

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 7, 1984

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS AND QUESTIONS

HON. MR. MCLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I shall, on Tuesday, move first reading of a Bill, an Act to amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. ANDREW: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to the Assembly a group of students from Eston High School. Eston High School, of course, has distinguished itself with an excellent band program, and an excellent band throughout the years.

Accompanying the students are their teacher, Sandra Mooney and Carl Hanson, along with Ray and Linda Burke, who are also well known to me in another field.

The Eston High School is . . . A couple of the members of this side of the House — the Minister of co—ops, Co—operative Development, Mr. Sandberg; Minister of Social Services, Mr. Dirks — were former teachers of that school. And as well, it's the high school from which I graduated.

I would like to welcome them to the Assembly, to the city of Regina. And it's encouraging . . . I think it's perhaps the first year, while the Assembly has been on, that a group from that high school has been able to attend, and I would like all members to welcome my friends from Eston.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to also introduce some guests today. It's with pride that I would like to introduce these people. They are Les Parker from Saskatoon, who's in the Speaker's gallery, who has 34 years in the fire service; Hugh Ryan from Yorkton with 28 years in the fire service; Guy Archambault with 28 years in the fire service; John MacMillan from Broadview with 20 years in the fire service; and Ken Deans from the Professional Fire Fighters Association with 14 years of service.

These people make up the recommended committee from the fire committee report to advise on curriculum for a fire—fighters of Saskatchewan. Today they intend to finish the first three levels of fire—fighter training for Saskatchewan, following our report. And I welcome them today, and thank you for offering their services.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — I would like to join the member for Rosthern in welcoming these gentlemen here today. I've had the pleasure of working with them on the committee, and some of them have become very good friends. Welcome here. I hope you enjoy the question period, and good luck as you put the curriculum together. It will be a pleasure to see the new fire college in operation.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Each year at about this time it's my pleasure to introduce to the Assembly adults from the Independent Living Skills Program with the Regina Community College, and this year is no exception.

There is in the east gallery 10 such students accompanied by teacher Betty Nyhus. It will be my pleasure to meet with the students after the question period for pictures and for discussion downstairs, and I look forward to seeing you.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Action on Unemployment

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to . . . I was going to say to the Premier, but to the minister in charge of the job agency, in the absence of the Premier, and it deals with this morning's startling news about the unemployment figures. The latest report from StatsCanada shows that last month there were 40,000 Saskatchewan people unemployed. That's 6,000 more than a month ago, 7,000 more than November of last year. Saskatchewan no longer has the lowest unemployment rate in Canada; Manitoba does. Our seasonally adjusted unemployment rate last month jumped from 7.4 per cent a year ago to 8.7 per cent this year. My question to the minister is this: can you tell me what specific action you have been instructed to take, or you have decided to take, to turn around this very unfortunate situation?

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, the Leader of the Opposition, and if the Liberal member can give me a chance to reply, we share the general disappointment, but not unexpected, and not unexpected because an analysis of the unemployment in the province shows that there were approximately 6,000 of those in the agricultural sector. No one should be surprised at that, given the farm drought situation and the natural caution that is in the agricultural service sector.

Secondly, with regard to a further 3,000 was in the construction industry. Preliminary indications are that the severe weather situation and the downturn in house building has resulted — the severe weather conditions shut down sites in October in some cases, and secondly, the downturn in house construction would indicate that the bulk of the increase in unemployment came in those two sectors.

Offsetting that is a very significant positive factor, and that is in the service sector generally. Year to year there's been an increase of 11,000, and October to November an increase of 3,000. With regard to the matter of residential house construction, in my view it would be too soon to take initiatives, and one should not assume that this government is not prepared to take appropriate measures.

The interest rates are dropping. The latest figure at the prime rate of 11.75 per cent would indicate a further drop in interest rates. That, of itself, will cause people to make decisions to either buy or build a new home. So that particular aspect we are monitoring closely. I think the record of the government, of action in that area at an appropriate time, is one that the people of Saskatchewan can count on.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Over the past year Saskatchewan has had the second worst job creation record in Canada. Only PEI has been creating new jobs at a slower rate than Saskatchewan. The minister indicates that it's not time yet for initiatives. Do we have to wait until we have the worst job creation record in Canada before your government decides to take some action to put people back to work?

HON. MR. LANE: — I believe that the government's record of initiatives is second to none, and the Leader of the Opposition is perhaps being somewhat unfair in this record that initiatives are not being taken. We indicate, and I know the business community of Regina is becoming very much aware of the positive benefits of a heavy oil upgrader which will start in 1985, and the impact that that will have.

Only a certain small minority believe that a \$600 million project is put together overnight, and those initiatives take time and have started . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, that's not.

But having said that to the Leader of the Opposition, I would be surprised if anyone other than the NDP blames the provincial government for the drought and the spin—off effect of the drought. And secondly, I freely recognize that initiatives may be needed in residential home construction. Whether one does it when interest rates are still falling, or when they stabilize, whether we determine the effect of that factor, I think it's an appropriate time to act when that situation is stabilized.

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, in September your cabinet held a think—tank and announced that jobs were your number one priority, and at that time you had before you the unemployment figures for August showing that 464,000 people were employed. You now have the unemployment figures before you showing that 437,000 employed — 27,000 jobs lost since you announced jobs as your number one priority. Do you think that's even an acceptable performance for any provincial government in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — As I've indicated to the hon. member, we can take and do some window—dressing and some short—term projects that may be a stop to the hon. member, but, in fact, if we take a serious look at the sectors of the economy where the unemployment has gone up, and I have indicated to them earlier that approximately . . . unemployment has gone up 6,000 in agriculture, and I think the public of Saskatchewan sees why.

With regard to the construction industry, I've indicated that our preliminary information is that that deals with two factors: one, that the severe cold weather in October shutting down sites; secondly, the downturn in residential home construction. We freely recognize that the downturn in residential home construction is a problem.

The question is: when do we act? If we act in advance of further drop in interest rates, people will not take advantage of it, waiting for lower interest rates. I believe, and I think it's good management to say that, in fact, when interest rates have stabilized, we can then assess the problem. The government has acted before, and the government will be prepared to act again.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question to the Premier. The question, Mr. Premier, is: when is that government going to cease making excuses — inane excuses — and when are you going to deal with the reality? The reality of the situation is that we have the ninth worst job creation record in Canada; we have the sixth slowest growing labour force. It is December 7th and you have no winter works program, as is painfully apparent from that answer we just got from your minister of unemployment.

Mr. Premier, the question is: when are you going to deal with the reality of Saskatchewan today?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, obviously we are aware of, and concerned about, any increase in unemployment. The kinds of things that are extremely important in the province of Saskatchewan, as well as across the country, are to stimulate economic activity, provide that confidence so investors will build here, so that we can have long—run jobs maintained, sustained in our economy.

That's exactly why we are doing the kinds of things that you see in tourism, in energy, in upgraders, in mining, and so forth. We want to be able to provide the basis for economic activity here that can sustain us from one period to the next.

Second, let me point out to the hon. members, one month ago, one month ago, this is what happened. The number of people employed in the province of Saskatchewan increased by 11,000. One month ago, the increase in the number employed increased by 11,000. Unemployment dropped by 4,000 in the province of Saskatchewan. We led the nation in the

decline in unemployment. It was a record for Canada in the drop in unemployment, and we did much better than that. I think it was a record since 1944, 1945. It was for 30 or 40 years. One month ago. Today, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at an increase. We had employment go up by 11,000 a month ago, from 446,000 to 447,000, one month ago, and we're down by 10 this month, obviously because of weather, obviously because of agriculture. So when we're looking at long—run sustained economic activity, we have to go back and look at energy, and at tourism, at the service sector, and many other things that we find as our strengths here in the province. You can find that it will go up by 11,000 one month and go down by 10,000 the next month. The key is long—run training and investment in the province of Saskatchewan, so that we can continue to see the employment growth, the labour force growth, and the number of people employed in the province of Saskatchewan continuing to increase.

MR. SHILLINGTON: — New question, Mr. Minister . . . Mr. Premier, I'm sorry. Mr. Premier, you have the ninth slowest job creation record in Canada. Only Prince Edward Island, without any of the advantages in resources Saskatchewan enjoys, is doing worse. Is that a satisfactory record of performance?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member always knows that it's relative. You can take, as I have described in here many times in the legislature, you can take Newfoundland with 24 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . bear me out — 24 per cent or 40 per cent unemployment, and if it improves a little bit in terms of percentage, it could be a very large percentage. When you're virtually at full employment, except for unskilled, and you're down there where you're looking at the heads of households being virtually full employment, it's much more significant to provide some increases at the 7 per cent level, or the 8 per cent level, than it is at the 40 to 50 per cent level. The hon. member knows that. He knows that if you look at a percentage increase in P.E.I. or New Brunswick, or Newfoundland, and if you go from 40 per cent down to 39 per cent, you may have a tremendous percentage improvement.

