

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**December 3, 1984**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS**

**HON. MR. LANE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that I shall, on Wednesday, move first reading of a Bill — an Act to establish the Employment Development Agency.

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

**Job Creation**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and deals with unemployment. There are 34,000 people unemployed in Saskatchewan today. The throne speech promised them a staff of bureaucrats for your part-time employment minister. The throne speech indicated that the agency of which we have heard this afternoon will be refining and elaborating the government's employment strategy.

My question to you, Mr. Premier, is this: will this new agency refine and elaborate a specific target for job creation? How many new job opportunities has your part-time minister been instructed to find? What is the target?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the new agency will be co-ordinating the activities involved in both the government sector and the private sector and volunteers in the province of Saskatchewan, which hasn't been done before, and that's why we put the organization and the co-ordinating body together. In terms of a figure, we just want to make sure that Saskatchewan not only has the lowest unemployment rate in the country, and we're trying to maintain that, but try to move towards, as best we can, lower and lower and lower unemployment. We can pick a number. Obviously we've been doing better than other provinces, but we hope to do better, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Premier for that clarification that the minister is also co-ordinating the efforts of the private sector, and I wonder whether you are satisfied with his success. In two weeks, 42 people have lost their jobs at Dad's Cookies, 45 at Molson's, 24 part-time jobs at the Prairie Wildlife Centre, another 23 laid off at C S P Foods in Nipawin — in total, 130 jobs in two weeks.

Have you asked your minister what he has done to prevent the loss of any of those jobs, and whether he expects that any of those people may be able to look forward to having their jobs back in the immediate future?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, we are obviously working with the private sector and volunteer organizations, as well as all the departments here in the Government of Saskatchewan, as well as with the federal government. We have put together some of the largest job-creation projects in the province's history during some really difficult times.

Now when we create something like an upgrader, Mr. Speaker, when we put together an upgrader here in Regina with the Co-op, or if we put together a project with Husky Oil, which has the federal government involved, provincial governments involved, the private sector working here, we're looking at thousands and thousands and thousands of jobs. In fact, that's the largest single job-creation project any place in the history of our province.

So I am disappointed to find out that 30 or 40 people may be out of a job in Saskatchewan because of a closing of a cookie manufacturing project. I'm glad it isn't as big as the closure in Montreal with 500, but I suspect, with the ongoing activities here in the province in several different dimensions, that there will be opportunities for people here and, in many cases, more opportunities than in other provinces.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the people at Dad's Cookies will be gratified to know that there may be a job for them some years hence at Lloydminster.

### **Winter Works Program**

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — My question to the Premier is this. The throne speech promised a winter works program. Can the Premier tell us how many temporary jobs have been set as the target for this winter works program?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the job opportunities associated with specific programs will be announced in due course.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And the targets.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — And the targets. I believe it will be introduced in the next day or so, so the minister will obviously be prepared to deal with that in some detail.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Premier even give the outline of the program — and I speak now to the winter works program? Who will be eligible to be employees under the program? Who will be eligible as employers? What level of assistance will be available? When will the guide-lines be made public? What will be the deadline for submitting applications?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, as I said on Friday, Mr. Speaker, when there is legislation that is going to be brought forward in the House, we wouldn't need any ministers if I was going to give it all in advance. I mean I would be providing that information and all the detail. As the ministers introduce Bills with respect to agriculture or with respect to the employment agency, they will go through the details at length, and members opposite can ask a lot of questions and they can be answered at that time.

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, question to the Premier — and I have found the last answer even more incredible than the earlier ones. It is, Mr. Speaker, December 3rd. It's winter out there. A winter works program, to be successful, is ordinarily announced in August or September with specific guide-lines and information on eligibility available for employers and employees, and that's the way you should have proceeded. You claimed last November in your throne speech that job creation was your number one priority. Do you believe that mounting a winter works program in mid-December is consistent with a claim that job creation is a number one priority?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, we have said that job creation and agriculture are the number one priorities of this administration, and that's exactly what we said. And when you look at the record in the province of Saskatchewan in terms of the level of unemployment, either in the capital city or in the province, consistently year after year since we've taken over, or if you look at the money that we've put into agriculture, I will compare the per capita of agricultural expenditures that we've put into that industry with any other jurisdiction. And obviously our unemployment rate compares well with any jurisdiction that you want to see. They are number one in our priorities.

We would like to see more money in agriculture. We'd like to see everybody with a job. I'm sure all members of this Assembly would like to see that. And that's precisely why we're making them

number one priorities, doing as much as we can to encourage the private sector to come into this province, do as much as we can to co-ordinate the activities within government, is one of the reasons we put together a water corporation, to co-ordinate all the activities. The public believes that the co-ordination and consultation with various levels across Canada, along with the private sector, is extremely important, and particularly now going back into the communities dealing with voluntary organizations, with schools, with school boards, with churches, with all organizations, to make sure that we don't leave, particularly children, young people from 15 to 19 to 20 years old, that aren't skilled, out in the cold in the winter-time particularly because they've dropped out of the system.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Mr. Premier, the ministers around you are coaxing you to tell us that this program will be announced in the normal course. Will the Premier not agree that the normal course is to announce winter works programs in early fall when employers can make plans to take advantage of them? Can the Premier think of a single instance where a winter works program has been announced as late as December 1 of the year?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, obviously there are an awful lot of things going on in the province of Saskatchewan now, and were last month, and the month before, and the month before that, or else we wouldn't have the lowest unemployment in the country. That's true. Now when we're bringing in brand new legislation, you normally wait until the House opens up. It's been a week or two longer than we thought it would be. We bring it in. It will be legislation put before the floor of this Assembly, and it can be debated, and we will go through the details at that time.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — Supplementary. When does the Premier expect this legislation to be tabled that we apparently need to deal with the winter works program?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the legislation will be tabled, obviously in this session. And it'll be tabled within the next few days, and they can debate it at length.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — New question Mr. Speaker. The public of Saskatchewan really must find this to be incredible. Everyone but the Premier is painfully aware that December is far too late to be introducing a winter works program. And to quote the throne speech, you aren't ready to introduce it, you are still refining and elaborating such a program. My question to the Premier is: you have claimed since last November, last November's throne speech, that job creation is your number one priority. Why, a year later, are you still only refining and elaborating a program which was desperately needed months ago?

**HON MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, there are no end of programs that we're involved in to date, and the hon. member knows that. We've been working with the private sector and volunteer organizations, as well as the federal government, to provide as many job opportunities as possible. Now, we are continuing to come up with more ideas and other things that we can do.

That's why we're co-ordinating them with one minister, and we're going to see if we can perfect them and encourage more investment here in the province of Saskatchewan, encourage more activities. We're working with the co-operatives to do more things in agriculture, as well as in the energy business, as well as the oil patch, and so forth. So it isn't that the province is just shut down waiting for this single piece of legislation. And obviously an awful lot of programs are in the mill already and have been very successful. We want to make sure that we can move unemployment down, and down, and down. We're into some difficult economic times. Obviously unemployment on either side of us is very high. People come in here looking for jobs, and we have been successful in providing them opportunities here because the unemployment stays the lowest in the nation.

We have many programs in the mill. We will continue those. We're just adding one more that hopefully will co-ordinate with the federal government, provincial governments, departments

here, as well as the private sector and community organizations.

**MR. SHILLINGTON:** — A supplementary. A simple question which should admit of a simple answer. Why didn't you announce the winter works program in the early fall when it would have been of some use to someone?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I suspect that people will find it very much of use when the hon. member, my seat-mate here, announces it.

### **Planning and Job Creation**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Premier.

Mr. Premier, your government has had the habit of using bureaucratic reorganization to cover up for the lack of action in dealing with problems, and unemployment has been no different. In the spring of 1983, it was the creation of a new Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. In November of 1983, it was a new branch in that department to develop additional youth programs including those to assist in the transition from school to labour to the work-force, and the labour market planning and information branch to provide labour and market data and analysis.

But I want to ask you, Mr. Premier: what have all these people been doing in the past year if not acting on what you claim was your government's number one priority, namely jobs?

In other words, I ask you: why do you need another government agency to do the work that you claimed you had set up, and established a new Department of Advanced Education and Manpower?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I think one of the best examples that I can use, and I've referred to it, is the whole question of water in the province of Saskatchewan. Under the former administration I believe that there were, well, dozens of departments that dealt with water — several different departments that dealt with water. Several different departments that dealt with it all across government, and as an individual, wanted to come in and deal with water. Whether it was with respect to irrigation, or it was community development, or what not, they were shuffled from department to department to department. Now that could obviously work, but it didn't work as well as some people would like to have it. So we set up a brand-new Crown corporation to co-ordinate these things to provide as much one-stop shopping as possible.

The same idea applies to job creation and co-ordination in the province of Saskatchewan. If we can have one small, tightly-knit body involved in the co-ordination of all these activities, whether it is young people that don't have the skills, or whether it is those that have skills that want more opportunities, all that can be pulled together with a tiny organization, but one that has the feel for an awful lot of things that are going on in the province of Saskatchewan, and within government, and with the private sector.

Now I don't think the hon. members would argue against good, solid, tight co-ordination. And that's what people want to see when it comes to job creation and job training, which are two major problems that we have in this part of the country, and in this country, and in North America at a time of recession.

So co-ordination is something that is positive. Co-operation and consultation with many groups and other governments and departments is important. That's why we're putting it under one agency so that we don't miss any opportunities as they come up in the future.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Premier: why does Saskatchewan need here a part-time employment minister, the Minister of Justice, when you are supposed to

have, indeed, a full-time Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower which was given the authority to co-ordinate and to advance employment in Saskatchewan? What you're really doing here, why wouldn't you use the minister which was designated these duties initially, rather than shifting to the Minister of Justice as a part-time minister.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, obviously, we could have the Minister of Economic Development involved with it because he is involved in creating an awful lot of jobs. You could have the Minister of Agriculture involved. You could have the Minister of Labour involved. You could have the Minister of Education involved, the Minister of Social Services, because he's dealing with people who are involved in welfare, or those that have dropped off unemployment lists.

Obviously, many different departments and bailiwicks are involved in jobs. And people that are skilled, looking for opportunities, which falls into the economic development area, and those that do not have skills and fall into Health, Social Services, and a number of other areas — both of those need to be co-ordinated. To a large extent, across Canada we didn't find a mechanism that we could see, in any jurisdiction, that did a really top-notch job of co-ordinating those activities — for the unskilled on one side, that tend to show up in Social Services and in Health and in various departments, or the skilled on the other side which will tend to show up in Labour or Advanced Education or in Economic Development and so forth. What somebody has to do is say: what's going on in both those bailiwicks? Let's bring them together, using existing people so it's not doubling the size of bureaucracy, but saying: let's make sure we don't miss any opportunities, and let's make sure that we're not wasting any money.

**MR. KOSKIE:** — A further supplemental to the Premier. I'd like to ask the Premier when this revelation came to him that he needed to have a co-ordination of jobs in this province? Why wouldn't you, indeed, have done that initially, when for two and one-half years the young people of this province have been struggling to find jobs? Why all of a sudden?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Basically, it is simply a cover-up of your failures. Because if you say you need co-ordination for jobs, then in the whole area of economic development similarly do you need a co-ordinating minister. Why don't you follow it in other areas?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — I am going to remind my hon. friend, from now on, that he said that. Because we have introduced . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, we've got one now. We have introduced no end of programs, brand-new programs, into the province of Saskatchewan, and they've been criticized by the hon. member opposite saying, "Why did you do this? Why did you do this? Why did you wait? Why didn't you do it right at the beginning?" he's saying now.

For example, they've criticized our oil policy, and they said, "How could you ever do that?" On November 24th, 1981, their colleagues, I quote, do the following in the province of Alberta: "According to the NDP in Alberta, their new programs will be no . . ."

Mr. Speaker, it takes them a little longer than . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please. Order, please! The Premier.

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, the point was: why did it take two and a half years? My Speaker, my point is simply this: we have been introducing new programs into the province of Saskatchewan for the past two and a half years, and we've been criticized — every one of them — by the members opposite. They criticize every single one of them. We are now receiving praises from the NDP in the province of Alberta for our oil policy. The NDP just passed a resolution saying there will be no royalties on new oil and gas wells until the investor gets his money back in the province of Alberta if they are government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Now it might have taken two and a half years for the members opposite and their party opposite to understand that, Mr. Speaker, but we are saying we have been working very hard to make sure we have the lowest unemployment in the country. We are saying being number one isn't the best. We're still going to try to be better. We're going to try to provide more training for young people that can't get into the work-force and provide more jobs for people that want to work in the province of Saskatchewan, because we have now figured better ways and improved ways to do it, and we've been doing it for two and a half years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **Problems of the North and Native People**

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Premier. My question to you is, Mr. Premier, with your government's barren and empty throne speech presented here last Thursday, and the fact that this throne speech totally ignored the problems of the North and the native people in northern Saskatchewan. And, in fact, they didn't even rate any mention of your government's legislative plan.

