact, we heard.

And it's not, Mr. Speaker, it's not because we're going to have an election. And it's not because some pollster said you should do it this way. That's not what the budget was about, Mr. Speaker. And surely, to respond that way is to heap scorn upon ourselves in this Assembly, that we, as elected officials, elected people, are so cynical to think that the only thing we do as government, is because what is going to happen in an election forthcoming.

Surely the country has had too much of that, Mr. Speaker. Surely the country has had too many budgets that do nothing for three years, and then give everything away in year four. Surely we've had enough of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, we listened to the people, and we responded to the people, not because there's an election coming. We did it because that's what we believe we were elected for. That's what we believe the function of government is. And

finally, that's what we believe democracy is all about, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — And they said, perhaps most important of all, Mr. Speaker, what they said was this: we elected you people in government to make changes. We elected you to do something different. We had become tired. We had become tired of the previous administration. And in 1982, we spoke with a very loud voice – a very loud voice, and 56 members now sit on this side, Mr. Speaker. And they said we want to see change. We want to see change, and you've done those changes. We know that. You brought in new programs to protect the home owner, to help the young farmer get a start to build a new farm.

We cut the tax on gasoline. You brought in the Public Utilities Review Commission. We know you did that. But that was in the first year. Keep going. Don't stop now, they said. That was the message they sent to us. Keep what is good, they said to us. Keep what is good, they said to us. Keep what is good, Mr. Speaker. Examine those areas where you're having problems. Keep examining those areas. And put a stop, Mr. Speaker, to the things that aren't working.

And that's the way we responded in this budget. And we did it with venture capital – venture capital concepts. We did it with the livestock program. We did it with the new views on crown corporations. And we did it with welfare reform.

Each of those programs, Mr. Speaker, and other ones within this budget, but each of those programs are capable of not only having application to our province, but are capable of having implications and being national in scope. The welfare reform brought in by Mr. Dirks – by the Minister of Social Services, pardon me, Mr. Speaker – by the Minister of Social Services; that program can have application to the unemployment insurance fund across this country. It's new and it's innovative, and things can be done in that regard. And many of the other ones have that application, as well.

But let's go back and ask what the opposition told us. That's what the people told us; what did the opposition say? What have they said? They've made two responses, Mr. Speaker – a response before the budget, and a response after the budget.

Now let me refer to the response they made before the budget. This is in the *Leader-Post*, I think two days before the budget was brought down – interviewing myself, Leader of the Opposition, and Ralph Goodale.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who's that? Ralph who?

HON. MR. ANDREW: — We'll come to him in a minute.

And here's what the Leader of the Opposition said, Mr. Speaker, two days before the budget. The NDP leader says he would like to see measures in the budget to help farmers and small businessmen.

Before the budget, Mr. Speaker. He went on to say that the government should encourage the private sector to create more jobs. That's what we heard two days before the budget.

And what about his protégé, Ralph Goodale? What did he say? Ralph says this. He suggested that we establish tax incentives to encourage the development of capital pools. That's his protégé. But he went on to say, you have to do more than that; you have to do something else. He said there is a tight situation regarding the availability of beds in nursing homes, and that's a

March 30, 1984

big concern. That's what they said, Mr. Speaker, before the budget.

Now, what did they say after the budget? What they said after the budget, and perhaps most importantly was the first, very first opportunity to respond. And what did they say? They said there's nothing in the budget, and it's the first budget I've ever heard where there was no mention of highways. That's the response that came first. But, Mr. Speaker, that says more than just a knee-jerk reaction for something to say.

It says more, Mr. Speaker, to me because really what it was saying is this: for the last 25 years in the province what was a budget? A budget was the Minister of Finance standing up and saying, for the folks in Wilkie: we're going to build you a new rink; and for the folks in Duck Lake: we're going to build you a new road; and for the folks in Canora: we're going to build you a new school. Now that's hardly what a budget is about, Mr. Speaker.

Surely a budget is to tell you what we can do as a country, what we can do as a province, what type of tools, of instruments we can use to build a future for our province. And we believe on this side of the House that the future of our province has never been more golden. There's never been more opportunity, and we believe this budget is seizing upon that opportunity, and we believe that this budget is looking towards that future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — But they responded then, a few minutes later, by saying, oh, the deficit. And they said, "He's a red Tory. Well, that guy is a red Tory. The deficit is awful." If I'm a red Tory, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is a blue socialist.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — And in the last week I can assure you he is looking more blue and blue as I've ever seen him look before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — His response, his response on the deficit, Mr. Speaker, looked like it was addressed to the people of Bay Street rather than the people of Saskatchewan, and that's the direction he took. But I think he was saying more; I think he was saying more, Mr. Speaker. And what he was saying was this: we want the deficit reduced significantly, eliminated. And why do we want it eliminated? And how would we eliminate it? And he knows how you would eliminate it, Mr. Speaker. You'd eliminate it on the backs of the poor, you'd eliminate it on the backs of the taxpayers, you'd eliminate it on the backs of health care, you'd eliminate it on the backs of nursing homes. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I say to everybody in Saskatchewan: we are not prepared to do it that way; we will do it our way, and in the end we will do it the right way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — But, why does he say to do it that way, Mr. Speaker? Why does he say to do it that way? Does he believe that? I don't think so. He does it in the cynical political reason that he wanted something to attack on. And there's not going to be a day, and I serve notice to the Leader of the Opposition, as we have served notice in this party for the last 10 years, that you will never stomp the province of Saskatchewan saying that the Tories are going to take away health care. I defy you to do it. We have put that behind you once and forever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Then they go out and say (not in Regina because our folks, the scribes

in the media would pick it up too quickly), but they go to the rural area, and they say: the deficit, this extra \$267 million will have the effect of increasing interest rates for every man, woman and child in this province by 1 per cent. That's what they said, Mr. Speaker.