I would venture to say there isn't any jurisdiction in this country that wouldn't want to trade places with the province of Saskatchewan because of the opportunities in oil, because of the opportunities in growth, plus the unemployment level. And I'll go back and look at . . . Mr. Speaker, I'll look at '82, '83, and '84.

In 1982 we were the only jurisdiction in the country to create new jobs — 192, the only one. In 1983, Mr. Speaker, we were the only place in Canada to have more people working in that year than there was in 1981. In 1984, Mr. Speaker, what have we done? We've announced two brand new, very large job creation projects in our province. One is an upgrader in the city of Regina; the second is an upgrader in Lloydminster. The Lloydminster project is the single largest job creation package in our entire history. That's long—run; that's jobs; that's building on our strength.

Employment Initiatives in Northern Saskatchewan

MR. THOMPSON: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the minister in charge of the new employment agency. And I want first of all, by way of information, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that with the serious problem that we have in northern Saskatchewan, with some communities running with unemployment as high as 95 per cent, could you indicate to the House if you have any special plans to tackle that region of the province; and if so, when could we expect that?

HON. MR. LANE: — We expect to announce some initiatives in the next week or so, to the hon. member. We will address, at least in some slight way, northern Saskatchewan in the initiatives. Our view is that the problems in northern Saskatchewan are, as the member said, extremely serious. Having said that, there's not much of an indication that massive government expenditure, subsidies, bureaucracy, have solved that long—term problem. That is a long—term problem that won't be solved this winter, next winter, or probably over the next 10 to 15 years.

Certainly an effort has been made, and I think in fairness to the previous administration, to them and to those involved in looking at opportunities — wild rice . . . I know the hon. member was critical yesterday of the wild rice initiatives in northern Saskatchewan that our government has taken. We think it is the way to go. We think that the potential for tourism and changes in those areas are the ways to go. But those are long—term changes, and those initiatives have been announced, and more will be announced.

MR. THOMPSON: — New question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister in charge of the job creation agency. As you are aware, Mr. Minister, in northern Saskatchewan you just don't go up there and start a program. There has to be some planning taking place, and most certainly, as you have indicated many times, you don't want any short—term solutions. You want long—term solutions. And I want to remind you that we have been waiting three years, and the problem is getting quite serious.

I would ask you, Mr. Minister, would you not agree that you have to go in there fairly fast and let these communities know what your plans are, and what the regulations are going to be governing your winter works programs, so they can govern themselves accordingly? So far nothing has been done. And I would ask you if you would give assurance to this House that you will be going in, or having your staff go into northern Saskatchewan and meeting with them communities as soon as possible, so that they can get started on these winter works programs. We know that it's too late to start planning long—term job opportunities for this winter, but what we want right now is winter works, and in closing, Mr. Minister, the remark that you made, that I was critical of wild rice the other day, it totally untrue.

HON. MR. LANE: — Well, I appreciate the hon. members, and I perhaps apologize to him. It was, I gather, the other member from northern Saskatchewan who was critical of our wild rice initiatives.

Having said that, I agree with the hon. member that the problem is one, and it takes planning, and it also takes — and I think the hon. member will agree with me — is we try and look at some long—term initiatives for northern Saskatchewan, that one does take planning. Secondly, it does take the support of those we are trying to encourage to develop northern Saskatchewan.

So the general economy is a factor, and the hon. member recognizes that. When we look at winter works initiatives, my attempt will be to deal with those institutions that can get them started up in a very short period of time, and discussions are going in that area.

Cash Assistance for Farmers

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, your unemployment minister, just before you arrived, said that 6,000 people that were working in the agricultural sector, in the rural sector, are the number that are contributing to the unemployment.

Would you not now admit that you should be injecting some cash and following our suggestion — injecting some cash into the farm economy, that farmers can afford to repair their equipment before next spring in the seeding operations, because the unemployed that are in the agricultural sector are people that have been laid off by the small—business men, right across the province. The minister admits there are 6,000. I wonder if there's not more than that.

Wouldn't you suggest that now is the time to inject some cash into agricultural sector, so that those people can go back to work?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, clearly the hon. member knows that we are putting in \$150 million cash this year into agriculture . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, is it true or isn't it — 150 million? Let's add it up. Let's add it up, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order, please.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — We have initiated programs in this province, and we have helped initiate programs at the national level, Mr. Speaker, that amount to well over \$150 million, and the hon. members know that. That's \$150 million cash into rural Saskatchewan — 150 million. And that's new money that wasn't going in before. And the farmers of this province and the businessmen of this province know that.

We've got 13 million that we put in, in terms of the cattle program — \$13 million. We got 7.5 million into the flood program. They won't acknowledge it. Let's hear them acknowledge it. We have 35 million in the natural gas program. We've got 13 million in the home quarter. We've got 70 million in terms of gasoline breaks. That's 44 million just in terms of surface rights. Well over \$150 million brand new money into agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Second point, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member, my friend from Gravelbourg, says the following: that we should provide \$30 an acre to agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. I believe that's what he asked — \$30 an acre. Mr. Speaker, the NDP are asking for a \$30 payment to agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. If you look at \$30 an acre, Mr. Speaker, you're looking at \$1.5 billion that they expect the province of Saskatchewan, or the Minister of Finance, to spend in agriculture.

I go back to my third point, Mr. Speaker, the third point. My hon. friend from the riding of Assiniboia—Gravelbourg had an opportunity, when interest rates were 18 or 19 or 20 per cent, to inject cash. They injected no cash at all. They didn't provide any assistance on interest rates. And now when we're putting \$150 million, when we've got a farm purchase program at 8 per cent, they're asking for \$1.5 billion from the Minister of Finance. I mean, the average person in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, knows that it's pure nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Well we've heard that song, Mr. Premier, before. My supplementary question is this: why did you introduce your Bill to save the family farms if they're not in trouble? If the family farms aren't in trouble and if that \$150 million that you injected is working so well, how come there's 6,000 unemployed? And how come you had to introduce a Bill to try and save the farms if your program's working?

I'm asking you to inject some money, inject \$30 an acre into the drought area, and it will cost you \$150 million. And do your numbers; do your . . . (inaudible) . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, evidently . . .

THE SPEAKER: — Order, please. Order, please. It's impossible to carry on the work of the Chamber with the number of people hollering in here, and I would ask for decorum.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, obviously my friend from Assiniboia—Gravelbourg doesn't know there's been a drought in the province. The drought is the problem. On top of that we've had a high interest problem, and we have just . . .

THE SPEAKER: — Order, please. Proceed.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — This administration is aware of the fact that high interest rates through the early part of the 1980s have caused a severe economic problem in the province of Saskatchewan, particularly in agriculture. The drought compounded it, and the flood compounded it. So we've got those particular programs or problems in terms of drought, in

terms of flood, in terms of interest rates that were high that the previous administration did nothing about. We put \$150 million cash into rural Saskatchewan, and we've initiated a piece of legislation that will give them a breather so that they can restructure debt, so that they can provide some cash to rural Saskatchewan into small business. And what does the hon. member say? The NDP asked the provincial government to find \$1.5 billion in cash to spread out in agriculture — 1.5 billion. Mr. Speaker, any province in the country, the national government, would have a difficult time trying to find \$1.5 billion to redistribute to the farmers of Saskatchewan. That's what the NDP is asking for. Obviously, to be responsible, we have to reduce interest rates, and we brought in our 8 per cent program. We have protected home owners with interest rates. We provide \$150 million cash that wasn't there before by the NDP. And on top of that we've encouraged the federal government to do the same, and it removes the tax on farm fuel which is another 25 to \$50 million. We're looking at over \$200 million cash going into rural Saskatchewan because there was a drought, because there was a drought and because there was high interest rates to start with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Saskatchewan Auto Fund

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce some excellent news for the drivers of this province. The initiative I'm about to announce reflects the superb financial performance and the management of the Saskatchewan Auto Fund.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Auto Fund recently appeared before the Public Utilities Review Commission, proposing not only a zero per cent change in rates, but a program of cash rebates to the drivers of this province. I am pleased and proud to announce today that more than 530,000 of Saskatchewan's 638,000 drivers will indeed be receiving substantial cash rebates in 1985 for their excellent driving performance.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate and thank the Public Utilities Review Commission for fundamentally concurring with SGI's recommendations, and for giving the government approval to reward the motoring public for its contribution to the auto fund.

The Saskatchewan Auto Fund has turned out its best performance in its 38—year history, and the drivers are primarily responsible. We recognize this and we thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate and thank the Public Utilities Review Commission for fundamentally concurring with SGI's recommendations, and for giving the government approval to reward the motoring public for its contribution to the auto fund.

