

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

December 3, 1984

EVENING SESSION

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Ms. Zazelenchuk, seconded by Mr. Tusa.

HON. MR. GARNER: — I think it's time that we present to the members of the Assembly, and to the people of Saskatchewan once again, the report card that was done by TRIP (The Road Information Program) Canada on the highway network in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, what it has pointed out, that in the five-year pavement reconstruction needs in the province of Saskatchewan the highway system as it has been rated . . .

We'll start first of all with a province that I believe the members of the opposition should relate to fairly well because it is their party that is government of the province. I refer to the province of Manitoba. Their situation is 27 per cent as a backlog of roads that need reconstructing in the province of Manitoba. We move to Ontario — we've got 8.5 per cent; P.E.I., 67 per cent; New Brunswick, 14.5 per cent; Newfoundland, 89 per cent. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, the province that we live in, the road system that members in the opposition have stated there was no highway work being done; the roads are deteriorating; they're gone, under a Tory government; the report is, and I'm proud to say, Mr. Speaker, the lowest in Canada, 6.7 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GARNER: — Let me just finish, Mr. Speaker. The province of Alberta, 25.4 per cent. They used to be, Mr. Speaker, they used to be number one. They are not number one any more. The people and the province of Saskatchewan are number one — not done by our government, not an assessment done by us, not an assessment done by an individual political party — an assessment done by an independent consulting group done right across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, very hopefully this will put to rest that, because of the removal of the gasoline tax, the roads have deteriorated in the province of Saskatchewan. Not true. Another false allegation by the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, just another figure from that same report. This one here, "Extra Annual Costs per Driver Caused by Driving on Deteriorated Roads." We'll do some comparisons once again, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba, (the province that their party is government of), \$113 extra a year; Ontario, \$97; P.E.I., \$180; New Brunswick, \$72; Saskatchewan, \$70; Newfoundland, \$378. Mr. Speaker, once again, the costs are still too high, but they are the lowest in Canada. And I will share with the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, the conclusion of the TRIP Canada Report. I read it into the record:

The major conclusion from the above analysis is that a very small proportion, 6.7 per cent of Saskatchewan's paved highways, are at present efficient in terms of pavement conditions, or geometrics. As pavement construction in the '60s and '70s reached the end of their design lives, resurfacing requirements are expected to increase over the next five to 10 years before levelling off. Reconstruction of the paved highways will not be a major requirement. Most of the reconstruction required will be on the existing, oil-treated highways. The need to maintain Saskatchewan's investment in its highway system is apparent. Undertaking the

recommended program will not only help further deterioration and restore the road system, but also will create jobs and lower motorist driving costs. It is a program which makes sound economic sense.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a report card that any government would be proud of, any minister of transportation would be proud, as I am, to stand in this Assembly and say to the people of Saskatchewan: it isn't all doom and gloom, as the opposition tries to predict and project to the people of Saskatchewan, to the members of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this last weekend I was at the Saskatchewan road builders conference held in Saskatoon, one of the largest conventions they'd ever had in their history; in tougher economic times, now the largest. Mr. Speaker, those people have the faith in what we can do in this province. Those people are the road builders of not only today but the future as well. You don't find the doom and gloom with those people.

And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it's quite easy to understand why there isn't doom and gloom in the minds of not only the people of Saskatchewan but the construction industry as well in the province of Saskatchewan. Last Thursday we announced to them a winter tender schedule of \$26 million. Of that \$26 million, Mr. Speaker, we have announced 11 separate highway projects — resurfacing, grading, and paving, 13 gravel crushing projects. Mr. Speaker, what this means for jobs to the people of Saskatchewan, and, Mr. Speaker, I hear one of the members hollering from his seat about what about this, what about that — that is the foresight that the NDP has. What are they going to do in my own little area? Not concerned about the province, just what are you doing to do in my town. Not concerned on a broader scale, just pick a little bit here and a little bit there. That's how deep, Mr. Speaker, the NDP is.

I will finish. The winter tender schedule means 500 jobs — 500 jobs this winter for Saskatchewan people. Next summer, with the tenders that we have announced that will be let out by about February of next year, another 900 to 1,000, with a spin-off factor of plus two, means that we will be in 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 or more jobs created in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I expect the members . . . Yes, I hear them hollering doom and gloom again, doom and gloom. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are bigger than the NDP. They proved that in April of 1982, and whenever there is another general election, Mr. Speaker, they will prove it again of who they put their faith in. And, Mr. Speaker, their faith isn't going to go into the individuals that go out there that either just look at their own little town or their own area or the people that are talking doom and gloom. Because, Mr. Speaker, it's the pioneers that have built our Saskatchewan. They are the people, and they are a lot bigger than the big socialists dream that we hear in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and talk about school buses, stop arms on school buses, some of the safety programs we've brought in; the new Vehicles Act members opposite weren't in favour of. Accidents are down, alcohol-related fatalities are down, Mr. Speaker, but that's doom and gloom. That's not good. That's not good. You don't do something like that.

But oh, my colleague, the minister responsible for SGI, brought in a program, Lights on for Life. And we heard comments from members opposite: well, maybe the lights are on bright. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, at least on this side of the House the lights are on, and over there they are all turned out, and that's what it comes down to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GARNER: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are tired of the same old rhetoric, the same old policies where it's flip-flop. And now I go back to the last provincial general election. You went into a nursing home, a senior citizens' home, and what did you get? "Oh, I can't vote for you because the NDP was around here, and they said you're going to kick

me out.” Mr. Speaker, that's the style of the NDP, scare tactics, and I say: shame on them; shame on them. That's how low they will stoop.

I bring up another small point, Mr. Speaker: how we're working with the people, not only in Saskatchewan, the people from Alberta. And the MLA from Weyburn brought up a very good point. What about recent meetings with the Red Coat Trail? And the member from Shaunavon was there. He didn't stay for lunch with us, but he was there in the morning. It's too bad because he would have got this message.

Now, the Red Coat Trail, you say it's a laugh. We talk about a small association but, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about Saskatchewan people working together. They wanted to name Highway 13 the Red Coat Trail. Well, that's fine. We had no problem about it. I remember the one member opposite brought up a real concern about where the highway signs were being made. I guess he thought I was making them in my basement, but I wasn't. We bought them from Signal Industries, but it was a big pressing need, a pressing concern.

So Alberta has joined with us. Manitoba is part of it. They asked on this historic trail if these three prairie provinces would allow them to call the road the Red Coat Trail. Well, the Government of Saskatchewan took the lead. We said sure. Alberta said sure. They go to NDP Manitoba. You know what? The answer was no. The NDP there wanted to play politics with the road and name a different road. So we have the Red Coat Trail going through Alberta, Saskatchewan, but it stops in, I guess, red Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. But, we'll have to change that in the next general election, and I'm very confident the people of Manitoba will change it as well. Those people will be heard and will have their voice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. GARNER: — You know, Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that our government has done. I could stand here for an hour and a half, and I notice the members opposite are finally quietened down. They're enjoying it, and maybe they're picking it up. Maybe they're picking up that what this government is doing is listening to people, working with people, and caring about people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if they can absorb anything from the throne speech that has been presented to them, is that maybe they can change that negative attitude. To stop being opposed to, whether it's oil companies that move in, create jobs — a lot of jobs in the province — heavy oil upgraders, and we could go on and on. Maybe, hopefully, they will get away from the doom and gloom, get onto a positive avenue and start working with people and not continue this philosophy of opposing everything.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt I have no problem whatsoever supporting this very good motion. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SAUDER: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me to stand in this House as the member for Nipawin, representing those people in north-eastern Saskatchewan, and to take part in this debate on the throne speech, which is opening this, the Fourth Session of this Twentieth Legislature.

(1915)

I believe that this Fourth Session will be a historic session, and one that we members of this legislature would be able to look back on with pride. I believe that historians will record that it was a Progressive Conservative government under the able leadership of Premier Devine that set a new course for Saskatchewan and turned it around after the many dismal years of failing

socialism, and put us on a new course: a new course which will make Saskatchewan number one in economic activity and domestic output in this country.

Already we've begun to see the turn-around in the course of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan has the enviable record of creating 44,000 new jobs and having the lowest unemployment rate in Canada since this government took office. In September we had an unemployment rate of 8.5 per cent, which was the lowest in the country, and it has been consistently the lowest in this country since April of 1982.

Mr. Speaker, this hasn't happened by chance. It's a direct result of the changes, policy brought about by the present Progressive Conservative government; changes, I might add, such as those in the royalty structure in the oil and gas industry; changes, many of them brought about not necessarily by policy changes, but by people having a new optimism, realizing that they have a government which is here to work with them, and not to provide everything for them, and not to take everything from them after they attempt to create real wealth.

The Economic Council of Canada has indicated that Saskatchewan has the greatest potential for growth of all provinces in this country in the years ahead. Many would say not only Canada, but also in all of North America. We find this despite severe economic problems in our agricultural sector. Depressed world markets, prices for grain, drought in southern Saskatchewan, flooding in north-eastern Saskatchewan, these have all contributed to causing severe hardship to our farmers. But this government has been quick to act to alleviate those problems. The north-east Saskatchewan flood assistance program provided \$7.5 million in financial assistance directly to some 1,800 farmers in the north-east who were experiencing severe difficulty with seeding due to flooding this past spring — this following a year when they had excessive rainfall which flooded much of their crops in 1983. This government acted quickly and promptly to provide farmers and ranchers with assistance when the drought hit the southern part of the province. We provided assistance to move cattle to summer pastures, and assistance to identify and develop alternate water sources. We implemented the Prairie Livestock Drought Assistance Program, which, in conjunction with the federal government, is providing \$26 million to assist livestock producers in the drought-stricken areas.

Improvements to the crop insurance program has been implemented to provide a vital safety net to the grain economy to minimize these situations in the future — improvements, I might add, which the farmers have been asking for, for many years, another example where this government has responded to the wishes and requests of the people after listening to them and preparing to act on their suggestions.

I'd just like to, after listening to the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, take a look at some of the things that he proposed for solving the financial crisis in rural Saskatchewan. Number one on the list, and I believe we looked at it, was his request that grain farmers should have an acreage payment of \$30 an acre. Mr. Speaker, I believe if we would multiply that by the acres in Saskatchewan, we would come up with a bill of somewhere close to \$2 billion, undoubtedly a worthy injection into the rural community. Unfortunately, I believe this province could not stand that cost. I believe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, he's suggesting now that maybe it's only where the drought was. Perhaps, if we look at the record, we'll find that he said in Saskatchewan.

I think that, if we saw those kind of payments, that many of their other requests would become very insignificant. Mr. Speaker, this government is working in concert with the federal government to ensure early and substantial pay-outs from the Western Grains Stabilization Fund, to get some of the farmers' own money returned back to them, and I believe that they will be coming out with that very shortly. However, we realize that there are still those in Saskatchewan who have their family farms under jeopardy through no fault of their own. Because of rising costs, uncontrolled interest rates, and the adverse effect of climatic conditions, many people are in danger of losing their family farm enterprise. This government in the throne speech has committed itself to providing viable Saskatchewan farmers with the opportunity to

remain in business despite these adverse conditions. These programs will be discussed at great length, and I'm sure debated actively in this legislature by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, who introduces the enabling legislation shortly.

Mr. Speaker, on many occasions the members opposite have criticized this government and its handling of the social programs. They've tried to make the people of Saskatchewan believe that this government is not concerned and not committed to caring for those among us who are less fortunate. In this throne speech the Government of Saskatchewan has committed itself, once again, to improving the quality of life for all Saskatchewan residents, to developing services for the elderly, and to upholding the dignity of the individual, protecting their children, preserving the sanctity of the family.