My question, Mr. Premier, is this: are you trying to claim that Northerners and native people have no problems which your government needs to address, or are you simply admitting that you have no idea of any way to approach those disastrous problems confronting Northerners?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Well, two or three observations, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we're more concerned about northern Saskatchewan than the members opposite because we haven't closed all the mines, and they would. That's number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, we will provide — and one of the reasons for the co-ordinating agency here is to provide more skills to people who do not have skills. You could bring in new mines and new activities and new kinds of economic activity all across this province; and for individuals that don't have any skills at all it's extremely difficult for them to compete with people from Quebec or Alberta or Manitoba who come into this province. We want to make sure Saskatchewan people have the skills necessary to meet those requirements. That's half the problem.

The other half of it obviously is co-ordinating economic activity associated with the private sector, with government, with the federal government and other provincial governments when we're putting packages together here. And in those programs you will hear from the minister that they're designated for native people. We've done design programs that will be initiated and announced, and to continue to design them in terms of education and training and opportunities in central Saskatchewan and northern Saskatchewan.

So the hon. member knows full well that those opportunities will be there, and they certainly will be announced when the minister takes his place.

**MR. YEW:** — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Page six of your throne speech, Mr. Premier. You talk once again about putting a special emphasis on the private sector. Is this your northern economic strategy as well? Are northern people supposed to suffer high unemployment and increasing welfare dependency and substandard housing and services until such time as the huge — your corporate friends and big business decide to give us a chance? Is that the extent of your northern program?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, and we certainly agree on this, that unemployment across northern Canada is difficult, extremely difficult. If you go into other provinces in the northern regions, it's not that good. We have private sector development in northern Saskatchewan, and we want to keep it there, and we want to be able to work with the private sector to make sure that they don't leave and, they don't quite, because many, many thousands of jobs will be lost across northern Saskatchewan as well as many cities in the South and the central part. That's why I've said quite clearly that we would not be closing the mines in northern Saskatchewan.

If you go to neighbouring Manitoba, it was bad enough there in this last federal election that an NDP member of parliament for the northern part of Manitoba lost to a Tory MP because the NDP were not working with the private sector to create economic opportunities.

You look at the same thing in the province of Saskatchewan, that John Gormley won the west side of this province from the middle of the province to as far as it goes because they're interested, Mr. Speaker, in working with the private sector, in mining, in fishing, in economic development, and tourism, and agriculture, and timber, and all those activities. They don't hear that rhetoric from the NDP. They hear, "Close the mines, or we'll nationalize you for a dollar, or we will close it." They hear doom and gloom, and doom and gloom. That's why they vote Tory, and that's why they did in Manitoba, and that's why they did in north-western Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. YEW:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary to the Premier is this. The Premier knows full well, and I believe he has admitted, that his throne speech contains no mention of the people in northern Saskatchewan, the native peoples, the universities, and the environment. Will he guarantee this House and the people of Saskatchewan these sectors of our economy will play a major role in the winter works program that they are about to announce?

**HON. MR. DEVINE:** — Mr. Speaker, I've said many times that when we're talking about the province of Saskatchewan we're talking about skills, and agriculture, and training, and fishing, and tourism, and mining. We talk about the entire province. We are now two and one-half years, the hon. member from Quill Lakes, it's been two and one-half years since we've changed the policy. It takes two and one-half years . . . They haven't quite caught on yet, but I imagine the NDP in Alberta will be espousing our programs because eventually they will pick it up. This province is one province, Mr. Speaker, the health department goes from the very South to the very North. The agricultural department goes from the U.S. border all the way to the top of this province, as do every other department now in the province of Saskatchewan, and we're going to keep it that way, Mr. Speaker.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **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. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, on Friday when I entered this debate, I took the opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion in the manner in which they have delivered their addresses. I had reason at that time to congratulate the member for Riversdale, and I have reason to congratulate the member for Riversdale again on the decision of the court of appeal which allows her to hold her seat.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — A decision in which two judges support her election and two called for a by-election is something less than an overwhelming win, but, as it now stands, it may be enough to save her from the humiliation of a defeat in a by-election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — I'm sure that the member for Riversdale regards the decision as something of a divine deliverance from certain electoral defeat.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to deal with several topics in the course of my remarks. I do not propose to move an amendment to the motion. One of my caucus colleagues will do that later in the debate. Mr. Speaker, I propose to address some remarks to the farm crisis, to the cuts in services relative to my own constituency and to the city of Regina, but also the whole province. I propose to say a brief word about the special issue of electric power supply to deal with jobs and job creation, and with the broader questions of world hunger and world peace.

I do not propose to address some very important matters: the North and its neglect by this government; the environment and the total absence of any reference to environmental issues in the throne speech; the working poor and their shameful treatment; matters such as minimum wage and labour standards enforcement and subsidies to low income mothers for child care. I don't propose to discuss the special problems that students are facing in this time of high unemployment and crowded universities and technical institutes. My colleagues, Mr. Speaker, will be referring to these topics during the course of their remarks.

Before I turn to the body of my remarks, I would like to say a few words about Canadian Western Agribition. Mr. Speaker, we have just completed another highly successful Canadian Western Agribition in Regina, number 14. As will be recalled, Canadian Western Agribition was an idea worked out by cattlemen in this province. It received the blessing of premier Ross Thatcher, himself a rancher. The first show was in the planning stage when the government changed in 1971, and I had the great good fortune to be associated with the opening of the first Canadian Western Agribition in November of 1971.

Since then it has grown from a promising livestock show to the greatest livestock show in Canada, and more. It is now a grain show and still expanding. It is without doubt one of the great beef cattle shows in the world and attracts observers and buyers from many countries, world-wide. Not only does this offer opportunities to sell pure-bred cattle throughout the world, it also offers encouragement and support to our breeders who are steadily improving our commercial cattle, the ability of our cattle to convert feed into beef, their ability to resist disease, their general ability to feed this continent, and the return of profit to producers.

This year we've again seen some great cattle and some good sales. That was particularly encouraging because things are, at best, uncertain on many farm fronts. Some of the sales reflected some uneasiness in the minds of cattlemen. Some were quite successful. The organizers of Canadian Western Agribition, and all those who have helped the show, deserve our thanks.

At this year's Canadian Western Agribition two of the key founders were honoured — Chris Sutter, the first president, and Jim Lewthwaite. Other presidents have been Bill Small, Leroy Berry, John Willmott, Barry Andrew, Gerry Miller, and the current president, Ken Halvorson. We express our appreciation to these men and all who worked with them. Agribition is a great show — a great show for Regina, for Saskatchewan, and for Canada, and for agriculture world-wide.

**SOME HON MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!



Mr. Speaker, during the session of the legislature just ended last week my colleagues and I warned repeatedly of a growing farm crisis. Last March we proposed a four-point program to deal with that crisis.

The government did nothing or next to nothing. They argued, in effect, that we weren't in a crisis yet. But we legislators know that sometimes programs don't always work out as we'd like them to. We know that they frequently take longer to work out than we would like, and that's why we shouldn't have waited until there was a crisis before we started to take action.

Last spring, the New Democrats said this: first, get a handle on those foreclosures and seizures and sellouts. Put on a moratorium. This will buy some time, and then work out a comprehensive package to save our farms. We put forward our ideas of what should be in that package. Eight months have gone by — eight months in which the farm situation has got worse every day. More and more farmers got into difficulty. Some people said, "Oh, it's only the inefficient farmers that are in trouble. They're the ones that are in trouble." But the facts are in, and that simply isn't so.

A recent study by the Farm Credit Corporation shows that farmers who were in the most trouble are the ones with the highest debt. But it goes on to show that these aren't marginal farmers. Indeed, the 33 per cent of the farmers with the highest debt produced 50 per cent of farm products. This is not some fringe group. This is the very core of our younger and most productive farmers.

So that's point number one. The crisis does not involve only some marginal farmers. It concerns the very core of our younger and most productive farmers — farmers who still have a debt load because they have entered the industry only in the last ten years or less, perhaps. And that's a lot of farmers, 33 per cent with 50 per cent of the productive capacity, a lot of the most productive farmers. These farmers must be saved for agriculture. We're going to need them in the years ahead.

So New Democrats say this: impose a moratorium, first, to give some hard pressed farmers a breather; second, to give governments, both federal and provincial, time to develop programs that work. A moratorium itself is not enough. We must get money into the hands of farmers, and we must help them with the expenses which they have to face in carrying on their occupation.

Now this is a job for both provincial and federal governments. I want to turn first to the provincial government, hoping the cabinet are not saying what the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood is saying, that everybody is optimistic out there on the farms. Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether optimism is on the rise on many farms in Saskatchewan. I like better the quote of the Minister of Agriculture, where he is quoted as saying, "Hepworth says farmers desperately need help." That, I think, is the right quote. Farmers desperately need help. That's the Minister of Agriculture. And we Democrats agree. We agree with the Minister of Agriculture, and totally disagree with the people who are saying that optimism is on the rise.

Well now, what kind of help, Mr. Speaker? Well, I've mentioned the moratorium, but I want to say more. On the income side, grain farmers need an acreage payment of up to \$30 an acre to help them who were savaged by the drought. Livestock producers need strengthened beef and hog stabilization programs, not the kind of cutbacks on the beef stabilization program imposed upon it by the government opposite.

All farmers need a farm fuel rebate. Alberta has a rebate of 32 cents a gallon. Such a rebate would help our Saskatchewan farmers survive. All farmers need some relief from spiralling utility rates. The provincial government should freeze utility rates, or at the very least limit utility rate increases to the rate of inflation, not three or four times the rate of inflation, which we have recently seen.

All farmers need some protection against soaring property taxes. Grants to municipalities and school boards should be enough to allow councils and boards to hold mill rates steady without sharp cuts in the services that farm families need.

With respect to crop insurance, farmers who have crop insurance claims should get prompt payment and not the snail's pace action that too many farmers are suffering from now. Now these are some of the things which the provincial government could do.

I want now to turn to the federal government. The federal government should make a major payment from the Western Grains Stabilization Plan immediately, in December if possible, because I think all will agree that farmers need money. They need money to meet their commitments. They have paid their money into the Western Grains Stabilization Program. They now need a payment out, and it should be made promptly.

The federal government should freeze grain freight rates as was promised during the federal election campaign, and furthermore, they should freeze them as of the date of the promise and not at some distant point in the future. Freeze grain freight rates is what I said, Mr. Minister, and that, I think, is what should be done.

The federal and provincial governments together should do something. They need to deal with interest rates. The federal government should lower the very high interest rates charged by the Farm Credit Corporation. The provincial government should provide a shelter or write-down for farmers caught in the massive interest rate increase of the 1980 period. We're all familiar with the period. The government should seek and get some support and help from the federal government to carry out such a program. They should also seek and get help from the financial institutions. If nothing is done, the financial institutions stand to lose some money, and perhaps, quite a lot of money as farmers go to the wall. They have an interest in seeing that doesn't happen. They should contribute to a restructuring and a write-down of past and future debts in exchange for government assuming part of the interest load.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes said that a moratorium will mean bad things for farmers, that they will not be able to get credit in the future. To that argument I say two things: one, that was not the result of the moratorium legislation of 1971. Farmers in the 1970s found that credit was readily available — some people believe too readily available; two, if something is not done to stop foreclosures and the distress sale of land, there's a real possibility of a break in the price of farm land, perhaps as much as a 30 or 35 per cent drop in the value of farm land. That would savage the chances of thousands of farmers to obtain credit because their farm land is their basic security.

I say that such a drop in the price of land and uncertainty about future crops will frighten lenders far more than any moratorium. It is in the interest of lenders, as well as borrowers, that farm debt be restructured in a rational and orderly way. I urge the government to tackle the farm problem now, before the situation deteriorates still further.

I've attempted, Mr. Speaker, to outline the position of the New Democratic Party, and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture, or the appropriate minister, will similarly outline the position of the government on the issues which I have raised.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to what is happening to services in this province, and I want to put it in the context of my own constituency and the city in which I live.