The Saskatchewan Auto Fund has turned out its best performance in its 38—year history, and the drivers are primarily responsible. We recognize this and we thank them.

Mr. Speaker, when this government took office in 1982, we promised to relieve Saskatchewan people of the burden of high utility rates that they had borne for so long under the previous administration and, Mr. Speaker, we have honoured that commitment.

We removed the gas tax, 20 per cent of which was a direct subsidy to the Saskatchewan Auto Fund. We froze insurance rates for more than a year, and they have gone up by only 3 per cent since that time. And most important, Mr. Speaker, we took the rate—making process from behind the closed doors of cabinet and opened it up for the public to see and participate.

Mr. Speaker, last month SGI informed the Public Utilities Review Commission that excess revenue existed in the rate stabilization reserve and should be returned to the motoring public. SGI asked for PURC's permission to do exactly that, and then they indicated that there could be future returns of revenue as well. Mr. Speaker, keep in mind that the PURC order refers to 1985, to revenue that hasn't yet been paid in and to claims that haven't yet been paid out. Our projections and the commission's suggest that there may be as much as \$50 million in excess revenue by the end of 1985, and we know there's approximately \$25 million now.

The PURC order approved SGI's proposal to return surplus revenue as soon as possible to the motoring public and paved the way for potential additional returns. provided the year unfolds as anticipated, further initiatives will be proposed.

How do we propose to rebate the \$25 million, Mr. Speaker? We intend to put the money right where it belongs, in the hands of the safe driver, who has made all this possible.

Mr. Speaker, SGI is looking at a program that will reward drivers who have accident and offence—free driving records for the past three, four, or five years. The actual details of the program will be discussed at the appropriate time, which is, of course, the Phase II PURC hearings for the Saskatchewan Auto Fund to be held in the new year.

And also at that time, SGI will address the other part of the commission's order, which is to reduce projected revenue for the rating period. Members can appreciate that the government and SGI have just learned about the order this morning, and that there are a large number of options open to the corporation.

I can say, however, that more than 530,000 people of this province will receive some kind of rebate, Mr. Speaker. I'm talking about farmers. I'm talking about small—business men and women of this province. I'm talking about senior citizens. I'm talking about the man on the street. Cash money, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this rebate, along with SGI's earlier proposal to the commission to reduce the cost of insurance for farm plates, is also further evidence of our clear commitment to help farmers in these difficult economic times.

For years, Mr. Speaker, we have been calling for a system to reward drivers who deserve a break. And I'm pleased that we are now in a position to begin fulfilling that promise.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SHILLINGTON: — Mr. Speaker, let me say initially that I was somewhat surprised to see something that as news is two or three days old, and indeed appears on the third page of today's *Leader—Post*, the subject of a ministerial statement. I thought there was supposed to be something new about ministerial statements.

I want to correct one thing that the minister said. Much of what the minister said was absolute nonsense. one of the things you said was, you want to thank the Public Utilities Review Commission for concurring with SGI's recommendations. They did not. They rejected SGI's submissions. Oh, yes, they did.

What PURC fundamentally said is what we have been saying in this House for two years, and that is that you have been manipulating rates. You overestimated the loss when you came into office, you raised the rates by more than what was needed to raise them, and you're now trying to play Santa Claus. And what the Public Utilities Review Commission has said is that you've been doing just that. And I want to quote from their decision, which I happen to have with me, by chance. The commission concluded that:

The current rapid growth in the rate stabilization reserve is primarily due to the overestimation of the projected cost of claims and the underestimation of premiums earned by SGI.

Compliments which the SGI received were somewhat thin, as I find when I read.

What you have been doing, Mr. Minister, you have been manipulating the rates at SGI. I think you're going to receive a lot fewer accolades from the public than you think you are. I think the public understand what you're doing. And I think many of the current political problems of this government have to do with the kind of cynical manipulation which you exemplify, Mr. Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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.

MR. KOSKIE: — Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to open by saying that I am very pleased to rise and to participate in this debate on the throne speech.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and the seconder. I want to say that their task was indeed difficult because of the lack of direction in the throne speech itself.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in my nine years here in the legislature I have never seen government members so reluctant to speak. Few, if any, spoke on the throne speech. Most spoke on NDP resolutions from the convention.

And you know, I could see the expression on their face, how they wished that they had it, and were a member of a party where delegates and back—benchers could indeed have some input.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — The government members who spoke, it seemed to me, seemed to be very discouraged. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that they had reasons to be discouraged. you know, last fall, in September, we had a federal election, and that was to be the reassuring test that all was well with the Devine government. Here in Saskatchewan the word was out. Fourteen seats the federal Tories would take, and all of the back—benchers of the Tory government in Saskatchewan believed that.

And after the election, I want to indicate that the people of Saskatchewan sent a message to this government. Here in Saskatchewan in the last federal election, the New Democratic Party got the largest percentage vote that it had in some 26 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — And these results, I want to say, shocked the Devine government, and shocked all of the back—benchers. And then, shortly after, they held a four—day, so—called "think tank," if you could believe it. And they met, and they said, "We will make things right in Saskatchewan. What we will do is embark now on a \$12 million advertising campaign. We will tell the people of all the good things we have done." And then they have taken recent polls, and they're still in the doldrums.

So then the had their convention. And they said, "Well, we'll get our little cheer—leader, the Premier of this province, to get all the troops riled up." And they sent the Premier to the

convention. And the Premier there at the convention declared in unequivocal terms, he said that no family farm would go under. He would open the treasury of this province to secure the farmers of this province. And once again, the back—benchers believed.

And then they came into the new session of the legislature. And this government has been saying they have two priorities, jobs and agriculture. I can understand how the back—benchers in the Tory party feel — down, discouraged. Because here they are dealing with what they call their two priorities, jobs and agriculture. And here all the could come forward with was a watered down farm Bill, a Bill which has been negotiated and written together with the bankers, the friends of the Tory party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — And so I want to say that out in Saskatchewan the people believed the Tory party, going into the 1982 election. But today I want to say that the people of Saskatchewan are less than satisfied with what they have seen. In fact, they realize the province is drifting into a disaster.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the document itself. And clearly this document shows to the people off Saskatchewan, it shows a government without leadership, a government with an outdated philosophy, a government without direction, a government without purpose, a government that no longer enjoys the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan, a government so trapped up by its own rhetoric and ideology that it is no longer capable of addressing the problems that it has caused for so many people in this province.

(1045)

I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan that this is a bankrupt government. It is bankrupt financially, bankrupt economically. It has run out of ideas. It has no imagination to meet the crisis. Its hands are tied, because they tied their hands to the bankers and the oil companies from out of Saskatchewan, and the have deserted the businessman and the farming community of Saskatchewan.

I want to say that this is, indeed, a sorry excuse for political leadership at a time when leadership is so sorely needed. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, not in anger but in sorrow, because it is not the members opposite who suffer because of their actions and misdirections. It is the people of Saskatchewan who suffer, trusting people. The young people have been betrayed by this government; good people have been exploited by this government; and kind people have been repelled by the callousness of this government. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that needy people have indeed been neglected by this government.

The good people of Saskatchewan deserve a better fate than to be governed by the members opposite, and the next election I predict this government will get what it richly deserves. I want to say that this government has been characterized by arrogance, incompetence, and callousness, and I'll tell you that, come the next election, the people of Saskatchewan will accordingly respond.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this throne speech says nothing because this government has nothing to say. It couldn't even develop a snappy slogan, let alone a policy. To be sure, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech did try to persuade us of their commitment to job creation and agriculture, but that sort of empty talk has become an embarrassment to the PC members opposite and their Tory friends, even the bankers. For people remember how the Devine government has been talking for over a year about its two main priorities, jobs and agriculture. And they are tired of talk. Even the members opposite are tired of talk. They know

what the people are saying about them, and once again out in Saskatchewan the word is that Tory times are tough times. Tory times are tough times. They know what the fate awaits them in the next election. They know what the government says and what it does are totally opposite. They know that while jobs have been their number one priority over the past year, we have had an increase in the number of unemployed, an actual decrease, Mr. Speaker, in the number of jobs for young people in Saskatchewan. Fewer jobs for young people than one year ago.

I want to turn to their number one priority of jobs, Mr. Speaker, and indicate what has happened. Let's just look at Saskatchewan figures, the year over year figures. Last November the PC government said in its throne speech that jobs were its number one priority. Well, since that time in the last 12 months, let's see what happens.