That is irresponsible. That is the same type of argument they used on health care. And if we paid 1 per cent more interest because of this deficit, it would mean that our rating would be dropped from a AA plus where it is, and will stay, down to a B. And if that was to happen, Mr. Speaker, their friends in Manitoba who have been downgraded, and who have a deficit five times as large as ours, would be rated a C, would have to go to Avco Finance to finance their deficit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the members opposite should read some of the material being generated, being generated within their own party. And I commend to them the work of Jim Laxer, former researcher for the NDP. He wrote a thick volume, Mr. Speaker, and there was some interesting reading in that volume. I read it. He ended up, Mr. Speaker, with the following paragraph:

By concerning themselves with distribution much more than production, Canada's social democrats have stood on the sidelines for far too long in the great debate that the future is about. It is time for them to face the future.

That's what Laxer told them, Mr. Speaker. What does that mean? And what have they responded, and how have they responded? We have heard over the last week of this budget debate, Mr. Speaker, one view running through all their speeches. They haven't yet come to the realization that April 26, 1982 happened. They haven't come to that view yet. They're still saying: our way is the best way. Don't look forward. Don't look for new ideas. Don't 'look to the future; look to the past.

Look to the past, Mr. Speaker, and that's what they are talking about. Go back to what we did before; all that we did before was well. And that, ultimately, if you take that all aside and ask what that means, Mr. Speaker, it means that they believe the people of Saskatchewan don't know what they're doing and don't know what they were doing on April 26, 1982. That's what they're saying, Mr. Speaker. And I don't think the people of Saskatchewan will accept that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Many people, and I think the Leader of the Opposition made reference to this being 1984. And 1984 has been associated with the notion that Big Brother is taking over —the notion that an every-growing bureaucracy is going to stifle the freedom that government is supposed to be all about.

But there's another thing about 1984, Mr. Speaker, and that is perhaps less obvious, but every bit as much serious, and every bit as much ominous. And that is the point that somehow, in 1984, we've come to a plateau, and we've stopped, that the world is sort of stopped. It's stuck in place, Mr. Speaker, with no place to go. That's 1984.

And the reason for that, I think, is twofold. The effects of the world-wide recession has made people timid, has made people draw back and say the status quo, or protect, or let's not do anything. So has the fact of massive deficits around the western world. And that has taken the creativity to a large degree out of what government can do.

I am saddened, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that that same effect is creeping across our country. If you go back to the federal budget of just a month ago, what did it really say, Mr. Speaker? What did it really say? Mr. Speaker, it was an admission in defeat. Mr. Speaker, it was almost a council of despair. Do nothing. Steady as she goes. All is well.

March 30, 1984

All is not well, Mr. Speaker. In other provinces in the last few weeks, what have we seen? We've seen your taxes going up, massive programs cut, cut, cut. Mr. Speaker, that's what we have seen. Nothing by way of initiative. Almost defensive mechanisms, if you like, Mr. Speaker. Almost a sense of there's nothing we can do.

What this country needs, Mr. Speaker, is leadership today, not abdication.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — What this country needs right now, Mr. Speaker, is foresight, not short-sightedness. And above all, what this country needs is a sense of confidence in ourselves as people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ANDREW: — And what this budget does, Mr. Speaker, above all is it shows leadership. It shows foresightedness, and it shows confidence. We will not stand by and watch basic institutions that have taken 100 years to build in this country, Mr. Speaker, be put to the chopping block. That is not our way of doing it. But, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to look, and this budget, Mr. Speaker, looks not only at 1984. This budget is designed to look beyond 1984 to '85 and '86 and '87 and beyond, Mr. Speaker. But more importantly, this government is not afraid, Mr. Speaker, to look the future straight in the face. Mr. Speaker, this government is not afraid to put the future of this province back into the hands of our people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

YEAS – 8

Blakeney
Thompson
Engel

Lingenfelter
Koskie
Lusney

Shillington
Yew

NAYS – 44

Devine
Muller
Birkbeck
McLeod
Andrew
Taylor
Katzman
McLaren
Garner
Smith (Swift Current)
Baker
Hepworth
Schoenhals
Duncan
Sandberg

Klein
Dutchak
Embury
Maxwell
Young
Domotor
Folk
Muirhead
Petersen
Bacon
Sveinson
Hodgins
Smith (Moose Jaw South)
Hopfner
Myers

Rybchuk
Caswell
Hampton
Gerich
Boutin
Schmidt
Tusa
Meagher
Glauser
Sauder
Zazelenchuk
Johnson
Martens
Weiman

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS – 44

Devine	Klein	Rybachuk
Muller	Dutchak	Caswell
Birkbeck	Embury	Hampton
McLeod	Maxwell	Gerich
Andrew	Young	Boutin
Taylor	Domotor	Schmidt
Katzman	Folk	Tusa
McLaren	Muirhead	Meagher
Garner	Petersen	Glauser
Smith (Swift Current)	Bacon	Sauder
Baker	Sveinson	Zazelenchuk
Hepworth	Hodgins	Johnson
Schoenhals	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Martens
Duncan	Hopfner	Weiman
Sandberg	Myers	

NAYS – 8

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Thompson	Koskie	Yew
Engel	Lusney	

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

AGRICULTURE

Ordinary Expenditure – Vote 1

Item 1

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:00 p.m.