I would like to draw your attention to a number of projects in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, which are proceeding, which are directly benefiting the people in those communities. I think particularly of the commitment to building a new nursing home in the town of Arborfield. It's a nursing home which the people from that community had requested the former government for on a number of occasions and had always been told "No," or "Sorry, we know you need it, but we don't have any money." Also the town of Zenon Park—it's just recently had the sod turning for an enriched housing project to better enable the people of that community to look after their senior citizens. It's very much welcomed by those people to have a government who first of all comes and listen to them and then acts on some of their wishes.

In both cases, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, these people had requested the government, under the former administration, for these services, but they had been denied, I presume because of the moratorium which they had placed on the expansion of nursing home facilities in this province.

The former administration in effect said, "No, we will not look after your elderly. No, we will not look after your less fortunate. No, we are not going to expand the facilities in your community."

But this government said, "Yes, we recognize that you need them. Yes, we're going to build them." This is a government that cares, Mr. Speaker.

During the last session, Mr. Speaker, we heard members opposite very vocally criticizing the excellent programs of welfare reform that had been brought in by the Minister of Social Services. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that those reforms were brought in after consultation with many people across this province.

The reforms have been very well received in my constituency. The people of the Nipawin constituency believe that welfare and welfare payments should be made available to those less fortunate. However, they also believe that our prime concern must be to get people back into productivity and into the mainstream of society where they can make a substantial contribution. They applaud the Minister of Social Services for his innovative and well thought out reform program.

In this Speech from the Throne we're told that employment and employment issues will again be a high priority of this government, despite the fact that this province leads all of Canada in creating jobs, has the lowest unemployment rate, and has the brightest prospects of recovery from the recession.

We believe it has the best potential for future development. The government has committed itself to further assisting those who are unable, through lack of skill and training, to find meaningful and gainful employment.

These initiatives, together with our record and our initiatives in economic development, will prove to the rest of Canada and, in fact, to the world, that the Government of Saskatchewan

cares about its people and is leading the nation in its economic recovery.

Let's just take one particular example and take a look at the Saskatchewan oil industry. Since May of 1982 when this government came to office, over 250 oil and gas companies and over 90 service and consulting companies have set up business in Saskatchewan.

The oil industry has never been so healthy. It is producing presently at a 100 per cent capacity. A record \$108 million were invested in land sales in 1983 with growing investment this year. A record of 2,002 oil wells were drilled so far this year; 2,280 drilling licences were issued by mid-September for 1984. That translated into a half billion dollars of new investment in Saskatchewan in 1984. Over 2,000 new direct resource job opportunities were created in Saskatchewan, and over \$200 million in additional revenue were generated by this activity for government programs and for services that can benefit all the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, these are things that are the direct result of programs implemented by this government and, yes, I'm even happy to see that our opposition's friends in Alberta have realized that these are good programs and good policies and if, counting the long-shot, they ever had the opportunity, they would do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, that is our record in the oil industry, and everyone in Saskatchewan can be proud of it. I find it extremely important that this government in this throne speech has indicated that policies and programs will be based upon the traditional Saskatchewan values of self-reliance and co-operation. Those are two words which the former government, the former administrations in this province, totally and completely ignored. It is self-reliance, the reliance of oneself upon one's own ability that opened up this country and made it strong. It is co-operation between neighbours, friends, and even between communities that was the corner-stone upon which our rural Saskatchewan society was built. This government recognizes that the strength of Saskatchewan lies in the strengths of the individual and not in the strength of a central government.

We believe that the economy of the province cannot be strong until the economies of each of these communities is strong and healthy as well. We believe in co-operation with local authorities and with the federal government and, through that renewed co-operation and through self-reliance and initiative and entrepreneurial spirit, this government will lead Saskatchewan into a new and exciting era in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there have been many specifics given in this House so far, and I'm sure there'll be many more people who want to speak on this throne speech. I would just add it will be my pleasure to be supporting it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise tonight and speak on behalf of my constituents from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

As you may know, Prince Albert is a town which comprises 32,000 people approximately. And the basis of the economy in the area is agriculture, forestry. And the forestry obviously is relating to the pulp mill, which was provided to us by a former government, the Liberal government. The pulp mill, as I recall, at that time was opposed by the present-day opposition due to various reasons. And later on they basically flip-flopped and decided that they were in favour of the pulp mill. And in Prince Albert we're now going through a replay of the old flip-flop.

As you may know, Prince Albert is the closest city to the Key Lake mine and other uranium mines, and the people of my constituency are quite concerned. Everyone in Prince Albert is aware of the mining and many have concerns as to the safety, and many have expressed concerns and confidence that our Department of Environment is looking into issues relating to

construction of the uranium mine and safety features and so on. And others are also concerned about the fact that the opposition, if they should be elected again in government, would shut the mines down.

Now obviously in Prince Albert we're aware that that will not happen. However, it does raise a serious question in the minds of the people in my constituency, and it's something that I've been addressing my mind to and doing some work with my people regarding the mining situation. And I believe the two members from the opposition representing the two northern constituencies know exactly what I mean as they, as well, oppose their party's position regarding uranium mining.

What concerns the people of my constituency, Mr. Speaker, is that approximately \$600 million has been invested in one of the mines, and the NDP seem to have decided to forego that public investment, and the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake would prefer to see a more orderly approach to uranium mining, determining whether all safety features are present and whether we can make — utilize this important resource, part of which we, as a public, own.

(1930)

Now the area of Prince Albert is also a northern service point. We are basically dealing with mining in northern Saskatchewan, forestry as he indicated before, and also, thanks to the present government, we now see the construction of a new technical school in Prince Albert. And this will, in fact, transform Prince Albert into an educational centre of northern Saskatchewan.

The throne speech indicated the need for improved training and improved work in the area of making people more employable, more suited to the present jobs that do exist. We recognize, obviously, that there are jobs that we must create, the private industry must create. Government must assist the private industry in that endeavour. However, there are also jobs, and I specifically refer to those in northern Saskatchewan, that are still being filled by people out of our jurisdiction, simply because the technical schools have been unable to keep up with the demand in certain areas.

The new technical school in Prince Albert, which will house roughly 650 students, is intended in its design to take care of that shortfall. And it's a shortfall, Mr. Speaker, that has been in existence for a number of years. The opposition was well aware of that need and, in fact, spoke about the need for roughly 11 years and decided to promise construction of it during the Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election. Unfortunately, they weren't in a position to construct it because they were in opposition. And I have to commend the minister responsible for the department in charge that the school is progressing quite adequately. And I drove by the construction site the other day and there seems to be a feeling of optimism. The residents of Prince Albert are visiting the site and understanding the magnitude of this particular school, which is in line with what was indicated in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker.

In the Prince Albert area as well, we've seen a great deal of work in the area of seniors' accommodation, dealing with the safety net that this government speaks of. In the past, again, certain politicians, presently members of the opposition, spoke about their concern for senior citizens, and unfortunately that didn't translate into much action.

In Prince Albert presently a senior citizens' high-rise is being constructed and the seniors are very pleased with the direction of our government. And I believe something else has transpired. I believe many people no longer fear that the Progressive Conservative government would take medicare away; and this is a legitimate, a valid concern, which was brought to us in the late '70s and, in fact, before 1982, because certain seniors were being told that medicare would be taken away if the government changed. And if I were a senior, I may believe that, because seniors generally hold politicians to have some credibility.

Now, I was at an opening the other day, and one of these seniors came to speak to me and expressed a specific concern that she actually believed that medicare was in jeopardy, and expressed valid support for the government programs we have entered into, and specifically complimented our government for constructing nursing homes and senior citizens' accommodation across the province. We have a nursing home which was opened by the hon. health minister and myself, and the member from Prince Albert several months ago. That particular nursing home was delayed for almost three years on account of the moratorium placed on nursing home beds by the then government, the present opposition party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think, when we look at a budget, we have to consider well what are the challenges for the future? And these challenges are based on rational economics, and I believe that's where the opposition party, when in government, ran astray.

Economics dictates that a country, or a province, must be competitive and must be productive in order to compete in the world market-place. I believe our challenge for the future, as addressed in the throne speech, would be to educate our people so they are the best trained people in the world, or in the country, and combine a strong enough base for the private sector to be productive, to produce something that is saleable across Canada or overseas. And this is something that wasn't recognized previously, and, I believe, is something being recognized now by the federal government.

The decisions are difficult in some cases, Mr. Speaker, because it will mean radical changes. It will mean concepts such as a venture capital concept which was brought in by our government some time ago. But I, I have confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the Saskatchewan people that they are ready for the challenge.

I don't believe that the Japanese people are more astute than the people of Saskatchewan. I don't believe that the multinationals are to blame for all of our economic woes in the province; I think that's too simplistic of an answer. You can't blame, you can't blame any particular group for our economic woes. When you look at the successful countries — the countries that are coming into the economic stream — the governments there don't blame any group or regime for the problems. The challenge we face for the future is competing with the new countries, the third-world countries who are now productive and are producing grain; they're producing cars, they're producing all sorts of manufactured products. The reason that they are competitive is that they have analyzed their situation in the world market and have built upon their strength.

And in Saskatchewan, we're beneficial. We're lucky because we have many strengths, and I believe that's why the throne speech is so positive in highlighting what we've accomplished to date and indicating that we really intend to follow the same course to build our economic base.

Our economy in the past, Mr. Speaker, I submit, has been too protective. Governments have tended to protect us from the competition which may be south of the border, in another province, and that has tended to stifle the actual production. And unfortunately, in the past, in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I submit that our government — former government — acted in the same way as well. They stifled competition in the private sector as if it were a sin to make a profit. And I believe we're now paying the price of misdirection.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it's too late. I don't share the view of the opposition that gloom and doom is here and we're into all sorts of problems which we won't pull out of. I have more confidence in Saskatchewan people.

The private sector is really the basis for increased productivity, Mr. Speaker, and I have confidence in the private sector. And I believe if government continues to work as an enabler, the job will be accomplished.

I want to mention the Husky upgrader as one example of the government working with the

private sector. And on the other hand, I don't want to say that we're always going to look towards megaprojects as the answer to solving our economic woes because the challenge is bigger than that.

However, I think, when we have a situation where something of that magnitude is put together, that we have to be proud of that on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan — 3,600 direct jobs created from such a project. You can't argue with those figures. The only people arguing are the opposition. I found it humorous to see the reaction of the NDP in Prince Albert after the announcement was made. The reaction was that the government had made a sweetheart deal with a multinational.

Now to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the Husky company is a western Canadian company and is really a success story — something that we should be teaching our young people about, that things could happen when energies are structured in the right way and targeted. And the NDP reacted in that way.

Needless to say, they probably forgot, or didn't want to advise the people that their former leader, Mr. Douglas, was on the board of directors of the Husky Oil Company. And I suppose they've cut ranks with him because Mr. Douglas was known as pragmatic and representing the little guy. And I think it's clear that the present NDP represent big government and have forgotten about the little guy. So I believe they've cut ranks with Mr. Douglas and decided to take on the company that Mr. Douglas was proud of, and that all western Canadians are really proud of.

It's gratifying to know, however, Mr. Speaker, that the Husky upgrader has been well received by the people in the north half of the province. In Prince Albert, the business sector is optimistic. I personally invited the president of Husky Oil to attend a conference we had in Prince Albert, and he attended. He was interested in listening to our business people in northern Saskatchewan, and the opportunities are unlimited in that regard, Mr. Speaker.

The challenge for the future is harnessing some of these megaprojects, putting people together who are ready to do business. I think the biggest assurance that business wants is that government is not going to get in the way, and government is there as a regulator. And I believe, business has been telling governments that for years and years and years in Saskatchewan. And the difficulty up to now has been fairly obvious, Mr. Speaker; it was the philosophy of the former government, which simply didn't work, and couldn't build a proper economic base.

Now the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, addresses various directions, and I believe it's really a continuation of a former direction, which is the proper direction, the building on what we have.