The number of unemployed has jumped by 7,000. The number of jobs for young people has actually declined by 2,000. Our unemployment rate has jumped from 7.4 per cent to 8.7 per cent. And how does this PC record of the Devine government compare with other provinces over the past year? Saskatchewan has the second worst job creation record in Canada. Only Prince Edward Island has done worse. Saskatchewan has one of the lowest rates of labour force growth in Canada, worse than almost every province in Canada. And that was a priority of this government.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to a young person, and there are many in my constituency, young people who are trained. I have in my constituency young school teachers with four and five years of education that have put in applications throughout the width and breadth of this province. They have applied for other jobs and are unable to find them.

I want to refer to the House to a case in question. Here is a young woman. She's 24 years old, born and raised in Saskatchewan, with grade 12 and a college degree. She has worked for more than three years in accounting. She was laid off earlier this year and has been seeking work ever since. In the past two weeks, she has applied for work at 43 places and has had 17 interviews: accounting firms, credit bureaus, ad agencies, retail stores, Canada Manpower. But no job. A young woman here in Saskatchewan, born in Saskatchewan; a young woman who obviously has the energy, the education, the training, the work experience, and the desire, and there are not jobs. And that's the situation that exists throughout Saskatchewan in respect to many of our young people.

So looking at one of the priorities of this government in respect to job creation, certainly the statistics are there. There are more young people unemployed this year than a year ago. The unemployment rate has increased dramatically. The job priorities of this government have been a dismal failure.

And while agriculture has been their number one priority also over the past year, we find that hundreds and hundreds of Saskatchewan family farms have gone under. While agriculture has been their top priority, scores of Saskatchewan rural communities and hundreds of small businesses have suffered, and continue to suffer, because this Devine government does not have the ability nor the will to address the needs of the financially pressed farmers.

But not everybody's hurting in Saskatchewan. Some people have found that open for business means open season on the farmers. And I'm talking, Mr. Speaker, about the real friends of the Tory party, their dearest friends and their closest allies, the big eastern banks. Their relationship is indeed a close and loving one. And I want to say that some people express their love and devotion by bouquets of flowers; the big eastern banks express their love and devotion to the Tory party by hard, cold cash to try to keep them in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — And that is their clear priority they place on the profitability of the big eastern banks. Thousands and thousands of dollars in direct political donations have been made by the major banks of eastern Canada.

And let the sceptics note that the *Financial Times* reports that the Canadian banks are now the most profitable in the world. At a time when Saskatchewan family farmers are suffering through the worst financial crisis since the last time we had a Tory government here in Saskatchewan — during the last depression in 1930 — Canadian banks are the most profitable in the world.

One of my constituents phoned me here the other day, Mr. Speaker, to tell me a news story that he saw in the *Saskatoon Star—Phoenix*, and the story had a big headline — a big headline — and it was written by one of the Tory friends, the banker. And do you know how he assesses the rural Saskatchewan problem? Headline: "Average Saskatchewan Farm Too Small, Banker Says." That's what the banker says: average Saskatchewan farm too small. Well, I want to say that my constituent, who considers himself an average sized farm and a good farmer, told me, he said, "Do you know what we in rural Saskatchewan are coming to believe?" He said, "It is the banks and the PC government that are too big."

And when we examine the record of this government, Mr. Speaker, we quickly find that this government does not have a philosophy, and does not have a commitment to the people of this province — not to the people, but a commitment to the profits of international, multinational oil companies; not to the people, but to their friends, the bankers; not to service, but only for their own ends.

Look at the record: hundreds of millions of dollars in loan guarantees to Manalta Coal, the big Alberta coal—mining oil company, but not one dime for the drought—stricken farmers of southern Saskatchewan; the largest and the most expensive cabinet in the history of Saskatchewan, but no support for our students in our severely strained universities; high—paid government jobs for their friends with rates of \$400 a day, but no positive action to reduce unemployment for our young people; assistance for big business, but no support for the hundreds of Saskatchewan small—business men which are threatened with the great depression that is being forced upon them by this Tory administration.

The priorities are there, but they are the wrong ones, Mr. Speaker. It is an important and fundamental way, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the throne speech inaugurating a new legislative session is a symbol. A government throne speech should set out a clear policy direction for the future and serve as a symbolic representation of the government's plans for the future.

And we also know how this particular PC government, and the Premier particularly, likes symbols — but only symbols he likes, not substance. The government's open for big business slogan was intended to be at least as much of a symbol, symbolic invitation to big business, as it was a policy. And the Premier's two expensive, flashy television broadcasts in the past few months have been designed for purely symbolic value.

Now, not everyone was favourably impressed by that shallow and flashy symbolism in the Premier's most recent television speech. What I'd like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to share with you a letter from a long—time resident of this province. And he wrote to me on November the 22nd, and he said:

Dear Murray: I wish to compliment you on the article in the *Star—Phoenix*. I am a senior citizen, just turned 85, and I wish I could make people realize what has happened and is still happening to Saskatchewan since April of 1982.

(He goes on.) I listened to Grant Devine's speech at their convention and was not surprised at the things he did not mention. He did not tell the people he had to sell

debentures amounting to over 274 million at interest rates of 15 to 15.6 per cent American money to pay for his election promises. He evidently thinks if you steal \$5 from a man and then give him back \$2, it makes you a good guy.

(He goes on.) He did not tell them he sold the coal mine and the machinery and most of the road equipment, anything to get a little cash. He did not tell them this is what he meant when he said, Saskatchewan is for sale.

(And he concludes his remarks; he says) You must excuse my writing. My hands are quite shaky. Best regards for the future.

(1100)

That, Mr. Speaker, is a senior citizen who saw through that empty, shallow, symbolic presentation of the Premier, and says so clearly.

Then let us look at some of the other symbols which are so clearly indicating to the people of Saskatchewan what this Progressive Conservative government is all about.

The PC record in health care, its symbol is a huge hole in the ground at the Regina General Hospital where the hospital regeneration project has been scrapped. The PC record in justice is symbolized by the lengthy and unnecessary vacancies in the appointment of judges to our courts, political interference in the human rights commission, and cut—backs in our legal aid to the needy.

PC awareness and sensitivity to the poorest people in the world — those in developing nations stricken by famine of unimaginable proportions — and that's symbolized by PC cut—backs in international aid. PC compassion for those who are unemployed and are on welfare, symbolized by welfare cuts and food banks. PC commitment to education, symbolized by overcrowded class—rooms and deteriorating buildings at the universities, and under funding. PC commitment to job creation, symbolized by 50 per cent increase in unemployment in our 10 major cities. PC commitment to decent family life for Saskatchewan people, symbolized by an aggressive alcohol advertising on TV and the terrible social and personal toll of increased alcohol abuse. PC priority on agriculture, symbolized by record numbers of farm foreclosures and record bank profits.

Empty, hollow symbols, Mr. Speaker, that reveal for all to see the real performance and the lack of commitment of the Progressive Conservative government to the real needs of Saskatchewan men and women. and the emptiest symbol of all — the Premier of Saskatchewan did not even have the courage and the moral fibre to stand in this Assembly and show his leadership, cast his vote, for the first time in Saskatchewan history where a member was expelled, a member of his party; a member of his caucus; a former senior member of his cabinet being expelled from the Legislative Assembly and stripped of his seat by a government resolution. Some 50 members stood in this legislature, and every member of the opposition stood and voted, stood here and recorded their votes on the solemn occasion. But not the Premier of Saskatchewan. He was missing from the action. This, I say, is the most telling symbol of all. A lack of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the general economic conditions, and the management of the economic economy here in Saskatchewan. I think I should clearly indicate that the members opposite are embarrassed with the economic strategy of this government, with the fiscal management of this government. And I want to say that when one deals with the stewardship of the provincial economy and its management of the provincial government's fiscal affairs, I want to refer to four sources of information.

Let's simply look at the economic and financial statement published in July by the Minister of Finance, "Saskatchewan Economic and Financial Position, July 1984." We'll look at that document. Let's look at this glossy and expensive booklet published by the Deputy Premier of

the province entitled *Saskatchewan Promise*, dealing for the years 1972 to 1982. And I want to also . . . Let's look at the government's most recent budget speech. And I will be looking at Statistics Canada. Let's look at the record, Mr. Speaker.

First, total investment. Under the New Democrats, Saskatchewan had an annual increase in investment, annual increase in investment of 10.9 per cent. But the budget speech shows that in the first two years of the Progressive Conservative government here in Saskatchewan we had an actual decline in total investment. And let's look at retail sales; and we learn that under the new Democrats from 1972 to 1982, Saskatchewan retail sales grew by 19 per cent, significantly higher than the growth nationally. But Statistics Canada now reports that so far this year, Saskatchewan has the lowest rate of retail growth in Canada, the worst in the nation, under this PC government. Mr. Speaker, if we look at the major summary economic indicator, the gross domestic product, again we find that it, in 1972 to 1981 under the sound policies of the New Democratic Party, Saskatchewan's gross domestic product increased by 51 per cent compared to only 30 per cent in all of Canada. But the Minister of Finance reported in his budget speech last March, on page 37, that in the Devine government's first two years, Saskatchewan's gross domestic product was significantly below the national average.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that the government members opposite do not, indeed, like these facts. But they are not my facts. It is the facts that have been put out by their cabinet ministers, and are published by Statistics Canada. And if the government members do not want to believe those indicators, let's look at some others — some other significant overall indicators compiled by the PC government agencies in Ottawa and in Regina — which show just how poor their stewardship of our economy has been.