My constituents in Regina Elphinstone, and other citizens of this city, are concerned about the continuing neglect of the needs of this city. We've had two and a half years, nearly three years of PC government, and they have been years of studies, and freezes, and cut-backs.

Let me illustrate: — in 1982, there was a plan, well under way, for the regeneration of both the

Pasqua and Regina General Hospitals. Since May of 1982 the Pasqua project has been slowed down, at best. It's ultimate completion is in doubt. And the Regina General project is at a dead stop. Nobody knows when or if it will ever start again. This from a government that talks about its commitment to health.

Nothing has been done about advance diagnostic equipment. Mr. Speaker, three or four years ago, CAT scanners were new. It was uncertain just what contribution they would make to the practice of medicine. There's no uncertainty any more. In that uncertain period a CAT scanner was ordered and installed — ordered, and they were installed in due course in Saskatoon and Regina. They have been found to be very useful, and, as a result, waiting lists are horrendous.

A recent report in the Regina Leader-Post states:

Patients with suspected tumors and brain damage now being put on the urgent waiting list for CAT scans will have to wait until spring, 1986, for their tests.

And I didn't make an error, Mr. Speaker. I didn't say '85. I said '86. Yet this government has not installed additional equipment in Saskatoon or Regina or anywhere else. So far as I am aware, it hasn't even been ordered.

And when I discuss this matter with medical people, they say that is an absolutely vital diagnostic tool, and it is wrong to deprive the citizens of Saskatchewan of diagnosis with a CAT scanner on a timely basis. Patients are suffering. People spend months waiting for their X-rays, their CAT scan, and wondering and worrying how much worse their condition is becoming.

This is but one example of the fact that the Regina hospitals are not getting the equipment they need. They have been reduced to organizing lotteries to get money to buy equipment. And young people who volunteer to help in the hospitals, the candy strippers, are being asked to sell lottery tickets in a lottery organized by the senior staff of the hospital.

Those who may not be familiar with Lotto 60/40 for the benefit of the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre should inform themselves on this new method of financing health care in Saskatchewan. I would have hoped that the senior people in our hospitals had something better to do with their time than to organize lotteries, and I would have hoped that idealistic young people who volunteer to help the sick would not be expected to beg for money for hospital equipment.

(1445)

I hear an increasing number of reports that nurses in the base hospitals are run off their feet and unable to give the quality of care that they would like to give, and further, I hear that this situation is getting worse rather than better. And for members who doubt this, I invite them to ask the nurses. Don't take my word for it. Don't take the word of the Minister of Health for it. Ask the nurses.

Space in nursing homes is very limited. And I can't, Mr. Speaker, recall a single nursing home bed that has been built or opened in this city since the PC government came to office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I hear members opposite shouting from their seats, but I wish, when they enter this debate, they would tell me what single nursing home bed has been built or opened in Regina since April of 1982, because it's got by me. It's got by me. All at a time when the general hospitals have a record number of nursing care patients occupying acute care beds. And I hope that's not denied. I hope any of the members for Regina who are here will check the figures, and they will find that more nursing home care people are occupying acute care beds in Regina hospitals, and in most hospitals throughout the province, than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to schools. The schools in Regina are still doing an outstanding job, but no thanks to the government. Both systems, the public and the separate, have had sharp cuts in grants, forcing cuts in programs. Not many new programs are possible in this environment; no expansion of community schools — and if there has been an expansion in community schools, please tell me, because I have overlooked it.

There's been no hiring of graduates from SUNTEP, the Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program. And we have heard a lot of conversation and talk from this government about the need for training. We've heard that time and time again. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that people are going to be able to get training unless they complete their schooling. And we need, therefore, to keep students, particularly native students who have a high drop-out rate in our urban schools, we need to keep them in school. Everybody agrees that the best way to do that is through the community school program, and through an increased number of teachers who speak the languages of native people and who can relate to them, not only linguistically but culturally.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, a look at these school grants indicates that there's no money for expansion of community schools, there's no money for the hiring of SUNTEP teachers, there is no money to get at that vital area of training which the government talks about but is not delivering upon.

I turn to the University of Regina, and it's in a worse financial crisis than it's ever had in its history, and small wonder. Grants for students have dropped from — and I'm now using 1981 constant dollars — dropped from \$7,000 per full-time student to \$5,000 per full-time student, measured in '81 constant dollars. Even if you measure it in current dollars, Mr. Speaker, it would be an actual drop in dollars.

This, Mr. Speaker, has naturally put the university in a very difficult situation. The result is bulging classes, students not having a choice of classes that they need to complete their courses, the university not having the money for library books and for lab equipment and for computer equipment and other supplies needed to do the job which needs to be done.

Building maintenance is neglected, and fundamental decisions, such as the future of the College Avenue campus, are avoided and delayed. Darke Hall, maintained by the Government of Saskatchewan, the University of Regina for 50 years, is closed because of neglect of maintenance by this government. The Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery is threatened.

I turn now to another area, the area of recreation. Not a single major recreational facility has been financed by provincial funds in this city in the last two or three years. Unlike the AgriDome, the Lawson pool, Taylor Field regeneration, the Douglas Park project, many small rinks which were built in the years immediately preceding this government coming to power, we have not seen any major recreational facilities financed by government money.

The court-house. The proposal to build a new court-house to house the superior courts has been completely shelved. Projects for a provincial law building and a new archives building have been cancelled. In so many areas there's a feeling that we're stalled. We're hanging on. The progress and innovation has stopped. Medical facilities, nursing homes, universities, schools, culture and the arts, sports and recreation were stalled.

We're not achieving our potential. Indeed, if I may use a phrase, Mr. Speaker, there's so much more we could be if we had a government that offered commitment and leadership. But that we do not have, and the results are there for all to see.

Mr. Speaker, I've talked about Regina, but almost everything I've said could be said about other communities as well. In Saskatoon, the regeneration of the major hospitals, City and St. Paul's, is hopelessly stalled, hopelessly stalled. The University of Saskatchewan, like the University of Regina, is asked to provide world class university education with fewer dollars per student than it

did in 1982.

The government is not treating itself, Mr. Speaker, the government . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . The member for Turtleford, the Minister of Advanced Education, says that the grant for 1984 is more per student than 1982, and I would very much hope that he would put all those figures on the record. And I hope very much that he doesn't take into account the . . .

I want to compare '84 with '82, and that is what I want him to do. And I venture to think he won't do it in this debate. The government, Mr. Speaker, is not treating itself that way. Comparing, (and I'm using now 1981 with 1984) their spending has gone up more than 25 per cent per citizen — 25 per cent per capita for themselves, and for universities and for many other bodies, far, far less than that.

Major projects at the University of Saskatchewan are frozen. Three years ago there was active consideration of the agricultural complex. It was to be planned following the engineering building which was then under construction, and since completed, and the biology building which was then — geology building, I'm sorry — which was then in the hands of the architects. In two and a half years there has been no progress on that agricultural complex, a project that many see as vital if Saskatchewan is to keep its agricultural industry in the forefront in a highly competitive world.

And if members opposite can tell me that the agricultural complex is about to be announced, I will congratulate them freely. They've had two and one-half years to wrestle with it and, I believe, allow it to go forward, and I will be the first to congratulate them if they announce it. But I am not holding my breath.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk about money for schools to operate — operating grants. The fact that school-board after school-board across the province has had to cut staff — and I hope that isn't denied; I hope that isn't denied by members. I could talk about recreational facilities, the number of rinks, and swimming pools, and parks that have not been built across this province in the last two and one-half years, but the public knows the facts. They know that things are not happening in their communities — not happening because our government lacks the commitment to make them happen, lacks the vision to understand that community projects and community facilities are what makes Saskatchewan the distinctive and special place that it is.

It has been said that there is no vision, that where there is no vision the people perish — where there is no vision the people perish. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will not perish. But you could say the same thing of a government, a government like the Devine government. It has no vision, and this government will surely perish, and soon.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few brief words about a major part of the industrial life of this province. As we know, it depends on readily available and reasonably priced electric power. The Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have the responsibility of seeing that that power is available now and in the future.

A characteristic of planning power development has been the need for longer and longer lead times. Decisions have to be made more and more years in advance. That's true for a number of reasons. Almost any project one can think of involves several governments, sometimes the International Joint Commission. And there has also developed a very healthy practice of consulting the public about power development, and that takes time. So we need longer and longer lead times.

So far as I'm aware, we've had no decision from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for two and one-half years on the next project to supply power for Saskatchewan citizens and industry.

When this government came to office there was a commitment to Nipawin, a commitment which perhaps might have been aborted, but this government decided not to abort, and I think they made the right decision. And so Nipawin was the last decision made as a result of a royal commission which considered the environmental impacts of that project, and there was a very substantial lead time before Nipawin was announced.

Now two and a half years have gone by and we haven't had another announcement. It suggests that decisions will have to be made soon. And the point I wish to make is that there should be enough time so that citizens can be involved. We want to leave enough time so that people can have their say, because these decisions vitally affect their lives. If the idea of using power generated by northern poplar forests is going to be discarded, we should know why.

We've had a proposal — I don't know whether it was sound or not — from people who said that they would sell power to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation that they generated by the use of poplar as a fuel. If that's going to be rejected, we should know why. On the face of it, the idea offers so much economic development to a crucial area of the province that it's very attractive. If it can't work, the public should be told.

If we're going to import a large block of power from Manitoba, this will involve the construction of a major transmission line. Time should be allowed to plan the route of that line to avoid confrontation with landowners over whose land the line is being built, and that requires time.

If SPC is not going to proceed with the additional units at Coronach, we should know why. The project goal was designed for four units. This is no reason that we should necessarily be wedded to that. But the design was for four units. Two are now installed. If a new power plant is going to be built at Estevan in preference to installing further units at Coronach, that decision should be made public. The reasons for it should be made public and debated.

(1500)

Clearly these decisions affect the lives of all Saskatchewan citizens, and they directly affect the lives of people in communities like Big River or Spiritwood or Coronach. And they have a right to know what the decision is, the reasons for it, and opportunity to make their point of view known.

I call upon the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to make a detailed statement on power supply, outlining the options being considered, and the pros and cons of each option. That will allow the public to be aware of many of the important issues involved, and will allow an informed decision to be made on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch now on the issue of jobs. We are told that jobs are a priority of this government. But we are not told what they propose to do about it. Certainly we don't need another announcement. We don't need another announcement that jobs are a priority, or number one priority, or as the case may be. We've had enough of those already. Every few months we get an announcement saying that jobs are the priority, but we don't get any jobs. Mr. Speaker, let me review some of these announcements.

In March of 1983, the budget speech was said to be designed to mobilize the full range of Saskatchewan's resources and talents to generate new investment and new employment. March of '83.

November of '83, throne speech: "Job creation will continue to be a top priority of my government."

November 29th of '83, throne speech debate, Premier Devine: "The priorities of this government — what are they? It's job creation, and the record speaks for itself."

March 1984 budget. "In this evening's budget I will announce immediate job measures for our young people."

In September of '84 —that's March of '84 —September of '84, after the cabinet think tank, the Premier announced, he stated: "Cabinet will make an all out effort to create jobs. The government will leave no stone unturned to create jobs. Job creation efforts will need to be focused and be brought together."

Now those are some of the statements. The last one was rather ominous. If, after five or six or seven statements over two years, the Premier has reached the conclusion that the job creation efforts have got to be focused, I can only assume that in the last two years they've been unfocused. And if they've got to be brought together, I can only assume that they have been scattered over the last two years. And certainly the results suggest that they have been unfocused and unproductive.

By almost any measure the government's performance on job creation is dismal. Let's look at the latest figures, and I'm going to use the October 1984 figures because they're the latest ones. I could use other figures, and some of them would produce more favourable results for my argument, some less favourable. These are the latest figures, and they're not selected figures.

And the only way you can compare job figures is to take a month, let us say October, and compare it with October in preceding years. You cannot accurately and logically compare October unemployment with April unemployment or vice versa because there is a seasonable variation in employment in Saskatchewan known to all, hence the production of seasonally adjusted figures. But what one does is compare October with October, November with November, and as the case may be.

So turning back to October 1984, compare that with October 1981. Non-agricultural jobs, October 1981, there were 345,000 in Saskatchewan. Non-agricultural jobs, October 1984, 357,000 — an increase of 12,000 in three years.

Mr. Speaker, those are the latest figures. Job creation at the rate of 4,000 jobs a year. During the entire period from 1971 to 1982, job creation ran at approximately 10,000 jobs a year — 10,000 a year. Look at the figures. You will find that that is true, and you will find that in the last three years the record has been about 4,000 jobs a year, and that is unspectacular, even dismal, compared with what happened in Saskatchewan in the past.