The venture capital program, I submit, will prove to be a success as never before seen because it illustrates a new way of commencing businesses. I believe in the past we've seen government really substituting — throwing money where their competence wasn't adequate to solve the problems. I believe the venture capital system will become commonplace in the province of Saskatchewan. It will likely be copied across Canada because it does start business, create jobs, which doesn't cost the taxpayer anything up front. In fact, it returns dollars to the coffers at the end, which is really what the system is all about.

Now I have to look at the NDP solution. I don't normally like to dwell that much with the NDP position, Mr. Speaker, because their positions don't make sense. But far too often, I believe, our government members, and myself particularly, assume that people are going to know that the NDP solutions don't work, and that we are correct in our position. But what I'm running into lately is, people are questioning. They say, "Well, the member, the NDP member that spoke yesterday, surely he doesn't mean that. I don't believe he's right, but could you confirm that to us?" And so I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we, as government members, must continue to indicate

to the people of Saskatchewan that the proof is in the pudding.

The financial statements will indicate what our position is, and what the position of the former Heritage Fund was. And we constantly have to inform the people as to these matters. The NDP solution doesn't work, Mr. Speaker. Doubling the welfare payments does not help a welfare recipient to get training and get employment. It's as simple as that. We've been commended recently in Saskatoon and Prince Albert for the program brought in by the Department of Social Services, because it gave the welfare recipient something to look forward to — training, so they can go to somewhere and get a job. That's happening, Mr. Speaker.

I have, in the Prince Albert area, spoken to various groups and organizations who have taken advantage of the employment program and have found that a good number of the welfare recipients who got involved really wanted to work, received their training, and actually went to work at a later time.

And I think this — the important part of what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the dangerous effect of the position of the opposition party is that it tends to convey a message of hopelessness to those on welfare, and to those unemployed. And I think that's very dangerous for an opposition party to do. I would hope that in the 1980's an opposition party would be politically civilized enough to offer some suggestions where governments can, perhaps, improve the state of events in the province of Saskatchewan. And I know in the housing corporation, which I'm in charge of, or the Indian affairs secretariat, I'd be pleased to receive suggestions, because we all certainly could use suggestions because we always face tough decisions. And it's a little disheartening, Mr. Speaker, to find an opposition that has one thing in mind, simply to say something or do something which will scare people into distrusting the governing party.

And I don't normally commend members, but an example of a proper opposition action, as far as I'm concerned, was when the member from Athabasca contacted me this summer regarding the seniors repair program, and the reason I'm mentioning it in this speech, Mr. Speaker, is that it's so unusual for that party — for a member to contact me by telephone to express his concerns regarding a program which maybe wasn't working that well in northern Saskatchewan.

(1945)

As a result of his phone call we did look into the dilemma and found that we could be doing things a little better in communicating the particulars of the program to the northern residents in his particular constituency. We've done that and I'm happy to report today that to date we have had more successful applicants under the seniors repair program than the former government did in the history of that program, from northern Saskatchewan.

So I believe there may be rays of hope in the opposition benches and I hope that in the months to come they will realize that we, as Canadians, face some important decisions, and their challenges are important for the future as well; and Saskatchewan has the opportunity to lead Canada out of the recession and to place some dominance in the world markets because we've been successful in many areas. And I believe the opposition may want to be a little more constructive in regards to what has happened in the province because it does get our people motivated. The public business people and so on, they get motivated, and they don't want to be fed various stories, especially when they aren't accurate.

I believe our economic development department should be commended on recent progress being made in the high technology industries. Several years ago, I recall someone telling me that the government's . . . The problem with the former government was that it viewed Saskatchewan as a hinterland, somewhere where we would grow grain and haul it away and didn't have much confidence that Saskatchewan people could do more. And I was pleased to hear recently that Saskatchewan companies are assigning contracts to supply Germany, to supply America with all sorts of high technology equipment; and the companies I speak of are

located in Saskatoon, but they are locating to other parts of the province as well. And that's just an indication that Saskatchewan people are noted for accomplishment and perseverance. And I believe that the opposition is missing the boat, so to speak, when they think that Saskatchewan people can be scared or afraid to venture into new areas.

Now I believe as well, Mr. Speaker, that the throne speech addresses some of our key thrusts and key concerns. We are all concerned about the deficit, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the debt of government must be a consideration, not only the deficit as we know it and as the people of Saskatchewan know, Mr. Speaker; much of that debt was inherited from the former government in the form of debts in each corporation. So I believe that all has to be looked at under the same theory that Saskatchewan enterprise must become strong enough to pay those debts, including the deficit, in order for us to be competitive in our world market.

The other areas, Mr. Speaker, and I want to specifically refer to northern Saskatchewan for a moment. As the House may know, Mr. Speaker, I am considered one of the northern members, although I come from the centre of the province, because our population base is in southern Saskatchewan. And I have travelled the North extensively and have travelled through the constituencies of the two northern members in the opposition benches, and I am well aware of the challenges that face us in northern Saskatchewan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I travelled the area extensively roughly 10 years ago as a lawyer and on various contracts, in fact, with the provincial government, and I was able to see the differences and the opportunities in northern Saskatchewan.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's important for us to analyse an area of the province for what we can do, rather than what can't be done, and this is something where the former government failed drastically. The DNS, as we all know — and I don't believe even the opposition would think that the DNS had succeeded — but we all know that it was a colossal failure. The reason it failed, Mr. Speaker, is that the precision to programming was not designed by Northerners or anybody that really knew anything about the North. I remember seeing people fly in from Regina, from Winnipeg, from everywhere else and attempt to tell the Northerners why the new program would work. And as soon as the Northerners would start asking questions, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the Northerners would start asking questions, there was simply an allocation of funding for that particular group that asked the questions. And that was the name of the game in northern Saskatchewan, and it simply didn't work.

I was in Ile-a-la-Crosse two months ago, Mr. Speaker, and I spoke to an elderly gentleman there who is about 75 years old, and he indicated that he has seen a lot of things in the last 75 years in northern Saskatchewan. He had grown up in the area and had seen an area move from self-sufficiency to total reliance on the government. And, Mr. Speaker, anyone that has spoken to any of the elders in northern Saskatchewan will verify this, and I believe the members from the North will also verify it. The interesting part of what he said, Mr. Speaker, was that there were cattle being raised. There was farming in northern Saskatchewan. There was trapping. There were various small industries that had been established by the Northerners in their traditional ways.

Now it appears, Mr. Speaker, that the former government simply flew into town one day and said: well, no, you need a 40-hour a week job, year-round, and putting three occupations together for the year isn't the way we'd like to see it, and while you're thinking it over, we'll build you a house which was designed in Regina. And, Mr. Speaker, it simply didn't work.

This elderly gentleman indicated that year by year the line-up at the dock waiting for the pontoon plane simply got longer and longer, and sooner or later the towns grew because people had no reason to live outside of the town sites. And, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't anything for them in town except houses. In fact, Mr. Speaker, right now some of the communities strive to acquire government housing simply to put people to work — not for the accommodation aspect only, but because it's a make-work program.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe the challenge is for us to create economic activity, legitimate economic activity so Northerners can be employed in a productive manner. We don't want to create a social service area of the province which was created by the former government. We can't fence the North off and expect the rules to be any different. It'll never work. It'll never work, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, I was pleased to hear the northern outfitters, Mr. Speaker. This year the northern outfitters indicated that their business increased drastically in northern Saskatchewan. I am advised by the Northerners that more Northerners have been employed in the tourist industry than in the history of the province, Mr. Speaker. And I must commend our department of tourism and renewable resources — Tourism and Small Business, excuse me — for the work they have done in that area. And I can tell, Mr. Speaker, that the members of opposition don't like when the facts are provided, but those are the facts. And the northern outfitters have verified their position and the income that has been generated this year.

I am also pleased to report, Mr. Speaker, that consistent with the thrust of our throne speech, gold mining is now developing in northern Saskatchewan. A new gold mine was opened this year, and other exploratory work is being conducted.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Saskatchewan Business magazine of November indicated quite concisely that the gold mine companies weren't interested in Saskatchewan simply because of the former regime. And that was a quote from the developers. And these developers are Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker. I believe a little ploy utilized by the opposition — and they'll do it again in the next election; they did it in my by-election; they'll do it time and time again — that the people developing the northern mines are all multinational and big, bad business.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a good record in this province as far as junior resource companies establishing themselves in Saskatchewan because they didn't feel very safe in Saskatchewan. And, in fact, I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that some of them still do not feel safe and will feel a lot safer after the next provincial election when this government is returned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DUTCHAK: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I can quote the Saskatchewan Business magazine, I can quote the mining developers, I can quote the stockbrokers, I can quote the small investors from Prince Albert who are presently investing in gold mines. But I think all that the members have to do, all that the people of Saskatchewan have to do, is take some interest in what the Northerners are saying. Northern Saskatchewan people in La Ronge, and in Prince Albert, in Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-la-Crosse, and Cumberland House are anxious to see more development in mining because they can see jobs. They're anxious to see the technical school opening in Prince Albert so that the jobs will be filled by trained Northerners.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will get to a stage in Saskatchewan where we won't have to worry about quotas on hiring Saskatchewan people, or northerners for that matter. I believe northerners are hard-working people that have been given no credibility by the former government, and simply haven't progressed as they could have if government had taken the proper steps with them. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all the northern Saskatchewan people are asking for are economic opportunities, similar opportunities to those people in southern Saskatchewan, because we're all Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker.

Now I might touch on some other shining lights in northern Saskatchewan. And the situation of the wild rice industry is phenomenal. As you may know, Mr. Speaker, our budget, our previous budget talked about wild rice, and our former throne speech, in fact, talked about the wild rice industry in northern Saskatchewan. It's something that our government became interested in when we took power in 1982. And we found shortly thereafter the industry flourished. We're

producing the wild rice for European markets. We have markets that cannot be satisfied because of the demand for this particular product.

We've been pleased as government to get involved in financing some of the ventures in wild rice, and these were northern people who were getting involved in the projects, Mr. Speaker. And they have all in all been successful; in fact, Mr. Speaker, the success rate is so good that it holds absolutely no resemblance to the economic development policy under the former DNS department.

The junior resource companies, Mr. Speaker — presently, I understand — are in northern Saskatchewan, not only exploring in the gold fields; they're also looking at new industries, mining, also wild rice. They feel that we can't create an artificial economy in northern Saskatchewan. People producing wild rice . . . I spoke to an individual last week that ended up earning roughly \$15,000 himself this summer in the wild rice industry. He indicates that he intends to do some trapping this winter; however, he indicates that he is more than satisfied with his economic situation this year. He indicated that he didn't receive a grant; he didn't receive any hand-out from anybody. And he was proud to say so.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds and hundreds of northerners that are presently in that position. And we, as people south of those areas, must realize that the solution isn't to supply every northerner with a 40-hour week, 52-week-a-year salary-paid job. These people are employed in the northern industries, which are seasonal. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, there's such a challenge in the area of tourism, for example, and wild rice, because these people are intended —they're experienced in these areas — and they know how to do it, and they know how to do it well, Mr. Speaker. And the last thing they need is someone from Regina to indicate to them that the DNS is going to provide the job for them if they simply come in and get their pay-cheque and travel around the North and study something or other.

Now it's important, Mr. Speaker, as well, that the work of this government continue in northern Saskatchewan. And I know it's not politically to the advantage of the two northern members to compliment this government on some of the actions that have been taken in northern Saskatchewan. I must commend our Minister of Urban Affairs for meeting with the northern communities regularly to see what their concerns are regarding servicing in particular towns and communities, because the servicing is being looked at in regards to the tourist industries.

Northern communities realize that they're really sitting on great potential which could be realized if the message was simply provided to the right people who wish to visit the North. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that former governments have failed drastically in letting people know about the beauty in northern Saskatchewan.