So far this year, new housing starts in Saskatchewan are 46 per cent below last year's level. So far this year, the business bankruptcies are up by 5 per cent in Saskatchewan over last year level, even though, nationally, bankruptcy levels are slowly declining.

And since this PC government was elected, the number of welfare beneficiaries has jumped by 22 per cent, and now stands at almost 60,000 people on welfare — more welfare beneficiaries in Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, than the total combined population, man, women and child, of the cities of Prince Albert, Yorkton, and Weyburn combined. That's the legacy that this government has given to the people of this province.

In the last 12 months, Saskatchewan had the third lowest job creation rate in Canada. Only Alberta and Prince Edward Island have done worse. And I want to say that the recent statistics indicate that we're the worst, other than Prince Edward Island. We had last month 34,000 unemployed, and today we have 40,000 Saskatchewan citizens seeking work. those are not my statistics, those are the cold facts of what is happening here in Saskatchewan.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the figures tell only a part of the story. They are, in a way, too abstract. What Saskatchewan men and women, what the real Saskatchewan families in our community, know about this government and its economic stewardship, they know from their experience. They know in their own household budgets. They know, Mr. Speaker, in their smaller pay cheques. They know in their business accounts. They know in their hearts what is happening here in Saskatchewan.

In down town Saskatoon, small—business men don't need to know the latest bankruptcy figures. They know that their neighbour down the block and the one across the street that used to be open for business aren't open today.

And I want to say that a young man from the Watson district doesn't need to know the latest unemployment figures to know how bad it is. he's a welder, a graduate of the technical institute, did extremely well in receiving his training. he's been working for approximately three and a half years, but he got laid off because the PC government's policies are a failure, and he hasn't had

steady work for almost a year.

And the small contractors throughout my constituency, outstanding trained people — plumbers and electricians, carpenters — they don't need to look at statistics. They don't have to look at the latest PC propaganda. They know what is happening out there. They know that they could and should be building houses and apartments, business complexes, nursing homes and hospitals, paving our highways. But they know that there isn't any work. They're not big business buddies of the PC Party. They're not the big Alberta contractors who have come in and grabbed up the contracts that exist. So they know that there's no work, and they know that times are hard.

And the young woman in my constituency who lives near Wynyard, who's been a single parent since her husband was tragically killed a few years ago, she knows about this government's callous disregard for the unfortunate. She doesn't need figures. She lives that experience very day, Mr. Speaker. And at a time when she and others like her need support, support for their children and for their dignity, support and understanding from the provincial government, hope for the long—term future security of themselves and their children — all they find from this government is a blind eye and a deaf ear to their plight.

(1115)

And so, Mr. Speaker, there is no community in Saskatchewan, there is no community in Saskatchewan, no economic sector which has not experienced the depressing consequences of the Devine government's failed economic policies, its poor stewardship of our provincial economy. But it's not only their economic stewardship that has been poor, it is also this government's management of our provincial financial affairs which has been poor, Mr. Speaker.

Let's take a look at the deficit. And here I refer all members to the most recent statement of Saskatchewan's economic and financial position published by the PC Minister of Finance. And I refer the government members to page 10 and 11 of that document. It's not mine, Mr. Speaker; their Minister of Finance published it. And there on page 10 and 11 he has set out quite clearly for all to see that in the fiscal year ended on March 31, 1982 the New Democratic Party — which was governing the province at that time, last year in office — that we left a budgetary surplus of \$140 million. That's right — \$140 million in cash left to this Tory party when it took over government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Even the NDP don't believe that one.

MR. KOSKIE: — It's in the statement of your finance minister.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that after three PC budgets, we've had three successive, massive Devine deficits, each one larger than the last. Their official figure, Mr. Speaker, says that there's a cumulative deficit in this province of 839 million after less than three years.

And recently we had the announcement of the Minister of Finance, and he says, "I've got to tell the people of Saskatchewan that I'm not accurate. I'm shocked, but I'm not accurate. There really is going to be an additional 100 to 150 million deficit for last year." So what I'm saying is that in less than three years, Mr. Speaker, the Devine government has mortgaged our future by the tune of \$1 billion — \$1 billion. Just to pay the interest at 12 per cent — \$120 million. What we could do for the people of Saskatchewan if this Devine government hadn't ridden us into debt by their economic policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — A \$1 billion mortgage on our future, which we and our children will have to pay, with interest, because of this government's mismanagement.

And what about their handling of the Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker? What about the management there? Well after they appointed the former president of the Saskatchewan PC Party to be chairman of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, that corporation lost more than \$19 million last year, its biggest loss ever.

And after they took over the management of the potash corporation it lost money for the first time in its history.

In 1981, under the New Democrats, the Saskatchewan Crown corporations made a very positive contribution to the Saskatchewan economy, the Saskatchewan people, and to the Saskatchewan treasury. In the last year in office, the cumulative amount of revenue, of profit by a Crown corporation, was \$115 million. In the PC government's first year, in their first year of their big business management style, those same Crown corporations had a loss of \$126 million.

And in 1983 the PCs lost still more — a further \$55 million in 1983. And so whether we look at the economic stewardship or the fiscal management, whether we look at the objective figures, the hard facts, or look at the real experience of the real working people and family farmers and small—business men, we find that Saskatchewan economy is, indeed, in trouble with the mismanagement by your government opposite.

The record is clear, Mr. Speaker, whichever way you look. this government's policy, its performance, and its record, has certainly been a failure.

There is considerable more that I could, indeed, talk about, Mr. Speaker. I could speak in details on the agricultural dilemma that farmers find themselves in; small business; education — the under funding that is going on in the education, and in respect to the future for our young people.

And I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to sum up by making these points. First, this hollow and empty throne speech which we have been debating is a major disappointment to the people of Saskatchewan and, indeed, has been a betrayal of them by the Devine government.

They sought a sense of purpose and direction, but in this document of the throne speech they found none. The people of Saskatchewan sought hope and help for beleaguered family farmers, but found none. They looked for positive and concrete measures to reduce the tragically high levels of unemployed and welfare dependency, and they found none. Small—business men looked to the government's legislative plan, as set out in the throne speech, for recognition of their problems, but they, too, found none.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, what the people of Saskatchewan saw, clearly revealed to them in this government's throne speech and its policies, was confusion instead of purpose, arrogance instead of compassion, short—sightedness instead of vision, polls instead of policies, slogans instead of action, hypocrisy instead of integrity, greed instead of caring. The picture is there for all of Saskatchewan people to see. northern Saskatchewan has been devastated under the policies of this government. Rural Saskatchewan has been neglected, and urban Saskatchewan is depressed. What a sad and sorry record this is indeed.

And no wonder your throne speech is long in rhetoric but lacking in specifics. It looks to the past. And the reason for that is because you have no future. You seek to conceal because you have everything to hide. But no matter how hard you try it is evident to all that your values are clear: survival of the fittest, rewards to the slickest, red carpets for the rich, bonuses for the banks, write—offs for oil companies, auctions for the people's assets — the trickle—down theory carried to the absurd lengths.

And what has it achieved? You have hurt job creation. You have hurt our small business. You

have hurt our farmers. And you have betrayed our young people. This is the PC menu, and I want to say to the people of Saskatchewan this menu is a very tasteless dish.

But there is another way, Mr. Speaker, another approach, another approach being called for by ordinary men and women across Saskatchewan; an approach, Mr. Speaker, which would have us work together, not compete viciously with each other; an approach which stresses fairness and dignity and justice and opportunity; an approach which would have us work together co-operatively in a true Saskatchewan spirit to eradicate forever from our society and from our children's future the evils of ignorance and fear and hate and want; an approach, Mr. Speaker, which would have us look together to share our affluence and our blessings with those less fortunate than ourselves at home and abroad.

And this approach has been set forward by the Catholic bishops in their economic statement. This approach calls for, and I quote their document:

This approach calls for economic policies which realize the needs of the poor have priority over the wants of the rich, that the rights of the workers are more than the maximization of profits, that the participation of many takes precedence over the preservation of the system which benefits so few.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is at a crossroad. Not since 1930 has the choice been so clearly outlined. One road, the road of the Progressive Conservative Party is a road that is based on selfishness, where success is measured by how much you exploit your fellow man. and this road is illuminated by the fading light of power abused. This road leads to the depths of despair where only the shouts and the curses of the dispossessed and the disgruntled beg for silence. This is the road that Conservatives have chosen as the destiny for people of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we reject that way, and we in the New Democratic Party say there is a better way. The people of Saskatchewan needs a better way and, Mr. Speaker, we know that we will choose a better way, that they will choose to travel the road that follows along the heights of justice and quality and progress, a road that is illuminated by the rising sun of human kindness, a road leading to the highlands where the glad shouts of humanity can be heard, a road where caring and sharing and honest effort is rewarded, and indeed, where an organized, civilized society can be developed.

This, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is the road that I choose, where all people in society are given an equal opportunity, not the privileges supporting the rich. I say that this is the road that I choose. This is the road that my party chooses. I say that this is the road that the people of Saskatchewan will choose. This will be the road which will drive the Tory party into oblivion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that never before, never before have the New Democrats felt better. People of Saskatchewan have had an opportunity to compare the mismanagement of the economy by the members opposite, and they are saying, let's get rid of those birds. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, come the next election, we in the New Democratic Party will again have achieved confidence of the people by building a society where all can participate — young people, the business community of Saskatchewan, the farmers, the professionals. We will not exclude them for the benefits of the eastern bankers, the friends of the PC Party, and for the multinational corporations.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I will indeed be voting against the original motion and supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

(1130)

MR. YOUNG: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise and take part in this throne speech debate. It was quite entertaining to listen to the member from Quill Lakes and his babblings. It's going to be a little tougher to be as entertaining. I want to restrict myself to facts as opposed to fantasies, as he delved into.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, representing the people of Saskatoon Eastview. And for those of you who may not be aware, Saskatoon Eastview is the constituency in Saskatoon that's located on the south and east side of the city. It's roughly south of 8th Street and east of Preston Avenue.

I'm not going to delve at great length into the accomplishments of the people of Saskatoon Eastview in some of the new projects that have been undertaken in my constituency since we took office in 1982. I will mention the Ilarion residence; the Elim Lodge; there was, certainly, University Drive Alliance Church, the sod turning out there about four weeks ago that the Minister of Social Services attended; there have been . . . (inaudible) . . . etc., etc.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Smoke and mirrors.

MR. YOUNG: — Well, not smoke and mirrors. I was there, Mr. Member from Gravelbourg, and these things did take place, and I'll tell you that the senior citizens of my constituency do not consider those projects to be smoke and mirrors.

I want to dwell, Mr. Speaker, for the most part on jobs. I'm not going to reiterate our record of job creation in this province — second to none. I'm not going to go through the jobs created in the oil patch and, obviously, the thousands of man—years of jobs that have been created in the two megaprojects, being the oil refineries that have been announced since we took office.

I would, however, indicate that our oil patch policies, our royalty structures, are obviously now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the envy of the Alberta government. They're the envy of our new Minister of Energy federally, Pat Carney. She has been having some meetings with our minister and it's quite obvious that they're attempting to take a leaf out of our book when it comes to oil policy.

Certainly the New Democrats in Alberta, as I understand it, want to take a leaf out of our policy book and have our Saskatchewan oil policy as part of their platform in the next provincial Alberta campaign. Certainly I'm sure that members opposite, the New Democrats, in their heart of hearts, understand what our policy has done for the Estevan, Kindersley, Lloydminster regions of Saskatchewan.

Now the question becomes, Mr. Deputy Speaker: should the government provide jobs directly, as proposed by the NDP? Certainly we can see what that did in northern Saskatchewan under the department of northern Saskatchewan. We can all see what happens in a country such as Russia where the government provides jobs. Everyone has a job. There's full employment in Russia. What you have there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is everyone employed . . .

And I note that the NDP in this province in their last convention had a resolution from their social justice and human rights panel suggesting that minimum wage should be set at 70 per cent of the average weekly wage. How you would have, I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, something very akin to Russian social justice if that was adopted here in Saskatchewan. You'd have a lot of people with jobs. You'd have the universal suffering of misery. We would end up more in that direction than, I would suggest, in the American direction where the government doesn't directly participate in providing jobs but opens opportunities. I think it's abundantly clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one route is preferable to the socialist route.

Government's legitimate role, it has been said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not to dictate detailed

plans or solution to problems for participating companies or industries to follow. Government certainly serves out country best, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by protecting and maintaining the free market—place and ensuring that the rules of free trade are followed by both labour, industry, and the government itself.

We note when we look world—wide, Mr. Speaker, what's happened across the world. You can look at France under their socialist premier, Francois Mitterrand. He tried a new industrial policy. and where did it get that country? The French franc dove; there was massive unemployment; the economy was literally run into the ground. The French are attempting to pull out of this now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with their austerity program that we've heard about of late. What this involves is nothing more than higher taxes, fewer services, and severe penalties on private spending. That's what you get when you have one of these socialist industrial policies where business and everyone is led by the nose and told what they must do vis—a—vis job creation, etc., etc.

We can take a look further around the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and see Italy — same sort of story as France. on the other end of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have Germany and Great Britain, who took another route. And it's quite evident to all of us the differences in the economies between those two countries.

I noted last week, with interest, that Mr. Eisler brought to the attention of Saskatchewan the speech given by our Premier at our political convention, and he suggested in his column that our Premier was attempting to copy Ronald Reagan's tactics. Well, if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, I just say what Canada, as a whole, wouldn't give for the American economic record — their inflation rate, the strength of their dollar, and their patriotism and optimism. I think that Mr. Mulroney is certainly turning that around, but I would think that is something that we could look at and receive some direction on it.

Both Mr. Eisler and Mr. Johnsrud commented that the Premier's television address and the flag—waving was something odd. I'm sure that neither of them have ever saw a flag—waving in this province for some time. I think for myself, and the member for Moosomin, attended with Michael McCafferty, who went, too, and we were guests of the Americans for the nomination of Ronald Reagan in Dallas this August, and certainly we saw there what optimism and patriotism do for the spirits and the economy of a country.

The member from Shaunavon, as you might know, attended, of course, the Democratic nomination meeting in San Francisco for Walter Mondale. Now you would think that the member from Shaunavon would have learned from his sojourn to San Francisco what results from those types of policies. Certainly the pressure this province has, and I would suggest from looking at what the NDP have done after that San Francisco nomination which they had one of their members attend, they haven't learned either.

But the patriotism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we noted fervently in the United States, is certainly more than flag—waving, but it also shows patriotism. And the flag—waving showed the pride in a country and a province, the values of their institutions, and their governments, and their democratic system.

It's good patriotism, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It involves commitment. It involves action. Patriots are doers. They serve on school boards. They work with the disadvantaged. They develop products. They ring doorbells for candidates. They're doers and shakers in the country, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and, as far as I'm concerned, I'll stick with the flag wavers and the Premier. I don't want t join company in any way with the members opposite who are flag burners, and who are anti—patriotics.

I would like to contrast what the New Democrats do in this country vis—a—vis our neighbour to the South, and what we witnessed when we were in the United States at Reagan's nomination. I

have here a copy of a newspaper. It's the *Sanford News*, and certainly it wouldn't be in our legislative library. It's an American paper. But it has a headline of "Emile Roy Tours White House." And he has a big flag in this picture which I'll table in the legislature during my speech, and it says,

Canada. We in Maine salute you. You're a great nation.

That was the stuff, a giant flag. It's about 20 feet long, Mr. Speaker, and about five feet in width, out in front of the doors of the White House in Washington. And this was also taken to the giant nomination meeting in Dallas, Texas. And that's what we saw, those people down there. That's how they evidenced their feelings towards us.

And this is a far contrast to what the NDP cabinet ministers participated in on the steps of the western Canadian legislature, burning the American flag. And I say shame on them, and take some example from our neighbours. They are certainly willing to deal with us fairly and respect our institutions and our sovereignty.

And if I might have a page, I'll have this down for tabling, please. I want all members to have a look at what I'm referring to in my speech.

Now going back to what I'd mentioned earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker — comparisons. Mondale in the United States openly advocated raising taxes. He certainly wasn't as patriotic as Reagan. He wasn't exactly Pro—Life. Mondale wanted to help the economy with injections of dollars, grants, and rolls, and subsidies, not much unlike what the member from Gravelbourg be, the former owner of Engel construction, suggested I this House — \$30 an acre, Mr. Deputy Speaker; \$1.5 billion to 60,000 farmers.

To get a grip, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the size of the money he's talking, that figure is in excess of our entire health budget in this province. It's more than one—third of our entire annual budget. And this hare—brain from across the floor wants to throw that out in one program, Mr. Speaker, it's totally irresponsible.

Now we look here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and see what the NDP are doing. And despite the notes they should have taken last summer, they're dogmatically continuing on with their social agenda. They want to, like Reagan . . . or, excuse me, like Mondale they want to increase taxes by pulling out Saskatchewan's largest in history tax cut, the gas tax.