But you may say, well conditions now are tougher than in the 1970s and we can't create jobs at the same rate. All right, let's compare Saskatchewan today with other countries and other provinces today. And I will confine my comparisons to other Canadian provinces. How does it compare? Well again the record is dismal. In Canada as a whole, compared with last year, the number of jobs is up by 2 per cent. What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that 2 per cent more people are working in Canada this year than last year.

In Saskatchewan the figure isn't 2 per cent, or 1 per cent, but a half of 1 per cent — 2 per cent up in the rest of Canada, a half of 1 per cent in Saskatchewan. Of all the provinces, Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia, did better than Saskatchewan. Only Alberta and Prince Edward Island did worse. And that is a dismal record, a dismal record indeed.

Note, Mr. Speaker, that I'm talking about the number of jobs created. This does not depend upon any number of people pouring into the province. Indeed, if the government's story about people pouring into the province was accurate, one would think that jobs were going to be created at a faster rate because some of the people who come into the province, as it is alleged, would undoubtedly bring particular skills with them. But I'm talking about the number of jobs created regardless of how many people came or left the province.

I could indeed paint an even blacker picture if I just talked about unemployment. The number of people without jobs: — in October, 1981 — 18,000 people; in October, 1984 — 34,000 people. Almost double, almost double.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it is not true that rising unemployment is because people are moving into our province at an unusually high rate. Notwithstanding the frequent statements by the Premier, that is not true. If his statements were true our labour force in this province, the people who either have jobs or want to work, should be growing at a rate faster than elsewhere in Canada. But that's not true. And if it is true, I invite members opposite to lay the figures on the table because I am using StatsCan figures, and they make it very, very clear that the labour force in Saskatchewan is growing at a slower rate than almost any other province. Indeed, eight provinces in Canada have a labour force that is growing at a faster rate than Saskatchewan. These are figures from StatsCan, and I do not think they can be effectively rebutted.

The statistics tell a grim story, but, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to talk about statistics all the time. I invite the jobs minister to come to my constituency or to any constituency in Regina or Saskatoon or Prince Albert or particularly to La Ronge or Buffalo Narrows or La Loche, and speak to some of the young people there. Ask them this simple question: is it easier to get a job now than it was three years ago, or harder? Just ask that. Is it easier to get a job now, or harder, than it was three years ago? Ask the young people at university. Ask the people who are in their final year and who have tried to get a job each summer. They will tell you that it's harder to get a job, and it was harder to get a job in the summer of '84 than it was in the summer of '81 or '82. Ask them, and if you don't get that answer, I will be surprised.

Let me talk about a young person I know.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Your daughter?

**HON. MR. BLAKENEY:** — No, this is a young man of great energy and initiative . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know what the politics of the young man is. All I know is that this summer he managed to get some jobs building steps and pouring concrete, and he can do a lot of those things and is willing to do anything that is available. In fact, he can do many of those jobs. He's willing to quote prices, although he's a young man, and he's willing to take on the entrepreneurial role: go when someone wants a set of steps. He will quote them a price and do it. He's kept reasonably busy all summer. Whenever he had a job he worked it through the weekend in the hope that something else would come upon in the week and he'd be able to keep working. And he kept reasonable busy, but since about the first of October things have been tough for him.

Now he's the sort of young person who ordinarily would be working building houses or in other building projects all through the winter, but there aren't any housing projects to speak of in Regina or about in Saskatchewan. Housing starts are drastically down, as members will know, and there aren't jobs for young people like that, and no one can deny either his energy or his initiative.

Or take my neighbour. I've got a neighbour who has worked for years for Sears. She's been a part-time worker, happy to be a part-time worker. She's also a homemaker, but she tells me that she's getting fewer hours this year than almost any previous time. She still gets some work, but less than she wishes and far less than she used to get.

Now comes the announcement that Dad's Cookies is closing permanently with the loss of permanent jobs. And other major Regina employers are laying off. So on the basis of the figures, Mr. Speaker, or on the basis of very real and very human stories, jobs are scarcer; they are harder to get. Many people who have worked in the past are not working now, notwithstanding the fact that they want to work. The jobs are not there, and they are not there because this



government is not taking the action which would create jobs.

If this government was making jobs its number one priority, there would be jobs. Sadly, this government is not making jobs its number one priority. Sadly, it is making talking about jobs its number one priority, and that does not provide jobs for people, young or old, who are looking for jobs — who are willing to work, but who are denied the opportunity to work because of the failure of the government.

(1515)

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a bit about . . . I've talked a bit about this government's view of what is fair and what is unfair. Let me talk a little bit about the federal government and their view of what is fair and what is unfair. We've recently had a statement about fairness. I think it was not intended as such, but it stands as such, this one from the Minister of Agriculture of the Government of Canada, the Hon. John Wise. He is quoted as saying that farmers have to bite the bullet along with the rest of society in an effort to clean up the government deficit. He goes on to say, and he's talking about reducing the deficit, and I want to quote his words: "This is a painful process and everybody has to share the pain."

This is reducing the deficit. A painful process, and everybody must share the pain. Brave words, Mr. Speaker, brave words. But will everybody share the pain? Is everybody sharing the pain? Well, let's see. Let's see how people are doing, how tough it is for them.

A Saskatchewan farmer grows grain. He borrows money from his bank and he pays interest. He buys fuel and chemicals that come from a major oil company. He ships his grain by the CPR or the CNR, and all of them get money from his grain. The grain brings in foreign exchange for the benefit of all Canadians. Now if Canada is in trouble, this farmer who is being asked to share the pain has a right to ask, "Is my banker sharing the pain? Is the oil company sharing the pain? Is the railway sharing the pain?"

Well, let's start with the farmer. Is he profiteering? Well, not so as you can notice. His net income is going down, not up. He certainly is sharing the pain.

But what about the banks to whom the farmer is paying his interest? Are they sharing the pain? Well, not exactly. Not exactly. Almost every day a report of bank profits comes in. I have one for the Bank of Montreal: "Bank of Montreal profits for the fourth quarter ending October 31, 1984, up 14.2 per cent." Not too painful. Not too painful.

Well how about the banks generally. Well a recent story in the Globe and Mail tells the story, and the headline says this: "Bank profits in Canada world's best. Bank profits in Canada world's best." That doesn't sound too painful, at least for the banks.

I think it's fair to ask how much they are going to be asked by this PC government of Ottawa to share when it comes to getting down our deficit. I think it's fair to ask that.

Well if the banks aren't exactly sharing the pain, how about the oil companies? Well here again the evidence is hard to find. Clippings say: "Oil profits increase." "Gulf Canada, six months profit rises to 142 million." Twelve petroleum companies surveyed it.

In 1983, oil company profits were up 25 per cent over 1982, and the 1984 profits are still rising. Gulf Canada's six months profits are up 15 per cent. profits of oil companies 25 per cent up in '83, another 15 per cent in '84.

And it's true of the other major oil companies as well, and if members opposite deny that, I will be delighted if they would put their figures on the table and show us which of the major oil companies that traditionally sell fuel and chemicals to the farmers are seeing a sharp drop in income.

So when it comes to sharing the pain, so far oil companies have escaped, and certainly they have escaped any effort by this government to tax them. Oil companies are not being asked to share the pain by this government. And I'm speaking not now, Mr. Speaker, of the federal government, but of this provincial government.

The federal Minister of Agriculture says that farmers should help to share the pain. Farmers are helping to share the pain. Are the people who make their money off farmers sharing the pain? And they being asked to do that by the federal PC government, or by the provincial PC government, and the answer is a flat no.

Now what about the railways, Mr. Speaker? I have two reports here on the CN. Well here's one. This one reads, and they're all recent clippings, Mr. Speaker: "CN shows big profit." And another one: "Rail division carries CN to record first half profit." Those don't sound too tough. The report goes on to say that in the first six months of 1984, CN profits were up almost 200 per cent over 1983. But that doesn't sound too painful. I know many farmers who would be happy to settle for 200 per cent increase in '84 over their '83 net, quite a few. The CP Air is not on the road to the poor-house, either. A recent report in the Western Producer says this:

Third quarter CP Rail profits, buoyed since August 1st by higher grain freight rates paid by farmers, rose 150 per cent over last year's level, the railway has reported.

One hundred and fifty per cent. Well, it's not 200 per cent, but still not bad. I know some farmers who would be willing to take 150 per cent more than they got in 1983.

Farmers are being asked to share the pain by this PC government. They're being told by federally and provincially that there are no quick fixes, that they have to bite the bullet and share the pain. It's fair to ask whether the banks and the oil companies and the railways who are waxing fat on what they're charging the farmers are going to be asked to share the pain. As someone has said, the first to bite the bullet should be the one with the strongest teeth. And I don't think Saskatchewan farmers have teeth which will match those of the chartered banks or the international oil companies or the railways.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that we ought to watch to see whether or not these groups will be asked to share the pain along with farmers. We're about to see what the PC party, federally, means by fairness. We're about to see whether fairness is a fundamental value, or whether fairness doesn't apply to Canada's banks, the world's most profitable, or the international oil companies, or companies like the CPR, Canada's largest corporate giant. We will see over the months ahead whether or not fairness applies only to farmers, and the right to extract extortionate profits continues in the hands of banks and other major corporations in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn my attention to a broader topic. I've already mentioned, in the course of my remarks, several things are missing from the throne speech, and missing from the government's approach to leadership in our province. Let me turn to what I think is a fundamental issue of what is missing. Christmas season is upon us, the time of year when in our families, our communities, our thoughts turn to joyous celebrations, and to good fellowship and family and friends and neighbours. I, for my part, look forward to some of my children coming home, and I know others will similarly look forward to happy reunions.

We usually associate Christmas with tinsel trees and gift-wrapped parcels, but these are only the trappings of Christmas. Its meaning lies deeper than that. To find its real significance, we must go back to those words heard by shepherds 2,000 years ago: peace on earth, good will towards men. Many of us in church this last Sunday, the first Sunday of Advent, will have heard some echo or re-echo of that message.

There will be cynics who will impatiently ask: how can we think of the true meaning of

Christmas in the midst of a world daily threatened by war and oppression and racism and famine — by the nightmare of nuclear war? And so these cynics will tell us — and there may be some members opposite who will be among them — that we here in the Saskatchewan provincial legislature cannot affect those global events, and therefore we shouldn't talk about them in this legislature.

But I say these cynics are wrong, and their short-sighted, parochial view is wrong. For while the world is indeed big, we're part of it. While there are many voice, the voice of Saskatchewan is one of them. And while others clearly have a responsibility to speak out and exercise moral leadership on the great issues facing us, so, too, does our provincial government, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, have that responsibility.

I am distressed to think that as Saskatchewan citizens pour out money from their purses and grain from their grain bins for the starving in Ethiopia and elsewhere in Africa, the Government of Saskatchewan has refused or neglected to match those grants, and has not offered to expand the amount which it has in its budget for international co-operation and aid. And the people of Saskatchewan are disappointed that the Government of Saskatchewan is not fulfilling its responsibility, will not even acknowledge its major responsibility, because we are a wealthy part of the world — among the wealthiest.

As I travel about the province listening to people, they're asking me an important question. And they phrase it differently, but it's all the same question whether I get it in my own constituency or in Saskatoon or whether I'm talking to church leaders or other citizens: shouldn't the provincial government at least acknowledge the major issues facing the world today? Shouldn't it at least respond to those issues of widespread famine and the threat of nuclear war? Why doesn't the government show some moral leadership? That's what they ask.

And in asking me this question they know that, while they wouldn't want to preach, they know that we can't measure our lives by what we get, but rather by what we give. And what is true of an individual is equally true of a province. The real measure of Saskatchewan's greatness does not lie in any pomp or ceremony by which we may surround our government, or this legislature, or in accounts and ledgers, or balances. The true measure of our greatness is the quality of the life of Saskatchewan men and women — what we accomplish together to give hope and dignity and opportunity to the least fortunate among us. And equally important, what we do together to share our affluence and our blessings (and they are great compared with most in the world), with those people around the world who suffer poverty and disease and famine on a scale which we can scarcely imagine. For better living conditions here in Saskatchewan or elsewhere in the world are not an end in themselves, they're a means toward our realizing for all mankind a society in which Christian ideals can survive, thrive, and flourish.

Mr. Speaker, I say Christian ideals, but the same ideals are held by all of the great religions of the world. These ideals can flourish nowhere on this planet, however, so long as the dreams of children are haunted by the nightmare of nuclear war.