(2000)

The member from Cumberland is always talking about the 85 and 90 per cent unemployment. And I suggest to him it is 85 or 90 per cent — it's 95 per cent in some places. However, the member of the opposition, unfortunately, fails to tell people that tourists, when they leave northern Saskatchewan, are overwhelmed by what they have seen, and return year after year after year and provide more and more income to northern Saskatchewan people.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition want to cloister northern Saskatchewan and create some special zone which takes care of people, provides needed welfare and administers for them. And in my travels in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that is what northern Saskatchewan people want or require.

Now, Mr. Speaker, part of what I spoke of relates to welfare reform which isn't only northern Saskatchewan; it's happening across the province. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the direction we're going in welfare reform is important in northern Saskatchewan because it ties in with

training and economic development prospects for northern residents.

The Department of Advanced Education has programs to administer education, provide educational programming in satellite areas in northern Saskatchewan wherever they're required. And the Minister has taken it upon himself to review all of the programming, Mr. Speaker, because the northern programming cannot again be decided solely by people in Regina. It must be decided, the programming must be decided by Northerners in co-operation with the particular industries that are located in northern Saskatchewan.

I again mention the lack of trained people to fill all the positions in the uranium mines. Due to the length of time the mines have been operating, it's inexcusable for a province not to have that type of trained person available. And I'm pleased to say that this will be available as soon as the Prince Albert technical school is complete. It's something that is long overdue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the agriculture situation is obviously not as serious in the Prince Albert region or the northern region as it is in some of the southern areas because we simply didn't get the drought. However, I believe the problem is more massive than that and has been building over many, many years. The challenge for the future in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is to identify how the farming community can retain its vitality. Needless to say, our farmers are the hardest working people anywhere in the world. Our farmers are the best.

We, as government, have to continue to look at ways to cut the costs of operations. I was happy to hear about the federal government removing the fuel tax recently. That was long overdue.

And, Mr. Speaker, those are the real changes that can take place which can create a more healthy agricultural economy. I believe the farmers are now looking at diversifying into various crops and grains, into oilseeds, and so on. That, as well, is something for the future, and you'll see that increasing.

However, I also believe that farmers want an assurance from the government that the safety net will always be ready, as the safety net was ready when we protected the home owners in the province of Saskatchewan from undue interest rates. And I'll be pleased to hear the Minister of Agriculture come through with his information regarding the farmers of this province because the farmers simply want the government to recognize their existence. The farmers, unfortunately, have not been accustomed to the former government being allied with them. And I know the farmers, the dairy farmers in my area, were extremely upset at the position of the opposition in the dairy strike issue.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer — you won't find a fairer group of people than the farming community of this province. And they simply want a fair break. That's why, Mr. Speaker, our Premier has been talking to other ministers and talking to the Prime Minister to recognize other ways that perhaps the costs of farmers in Saskatchewan can be reduced.

And this is really a national concern which the former government didn't consider that important. I believe the Premier's position, as he takes with the present federal government, is a proper one — that we have to look not only at short term bail-outs as suggested by the opposition, we have to look at constructing something more lasting. We have to look at tariff structures. We have to look at products that are made in the United States but somehow can't come to our farmers because of protection of some other industry in some other province.

Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in the next two years you're going to see a drastic change in the area. I believe, Mr. Speaker, you're going to see progress, some intelligence taken in deciding where our economy should be going. I believe we obviously have a new air of co-operation between the federal government and the provinces, and this is all provinces, Mr. Speaker.

I was recently at a ministers' conference on constitutional matters, and even the province of

Manitoba that isn't politically disaligned with the members opposite was having a freer, more open conversation with the federal ministers involved. So I don't believe it's a partisan matter, Mr. Speaker. I think that certain political parties have been astute enough to modernize to what the people expect. And I believe those parties are now governing our federal government, and this provincial government, and many other provincial governments in Canada.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to support the motion because I believe the throne speech does set a direction that the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake would like to see. It's an intelligent direction. It's a direction dealing with real economics. It's a direction that doesn't blame anyone. We don't have to burn flags or picket buildings or do anything of that nature, Mr. Speaker.

The problems are too fundamental and too important to waste. We have the opportunity now to solve some problems, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you're going to see progress because of our closer association with other provinces and the national government in these areas. It's no longer feasible to simply pass the responsibility from civic administration to provincial administration, or the other way around, or through the federal system. There is one taxpayer, Mr. Speaker. He pays for all levels of government, and that has been realized by this government, and I believe the people of Prince Albert-Duck Lake are agreeing with that direction and the throne speech. I'm glad to support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got a little I'd like to say this evening about the throne speech, but I'd like to talk a little bit about the record. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of chairing the Special committee on fire protection and I'd just like to bring some things up to date to the members of the House on a non-partisan basis and remind them that the report was tabled in this House on the 23rd of March, 1984.

Of the 19 recommendations that were in the report, every one is heading along, is exactly as prescribed by this report by the Minister of Labour and I commend him on it. One of the first things he did, of course, as is required, to establish an advisory board consisting of people from in the province and the fire industry. The minister chose people of excellent quality and ability. John MacMillan from Broadview, who is one of the prime people arranging and pushing for the concerns of the firemen in the province. Russ Dinsmore, a volunteer chief, also on this special committee to advise on curriculum for rural people and so forth. Les Parker, Battalion Chief, Saskatoon administration. Hugh Ryan, with the fire prevention department, Guy Archambault of the department, Morley Nelson from Kalium Chemicals, Chief Bowes from Moose Jaw with the professional firefighters. These people, I'm pleased to say, by next week will have the first level of the curriculum available for the outreach program for the firemen of Saskatchewan. It is in its rough form and on Friday they will be finishing it and turning it over to the minister so that in January the program can go forth. All through the recommendations there were suggestions and time lines and things to happen. I'm pleased to say that the minister has taken the report very seriously and has been working diligently on it. It's nice to know that he has now — we now have a program going around this province, in co-operation with SGI and others on up from the grade one to the grade six students, informing them about the importance of fire protection within their homes.

And I compliment the Minister of SGI for co-operating with the Department of Labour, the volunteer fire chiefs all over the province, and the professional forces. They're looking after a very important group of people, our citizens. The whole report is basically being dealt with step by step by the minister, and I'm pleased to say that all things are right on schedule. And I understand that he is now at the position of . . . As the report suggested, we have to have a person to co-ordinate everything, which is called a principle in this recommendation. And they are about to try and write the requirements for that person before he can be hired. It's going step

by step as the original plan calls for, and that's important.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I will wind up what I have to say on the fire college and only say that, as the chairman of that committee, I have hundreds and hundreds of letters on my desk and in my files, of communities that were requesting the fire college.

I would like to make a few comments which I repeated at the fire chiefs' convention in Regina to put them on the record for this House. They are: the fire college as the committee decided should not be built in any city, town, or village. The reason for that was: they need a space of almost one-quarter section of land to have the training facilities and all the different apparatus that they must work on, and because of smoke regulations in all communities, because they could be burning different kinds of fire and causing smoke seven days a week, and most towns and cities have regulations against that. Therefore, the requirement, as I indicated to the people at the fire chiefs convention, is a requirement of 160 acres approximately, some of it strictly for distance between you and your neighbour, and other things along that line.

I'm pleased to say that the committee saw many different fire colleges and ideas, and the department has picked it up from there and are looking at others to make sure that when Saskatchewan goes forth that we go forth with the best possible fire college for our 6,000 firemen, 5,200 volunteers, 8,000 professional. These are our key people giving key support and protection to our citizens, and let's do the job right.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, I also have the privilege of being legislative secretary to the Minister of Highways. Among my duties I have the privilege of meeting with a lot of people who have concerns. And they have said to me, "You know, Ralph, it's the first time that somebody from the minister's office actually came out and listened to us explain our concern." Under the former government they dealt with the bureaucrats all the time. They didn't get to talk to somebody, an elected official. When they would say, "Look it, the bureaucrats say one thing and the engineers say . . . But this is our problem. Can you arbitrate between us and find a mutual settlement between all of us?"

That's basically what I've done, Mr. Speaker. And I just happen to have the very last one I worked on in my hands here. And it comes from your constituency, Mr. Speaker, so nobody can say I'm trying . . . (inaudible) . . .

And I'm pleased to inform you tonight, Mr. Speaker, that the Departments of Rural Affairs and Highways have worked out a solution to an old problem in your constituency, which is the Riverhurst ferry and the crossing. For many years, I am informed, people had problems when they went onto the ferry with a trailer of any type behind their vehicles, ripping the bottoms out and so forth. It's a little problem, but nobody took the time to look at it. We took the time to look at. We tested different ideas. And I'm pleased to say by this summer it should be cured for the benefit of your citizens and all the tourists, especially that tourist traffic pulling trailers and coming to our province. We welcome them here, and we welcome them, and we don't want to wreck their trailers, and therefore we're fixing that problem.

(2015)

Mr. Speaker, I spent a lot of time visiting with a lot of different groups. And I've got 144 different visits that I've made with different groups. And one thing they always tell us is they're glad to visit with us and lay their problems out to us.

And I had an interesting problem in Saskatoon a short while ago. In 1955, the Government of Saskatchewan designed a road but never told the people beside the road what was going to happen down the long stretch. They were going to close certain approaches and so forth.

You know, the member from Pelly sits from his seat and makes some little comments. I should inform him that I'm going out to his constituency to look at a problem where your community would like to do something to the boulevard. And they have asked me to come out to see if I can arrange to have that done for their benefit. And I've been out to the member from Shaunavon's seat to discuss with his R.M. council the problem that they had, and we came to an equitable solution for everybody.

I think I should go to the very last one on my list, and turn to the Minister of Tourism and say . . . The speech that we've had in the House talked about jobs and agriculture. Well, on November 13th I had the privilege of going up to Chaplin, Saskatchewan. And because of my visit with officials from Parks and Renewable Resources and the Highway officials, we were able to get a resolution from the community, which will allow \$1.5 million worth of work to take place in that area, will cause 18 jobs — sorry, 18 many-year jobs in their construction, and three man-year jobs permanently thereafter. And this is Ducks Unlimited money, not the government's money, in creating employment within the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it's been a very quiet day in the House. And I don't know. Today we started with the Leader of the Opposition, and I noticed this year he wasn't putting names on people. He did that a couple of years ago, but the speech he delivered seemed like the same speech he delivered every other year when he got to his feet. Very lacking in new ideas as the member from Saskatoon Sutherland says. Tired, old ideas.

You know, let's go back and look at some of those old ideas. In fact, let's go back and — I think we all remember the former Minister of Agriculture. He was under the former administration when they got defeated. He's now the Mayor of Semans, Saskatchewan, and he made a presentation a short while ago in Saskatoon in the city council chambers to a committee, Saskatchewan Local Government Finance Commission, Options for the Future, and in his submission I wondered if it's the same former Minister of Agriculture that I remember. I sat there and listened to his presentation.

I must say he must own the CBC or something because all day long there was no press there, but the moment he walked in, in came the CBC, and the moment he left, out went the CBC. I don't know if that tells me anything but that he's still playing to the press or something.

But it's interesting to know that on page 3 of his submission — Property Taxation: the Exclusive Domain of the Local Government — now at the NDP convention I understand that they suggested people shouldn't pay property tax for education. But in his submission he said, "Communities are built" — sorry — "it is appropriate that property taxation remain exclusively the domain of the local governments. This includes not only municipal governments, but local schools, hospitals, and library." What's interesting is, you people at your convention say no way, the provincial government or somebody else should take it — local taxation. And yet the former minister of agriculture, municipal affairs, education I believe, says in his submission in November that it's the domain of the local towns.