At their last resolution here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they had a resolution to remove abortion from the Criminal Code and install abortion clinics in Saskatchewan. Again on the Mondale side, and not on the Reagan view, with respect to that issue.

The Alberta NDP, no less, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at their convention in Alberta, resolved to send a congratulations letter to Morgentaler after his criminal acquittal. The NDP further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in their last convention, it wanted to limit farm size. In their last convention they wanted to limit farm size outright. In this last convention they had here in October, they want to limit farm size by creative use of the tax system.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They already did that.

MR. YOUNG: — They have done that before. And I just want to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this outrageous continuing position of the New Democrats to limit farm size.

Now what do they mean by the creative use of the tax system? I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have seen them in action limiting farm size by creative use of the tax system in the past. We only have to look at the early 1970s when they brought in their succession duty.

Now this was certainly a creative use of the tax system to limit farm size in this province. If a

deceased in this province died and had an estate in excess of \$50,000, this tax was triggered. As a result, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when a father died he wasn't able to leave the entirety of his farm to his children. The government had to get their hand in the kitty and have some of it. And the bitterness that I have towards this comes from not that — if they had come clean and said that's what we're trying to do, fair enough — but I can remember all too clearly, at that time, Mr. Romanow standing up in this Chamber and suggesting that this was not aimed at formers, this was aimed at big, rich people. But when it was all said and done, Mr. Deputy Speaker, approaching 90 per cent of the revenue from the estate tax came from farmers. It was a creative use of the tax system to limit farm sizes.

(1145)

Many, many people that I know in my community where I grew up had a father die, and they ended up having to sell possibly a quarter section to pay this heinous succession duty tax.

And the Leader of the Opposition is not exempt from his efforts to pull the wool over the eyes of the Saskatchewan farmers during the introduction of that succession duty act. And I have here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, *Hansard* of April 27, 1972, and it's page 2008. And it reads — Mr. Blakeney, he speaks, he says:

It will ensure that the transfer of large accumulations of wealth will not go untaxed at the expense of the vast majority of taxpayers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney continues. And here is where, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he is pulling the wool over the eyes of the farmers of Saskatchewan, bearing in mind where the revenue came from. Approaching 90 per cent of it came from farmers. He says, and this is the Leader of the Opposition, at the time the premier, Mr. Blakeney, speaking of succession duty tax on second readings — here he goes:

It protects the transfer of family farms and small businesses.

He goes on to say:

. . . it introduces into Saskatchewan what I think is a basic element of any fair tax system, the tax on inherited wealth, and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to give their support in principle to The Succession Duty Act, 1972. I move second reading of the Bill.

There he goes — "It protects family farms and small businesses." It sure protected them. It raped them is what it did. It took earned tax paid on farms. The farmer had earned this money. He'd bought the land. He'd sweated and toiled through years, possibly, and put this farm together, hoping all along he could pass it on to his kids. This has been going on for centuries but no, sir, we can't do that. We're going to limit farm size with . . . (inaudible) . . . use of the tax system.

I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have no clear idea as to how the NDP propose, if they should ever get into power in this province again, to limit farm size with the greater use of the tax system. This could be mild, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It could be mild compared to what they have in mind. Who knows?

And I would suggest to any farmers who may be listening to this throne speech debate on TV, that you take a chance at the peril of your farm. They did it in many ways. We must remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at the same time — the portion from *Hansard* that I read was April 27th, 1972, and Mr. Blakeney was moving second reading of The Succession Duty Act — at that same time, they were getting land bank off the ground which, again, was along the same lines as

The Succession Duty Act, to limit farm size, to control farming.

I had occasion to do a study when I was in law college with respect to The Land Bank Act, and it's on permanent record in the *Law Reviews*. But I went through, in some detail, the land bank leases. And what those people could do in there I don't think was known to the general population of Saskatchewan. They could control what you planted and where you planted it and when you planted it. They could control every aspect of the farming. If you grew a weed that was too tall, they could walk in and take over and say: those weeds are too tall, or they're too short, or whatever.

Now I would imagine that they were not too interested in the beginning at using that as a tool to operate farms in that they were still in the process in many ways of selling that to a lot of people in Saskatchewan. However, had they been in power for longer than what they were, they had taken the time to put that within their bag of powers so that one could only assume that they could make use of it some day.

Certainly the members opposite cannot in any way suggest that they are at all champions of the Saskatchewan farmers. They have, at every opportunity, attempted in some way to restrict, or impede and regulate, the farmers of this province. Certainly I know I can speak for the vast majority of farmers; they don't want any more government interference in their operations by way of land banks or limiting farm size than they can get.

Now we have seen, Mr. Speaker, what has taken place in Ottawa since Mulroney's election on September 4. We have clearly . . . They have taken an initial step right off the bat to remove taxation from farm fuels. Certainly this is something that's been the subject matter of a lot of heated debate here in western Canada, and right out of the chute it comes to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I think that that is an indication of the co—operation and the conscienceness that we can expect from the new Progressive Conservative government in Ottawa in the future. Certainly we will be urging them to continue in that direction and assist our farmers here in Saskatchewan with respect to the problems that have arisen as of late due to the weather.

Now earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, we here made a move to assist the farmers. We moved a Bill that provides a moratorium on foreclosures on farm land as a result of the severe droughts and conditions which have left many viable farmers in this province unable to fulfil the entirety of their land payments for this year. Certainly it will allow them to get on their feet again. Certainly even an average crop or two over the next year or two should assist the viable ones back onto their feet and will be very much appreciated by farmers who have suffered, in some cases, a number of years, now, of drought.

I look to the members opposite, and I recall their land bank legislation. I was pleased to be part of the party who zapped that, hopefully for forever, from this province. The hypocrites across the way, Mr. Speaker, they're in favour of limiting farm size.

But we have the member sitting opposite from Pelly, and the member from Gravelbourg, and we had here, three years ago, Reg Gross from the community where I grew up; these people, I think . . . As a matter of fact, Mr. Gross was running for the presidency of the New Democratic Party in this last convention. These are the people who want to limit farm size.

Mr. Gross has a vast tract of land out in the community where I grew up. You have to have an R.M. map to find out where every quarter section is, and I'm sure he probably has to have one himself. However, that's not enough. He's got to go to Manitoba and get into farming in a big way. So what does he do after he loses here to our present member from Morse? He expands. It's time to expand. He's going to Manitoba to start farming in a big way, and as I understand it, he has as much land in friendly Manitoba as he had here. He doesn't own it, of course; he got that land through some of his connections in Manitoba. However, these are the types of people who have come back to Saskatchewan, go to an NDP convention, run for a high executive

position, and in favour of limiting farm tax. Certainly hypocrites, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how they can do it.

I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, from reading the resolutions of the New Democrats at their last convention, that they have learned nothing from the member of Shaunavon's sojourn to San Francisco. They're not on the pro—life side of things. They want government intervention at all intersections. They're in favour of raising taxes. They are literally drawing their agenda on the Mondale—Ferraro agenda.

And I would suggest, and I agree with Mr. Eisler, that we are doing some things. Our flag waving and out patriotism here in Saskatchewan are like those of Mr. Reagan. We are certainly not anti pro—life as was Mr. Mondale and as are the NDP. and I think that our just desserts will come in the same way as Reagan's did.

I think that the NDP will be rejected in the same way that Mondale was in the United States of America, because of his programs of raising taxes and his programs of government intervention and government involvement in the economy. The people in the United States didn't want that. The people in Canada on September 4th rejected totally any notions of that kind by the overwhelming election victory of Brian Mulroney. And I think that Saskatchewan is in the same vein as the rest of North America. We've had enough of that for a long, long time. And I think that the NDP will be trounced henceforth, unless of course they've changed their ways of thinking and some of the policies and pronouncements that they suggest they would put forward if every elected to the government again.

However, I don't think that is around the corner. They seem to be sticking pragmatically to the types of policies and thoughts that they had through the last 11 years. And this last 1982 election has apparently had no effect on their way of thinking whatsoever. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they haven't learned a darn thing from 1982. And until they do, they're going to be left with a few members opposite, as they have now, for a long, long time. And rightly so, Mr. Speaker.