And I don't know if you have been struck as I have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by the stories of the large number of teenagers in North America who don't believe that they're going to be able to live out their lives because their lives will be terminated by nuclear war.

I think back on my teenage days, and such a thought, or anything approaching it, never crossed my mind. And I wonder what this threat of nuclear annihilation is doing to the thought patterns of a generation of young people. I don't know.

(1530)

But I think that we ought, as citizens and as a government, to do everything we can to give some assurance to these people, young and old, who believe that our world is on the very brink of

nuclear annihilation. As long this provincial government and other governments like it around the world remain silent and refuse to fulfil their responsibility to show the moral leadership that is required on this biggest of all issues that faces us, for so long will the military authorities of the superpowers continue to manufacture and deploy more and more nuclear weapons, weapons which are totally useless, useless because they're merely being added to the more than 50,000 nuclear weapons already in place, with more than enough destructive power to destroy all life on this planet several times over.

A former American president put it this way in 1981:

The risk of a nuclear conflagration has not lessened. The danger is becoming greater. It may be only a matter of time before madness, desperation, greed, or miscalculation lets loose this terrible force. In an all-out nuclear war more destructive power than in all of World War II would be unleashed every second during the long afternoon it would take for all the missiles and bombs to fall. A World War II every second. More people killed in the first few hours than in all the wars of history put together.

And that from a former president of the United States. Clearly, in 1981! When Pope John Paul visited Hiroshima in February of 1981, a couple of weeks later, he pointed out that the power of the nuclear threat was upon us. He said that the responsibility which lies upon each of us is heavy. And he said on each government as well, and I'll quote what he said:

In the past it was possible to destroy a village, a town, a region, even a country. Now it is the whole planet that has come under threat. This fact should finally compel everyone to face a basic moral consideration. From now on it is only through a conscious choice, through a deliberate policy, that humanity can survive.

And I hope that it will not be thought that a former president of the United States, or Pope John Paul, have no perception of real politics, real political issues, when they call upon us to address this major and most important question facing all of humanity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is because of its silence on these issues, the government's silence in this throne speech and elsewhere on this major issue, that this government is such a deep disappointment to so many Saskatchewan people, a government which refuses to acknowledge fundamental issues of concern to Saskatchewan people and around the world, fundamental issues such as world starvation and the nuclear threat, a government which refuses to respond to these fundamental issues, a government which refuses to fulfil its responsibility to demonstrate moral leadership, a government which, like Pontius Pilate, instead prefers to wash its hands, turn its back, and walk away.

The people's disappointment in this government is deeper, Mr. Speaker, because in its Speech from the Throne, which we're debating today, it nowhere demonstrates any commitment to addressing any of these great issues throughout the world. I speak particularly of the issue of famine and nuclear war.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have touched on some, but only some, of the shortcomings of this government's program outlined in the throne speech. I've referred to the farm crisis, what New Democrats feel should be done about it. I've talked of the cuts in services, the sorry state of much of our health system, the severe problems being faced by universities and schools. I might have spoken of the deterioration of our highway system. I've called for a policy statement on power supply. I've reviewed the government's sorry record on job creation and contrasted, Mr. Speaker, what this government has said about job creation and the steadily growing number of young people and old who can't find steady work. I've reviewed the failure of the Devine government to speak for the people of Saskatchewan on the great issues of human distress and nuclear conflict which are casting shadows over every citizen of the world.

This throne speech recycles statements we've heard so many times before, but has offered no hope, no new hope, no new visions, no blueprint for a better Saskatchewan in a better world. And because the throne speech was silent on all those issues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will be opposing the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. SANDBERG:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This government's throne speech, this government's plan for the coming year is to create jobs and to secure viable family farms. We will introduce legislation to protect our farmers caught with uncontrollable costs, burdensome debts, and adverse weather conditions of the past year. And our employment minister will be announcing his thrust shortly, which will stimulate both the public and the private sectors, which will create employment this winter.

On the social side, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are committed to upholding the dignity of the individual, protecting our children, and preserving the sanctity of the family. We will continue on a course where the people of Saskatchewan are in charge of their destiny, not the bureaucracy, and not the union bosses.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, from 1972 to 1982, the NDP government increased the number of departmental employees by 42 per cent, from 12,680 to 18,002. Since April of 1982, this government has reduced the size of departments by 16 per cent.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the NDP's family of Crown corporations are no longer on a planned course to control our lives and our pocket-books. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this province no longer has a gas tax. Our population is growing. More people than ever before are working. For example, if you rate January to January, 416,000 were working in January of 1984 versus 409,000 in January of 1982 when the NDP were in power. That's an increase of some 7,000.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm proud to be representing Saskatoon Centre in this legislature. Business is brisk in Saskatoon and we're growing. I have recently helped open several housing projects: the 10-storey 5th Avenue Place, a Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and CMHC seniors' complex administered by the Saskatoon Housing Authority. And I recently cut the ribbon at Hallmark Place, a 24-storey apartment complex building on 6th Avenue.

Many businesses have opened up this past year in Saskatoon Centre, and more are on the way. The new Young Women's Christian Association building is on schedule on 25th Street. Saskatonians are proud, industrious and renowned for their public spirit. With these qualities, I'm sure the mayor and council of Saskatoon will see their way towards a new civic centre arena complex in the near future.

And recent job programs have worked well in Saskatoon Centre. For example, the Saskatchewan Employment Development Program created 99 jobs; Saskatchewan Opportunities '84, 170 jobs; and Saskatchewan Access Youth Employment, 15 jobs in Saskatoon Centre. When you couple that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the 1982 program for small business employment program, some \$680,000 were allocated into Saskatoon Centre businesses, and this translates to about 135 to 140 jobs. As a matter of fact, one of my constituents wrote me a letter recently, dated November 26th, and he says:

I was pleased to receive the cheque for Opportunities '84. Projects of this sort are beneficial to both the employer and the student. Our experience has been that training expenses are costly to our business. Opportunities '84 offset that expense and therefore made hiring the extra employees more attractive. This student has now received 66 days of valuable exposure to commercial construction and will be invited back next summer. In effect, his future is now brighter. Thanks again.

So this indicates that that is just one of the programs that is working well.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to my area of co-operatives. Saskatchewan people, of course, have been developing co-operatives since the turn of the century, and we've a long history of co-operative development and an equally long history of accomplishments by co-operatives. The co-operative sector is an important part of our economic base and has a significant effect on our province's economy. Co-operatives provide jobs, they provide goods and services and develop resources, and reinvest that money back into the local economy, thereby contributing to this province's economic development.

Co-operatives are playing an important role in new economic initiatives including feed and canola processing, and of course the heavy oil upgrader. Co-operators have proven success records in business ventures of all sizes. They have the resources and expertise to undertake multimillion dollar developments, ventures, such as the heavy oil upgrader; and to participate in joint ventures with provincial and federal governments and the private sector.

Therefore, my department's top priority, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to encourage and facilitate the development of co-operative enterprise here, to increase employment, to provide investment opportunities, to support and encourage agricultural development, and to create new types of secondary industries to stimulate the provincial economy.

The Co-operatives Act, which was proclaimed on October 17th of last year, was a major step in that direction. The co-operative sector endorsed this Act which gives co-operatives the opportunity to operate independently, and as equals, with other forms of business.

And another major undertaking is the proposed credit union Act which is being developed because of the need for updated legislation. This Act will recognize credit union as equals with other financial institutions.

And some concerns have been indicated lately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the financial health or soundness of some of the nation's financial institutions. Mr. Speaker, I am assured that Saskatchewan's credit union system is in good health and will withstand the current tough economic times.

Turning to the area of employment, I'd like to point out that 10 of the top 25 Saskatchewan businesses are co-operatives. Number one, of course, is Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, which employs approximately 4,000 people, and almost 3,000 of them are Saskatchewan residents. Federated Co-operatives Ltd. hold the number two position in the top 100. It employs almost 2,000 people, and more than 700 of them are here in Saskatchewan.

And the list goes on: the credit union system, interprovincial co-operatives, CSP Foods, Dairy Producers Co-operative, and the Co-operators, just to name a few. All of them are providing jobs here in the province and are stimulating the economy. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they account for some 17,000 jobs here in the province. There are more than 1,000 smaller co-operatives throughout Saskatchewan, and they all contribute to the economy and employ local people.

One of my department's current priorities is to promote and facilitate the development of employment co-operatives, co-operatives which provide income and employment for their member owners by producing and selling their goods and services. These co-operatives have the potential to meet the vital need for jobs which was identified in the throne speech. They can provide jobs in a variety of business areas, and they can stimulate the local and provincial economy. So I see a broad spectrum of applications for employment co-operatives in terms of size, occupation, location, and potential markets. They can provide needed jobs, goods, and services, in communities of all sizes.

Saskatchewan people are showing a great interest in employment co-operatives, Mr. Deputy Speaker. My department is developing programs and information material to help them identify these opportunities. We are also working closely with several other government departments such as Social Services and Tourism and Small Business to co-ordinate our programs and to identify development opportunities.

On the agricultural side, Mr. Deputy Speaker, stimulation of that sector was identified as a major priority in the throne speech and it is a major priority for my department. The Department of Co-operatives has always worked closely with the agricultural community in this province, and I'm proud of the many agricultural co-operatives here. We have grazing, we have seed cleaning, fodder, feedlot, feeder, and watershed co-operatives, just to name a few.

One of our important new initiatives is the development of farm machinery agency co-operatives — co-operative businesses owned and operated by farmers to reduce the purchasing and operating costs of their farm machinery. These co-operatives offer farmers substantial savings in their capital costs for new machinery and their total annual operating costs. These savings contribute to farmers' financial stability and can free up capital for other uses.

(1545)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're working with Saskatchewan farmers to develop feeder co-operatives, and we are co-ordinating efforts with the Department of Agriculture which administers the feeder association's loan guarantees program. We already have several feeder co-operatives in Saskatchewan and more are in the planning stages.

In March and October of this year, my deputy minister and I met with the presidents and chief executive officers of Saskatchewan's major co-operatives to discuss ways that they could increase their participation in the province's economic development. Discussions at these meetings were positive and promising, and one of the highlights of our meetings was the agreement that the provincial government and the co-operative sector would be partners in economic development, that we can and should work together and find ways to expand our economy through increased involvement in the co-op sector. These meetings are part of our continuing dialogue and are an exciting vehicle for job creation, agricultural growth, resource development, and stimulation of our economy.

I spoke just a moment ago about partnerships. Well, the provincial government, the federal government, and federated co-operatives are in partnership in the new planned co-op upgrader just north of Regina. During its construction period it will provide some 2,500 man-years of labour, and at peak construction time will provide some 1,300 workers with jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we have several exciting initiatives under way. Our two top priorities are job creation and agricultural development. We are promoting and facilitating the development of co-operatives that will specifically address these needs in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government is moving ahead with positive initiatives and positive ideas. We realize that times are tough, but when times are tough, the tough get going. Saskatchewan people are tough. Our farmers are tough, and they're adapting. Our businessmen are tough, and they're rationalizing and controlling their costs. Our people are resilient, and even though this province's employment record is the best in the nation, we are not satisfied. We will continue to make it better.

The October Labour Market Review, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has these facts, highlights of the report:

The unemployment rate here in the province, both actually and adjusted seasonally,

has declined significantly in the past month to 7.1 per cent and 7.9 per cent respectively. The unemployment rate is again the lowest in Canada, and the gap has widened between ourselves and Manitoba, who have the second lowest rate. The decline in unemployment in Saskatchewan between September and October was the largest in Canada. Saskatchewan's 15-plus population is beginning to stabilize.

The labour force, Mr. Deputy Speaker, declined by 3,000 persons over the past month, but employment increased by 1,000. The service sector increased by 3,000 people over the month — the sector where most of the new jobs had and will continue to be created.

Agricultural employment continued its decline from the peaks of the summer, but this is typical for this time of year, and in this sector. And youth employment, although still unacceptably high, is falling, and is the second best in the nation.

Employment levels in Canada fell in October over September, but Saskatchewan's employment increased.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all over the province people are telling me that the NDP are moving far, far, far, far to the left. The union bosses are taking over the NDP. The NDP policy makers appear to be off-the-wall radicals. This is what they're telling me. The old T.C. Douglas CCFers may have in the past represented the farmers of this province, but that group of eight represents only the wild-eyed left. There may be one rational voice among them — the member for Athabasca, whom I'm told opposes the NDP Party position of closing the uranium mines in the North.