He goes on in his brief to make other comments. He makes comments about political decisions, and I'm wondering if he's referring to these political decisions while he was the minister because, you know, you wonder where he is coming from. You know, he goes on in his comment to say:

— recognition that a major portion of revenue of local government will be transfer payments from senior governments, and that this is the way it should be given to realize property tax revenue and the simple taxations.

What he does in his whole comment, Mr. Speaker, is he gets down to the bottom line that says — he says one thing, the party that he represented said another thing. I'm not sure if the NDP is trying to cover all the bases with two legs or what they're trying to do.

They don't seem to know where they're going, Mr. Speaker, the NDP the last couple of days have been wearing some interesting buttons in this House. And you know, they said something about the mine, the coal mine. Well, it's interesting to note the document sent to Mr. Allen Engel on November 22nd . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's the member for Assiniboia.

MR. KATZMAN: — The member from Assiniboia. I would just quote down near the end:

I would like to have forwarded to you the feasibility studies of the Poplar River site that would have been undertaken and completed before the NDP cabinet made the decision to own and operate this mine in 1974, and again in 1975. The reason I cannot forward them to you is because there weren't any. In other words, the NDP made decisions about a coal mine with no feasibility studies. It is unfortunate for the NDP government, although they would not have elected to proceed on the basis of ideology . . .

Sorry.

. . . would have elected to proceed on the basis of ideology, and not on good mining or business practice. Fortunately, this major error on the part of the NDP has only cost Saskatchewan citizens 10's of millions of dollars and we were able to correct the error, which will result in the people of Saskatchewan saving an estimated \$246 million over the next year — 30 years.

You know we heard Mr. Engel complaining about the sale and the price that was received, but he didn't talk about the problems that are involved. Let's go into this letter a little farther.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who wrote the letter?

MR. KATZMAN: — "Who wrote the letter?" somebody asked. It was a letter in response to Mr. Engel's letter to Mr. . . . Ask Allen. He'll tell you.

Let's go into this letter a little further, and you no doubt are aware that SPC under the NDP administration sold a drag-line in 1979 to an out-of-province company.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Who did?

MR. KATZMAN: — The NDP. They sold the drag-line in 1979 to an out-of-province company and then leased it back. And what are they saying to us about a mine? They're saying we shouldn't have sold the coal mine and buy coal back; it's going to cost us more money. The fact is, it's going to save us, over the next three years, \$246 million.

Therefore . . . and leased it back, the crane cost \$32 million. So if you take the \$32 million out of the numbers that Mr. Engel used, the balance was only \$97 million . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. Order please. I would caution the member to refer to members by their constituency or by their positions, not use names.

MR. KATZMAN: — I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. Let's go and look at this. Remember, they talked about \$129 million investment. What he didn't tell us is that they sold that crane for, that that crane cost \$32 million. So basically it's \$97 million was the investment and we sold it for more than that. That's good Jewish business sense. This was my heritage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, you must . . . Of course, we also must go into where the location of the government coal field was, the draining of the water, the suits involved because of changing water and so forth. But no, Mr. Engel didn't want to tell anybody . . . Sorry, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg didn't want to tell anybody about that. All he wanted to do was play with numbers. Half-truths. Not too good to do in this House because somebody will get you at it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I've been in this House a few years and spent many on that side and now I intend to spend many on this side, and I listened to the gobbledegook, for lack of a better word, and they talk about deficits. Well let's look at a deficit. Are you aware that, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan Power Corporation had a debt of over a billion dollars when the NDP was defeated? Over a billion dollars. In fact in April of 1982, it was one billion, two hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars — a deficit in Sask Power. They didn't tell the people of Saskatchewan.

Now we can go into . . . The member from . . . (inaudible) . . . is suggesting to me that I should talk about cooking the books. Well, you know the best example of cooking the books, I think, would be in the Provincial Auditor's report, where he indicated a Crown corporation, I believe it was Sask Computer, in December borrowed a million dollars, declared a dividend of a million dollars to the government with that money, put that million dollars in long-term debt. So what did they really do? They took a debt — a long-term debt — to clear a profit to the treasury so they could try and balance their budget. They did that all kinds of places, Mr. Speaker, throughout their term.

In fact, the way I hear it, there seems to be an indication that from about 1973 or '74 the former government never ever balanced their budget. They played what is called a nice double set of books, shifting the debt from one spot to the other; shifting the debt into the Crown corporations rather than showing it out front, as our Minister of Finance has had the intestinal fortitude to do. He said, "This is the way it is." And he has laid it out there.

Unfortunately, they have put a burden onto Saskatchewan and the taxpayers that is horrendous. Sask Power, Sask Tel, have major deficits. Their position of equity versus debt is unreal. If a farmer had that kind of debt he would be gone. It's just fortunate that they had the government treasury to back them up for their mistakes. When they took power, the debt/equity ratio was in proper perspectives. When they left power, they had basically mortgaged this province and the future of this province in their mismanagement and game playing.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember a former member from Kinistino that wore those very bright-coloured clothes in this place. You know, it's interesting to watch as their members got the feeling prior . . . I guess the Minister of Justice defeated that gentleman, and he sat out in the public in those days. But it wasn't long before he was rehired by the former government. And his main job was getting his picture taken around the SGI building. Because the day after he got the position, I happened to be in Saskatoon, by SGI, and there was that gentleman in a nice brown coat having his picture taken. And I always asked what he did, and nobody seemed to know. But then he didn't do much here, and that's why the new member from Kinistino is here.

(2030)

You know, the Leader of the Opposition talked about deficits a couple of years ago in this, earlier in this year. And the Sask Power deficit cost the people of Saskatchewan \$15,868 per hour. That's what the deficit cost that they left in that Crown corporation. That cost \$15,868 per hour. That's the deficit in Sask Power alone.

Let's ask, what did they do in Sask Tel? What did they do in those 26 Crown corporations that they have? Well, they also played some interesting games that we see in Public Accounts. They used a very creative set of books — super creative, and I think you almost have to compliment them on their ingenious methods of creating wealth that never existed.

First of all, as I said earlier about the one Crown corporation, they borrowed money, declared a dividend. Then they said the Heritage Fund had money in it. It had a bunch of assets, but their whole equity was in Crown corporations, not paying dividends. So what value did they honestly have? It makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker.

You know, they complain about our natural gas system and rural gas distribution system, but, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to say that, the way things are going in this province, my constituency will be one of the first constituencies which is totally covered — or, sorry — which natural gas has been made available to the people that want it.

Now, why, would you say, that they would start in my constituency? Sound business economic reasons: the shortest distance between farmyards of all the constituencies in the province because of the intensification of dairy farms, acreages, and small family farms. But when the former NDP brought their political one in, which they never intended to do, they went to the wide-spanning area rather than do it with a calm business sense: make sure that each step is done step by step, progressively, and financially sound.

And what does it do? It lowers the cost to the farmers of Saskatchewan and the rural residents. It makes rural life more possible in these tough economic times with grain prices down and all other inputs up — except the heating of our homes, our shops, our pig barns, and whatever other buildings we heat is now lower because of the economics of Sask Power bringing natural gas to our farms.

My compliments to the minister. You know, I was looking for some comments to talk about later tonight. I didn't have to look very far, and I came across a name, Terry Stevens. Now, I believe he is a union organizer or negotiator for Saskatchewan Potash, but I also believe he is a former — and remember what I say here — a former vice-president of the NDP.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Former?

MR. KATZMAN: — Former. Now, why is he a former vice-president? I wonder why? So I did some research and I found out. Do you know why he's a former? Because at the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour convention he suggested that he and Nadine Hunt, who are known for their partisanship to the NDP, should be taken off a committee to deal with the government, because they're so partisan they can't see anything. So his suggestion seemed to indicate: let's put a committee together of people who are not so partisan to deal with the government so that we don't have this political fight that Nadine always causes. Well, do you know, that cost him his executive position on Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. They wouldn't accept that.

That also, by the way, cost him his vice-presidency in the NDP, because he basically said that the minister's open-door policy was working. He made a comment that he'd been to see the minister a few times, and he got help, and the minister solved the problem. They didn't want to hear that. No, no. What they'd been saying, and Mr. Blakeney has been saying, is labour should get more militant. The member from Elphinstone says you got to get militant, cause strikes, disrupt the community, do everything to get them elected.

What's really happened? Less strikes; more harmony in the industry; and people are working. The lost days are down, way down. Not the way he wanted it. He wanted to lay up for his political benefit, not for the benefit of the workers of Saskatchewan. Where's he coming from? Where's the member from Regina Elphinstone coming from?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, you hear the members from the NDP talk. They talk about putting the gas tax back. They get very mad at the Premier of the province when he talks about

gas tax. Well sure, they should get mad, because if they really want to walk up to every citizen in Saskatchewan and say it's going to cost you 40 cents more for a gallon of gas — that's approximately — do they really think somebody's going to vote for them? Do they really believe that?

Then they come with this horse droppings about the roads being more holey. They're wrong there. There's more money being spent there than there was when they were government without the gas tax.

They talk about SGI. They don't talk about the hidden tax in the transfer at SGI to subsidize the losses, the silly things they reinsured. And fortunately for the good business sense of the minister of SGI, we're out of that mess.

You know, they didn't know how to be businessmen, and this government is the biggest business in this province. It's handling the finances of the people of the province. You know, as I started to say, this person from the potash got his hand slapped. Why? Because he actually went and talked to the Minister of Labour about improving a problem, to solve a problem. That's no good. You've got to cause trouble if you're with the NDP, because they've got to get elected above everything. You don't count; only their political party counts. That's wrong.

That's why they spent \$600 million in the North, and then the moment they're not government they say, "We're going to close them." Close them. And yet the two members from the North stand up and piously say, "You got to do something for the North." Yet they're willing to say, "Out of your jobs, guys. You're out." What kind . . . what's going on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — You know, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate the member for Assiniboia isn't here, because I think this might be a good time to . . . and the member from Regina North West isn't here, 'cause we might get into a little discussion of what happened in Public Accounts the other day as we lay all the facts upon the table. But we'll do that Thursday morning, and it'll be on Hansard, and we'll use it there.

Mr. Speaker, the whip has only allowed me so much time to speak this evening, but I think I'll take a little extra time to talk about the history of this House and the responses of the members. And maybe I'll . . . I heard a member from his chair saying: is this a filibuster? Well, that of course has got to go back and twig my memory, Mr. Speaker. You weren't here but several members were when, I guess, three of us that are still in this House today got — or four of us — got initiated under the Liberal filibuster. Forty-five days of potash and potash and potash and potash and more potash.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that those 15 Liberals had the ability to stand before the House and do the job, but it's also interesting to note that the Leader of the Opposition today did not move his amendment. Why did the Leader of the Opposition not move his amendment? Two, either he hasn't got it ready yet, or he's got no confidence in his other speakers so he wants to talk twice. I wonder which one.

Well, I would go for both of them. I would go with both of them, because he's done that before. It must mean that he has no confidence in the other seven members.

Mr. Speaker, the budget . . . the throne speech talks about jobs. The other . . . A couple weeks ago, the member from Saskatoon Fairview and I were discussing firewood. He wanted to buy three cords of firewood for him and his brother to burn in their fireplaces. I said, you know, I know a fellow on social aid that could really use the money. What are you paying? He told me. So I phoned this fellow on social aid and said: — look it, would you like to make some money? Here's \$150 for you. It's two days work, because the guy that ended up doing it, it only took him

two days. And his answer was: what for? I'm well looked after.

And this is a true story, Mr. Speaker, because the member from Saskatoon Fairview has got his firewood. It was by a young, aggressive young farmer who's got 600 head of cattle, but he was interested in \$150. But the guy on social services wasn't, and he's a bigger, and more strapped fellow than I am, and can carry a lot more than I can, but he's looked after too good. You know, you walk in his home and you see the cases of beer sitting there.

I wonder what's wrong, you know. Something we . . . something's wrong in our system. Sure we should feel benevolent to those who need, but there's a point. And hopefully, some day, governments and people will find that point — responsible to your brethren, but leave them dignity.

The Premier said that a couple days ago in a speech in Saskatoon, and some people were terribly mad at him, but it's the truth. Give them work. Give them dignity, and make it rewarding to work.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when you go out and spend a day on the farm when you're combining, or your tractor, or whatever, it's nice to look back at that field and say, you know, I did that. Me and my equipment, or me by myself if, depending what you're doing. It's an accomplishment. It hurt me and the fundamental beliefs of mine to see this fellow say no, and I couldn't understand it. But that's the way the cookies crumbles. That's unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to see the Leader of the Opposition in his chair. And I'd like to talk to about where we would be if we had him back as premier. God help us. I mean, that should never happen. But I know that he would like that. And I just wonder, in 1971 when he became government, and in 1982 when he lost the government, the civil service was increased by 10,000 people. Now who paid for those and where did the money come from? It came from the citizens of Saskatchewan. And some came from transfer payments from the federal government.

Well, you know, I saw a little cartoon, and I don't know if it's proper to reflect to it. And on that cartoon it had a picture of the former premier, and an express card or a chargex card typed. And what it says is, "Elect me premier so I can use this thing again."

I hope the citizens of Saskatchewan never give him that opportunity, or any of his followers. Because I would hope as he . . . You know, today he got sad news, and that's why he had no vibrance in his speech today. He heard this morning that his number one boy, the guy that used to get him out of all the trouble when he got into it, the fellow that carried the crowds and got the masses up and going, the former attorney general, isn't going to get a chance for a by-election. And he was down in the mouth today about that. But you know, he might have been happy, too, because there is no threat to him. The threat is gone.

So maybe it was a double-edged sword — a little bit of sadness because now he has to stay here to keep that crew of seven with some ability, but he doesn't have the fellow on the side that just might push him out the door.

Well, I'm getting some help again from the back, Mr. Speaker, suggesting about others that would like to help him to the door. Well, I think even I would love to help him to the door, and hopefully that our government in the next election and same people of Saskatchewan will definitely help him to the door and not re-elect him.

(2045)

But I think he may be smart enough not to run again, you know. It's a pretty tough thing to be finally told that people don't want you any more, and they may tell him that in the next . . . In fact, it almost happened to him in this election. It almost happened.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about the member from North West that's not here. You sort of prefer not to talk about members when they're missing from the House. But then, when he's missing, he's totally missing and you wonder why that member has gone to sit in the single chair all by himself? Why? Does he believe he will have more input into the affairs of Saskatchewan from the single chair or does he believe his ego will be better looked after as he gets press? I let you and the community be the judge.

You know, in opposition, Mr. Speaker, one of your duties is to criticize. There was a man in this House that once said to me, "Ralph, you, in opposition, are too responsible. You only ask for things or suggest things that you would do if you were government. That's not the way it works in opposition." And I said, "No, no, you're wrong. Oppositions should be responsible." He said, "You're wrong." And today I have learned why his party acts the way they do. They like to stand on their feet and say things; be it true or not true is not important. The thing is to rile things up, get things stirred up, get that headline for today and worry about tomorrow, tomorrow. That psychology will come back to haunt them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the former Minister of Social Services is back in the House and I've been waiting for him to come back for a comment I would like to talk about.

In my constituency I have something called the Mennonite Home. They have a sheltered workshop. They have a sheltered workshop for the people of the community and area which serves all around Saskatchewan. During the '82 election I heard an interesting statement, and after the '82 election I decided to find out who spoke with a crooked tongue.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Forked tongue.

MR. KATZMAN: — Or a forked tongue, same thing. So when checking in my own little way, and I checked and discovered that when they were government, and they will know that I seem to have had a method to find out what was going on in their back room all the time, and I still remember on the last day of the House the former Minister of Labour screaming at me and pounding his desk. But he was good at that. He scared a lot of people that way. Unfortunately, I was probably his size and didn't scare. And what they did is they suggested at this community that the \$92,000 was there for you in our budget to build your sheltered workshop. Well, they were defeated.

In fact, if I remember correctly, the member from Shaunavon and the member from Assiniboia were out promising nursing homes too, and I saw pictures in newspapers of them signing things which never were really planned for, and the money was never there either.

But on this one, I went and checked it out. The \$92,000 that was said to be there by the NDP had never — I repeat, never — been approved. Ever. It had been talked about in the department, but the cash was never put up. Lots of yap, yap, yap — no cash. That's the situation.

And I decided to check a few more of those things out. And, Mr. Speaker, I found lots of them. Lots of yap, no cash.

And you know, that reminds me of a Bill called The Mortgage Bill. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, they brought a Bill to protect your home. No cash, all talk. We, when we were in opposition, said — and being a responsible opposition — put the cash where the talk is. Well we became government, and you got 13.25 protection on your homes. We put the cash where our mouths were.

And I have to compliment the former minister of social services, Pat Smith, because on the say-so of the NDP, those people went out and spent thousands and thousands of dollars, and built that home, and discovered there was no \$92,000 that was promised. And what do they do now?

Fortunately that the member from Swift Current, former minister of social services, was able to find a few dollars here, a few dollars there, and a week before she lost — sorry — a week before she was moved to Education, she had sufficient funds to make good that \$92,000. Not the NDP, but the minister of social services from Swift Current went out and saved nickels here and dollars there, and ten dollars here, until finally it was \$92,000 to help that community who, on their word, had gone out and spent the money. But they knew that they had never approved it and didn't have the money. And you know, I hate to think what would have happened to that community if they would have got elected. We will never know, fortunately, but fortunately the minister was able to find the money.

You know, I heard the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake talk about mining in northern Saskatchewan. Well, prior to being an MLA — a few years prior to that, in fact — I was with a rent-a-car company, a local company in Saskatchewan. And one of our customers was Anglo-Rouyn Mines, La Ronge — copper mine, gold, and so forth.

When the NDP became government, Mr. Speaker, do you know what they did? They got a cement mixer out and filled the hole with cement because they couldn't work with that government. That government chased them out of the province, as they did many other industries that created jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the word jobs, and I think I should finish my speech on that note. And suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the record of jobs created by this government during tough economy finds way above the jobs that were created by a government who only knew how to create jobs within government. And that's going to be the tell-tale sign difference.

When the NDP were government, government grew. When the Conservatives have come to government, government has got smaller, and the private sector — the hub that makes the community spin and the province go — is growing larger. And that's the way it should be.

Governments are here to serve the people, not to control them. And under the NDP it was controlled. And of course once when I talked about control I can never forget the former attorney general again. And when 90-some per cent of the people voted against what he wanted in the R.M. of Corman Park and he said, "You don't understand, you've got to do it my way anyway." Fortunately, he's not here anymore to lay his ideals down without people having a say.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to support the throne speech. Why? Because it's a plan of step by step, long range, Mr. Speaker. The long range plans: giving people the skills to do the job; making sure that when job availability comes around we have Saskatchewan people to do them, not people that we have to bring in from Alberta, Manitoba, and other areas. We're looking at training people for Saskatchewan jobs.

Today I heard criticisms from the members across about the involvement of the Minister of Justice and all the other different departments. It's important for one person, or one group, to facilitate so that everybody knows exactly how the system's working and making all programs work. As an MLA it's awfully interesting out there in the boondocks to try and to explain to people that this program's by this department, this program by this part. And when you can say: look at, you go to this one department, as Tourism has done, and you can get everything there and know exactly where to look.

That's what we're going to see, I hope, with the new justice minister being the new jobs minister. Long range planning, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those in Saskatchewan.

Farmers, and the plight of farmers, and the economic base of the farmers. The Minister of Agriculture tomorrow, I guess, will be giving first reading — or very quickly — of the Bill. And you

will see a program that benefits the people of Saskatchewan, looking at the problems — not short-gaps, give-away cheques, give-away cheques because, you know, the government doesn't have a problem to spend — but long-range plans to make things work, and project them . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

And I'm glad that the member from the back row from Shaunavon, who once again is going to come to his seat to speak, asked me about a filibuster. Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to see a filibuster, I think I know the rules well enough to spend a couple of weeks at it, not just a couple of hours as the member from North West did.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to support the throne speech. I'm proud of the long-range planning that is going forth. And I'm proud of my government. And I will be supporting the throne speech. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise, speak on the throne speech — best I've heard in a long time. I can't say I've been here a long time. But I used to hear them in the bad old days under the former government, and they weren't near as interesting nor were they near as good.

First of all, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale, on her tremendous election win in her seat, which has been confirmed and reaffirmed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — I want her to know this, that she doesn't have to worry about being equal. She is a more than equal woman, and I don't think anyone can deny that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — Now, Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to support this throne speech, which continues the PC Government of Saskatchewan's progressive and conservative return to incentivism. Now I've never been a socialist, nor am I a capitalist. In 1976 I gave up on ideology, for ideology usually interferes with common sense and judgement. In the 1982 election I made only two promises, and I think before the end of the term I will be able to keep both of them. I promised common sense in government, and I promised strong representation for my constituency. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that my government has not let me down, that we are running a common sense government. And I am trying my best to keep the second promise.

However, even if you don't believe in ideology, every politician must have some principles. I have a principle, and the principle is incentivism. This throne speech is full of incentive, and I will explain what is meant by incentivism. It is a combination of free enterprise and government activity, which gives the people incentive to work to improve their personal standards of living. As a result of the collective work of the people, society has improved generally.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have always been taught that greed is a sin; however, there is a very fine line between greed and ambition. Both capitalism and socialism are based on raw, uncontrolled greed. It is the duty of governments to control this greed and turn it into something sensible. As I said, there is a fine line between greed and ambition. We try to promote the ambition of the people. We, as a government — not as the socialist former government — do not promote the greed of a few. It is the duty of the government to give incentive to the people to work and create wealth. Governments do not create wealth. Governments only spend the wealth of the people.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, socialists wish to punish ambition with taxes. They reward laziness

with the hard work of those people with ambition. Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of thousands of ordinary, hard-working Saskatchewan taxpayers who are creating wealth because the government has given them a place for ambition, an incentive to work. This throne speech recognizes that our government represents the silent majority of ordinary taxpayers. On the contrary, the NDP represents the minority of tax receivers.

(2100)

Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech there is a reference to the state of the Saskatchewan economy. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan economy is the best in Canada. We have the highest unemployment, the lowest welfare rate, the lowest gas prices, cheapest medicare, highest minimum wage. I read the other day that the citizens of Saskatchewan buy the most expensive automobiles and the most expensive trucks sold in Canada. On average, the per capita spending is highest in Saskatchewan. In addition, we have record oil drilling.

But, Mr. Speaker, by comparison, we must compare what happens in other provinces. If you compare Saskatchewan and Manitoba, there's a very interesting comparison. They have one thing in common. Both provinces have one million people. But, Mr. Speaker, the province of Manitoba is on welfare. And it's only fitting because they have an NDP government. Last year the province of Manitoba received \$427 million in equalization payments from Ottawa. Saskatchewan received zero, not one dollar from Ottawa.

Then, from time to time, my learned friends talk about Manitoba like it was the promised land. Well, it may be, Mr. Speaker, but it's only the promised land for unemployed socialists to find jobs in Manitoba.

With \$427 million in equalization payments that this province did not get, Manitoba still had a deficit larger than Saskatchewan's. In addition, during the federal election, for a period of two months, Manitoba had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, and the member opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, was gleeful that Manitoba had the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. There is a very simple explanation for that.

Mr. Speaker, during that period of time and in the year prior, the province of Manitoba received \$750 million of federal government spending by Lloyd Axworthy and the Liberals. It's a small wonder that the then prime minister Turner had no explanation as to why Manitoba was doing better. He couldn't tell the balance of the country about the welfare state or the welfare province of Manitoba. It was just too gross of a distinction between Manitoba and other provinces.