And if I may quote from an editorial in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix referring to the NDP convention late in October, it's called the NDP's recipe for disaster, and one delegate is quoted as saying, "You could pass anything here." That's what he said at the convention. "You could pass anything here." If that isn't radical and off-the-wall, I don't know what is. They even agreed that the party should work to develop a more organic relationship with labour. Organic relationship with labour — what is that?

And a former NDP MLA who had spent decades in the legislature, fumed. The party was all over the map in terms of policy because of them, he said, pointing to resolutions ranging from employee ownership to pro-active policies. He said their task force were a recipe for disaster. And he was asked if he was going to keep raising money for the party. He said, quote: "No, I think I'm going to sell shares in free-standing abortion clinics."

Seeing as the Leader of the Opposition took a great amount of time in attacking the policies and programs of this government, it's only fair that we should go back and have a look at what their policies and resolutions are — a summary of their resolutions from their June 9th and 10th policy conference in Saskatoon.

Here's the summary: the NDP would raise taxes. They called for the reinstatement of the 20 per cent sliding tax on gasoline.

I wonder how many of the people of Saskatchewan agree with you. They called for an inheritance tax to be established. The NDP would expand the size of government. They would double the size of the legislature to two MLAs per constituency plus proportional representation. This could mean 128-plus MLAs in this institution. They'd bring about more government control.

This is what they said in their policy conference. The potash industry should be nationalized entirely, all the potash mines. Land bank should be re-established. Farm size would be restricted. Total nationalization of all resources, Mr. Deputy Speaker — oil, minerals, forests, etc. They would restrict retail development. The NDP would be into the counters of small business in Saskatchewan. They would ban advertising of agricultural chemicals.



They'd play havoc with the economy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They would reinstate pro-1982 oil royalty levels. They would create bigger Crown corporations. They would increase government involvement in the economy through nationalization. And, as I mentioned, they'd phase out the uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan, which they paid \$600 million for.

And in line with their Big Brother mentality, they'd raise the minimum wage to 6.50 per hour. Union representation and decision making in government and Crown corporation administrations. Good heavens — the union bosses running the Government of Saskatchewan! The NDP committed to safe legal abortions in all Saskatchewan hospitals, and that any reference to abortion should be removed from the Criminal Code of Canada.

And more NDP state intervention. They'd establish a royal commission to investigate whether there is an excess of retail space in Saskatchewan because they feel there is an over-development of shopping centres. The NDP wants to go into the car-rental business as part of STC, and also look into passenger trains. I thought I heard them say, a year or so ago, they were going . . . Well, that was in '82. They were going to buy the CPR.

The NDP wants to finance with public money, debates on the radio on environmental issues, and the winners would be chosen by a government board. The NDP will guarantee citizens the right to have plebiscites on any municipal issue they desire. This means local government by plebiscite. That's some of the off-the-wall policies of the NDP party of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Well in closing, we — the government is promoting building and job creation by people, not by Big Brother government. This province is on the way to being the best in the nation in terms of agricultural production and jobs, through industrial and business expansion, for its people. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to support the motion before this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MRS. CASWELL:** — It is indeed with great pleasure I rise to speak on the throne speech. I am reminded of Rudyard Kipling: "Captains and the kings depart and the tumult and the shouting dies, and now we must get down to work."

I have sometimes been accused of being somewhat negative, rather labouring on the sins of the NDP rather than the positive approach to our government. But indeed, I think the issue is: do we believe in people, or do we believe in an overwhelming government? And if we believe in the people, then it's not up for you to decide — to stand up and to say: "This is going to be our policy; that is going to be our policy."

But, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to concentrate on the now dead party, not because I believe the NDP is a viable political force, but because I am very concerned that when we are putting the nails in the coffin of the NDP, that we also don't forget to bury the ideology of the NDP. The people understand exactly what they rejected in 1982, and so that no party in Saskatchewan will support the kind of views, values, and oppressive government that this NDP government wants to support.

The throne speech was positive. The throne speech is going in the direction of more opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan. But let's go back and see what the NDP would be up to if they were here on government side. One time I mentioned the Regina Manifesto, the members in the corner said, "What has that got to do with us?" In the November 21, 1984, Commonwealth, are published as resolutions:

Be it resolved that the Saskatchewan New Democrats affirm support for the socialist solution proposed by the Regina Manifesto, and a call upon the party to adopt a statement which builds upon these basic ideals. Carried.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, the Regina Manifesto has been resurrected, has been affirmed, as the recipe for the NDP. Now when I try a recipe, and after a great long while it never produces anything good, I will look for another one. But the NDP are so totally bankrupt, they are going back to the doctrine, their socialism of the 1930s. We have often heard of the Regina Manifesto, but other than socialists, few people have read it. And so I would like to discuss today exactly what it is that these people have affirmed at their convention, that this is the alternative.

We aim to replace the present capital system with its inherent injustice and inhumanity by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated.

They aim, not to bolster capitalism in the Keynesian philosophy or the New Deal philosophy; they aim, not to add social policies to a capitalist or free enterprise market. They aim to replace the capitalist system. With what? With the so-called classless society of Russia? With the so-called classless society of Nicaragua and in other communist states?

(1600)

They have in 1984 said, "We will go back to our roots and talk once of more of getting rid of capitalism." Capitalism has brought in innovations, enterprise. It is not Medicare that saves people, but it is the doctors, the nurses. It is the many innovative drugs and machines that allowing people to think for themselves has produced. Yet who they are going to replace our present economic system, with what? Let's go on to find out.

What we seek is a proper, collective organization of our economic resources such as will make possible much greater degree of leisure and much richer individual life for every citizen.

Where has the collective mentality, taken in its entirety, ever given people individual freedom? Where does this recipe work? Nowhere, Mr. Speaker.

And those are some of the things, the point programs, of this Regina Manifesto that they have affirmed will once again guide their party. Socialization of all financial machinery — banking, currency, credit and insurance — to make possible the effective control of currency, credit and prices, and the supplying of new productive equipment for socially desirable purposes.

One has often wondered if the government isn't everything. The government here is here; the government is there. Now to think that the government would also control who will get a loan, who won't get a loan, would have access to information on your bank statements, how much have you got in your savings account, and so on.

There is much more to continue, and I won't go on to all of them, but there is one on 13, the last one which I think is extremely significant, and one that people have not noticed how effective it has permeated our society.

Number 13 in social justice of the Regina Manifesto — the establishment of a commission composed of psychiatrists, psychological, socially-minded jurists, and social workers to deal with all matters pertaining to crime and punishment, and the general administration of law in order to humanize the law and to bring it into harmony with the needs of the people.

So what they are saying in this one is that we will replace the present economic system which talks about right and wrong, what is the law and what is not the law, and that law is defined and written by duly elected members of parliament or the legislature. But we will instead get rid of these ideas of right and wrong, of accountability, and to be controlled by psychologists, social workers, to be controlled by what is often called the new class of people. You say, well, that is humane. That is good. But the therapeutic society has not created a therapeutically happy

society. It has created the society where crime is rampant, where we see people challenging the laws and never learning accountability. It goes on to say:

While the removal of economic inequality will do much to overcome the most glaring injustices in the treatment of those who come into conflict with the law, our present archaic system must be changed and brought into accordance with the modern concept of human relationships. This new system must not be based, as is the present one, upon vengeance and fear, but upon an understanding of human behaviour.

And so we are going to be controlled by the mind manipulators who apparently are supposed to understand. For this reason planning and control cannot be left in the hands of those steeped in the outworn legal tradition. In other words, they want to throw away our British tradition of innocence before guilty, of trial by jury, of all those safeguards that were built in by our British tradition, and to replace this with so-called therapeutic fiascos of those people who have had a degree in psychology or sociology.

And one wonders, well, so what? There is something to be said for that. I think that the problem with the socialists' solution is that they have never been able to understand that the solution can cause a great deal of evil and a great deal of hardships. They never have been able to understand that government and government agencies can cause a great deal of oppression and violation of human justice. I'm reading from the Report of the Ombudsman, 1981, under social services:

For some time I've been trying to draw peoples' attention to the inequities of The Family Services Act which treats parents qua parents as bad for their children and assumes that the social worker qua social worker is always right.

As one legal aid lawyer said, it gives the social worker infinite discretion over a family and the lives of children. It causes much hardship and, as has been recounted by the Alberta Report magazine, and many, many children have committed suicide because of the decisions of government agencies. This does not negate that some of those government agencies are working faithfully and honestly and do support the family. But once again, when you assume that a government agency should have infinite power over peoples' lives, you get injustices as described here.

A second and perhaps most important issue which was raised by this file related to apprehension of the complainant's children by the Department of Social Services. A review of the information available to the department confirmed that there were ample cause being concerned about the welfare of the complainant's children. Of course the only information available was in the file that the social workers compiled. At the same time, it also became apparent that the department's staff lost their objectivity about dealing with this family. In fact, it would seem that the department was trying to establish a situation whereby the children could be apprehended from the complainant rather than continuing their efforts to assist the family in becoming more responsible.

A particular example of this attitude is demonstrated in the remark of a child care worker, and I am quoting from this file that the Ombudsman put in this report:

Monitor carefully over the next months. The kids are open to abuse due to the high degree of stress we have created. Mr. Blank will quickly become paranoid through his feelings of being unjustly victimized which I hope legal aid and human rights won't reinforce.

What you have just heard is a social worker telling another social worker to monitor this family because we have driven the father crazy and we think now we can nail him. That is the kind of abuse that the recipe of number 13 in the Regina Manifesto has provided. And we think that

somebody with a psychology degree or sociology degree automatically knows more than parents, than the legal system — then we have just a touch of the injustices of this system.

It is appalling when I hear the NDP talked about as the party of the poor — as the party for the poor. Continually you get this stuff that if you're poor, then therefore you will be more open to crime; you'll be more open to child abuse and abusing your children; you'll be more open to all kinds of problems because the poor are not accountable. The poor, as well as being short of money, are also morally deficient, have also a great need to have their lives run by someone else, and apparently can never rise above their position of being poor. In fact, they become slaves to a system where the new class, the elite, will make a great deal of money running their lives, but it doesn't help them very much.

When the Minister of Social Services, in the House, was talking about the brief presented to him by Social Services, I read a portion of it, and it talked about how about an example they gave, which they claimed to be quite realistic, that a father would abuse a child because he couldn't afford to buy him a bicycle, and therefore the child would have to go into a foster home. And this example is almost a vicious hatred of the poor that they assume because people may not have all the amenities of life, that they are also incapable of looking after their children.

And I suppose this is most evident when we see the NDP's resolutions about day care. They want day care included in the human rights code as an ultimate right. Only the NDP can call tyranny right. And they go on and on to talk about what type of day care, and who will run it, and who will finance it, and how it will be used, but no dissenting voice that maybe there are some people who might object to the huge tax bill this would cause that would force more women to go out to work, whether or not they wanted to. It's not a pro-choice position on day care; it's a pro-compulsory decision, because all of us would have to pay for that day care, and women would be forced to go out to work and put their children in the day care because the taxes would be so high they couldn't possibly exist without it.

And so these are the kind of . . . this mentality the socialists have of government, right or wrong, is always right, that as long as we have government to run everything, it will be good and virtuous, and just throw money at a problem, throw bureaucracy at a problem, create a new department, and everything will be fine. But it flies in the face of any respect for the family or traditional institutions including, of course, the market-place.

Another interesting thing, when they were talking about the human rights code, they were going to . . . there were resolutions that said that we should have the human rights code amended so there would be no discrimination on the basis of a criminal record and no discrimination based on sexual orientation. Now I certainly would support that someone who has been afoul of the law, that they have a right to have a future, and if they sincerely want to make a living and make a go of it, that they should have that right. But that your honesty, your integrity, has nothing to do with the job and that people can inquire whether or not you have been a convicted criminal for many serious crimes, is an economic absurdity and social injustice to the employers and employees.

It is interesting that they're resurrecting this idea of the sexual orientation in the human rights code. I remember, when the NDP government were in and they were going to put this in the human rights code, there was a great outcry in Saskatchewan. My husband and I wrote the former premier of the province. He wrote a letter back, which I have in my files at home, in which he says: well, it is unlikely, because due to the outcry it is unlikely we will be amending the human rights code, that it will include sexual orientation.