So then I say there is no comparison between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan gives incentive to people; Manitoba destroys incentive. I say it is no small coincidence that the aluminium smelter and the potash mine were cancelled when the NDP were elected in Manitoba because, Mr. Speaker, there was a lack of incentive.

Now things are not absolutely rosy and glowing in Saskatchewan. We do have some minor problems which turn into large economic problems for this government and our people. We have a combination of drought and high interest rates. Although the opposition may try to blame us, we are not responsible for the drought. They blamed us for the drought of the '30s and they're trying to do it again, but I'm sure the people understand we do not have that kind of power.

In addition, we are not responsible for the high interest rates. Interest rates are not set in Saskatchewan, nor are they necessarily set in Canada. We have a situation that is difficult, not impossible, but difficult, and our government has the duty and the courage to deal with a difficult situation.

While we may be the best in Canada, our farmers face a situation where they're taking a 10 per cent decrease in their income this year, on top of a 5 per cent decrease last year. Small business is receiving, at best, a zero increase in their income. Unorganized labour is receiving a small raise, if any. They were doing well to keep up with inflation. Seniors have received small increases, and those on fixed pensions have received no increases at all.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this throne speech goes a long way. As the member for Melville, I consider it my duty to recommend responsible action to both my government and to the opposition, so that we could have some unanimous common sense in this Assembly. I am suggesting that this government consider a freeze on government spending. Now I know we're not at the budget, but there is still time to consider this.

In the past few years certain sectors of our Saskatchewan economy have done much better than those unfortunate people I have just mentioned. Government workers, Crown corporation workers, health care workers, municipal employees, teachers, university professors, and welfare recipients, have done relatively better than farmers, small-business people, and unorganized labour. They have done better over the years, and now are in a better position to limit their increases so that other elements of our provincial society can catch up or survive.

Therefore these people will have to understand that in the view of this member, the back-bencher for Melville, the taxpayers cannot afford to grant them an increase this year. I will explain that a 1 per cent increase in government funded wages increases the deficit, or alternatively taxes, whichever you prefer, by \$20 million. So that if you had a 4 per cent increase, you're looking at \$80 million of increased deficit or increased taxes.

So I know that these people are responsible, that they understand that government workers, people who are funded by the taxpayers, have done relatively better over the last few years than the taxpayers themselves. As a matter of fact I might say that, as a member, I wouldn't say I found it distressing, but I found it a bit sad that many, many people, especially young people, approach me, as a member, and want me to help them find a government job. That suggests to me that government jobs are more lucrative than private sector jobs.

Why should government jobs be more lucrative than the jobs that the taxpayers are holding? And I say there is no reason whatsoever, that there has to be some incentive to taxpayers to catch up with the tax receivers. Unfortunately, no young people come to my office and ask, "How do I start a business? How do I become self-employed?" They are looking for government jobs, and I don't blame them. They are, individually, looking after themselves. But as a government, we have to collectively take care of the entire province.

So, therefore we have to give incentive to those people who do not have jobs. We have to give incentive to those people who cannot keep up with the powerful elements of our society.

The simple truth is that the taxpayers cannot afford to give their employees a raise. We require incentive to invest and create jobs.

This budget . . . this throne speech goes a long way in the direction of incentive to create jobs. But before we talk about jobs, I want to inform the members of the situation in rural Saskatchewan. The throne speech indicates the situation in rural Saskatchewan as being difficult.

And then I hear the Leader of the Opposition stand up, this very day in this Assembly, and list a list of projects that we should build in the city of Regina. Millions of dollars for this building and millions of dollars for that building and millions of dollars for various worthwhile projects that the taxpayers cannot afford. Again he is proposing millions of dollars be spent here, in his constituency in the city of Regina, for buildings. Buildings that will house workers — workers who will work in the city of Regina in his constituency, and contribute to further rural depopulation.

I would like the Leader of the Opposition to know that under his government there was considerable rural depopulation, and that his suggestion that public works be spent in the city of Regina, the centre of which is his constituency, is not fair to rural Saskatchewan. The citizens of Melville do not wish to live in the constituency of Elphinstone. They wish to be employed close to their homes. As matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am told that some of his voters do not even wish to live in his constituency. However, they will be given an opportunity to make changes.

Mr. Speaker, under the NDP and their policy of rural depopulation, they spoke, as the member for Rosthern has indicated, with a forked tongue. I recall their policy to save rural Saskatchewan. The policy was that they would institute a land bank, and the FarmStart Corporation, and various other agricultural programs. Some of them helped, and some of them hindered.

But in any event, the fact is that these programs did very little to stop the depopulation of rural Saskatchewan because if, you will recall, the head office of the land bank was right here in Regina. The head office of FarmStart was right here in Regina. Not one job was created in the constituency of Melville or Shaunavon or any other rural constituency. And I say: how much farm land is in the city of Regina? I would say very, very little.

And yet the NDP, their solution to saving rural Saskatchewan and saving farms was to create jobs in Regina. Now, had those head offices been placed throughout the province, the wives of those farmers, some of those farmers themselves, could have been working rather than eking out an existence in rural Saskatchewan. So that was their policy of saving rural Saskatchewan. I am pleased that our government understands the problem, that the throne speech indicates we will deal with the problem, and I am awaiting the results.

I must also indicate the throne speech talks about the farm situation. Farmers did not get into the situation they are in today by accident, nor did they get into that situation by choice. Last year Saskatchewan farmers paid \$40 million in interest. Excuse me, that is \$400 million in interest. The figure is so large; it's hard to comprehend — \$400 million in interest. That's the equivalent of \$400 for every man, woman, and child in the province of Saskatchewan was paid last year by Saskatchewan farmers in interest.

(2115)

Many of these farmers got into difficulty when we had floating rates that floated — as a matter of fact, they ballooned — well over 20 per cent. These were factors beyond their control. In addition, factors beyond their control indicate that in 1974 their farm income, as a percentage of gross revenue, was 38 per cent. By 1978 that had shrunk to 26 per cent of their gross, and by 1982 to 14 per cent of their gross. It is very difficult for these farmers to make an honest living, to raise their children, to buy shoes for their sons and daughters, when their income is constantly decreasing. And yet we have certain elements and segments of our society in Saskatchewan who are constantly clamouring for increases. There has to be some justice and some equity somewhere, and I suggest that the equity has to turn in favour of farmers.

Farm debt in 1973 was \$5.7 billion. By 1982 it increased to \$20.2 billion, or four-fold. The rate of inflation doubled everything in that period of time, and farm debt quadrupled. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has requested a 7 per cent interest rate. I tend to agree with the leaders of Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that that is a realistic rate for farmers. What no one seems to have is a solution or a method of getting to that interest rate.

I want to advise the members of this Assembly that about one year ago, I proposed a solution for some of the farm problems, and what I proposed was a farm survival tariff. Now, this is not government policy, but I think it's something that farmers and citizens of Saskatchewan will have to consider seriously at some time, and I think now would be a good time to start.

The number one problem in agriculture is simply lack of money, and the reason there is a lack of money is because farmers are not paid enough for their product. There is agreement between the various political parties that this is the problem. My federal member, the Hon. Lorne Nystrom, MP for Melville, and Yorkton upon occasion, has proposed a farm parity Bill, and his farm parity Bill is given with noble intentions. It got him re-elected. But I think deep down in his heart, he believes that something has to be done for farmers, and so he has proposed a farm parity Bill.

Now, there is only two things wrong with the farm parity Bill as proposed in Ottawa. First of all, it won't work; and secondly, nobody tells us who's going to pay for it — especially Mr. Nystrom, doesn't tell us who is going to pay for it. It is quite clear — and Mr. Nystrom knows this — that if farmers are going to receive more money, the eaters of this country are going to have to pay more money. But Mr. Nystrom carefully ignores that point. He is a shrewd politician, and I don't begrudge him that.

I also said that it will not work, and it is unfortunate that at one time the Hon. Mr. Nystrom, member for Yorkton-Melville, at one time he was trade critic for the NDP — and he still doesn't understand international trade. If we put a farm parity Bill into effect, and we decree that the price of beef will be \$3 per pound, who, I ask Mr. Nystrom and all the economists with wisdom, who is going to pay \$3 per pound for beef when they can buy it from Argentina for \$1 a pound or thereabouts?

So by necessity you then have to put import restrictions on beef, and I'm using beef as an example. When you put import restrictions on beef, you get retaliation. And the United States takes a dim view of import restrictions on their beef, so they would retaliate against our beef, and accordingly we wouldn't be able to sell our beef out of the country.

But Mr. Nystrom hasn't considered that. A farm parity Bill sounds good, it's supposed to give farmers money, and he's in opposition — almost in opposition. He's in the third party rump, and why should he worry about the details of whether something will work or not? It gets votes. People will vote for a farm parity Bill. And they did.

But clearly there must be some form of solution, and about a year ago I proposed my farm survival tariff. In its simplicity the proposal that I made . . . I made it personally as a member from Melville not as a member of this government. I proposed that we considered a 3 per cent tariff on all food sold in Saskatchewan, with that 3 per cent going directly to farmers to save their farming operations.

Well did that hit a sore nerve, Mr. Speaker, because the following day the Leader of the Opposition stood in this Assembly and questioned the Premier. He said, "Is the government going to put a tax on food?" You notice how he changed it to a tax on food. I said it was a food tariff, a farm survival tariff. And there is a reason it is a farm survival tariff. Because farmers are the only people in this country who sell their product at international prices — unprotected free trade in their products, within Canada and without Canada. And they are the last of the free enterprisers. And I can say they're being punished for it. That's how the NDP punishes free enterprisers. They punish the smallest and the weakest, farmers who are unorganized. The Leader of the Opposition immediately spoke against anyone paying an extra 3 per cent for food and having that money go directly to farmers. And that shows their true colours and their true intentions.

My proposal was quite simple, that everyone in Saskatchewan who paid 3 per cent more for their food . . . It would work out to approximately \$40 per person or \$3.33 per month per person in this province to help out farmers in need. And what could be done with a mere \$3.33 per person eating food in Saskatchewan? Well first of all it would work, but because it would apply equally to wheat and bananas, to beef, and to other foods. And it would even apply to pet food which is now sold in grocery stores. And for this \$3.33 per person in Saskatchewan per month, this government or any other government could finance 10,000 farmers with \$80,000 loans each

at 8 per cent at current interest rate. That, Mr. Speaker, is very close to what the wheat pool has asked for. And I suggest that 60,000 wheat pool members cannot all be wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Exactly right.

MR. SCHMIDT: — So what do we have from the NDP? The Leader of the Opposition wouldn't even dig into his pocket for \$3.33 per month to help farmers. Awhile ago Mrs. Broadbent, who's a leader of the third party rump, she's the wife of the leader of the third party rump in Ottawa, Mrs. Broadbent complained that the price of beef was too high. The NDP have no interest whatsoever in helping farmers. They say they want to help the disadvantaged. I ask: how many years does it take for them to understand that farmers are disadvantaged? But it doesn't seem to sink in.

I say that any farmer who votes NDP deserves to go broke. And I say that unequivocally because the NDP are no friend of farmers. Just think back to the milk strike last year and their position there, and you'll see what kind of a friend to farmers they are. I had young farmers who phoned me on the milk strike and told me that they did not vote for me. They said, however, "We expect you, especially your party, to help farmers in this tough situation."

And those young farmers will not vote NDP next time and they will not go broke. Because our government will save all farmers who are viable; our government will save all farmers who have worked hard and deserve to be saved. The throne speech indicates that. And our government is committed to that proposition.

In continuing with the theme of incentives, I have indicated that farmers need incentives and the biggest incentive they need is money. There is no incentive like money because it represents material goods.