(1615)

One wonders why government, when in power with a huge majority, with a very effective majority in the '70s, knew it was political suicide to talk about sexual orientation and the human

rights code, now presumably trying to become the government again, puts this in its resolutions. And we have . . . it is not the fanatic cries of a few so-called fundamentalists that are saying this is wrong. We have the Washington Post, the New York Times, telling stories of sexual abuse in day care, because in New York there is a . . . you can't discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation. This isn't the wild so-called — and I would certainly not call this magazine wild — this isn't a small fundamentalist group who is objecting to sexual orientation as a basis of no discrimination. This is the Washington Post, and some very left liberal papers, where they're telling the truth about day cares in New York, when people can't discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

And so this is the kind of nonsense the NDP have. They have no discrimination. And they say, well, that's good, we don't discriminate. But discrimination is a good word when it means common sense, when it means that there may be really rights and wrongs, when it may mean that there really is something to be said for protecting victims, employers, employees, students, children in the centres, as well as the absolutist rights of a few.

There is very little to be said about rights for families, rights and responsibilities. But, continually, their human rights codes is the human rights for a few to be selfish and to impose their lifestyle on the rest of us. And human rights without balancing it, the responsibility, becomes a form of tyranny. Continually it is emphasized in the absolutist doctrinaire philosophy of these resolutions.

Another area I would like to discuss is . . . the member for Regina Elphinstone mentioned. He talked about peace, and indeed all of us want peace, just as all of us want jobs. At least I hope the NDP want jobs. Sometimes I think they would love everybody to be unemployed because, hopefully, the gloom-and-doom party would then, you know, they would be part of the gloom-and-doom party. But all of us want jobs, and all of us want peace.

But just what is the NDP's solution for peace? It's part of the surrender lobby. The resolutions continually were so far on the point of stop uranium mines, never mind it means work. Outlaw children's toys and guns. We can't even, you know, let children play cowboys and Indians anymore, or cops and robbers, but we must continually control the people and to have . . . we'll have peace studies in our schools which have been documented in the States as nothing but, you know, sort of a socialist hysteria imposed on children which they're having nightmares.

And so the NDP have become the official party of the surrender lobby. Why call it the surrender lobby? It's because continually when we talk about nuclear disarmament or unilateral disarmament, what that just means is a bully such as Russia can then invade us. When you have an aggressive imperialist nation such as Russia, the only alternative is to have a . . . is to be strong enough that they know that you can resist it. The reason why the Russians are in Afghanistan and not in America is because the Afghanistans were inadequately armed and the Americans are not, hopefully.

But continually there is this . . . over and over again we hear the party of the unilateral disarmament. They are the Canadian Mondale-Ferraro crowd, and we know what the American people thought of that — not because the American people want war, but because the American people want peace and they have common sense enough that the way to avoid, the way to avoid war is that you aren't . . . you defend yourself. You don't attack, but you let people know that you defend yourself.

There are many NDPers who have, for good cause, had it with their party, and possibly maybe one of the more famous is Joe Borowski. And I would like to read a little bit of what he says about the NDP's position as part of the surrender lobby:

Another reason that the NDP will eventually end up on the scrap heap of history is their one-sided criticism and occasional slander of our best friend and neighbour, the United States. If one were to take seriously the anti-U.S. propaganda that flows from the NDP, one would come to believe that they are the bad guys on the world stage

and the Communists are either the good guys or simply responding to military threats from the big bully, the USA. One would think it was Roosevelt and not Stalin who built the bootleg . . . (inaudible) . . . concentration camps in Siberia, where 30 billion people were beaten, worked, and starved to death since the 1917 revolution; Kennedy and not Khrushchev who led half the population of the Ukraine to starve to death; Carter and not Brezhnev who invaded small and defenceless Afghanistan; Reagan and not Andropov who casually shot down an unarmed Korean civilian airliner and sent 269 passengers to a watery grave. As a matter of fact, that last one was a very rare occasion where . . . (inaudible) . . . publicly criticized the Russians for anything. Today the Communist death flag flies over 27 countries. The Russians are the world's chief exporters of revolutions, terrorism, and weapons. By brute force and terror they're cramming their Communist paradises down the throats of more people and more nations than have been subdued by any other conqueror in recorded history.

So what are we to do about this correctly called evil empire? We are to surrender. We are to say let's get out of the uranium mine because a very small portion of that may be used for nuclear energy. It may also be used for cancer research and cancer treatment. But let's get out of anything that's . . . (inaudible) . . . Let's clean Eaton's of the cowboy guns for Christmas.

Are they concerned about economic freedom? I really, you know, when I see the kind of things that they are saying, are they concerned about economic freedom, or are they concerned about a world run by bureaucratic elite that's a little more equal than others?

It is, I think, very important that we realize how much damage obsessive government can do even to the point, I might add, that it's become so fashionable to knock government that in the resolutions in human rights it starts talking about government as a servant, not the master. But then it goes on and the whole resolutions are full of how government will solve everything, and control everybody, and regulate everything. But it even says in this paper that government should be the servant, not the master. One really wonders how one gets a servant when one strips the family of any control and responsibility, strips the churches, strips all these other — the market-place of any responsibility; how you can have anything as a government as a master. And a very dangerous master as you will read in the ombudsman reports. And I often think these ombudsman reports, it just scratches the surface of the number of people who've been tyrannized, bullied, dehumanized, their families wrecked by government agencies trying to "do good."

The NDP has been called the party of human rights. They are proud of their human rights record. They want to support human rights. And yet I think of, when I read resolutions like this and, once again, it's the poor . . .

Whereas poor and young women presently suffer the burden of unwanted pregnancies and freedom of choice means that every woman chooses under her own conscience and conditions whether to continue a pregnancy, be it resolved that the NDP lobby to remove abortion from the Criminal Code and set up decentralized, publicly owned, safe therapeutic abortion centres so that every child in Saskatchewan will be a wanted child.

There's no mention of the brutalization, of the medical horror that abortion has created, of the psychological trauma that abortion has created. But it's something that the women and the poor want, and the NDP always know what the poor want.

It's very interesting that in, statistically, when you see polls concerning the abortion debate, the one group that is most opposed to abortion are those people in the low-income area, and women. But consistently the NDP are going to shove abortion at us for the women and the poor because, of course, the elitists always know what's best.

Of course, I think, we must emphasize how abortion exploits women. And, as a woman, I will continue to emphasize that often they are pushed into it. Often they are caused a great deal of harm after the abortion and the many of them are sterilized for life. Many of them, their marriage falls apart afterwards. And many of them can't continue their education or their job because they're psychologically traumatized.

But one thing let's not forget: that abortion kills a human being and his basic right of life has been denied. But the NDP, the party of the rights to life, who wants the most esoteric rights on everything possible from an ultimate right to day care, does not want to have the right to life on the basic issues.

And do you think perhaps the NDP is a little more sane in other provinces? At the same time when people were aghast that Morgentaler was acquitted, and they came to realize that for \$100,000 of American computerized information they hand-picked a very select jury that excluded anyone of any religious denomination, of any religious convictions, and excluded housewives and women with more than two children. They excluded the very young women and the very old women. They knew exactly, from the computer operation, exactly who to exclude on the jury. And the defence lawyers, not realizing what game was up, let them do it.

But on this basis of a very hand-picked, very manipulated jury, Morgentaler was acquitted when he admitted over and over again he broke the law. What did the NDP do? Rather than lobby, as many of us are doing, for an appeal to that decision, the NDP sent congratulations. Svend Robinson made it out as if it was the best day in his life. And the Alberta NDP, as a convention, sent congratulations to Morgentaler. It is interesting . . . Morgentaler, as far as I know, is the only free enterpriser in the country that the NDP support.

So they have little to say for those conscientious people in the mining industry. They have very little to say for those conscientious people who might be raising a few children or helping to raise maybe a few children, having a little day care in the home. They have nothing to say for people who want to run their own show and run their own business and not have government run everything. There is nothing to say for those. But do they support murder incorporated brought to us by Morgentaler? Hands down.

And so I think we have to realize the NDP human rights record is corrupt, it is selective, or else it is so absurd that we would end into another kind of tyranny. If there is any people in this province who are defending human rights today, it is not the NDP. It is some of the pulpits of the churches today. It is the small and large groups of pro-lifers and other groups and individuals on other issues, not just the pro-life issue who are doing it.

But the NDP are not the champion of human rights. They are the champion of might makes right, of degree over a parent. They're a champion of big government, no matter how oppressive. They are the champion of bureaucratic fiat and possibly destroying lives and families. They are the party, not of human rights, but the party of what we might call the new class, the new elite, who wants to control the rest of us. And as someone who is not always a woman who, as I've said before, has not always had a great deal of money in my life, whether when I was a child or otherwise, I am particularly appalled at their continual contempt for the poor, that the poor above all else need the strangling force of government.

It is interesting, and I've mentioned this before, that in my constituency office I have more concerns about people coming to me and trying to get me to help them to get government off their back than I have people coming to tell me all the wonderful ways they want the NDP to run their family and control their family and decide when their children will no longer be their children.

It is not that people are crying for more government involvement. They're crying for economic

freedom so they can run their own life and support the institutions, causes that they want themselves.

Let's finish where we started. No CCF government — and now it's no longer the CCF government; it's the NDP government — no NDP government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation the full program of socialized planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of the co-operative commonwealth.

Is there a group of individuals who can control agriculture such as the socialist Liberal's huge corporation they dreamed up? Is there someone who can control agriculture better than the farmers of Saskatchewan? Is there someone who can run the businesses of Saskatchewan better than the businesses of Saskatchewan? Excuse me for . . . (inaudible) . . . Do we really have such little confidence in the people of Saskatchewan? Do we want an elite to control them, such as would be in the Regina Manifesto?

We've had since 1932 to show that socialism leads to tyranny. We have the history of the Ukraine now. We have Solzhenitsyn books. We have the wrecked economy of Russia, that they haven't had a good crop since 1917. They're the first . . . Every year they say the crop was destroyed by, you know, poor harvest because of weather conditions. It's amazing, a country that should be the bread basket of the world, that could compete with ours in agriculture input and then some, continually can't feed its own members. It's a country that has 10 per cent of the population employed spying on the other 90 per cent, and people live in terror and fear.

(1630)

But still we have a party in Saskatchewan who is still so bankrupt that they're going back to the old socialist Fabian rhetoric that's hand in glove with the second and third International, and fourth International, in some cases, of the communist countries.

We're not talking any more about reform. We're not talking any more about the Keynesian hope of propping up the economy with social programs. They were talking about eradicating capitalism and replacing it with a new social order. Continually, to use these two new social orders; is that what the people of Saskatchewan want? Or do the people of Saskatchewan want to run their own lives, to raise their own children, to educate them as they see fit according to their religious beliefs? Do the people of Saskatchewan want a business that the only person in business on the block is the government? No, they don't. And they voted for that in 1982, and I'm sure they will continue to vote for themselves. Because when you vote against a party, a big government, you vote for yourselves. You say I have confidence that we can solve our own problems. And that's compassion. This garbage isn't compassion. This is tyranny, and it's time that we took the word "compassion" from the socialists and cleaned it up and used it where it was meant to be.

People said, "Don't forget to talk about job creation." And you know, I have talked about job creation, because this kind of stuff won't create jobs, except for the hands of a bureaucratic few. It will create misery. It will create high taxes. It will create, eventually, a paralysed economy because the government has only one source of money, and that's the private sector. The government rarely creates wealth, and if it does, it's because it has taken over a business run by the private sector.

And so what it will mean: this is the type of job creation. It will be the most expensive type. Job creation, when government does it totally, with no thought the private sector can help themselves, creates tyranny and creates an economy that has done what Saskatchewan has done, that has driven away the free enterpriser, the aggressive, the young, out of the province. And fortunately, with this PC government, we're seeing the trickle form into a stream coming back into Saskatchewan.



I think there's very little possibility that the NDP will ever be a viable . . . will ever form government again in this province, but I think it's extremely important that not only with the NDP that the people learn that we must bury the ideology of the NDP and understand exactly what the alternative is and vote for themselves, vote for their understanding, vote for their decision making, vote for their freedom, and vote for their families, and vote for their standards.

And so because I support the people of Saskatchewan, in particular, the initiative, courage, and good sense of the people of Westmount, I support the throne speech of a government that says, "I believe in people, and I don't believe it indeed has to control you," and we will not march to the tune of the out-of-date socialism of the 1932, but we will march to the tune that says people can control themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GLAUSER:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first of all want to congratulate my colleagues, the member from Touchwood, Last Mountain-Touchwood, and the member from Riversdale. I also want to congratulate the member from Riversdale. Her seat is now confirmed in this House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GLAUSER:** — Once again it is an honour and a privilege for me to rise in my seat, representing the constituency of Mayfair, to speak in this debate.

The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon spoke about walking the streets of Regina, talking to businessmen. He puts up the proposition that, should they be asked how they are doing, he thinks — he thinks — the majority would say, "Not as well as we were three or four years ago."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know about the city of Regina, but I do know about the city of Saskatoon. During the past summer I visited approximately 100 businesses in my constituency. The purpose of my visit was to distribute cheques under the business program of 1983. Very good program.

Anyway, I made that visit primarily to ask these people, talk to these people, ask them how they were doing. The answer I received from those people were that business is good, profits have been somewhat affected by the stiff competition, but all in all they were very happy, and under no circumstances did they ever want to see the NDP back in the province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GLAUSER:** — The member from Regina Elphinstone also talked today about profits. Profits is such a dirty word, these corporation profits. I want to pose a question to the members over there. Where do they think jobs come from? There is a close relationship between profits and jobs, and they don't understand that.

During this debate, and as we have heard on numerous occasions in the past, such negative statements from the opposition that I sometimes wonder what kind of a vacuum they operate in. I talk to the folks in my constituency, as I said, the businessman, the farmer, the professional, the tradesman, and they say, yes, we've been through tough times, but we are not suffering. We have dug in our heels, and we will make it. In spite of what the Leader of the Opposition says, there are confident people out there, and it is through their perseverance and the reduction in the bureaucracy of this government that this province is moving ahead and will continue to do so in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone through two and a half years of expansion, an expansion that has

taken place in terms of rapid growth in population, unprecedented growth in the labour force and numerous new jobs created in the private sector. This growth has not been accidental. Mr. Speaker, it has happened as a direct result of a confident private sector investing in the province's tomorrow.

The facts are there, Mr. Speaker. The NDP cannot deny that. The capital spending of Saskatchewan rose by 10.3 per cent in 1983, and the Conference Board of Canada expects that in 1984 there will be a further increase in capital investment, and this at a time when it has declined all across Canada.

When our Premier made the statement, more than a year ago, that Canada is in a depression and we do not want to participate, has held up. The economy continues to strengthen. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what would the corollary of this have been if two and a half years ago what happened didn't happen, and they had won the election?

Well, let me just talk a little bit about some of those items. Government would have been bigger and even a larger bureaucracy. An NDP government would have built, for the government, more vacant space would be than what is already available, for the sake of make-work projects, a temporary solution to unemployment problems; increase the gas tax to prop up further a once mismanaged SGI; shut down uranium mining for which they provided a 600 million investment placing another 10,000 people on the welfare rolls; continue the moratorium of 1976 on nursing homes; seniors sadly neglected and hospital waiting lists on the ever increase because of long-stay patients that they accumulated over those years.

Nationalized insurance business. More big government. Oil patch development at a standstill. 2,500 jobs lost. There would be the headlines. Upgraders agreement could not be achieved. Oil companies could not trust the NDP. Thousands of jobs lost in that case. More farm land purchased. Continue to encourage more militant labour. More power to union leaders in government. Government by the people for the people denied. Rural families denied natural gas services. And to finance their ever-growing government, higher taxes at all levels.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, it is not in front of you that blocks your way, it's what's inside of you that holds you back. Socialism in the province of Saskatchewan was the block. The social conditioning from an early age, the suppression of individuality, promoted a structure of power and privilege.

The citizens of this province are through with intervention in their lives. They do not have the stomach for it any longer. They no longer endorse the mentality of the NDP which is bankrupt of ideas and is out of touch with reality. Their theories have no room for market forces, entrepreneurship or individual initiative. It is clear that there's more widespread disillusionment with socialism in 1984 than that there ever was any time since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, this government inherited burdens of long interventionism, plagued with a legacy of high taxation, high public expenditure, and a sizeable public debt, albeit hidden as it was, claiming balanced budgets, and at the same time running up deficits in the Crowns. And I give you the example of 1.2 billion in the power corporation. And that's how they hid their deficits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in spite of what they inherited, along with not only a national but also an international recession, the leader of this party, our Premier, said we will not participate in a recession and we are open for business. And these were not mere slogans, Mr. Speaker. This was pointed out by one Nancy Russell, who happens to be the business editor for the Star-Phoenix. And we recently said:

This open for business policy is no joke and there is growing evidence it is working.

And why is it working, Mr. Speaker? The promotion of diversification, incentives, oil and gas

drilling, venture capital tax credit, tax breaks for manufacturing and processing sector, business employment program of '83, as I referred to earlier — all of these things have had a significant impact on what has happened to the direction of this economy in the past two and a half years. Exploring of off shore markets: example, the Australia show. You'd better listen to this, eh? Nine out of 14 Canadian firms in Australia were from Saskatchewan, and this is due to the efforts of our Deputy Premier, who, at times, you have criticized in this House for his traipsing around the world. Very effective moves.

We have seen why it's working — open for business. Let us examine the results. Saskatchewan continues to have the lowest level of unemployment in all of Canada. Business failures decreased and are below the Canadian average. Business incorporations up 8.4 per cent between January and December of 1983, over one year earlier, and 1984 will show a further increase. Inflation has continued to trend downward, and I might add to that that Saskatoon still has the lowest inflationary rate.

(1645)

The member opposite wanted to know about housing. Well, I'll tell you about housing: record home construction. Build-A-Home program put \$18 million into the economy and generated 5,395 man-years of employment. That's what the housing industry did. People were coming home because of opportunities.

Well, I've covered the state of the economy to some extent. That is not to say social programs have been not received much attention as well. Contrary to what the NDP says about day care, the fact is that the PC government developed 75 new day care centres in family homes and about 100 new spaces in day care centres, not to mention the expanded review of day care by my colleague from Saskatoon Riversdale.

Contrary to what the NDP says about cuts in funding for seniors, the facts are social services established a seniors' bureau and also sponsored a seniors' forum in Saskatoon.

Sask Housing — that corporation established a senior citizens' task force to study the needs of seniors. This is a case of talking to the people, finding out what the people wanted, and not developing programs that you think they want, which is the socialist way of performing for people.

Seniors — Saskatchewan income plan payments for single seniors have been doubled to \$50 per month, while payment to couples have increased from \$45 to \$75 a month.

Health care — I won't go into this extensively. I'm sure our very good minister of health care will inform you very well of everything in that area, but I'd just like to say that funding in this area represents \$1,000 for every man, woman, and child in the province, the highest per-person figure in the history of Saskatchewan.

And special care homes — no one should ever forget the NDP's moratorium of 1976 on the building of special care facilities — a two-year commitment of \$11 million by this government, compared to the previous government, 7.25 million expenditure over 11 years. What a shame that was. What a shame.

As I said earlier, the NDP are out of touch with reality, and they are dealing in falsehoods. The throne speech, Mr. Speaker, deals with all the areas I have referred to, and clearly enunciates the direction of this government in economic development, job creation, farm protection, and social advancement.

The Leader of the Liberal Party for Saskatchewan commented with reference to the throne speech, and he said — it's too bad our one lowly member isn't sitting in here to hear this — he

said, the leader of that party said, "It gave me a stiff neck." Well, perhaps all members will agree with me, he may have had that before any reading of the throne speech.

The Leader of the Official Opposition described the throne speech as platitudes. Well, Mr. Speaker, the member from Regina Elphinstone has described previous throne speeches in a similar way. He very well knows, however, that those mere words have translated into policy and programs — policy and programs that have been most effective, most popular, and have carried the province through difficult times.

This latest one will be no exception, and the ministers whose departments are responsible for bringing the measures forward are to be congratulated. I have every confidence, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice will accomplish the task that has been set out before him, and even more jobs will be created in the future to meet the needs of the ever-growing economy in this province.

I know there are other people in this Assembly that would like to get involved in this debate, so I think I will confine my remarks to that, and certainly I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to enter into the throne speech debate today, and I do so with a great deal of concern for the opposition, Mr. Speaker. And that concern, Mr. Speaker, is their attitude, their attitude to not only this Chamber, but the attitude to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we just noticed this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition stand up and bring forward some policy of the NDP . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And as the Minister of Justice has just stated, they don't have any. And, Mr. Speaker, that's true. It's very true.

Mr. Speaker, what we heard from the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon is the same tired old story, the same thing. For two and a half years, Mr. Speaker, we have heard nothing but doom and gloom. There hasn't been one thing, Mr. Speaker, that has come forward from the Opposition in this Legislative Assembly in the last two and a half years, that has been positive. What that tells me, Mr. Speaker, is that they not only have any faith in the Legislative Assembly, they don't have any faith in the people of Saskatchewan, and, Mr. Speaker, that is shameful, very shameful. They cannot even represent their own constituents, Mr. Speaker.

You know, we hear cuts. We hear freezes. Mr. Speaker, the only cuts, the only freezes are in the minds of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker. That's where it sits, right there.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — Mr. Speaker, their answer to the farm problem today, the NDP's solution: — we have to go back to when they were government, go back to when they were government, Mr. Speaker. Their answer to deal with the farming problems: — we'll set up a land bank. They didn't call it the true name, and I remember we sat in opposition. We condemned it. It was nothing more than state farming under a socialist government, Mr. Speaker, unless the people of Saskatchewan forget. But they haven't, Mr. Speaker, they haven't.

The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon said, we're going to see a drop in land prices. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's just put it down to: why did land prices increase? Let's just figure out why did they go up? You know, under the land bank program, Mr. Speaker, set up by the socialist doctrine that is sitting in opposition now and will for many, many more years to come, their solution was to go in and outbid other young farmers, using their own tax dollar — using their own tax dollar to compete against the young farmers that wanted to get established in the province of Saskatchewan. They wanted to take over. They did so many other things, take over the farm

land in the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, that's why they're opposed, that's why they're opposed to our farm purchase program where we have put 3,500 young people back on the farms owning their own land. That's the direction the people of Saskatchewan wanted this government to go.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. GARNER:** — You know, talk about having equity and talk about borrowing money. The young farmer is in trouble. Mr. Speaker, I don't know of a lending institute in the country that you can go to when you don't own your land, that you're just renting land, you're going to go in and borrow a lot of money. That's the way the NDP brought about starting to suppress agriculture. Putting agriculture into the problem it is today. It isn't the problem of this government, Mr. Speaker, it goes back to the NDP. That's where the problem goes back to.

Mr. Speaker, and I can give you examples, and maybe for the members opposite we had better just touch on it. A couple of young cattle farmers in my area wanted to buy some farm land. The land was for sale by Marathon Realty. Put up for sale. Put up by tender. The young cattlemen put a tender in on it. So did the Government of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, fact, not NDP fantasy, Mr. Speaker, fact. The Government of Saskatchewan outbid those young cattlemen, took the land over, and then had the nerve to come back to them and say, would you like to rent some land? Fact and shame. That has happened, Mr. Speaker. Those two young gentlemen are no longer in the cattle business. No longer farming. Not because of a Progressive Conservative government, but because of an NDP government that was in power before.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen, we will call the leader, or a member opposite, we have to call him, I guess the urban cowboy. This afternoon he stood in the Assembly and said, when are we going to have a payment under The Western Grain Stabilization Act? I'm a farmer. So is the Premier. So are many members on this side, and there should be some on the other side. They say they're farmers. There was a payment came out here within the last two weeks, but once again we have the members opposite are so locked in to doom and gloom, they don't know what is happening in the farming sector today. They haven't got a clue, Mr. Speaker.

You know, and we have many other things. They started condemning, Mr. Speaker, the highway system in the province of Saskatchewan. But the Leader of the Opposition said he didn't want to get into it. It's very simple why he didn't want to get into it, Mr. Speaker, because the record's pretty good. In fact, the record right now puts us, in the Dominion of Canada, at number one. Not fantasy., Not fantasy, Mr. Speaker, fact.

An independent consulting organization hired by the construction association, not by governments, known as the Road Information Program of Canada, went around, has done all of the provinces in the Dominion of Canada. And the report card, Mr. Speaker, is in. And I'm going to share just a few of those figures with you and for members opposite this afternoon. Once again, this wasn't done by the Government of Saskatchewan, wasn't done by any individual construction company — done by a group of independent consultants. And the report card, Mr. Speaker, is very impressive.

But I see that it's nearing 5 o'clock. We'll maybe have to share that with the members after supper. So I would beg to call it 5 o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.

**Editor's Note:** — Time breaks, based on the 24-hour clock, are inserted in Hansard every 15 minutes after Question Period at the first sitting of the day, and also after the beginning of subsequent daily sittings.

It is hoped that members and the public will find this innovation useful.