And I can tell you that out in rural Saskatchewan there are not a lot of material goods. I have seen rural Saskatchewan. I have seen urban Saskatchewan. I have been poor and now I am not so poor. And I can tell you the difference between being a farmer and being somebody with a guaranteed pay cheque every month. That pay cheque may be small but you know it's coming. And that is a big difference.

I see the farmers in my constituency and I compare them with the urban people in my constituency and I see that their children have to do without things. I see their children cannot take skating lessons; that their children cannot afford piano lessons; that their children cannot afford to play hockey. I see that their children have to go short on material things. But I can tell you one thing: they may be short on material matters but those children are growing up strong, learning to work, and learning what incentive is. The farm boys and girls of this province are not spoiled. They never have been and they certainly aren't spoiled now.

But I submit to the opposition that they take into account that those farm children are disadvantaged. And that they should find it somewhere in their hearts to help these disadvantaged people and stop worrying about their friends, their friends in special interest groups. They have come to be a group representing feminists, abortionists, native separatists, big union bosses, academics, and Marxists. These are not the majority of Saskatchewan people. And I say, thank God for that.

But the members of the opposition don't understand that. They insist, and they continue to speak, for the vocal minority. Well, the majority are taxpayers. And the taxpayers can no longer pamper the friends of the NDP. I am pleased to see that the throne speech recognizes this inequity, and that we will begin to help those people who really need it.

With respect to social development, I am pleased to see that the throne speech continues the strong support for senior citizens. Now, senior citizens used to think that the NDP were their

friends. But, again, the NDP put a moratorium on nursing home construction. They did not increase their Saskatchewan pensions, although many of them believed that the former premier personally signed them, addressed them, and mailed them to them. Well, many senior citizens believed that because they were told such nonsense.

In fact, I am pleased to see that we have proceeded with the \$1,000 home repair program, that we have doubled the Saskatchewan pension to needy seniors, that we are building enriched housing projects. And I am pleased that this government will be building an enriched housing project in the village of Grayson in my constituency.

(2130)

Under the former government the village of Grayson never had any form of public housing. They were very, very independent. However, they developed a need to take care of the elderly. And after my election in 1982, they asked for a nursing home in their village.

I was quite honest with them, and told them that they could not have a nursing home because it was not feasible or practical in their village. And they, being reasonable people, did not run straight to the opposition to campaign for a nursing home. No. They said, "Give us an alternative." They said, "We don't like these duplexes that are being built by the former government; give us something different." So we sat down together and we worked out a proposal. I don't know if they invented enriched housing, but they certainly got the idea at the same time as Ottawa's bureaucrats.

And I am pleased to say that, after two years, they will now be receiving their enriched housing project in the spring of 1985.

In addition, in social development, we have done very, very well with welfare reform. And I can tell the members here that while welfare reform is not popular with the NDP, it is not popular with their friends, it is not popular with some of the media, and it is not popular with those people who are getting easy money, welfare reform — which continues help for those who need it and penalizes those who don't like to work — is very, very popular in my constituency. I don't think there is a more popular measure among the NDP supporters in my constituency than welfare reform. They have a basic understanding of common sense and fairness and even the NDP in my constituency were not happy with the welfare situation in Saskatchewan under the former government. So I am pleased that the throne speech refers to welfare reform, gives a commitment to help the needy, and continues the safety net.

But there was a feeling out there among many of the people that the NDP had not created a safety net, but instead they had created a hammock, and that a lot of people were laying in this hammock having a good time at the expense of the majority of taxpayers. And therefore the majority of the citizens of this province, the silent majority, is very happy with welfare reform.

I am pleased that we're building many, many nursing homes. Fellow members, I can tell you a horror story about nursing homes in the city of Melville. Melville's nursing home was started in 1926 as a gift from the Lutheran Church of a building they no longer needed. It was operated by the Lutheran Church without any government help for decades. Finally, there was need for reconstruction and an addition, which was done in 1967. Finally, after the CCF government had been defeated, in 1967 Melville received an addition of 120 beds to its nursing home. The old building had to be abandoned after a few years and the NDP refused to replace the loss of those beds. They put a moratorium on nursing home construction.

The situation got so bad that now, until we can start construction next spring, constituents from my constituency have to go to nursing homes in Regina, to nursing homes in Broadview, to nursing homes all over this province because there is not enough nursing home capacity in

Melville — a city that started nursing homes in this province, nursing homes that did not cost the taxpayer or the citizens of the province one cent when they were started. But under the NDP from 1944 to 1982, it became a nightmare in so far as the expense involved.

In any event, finally, under sensible government, sensible government of Grant Devine, in the spring of 1985 we will commence a 30-bed addition to the Melville nursing home.

I am pleased to see that the throne speech continues with improvements to education. I am pleased to see that 1,000 spaces have been added to technical schools. I am pleased that our government . . . And this is ironic, it's very ironic. The former member, your Hon. John Kowalchuk — he was honourable; sometimes misguided, but he was honourable, I have to say that — he built the Melville Comprehensive School. He started it; he was the chairman of the board; he got it going and he got it built.

I am pleased though that this government can finally come up with \$900,000 to finish the walls that were falling down ever since they were constructed, and no longer will the walls of the school be falling down. So I am pleased that the former member, Mr. Kowalchuk, started the school. And I'm pleased that under my term in office the school will be completed.

I'm also pleased that the community colleges are going into career counselling. Mr. Speaker, I could go on for a very long time about the deficiencies of the Department of Manpower and Immigration in the federal government under the Liberals. They operated a nightmare. And if there ever is a department that needs house cleaning, it's the department of manpower.

When there is big unemployment in this country, it is unbelievable that jobs go unfilled. When we recessed for lunch between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m., I was served by a waitress that worked from 9 o'clock continuously through the entire day until 6 p.m. She was not complaining; she was only pointing out that they were short-staffed. When I pointed out, "Isn't there unemployment? Why don't they hire more people?" they said, "Well, they can't find anyone to work the day shift." This is a restaurant in Regina — cannot find anyone to work a day shift, and the opposition complains that there's unemployment.

Certainly the throne speech indicates that we will try to match the people to the job or train them for the job, and this is clearly needed. Another case, in the city of Melville, there is a body shop has been looking for a body man and assistant body man for in excess of four months. And yet the entire country has high unemployment, and these jobs cannot be filled. These certainly is a need, and I'm pleased that the throne speech indicates we will deal with that matter.

But we must consider the main problem in this country and in this province is that there is no incentive to create jobs. Therefore, the provincial government has taken one element of incentive into account. There can be government incentives; there can be industrial incentives; and there can be personal, individual incentives.

First of all, with respect to government incentives we have the Saskatchewan Access youth program. Opportunities '84 is a program that extended the NDP idea. Because the NDP had an idea that summer students should only work for government, they should only work for governments of provincial, municipal, local, but they should not work for private individuals. They should not work in private businesses.

We extended that program, and this year hundreds and thousands of students were hired on farms and in small businesses, where they learned something about small business, rather than learning something about big government. But it was against their ideology, and that's why I say I gave up ideology and I believe in incentivism. We have the Saskatchewan Employment Development Program. We have industrial development program and, as a total, those programs have created 8,000 jobs in the past year and a half.

In addition we have industrial incentives, the venture capital fund, industrial incentives for job creation. All of these things have contributed to job creation in the province of Saskatchewan.

But, Mr. Speaker, and fellow members, the main problem in Canada with unemployment is that everyone wants to be an employee and no one wants to be an employer. And how can you have jobs when there are no employers? Now the members of the opposition will tell you that employers are making too much money. They're not hiring people. They're pocketing their money. They will tell you that, "Oh, the government should employ people because we can't have big business or small business make a profit and create jobs." But there is a limit on how many people government can employ and no one is going to create employment unless there is some incentive.

The situation we have in Canada is that many small-business people in my constituency earn less than their employee. I know small-business people right in the city of Melville that actually, per hour, earn less than the minimum wage. What incentive is there for these people to go out and expand their business and create more employment? Absolutely none. We must get to a situation where there still is some possibility of making profit in business.

We are now at a situation where business and farms pay interest rates of, approximately, 14 per cent. It has been traditional that the profit margin in business be, approximately, 13 to 15 per cent. Now, how can anyone start a small business when all of their profit goes to interest? There is nothing left to replace capital. There is nothing left to pay for the business and there is very, very little left to pay their wages. So we must get to a situation where it is lucrative for people to create jobs. We get to that situation and then there might be some jobs.

What can be done about interest rates? Well, in Saskatchewan, I submit, very, very little. But I have one proposal. As the member for Melville, I take it upon myself that I was elected to think, and I think there is a possible solution. For every person paying high interest there is some person collecting high interest.

The opposition will say, "The banks are making all the money. The credit unions are making all the money." Well, I say, I'm a member of a credit union and it's not making very much money. And I read the financial reports of the banks and they are not making very much money. And the members of the opposition will say, "Oh, yes, a certain bank had a profit of \$8 billion, \$80 million, \$150 million, " and they say, "Oh, they made a lot of money."

Well I say, why aren't they rushing out and buying shares in that bank if that bank made so much money? Because they preach one story and they are smart enough to know that the banks are not getting rich. I'm not defending banks. I'm simply saying that the banks are not as rich as the opposition would lead us to believe. The opposition doesn't like to hear that. Why doesn't one of you stay here and the rest of you rush out and put an order in for bank shares?

All right, so we have determined that the banks are not making excessive profits. They haven't rushed out to buy shares, so that they speak by their actions. Basically there are some people like myself. I have a small amount of money in the bank and on that small amount of money I am getting too much interest. And because I'm getting too much interest, other people are paying too much interest. And there's a simple way of dealing with that. You can relate. You can make a "made in Canada" interest policy. You can relate the rate of return on interest through inflation. And you'd say, "Well, how do you keep investment in Canada?" It's very simple. Every individual invests money in a bank, and that's not an investment. That's just a place to park your money. Investment is where you go out, start a business, and create some jobs. But every person would be taxed a percentage on their interest income that is considered to be windfall interest. Today where I could receive 11 or 12 per cent on my money, and inflation is 4 per cent, I would submit that at least 2 per cent of that is windfall interest to me and to many other people. The NDP don't want to hear this. I thought it was part of their policy to redistribute income. Apparently I've touched a sore point.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You hit a nerve, Grant.

MR. SCHMIDT: — Yes, I think some of the NDP have large deposits in banks and credit unions and would not want to share with those people who can't pay high interest.

We have here a group of preaching socialists who are practising capitalism. And they don't want to hear anything about a windfall interest tax. In any event, it's something that should be considered. I don't care if it's called socialistic. I don't care if it's called capitalistic. Farmers are in need and that kind of a windfall interest tax could be used to reduce farm interest rates.

(2145)

As I've indicated, if you want jobs you need investment, and if you want investment you need incentive — returns for investment, some reasonable profits. If you want incentive, investment, jobs, you need stability. And stability is something you cannot get with an NDP government. This province is open for business. It is open for investment. But it is very, very difficult to attract investment and jobs to this province when you have instability sitting here in this very Chamber.

Now, you will recall that the NDP have passed resolutions to the effect that, if they are re-elected, any government Crown corporation, any government investment, that is sold to anyone in Saskatchewan or outside of Saskatchewan, will be expropriated for \$1.

And the day they passed that resolution, I took this dollar and I put it in my desk in the legislature here, and every second day I look at it to remind myself of what they represent. They represent instability. The NDP represents instability; they represent nonsense; they represent looking after a few privileged friends of theirs — the vocal minority.

Mr. Speaker, this throne speech is not perfect. Mr. Speaker, our government is not perfect, but it is the best government this province ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMIDT: — And therefore, I'm in favour of the motion and will be voting for it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 9:50 p.m.