The Saskatchewan people do not want those types of people with their socialist agenda, pushing it onto the rest of us here. It's an old party, Mr. Speaker, with old ideas, attempting to voice their agenda on a young and eager generation here in Saskatchewan who want to, I would suggest, excel on their own merits and abilities, and not on government grants, and hand—outs, subsidies, things of that nature. They don't want, here in Saskatchewan, minimum wage at 70 per cent of the average wage, whatever that is. They don't want farm acres restricted to X amount per farmer. That's not what the people of Saskatchewan want, Mr. Speaker, that's not what they're going to get from us. But it's what they will get, by all indications, if a New Democratic government should ever be re—elected in this province again, especially when those opposite are in control of the party.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the anti—Americanism of the NDP members opposite is not based in any way on a fear of the American military might. They're not worried about the marines from California showing up on our street corners on the next morning. What they really fear, and why they're so anti—American, and why they burned the American flag, is this fear that the free—enterprise system which is so much on display and so much in a fish—bowl for all to observe in the United States, will show up their socialism for what it is and for its obsolescence. And I think really that is why Ed Broadbent and the New Democrats have such an anti—American fervour, is because it really hurts them, and it is totally on a collision course with their socialist agenda.

The New Democratic leader opposite stood up here in his reply to the throne speech and criticized us for not mentioning peace in our throne speech. Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, peace is not a partisan political issue that one side or the other can claim any monopoly over, but it's certainly cherished by all people who value freedom. and when looked at that by any reasonable thinking person, freedom is not maintained really by ideology. It's maintained in the

first instance by a strong national defence, and certainly I would suggest that is the only reason that communists have not run tanks over Canada: i.e. the Monroe Doctrine and our proximity to the United States of America has been the one and only reason that we are not in the same shape as an Afghanistan, or a Poland, or Czechoslovakia in 1972.

(1200)

Only in a free nation, Mr. Speaker, can we have peace demonstrations, can we have cruise protests. I haven't noticed of late any missile demonstrations in Red Square. Who knows that those people think of missiles and nuclear war? At least here we have the freedom to do those things.

I think of the history that I'm familiar with of the Second World War, Neville Chamberlain. He was certainly well—meaning, but certainly suggested by some to be naïve. He thought he could negotiate peace with a more powerful nation, Hitler. It didn't work. Remember always that since America has increased its military spending since Reagan came into power, the U.S.S.R. has not invaded one nation. And I think it's attitudinal and it is just blatantly fear — haven't done it because they're afraid of the consequences.

The Leader of the Opposition, former premier Blakeney, stood up on the steps of this legislature not long ago and advocated that labour unions in this province become more militant. And I look now at what union militance has done in England — the anarchy, the debt. I would suggest that what has happened in Great Britain has put the Labour Party into the opposition benches for a long, long time. And I would suggest that any more irresponsible rhetoric from the Leader of the Opposition along those lines is going to do that for the New Democrats for a long, long time, and for everyone's good in this province.

I'm not speaking as a partisan Conservative politician. It'll be for everyone's good. You members opposite should have a little chat with him in the back room some time and tell him to cool that sort of hare-brained directions to his friends in the labour unions, because we here in Saskatchewan don't want to see what's going on in England happening here. And I implore you to speak some reason to that man so that we don't have those sorts of things happening in this country. And that's what will bring them about. If he's out there advocating militance, we're all looking for trouble. And I think it's your duty, Mr. Member from Shaunavon, to have a talk with that fellow and tell him to look at what's happening over in England and suggest to him that that's not exactly what we want here.

And certainly, Mr. Speaker, I could go on at more length than I have about the good things happening in Saskatoon Eastview. I could go on with respect to many of our programs that we've all become quite familiar with for the last two and a half years. But I will leave the floor to another member to enter the throne speech debate. I certainly will be supporting the throne speech when the vote comes later.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HARDY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour for me to speak to the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As we begin this fourth session of the 20th Legislature, I'd first like to congratulate the Premier for the fine job he's done in guiding our province to the forefront, not only in Saskatchewan, but in Canada and in North America.

Presently the western world is coming out of the worst recession since the 1930s, and many provinces in Canada and many of our neighbours have really been hit hard. We in Saskatchewan never joined the recession.

Saskatchewan has been experiencing rates of growth in both population and industry that any administration in the world would be proud of. Our policies and new legislation have caused the investor community to have such confidence in us that we are putting energy to work as never before — 1,000 direct new jobs, record drilling, record employment in the oil industry. We are causing large capital investments at a time when megaprojects are being abandoned in other areas. The two heavy oil upgraders are amassing capital into the multimillions of dollars. They are allowing Saskatchewan corporations and residents to take advantage of our great wealth, not by some untrustworthy government expropriating or nationalizing the hard work of the private sector, but by allowing Saskatchewan people to take advantage through such things as Saskatchewan bonds in oil and SaskPower.

Mr. Speaker, upon looking at a record such as this, I find myself in awe of the audacity of the opposition and its party supporters. If the members opposite would have their way, how high do you think investor confidence would be then? I would say very low, Mr. Speaker.

The opposition at their recent convention passed some real investment confidence builders, and I'd like you to listen to some of them.

In the Pelly constituency:

Be it resolved that if (and I'd like to "if", Mr. Speaker) the NDP takes power, that any property sold off by the Conservative government be expropriated back for the sum of \$1.

What about our farmers, Mr. Speaker? This sort of attitude and the confidence it generates in investment and business community can be witnessed in our neighbour to the east in Manitoba. I say this is real confidence builders, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, one has only to look as far as Manitoba to see what an NDP government does to the investor confidence. Saskatchewan is making phenomenal showings of being the only province in Canada to have its credit rating increased. Manitoba rate was reduced because, and I'd like to quote: "The province's financial position has deteriorated significantly." Three years of NDP government, Mr. Speaker, and nearly \$3 billion of a deficit. Mr. Speaker, the NDP are so uncaring and so incompassionate that they have gone so far as to propose a resolution which would cost literally thousands of jobs in the now booming oil industry.

Another NDP resolution, Mr. Speaker:

Be it resolved that this party, if (and again I say "if") it forms the next government, automatically raises the royalty rate structure for the oil industry.

A confidence builder, Mr. Speaker, I would say.

Although I've spoken about, and outlined a number of items of great record already, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to enlarge upon them with a few more specifics.

Job creation. Saskatchewan was the only government in Canada which had a net increase in jobs in 1983. In fact, since we took office, Mr. Speaker, 10,000 new jobs created. We want to keep the people of Saskatchewan home, and working in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we have some problems, and one of them is the youth — 25 per cent of our unemployment are between the ages of 15 and 19. To confirm that we are serious about creating employment and providing jobs to our Saskatchewan residents, a new portfolio has been initiated, and a minister responsible for the Employment Development. The minister in charge will be assisted by four other ministers to particularly address the problem, namely, the unemployed youth between 15 and 24 years of age. Keeping those individuals on unemployment insurance benefits and on welfare is definitely not the answer. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, a major effort will take place in informing the public

about the nature of the problem, and looking to address it.

Let me tell you about some job creations that has happened over the last year, and I know my colleagues have spoke about it. The Husky upgrader and the Co—op upgrader, an estimated 4,680 permanent jobs with 20,000 man—years of construction jobs. The Husky upgrader is the largest project of its time ever to come to Saskatchewan.

I would like to speak more about the farming industry. Mr. Minister, farming, and providing security to the family farm, is undoubtedly another priority of this government. Our government has developed many programs to assist farmers who experienced difficulty, much difficulty, this year. Certainly I'd like to speak about the north—east flood compensation program which paid out \$7.5 million in compensation to 1,800 farmers in the north—east part of the province. I'd like to talk a little bit about that program, Mr. Speaker. It was the first time, Mr. Speaker, that any government in Saskatchewan ever paid directly to grain producers to help them for any loss that has occurred. And I heard the member from Pelly talking about how it wasn't paid out right.

He said it should have been paid out through crop insurance, using crop insurance to a two—year average, and to pay only those who collected on crop insurance. He would have crop insurance adjusters out there for months. The farmer waiting for his assistance probably wouldn't have got it yet. We didn't do it that way, Mr. Speaker. We said we would do it and we done it within three to four weeks. That is what I saw — saying we will do it, and then acting.

There is a few questions that would certainly come to mind if we had to run through this the way the member from Pelly suggested. What about those who didn't carry crop insurance? What about those who could not insure because of the limited role of Saskatchewan Crop Insurance? What about those who have no quota books, such as the ranchers up in my area? What about those who transferred from a son or daughter, yet would have not carried insurance for the previous year? No, Mr. Speaker, we treated each and every one in that area the same. They all had problems. And it was decided by the people, not by us, that that's how it should be done, and it was done that way. It's been well received out there. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is the first time ever, and I'd like to congratulate my colleagues in assisting the corner of my province where we really needed it

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HARDY: — There's a few other areas that certainly I would like to just touch on. and one of the areas, and I know it has been touched on every several times herein the last few days, but one is certainly our health services, the best in Canada by far.

We have, Mr. Speaker, since we became government, we built new hospitals in Nipawin, Cut Knife, Lloydminster, and Maidstone. And another thing, Mr. Speaker, 400 new nursing positions have been established since we became government — 400 new nursing positions.

Housing — we had the Build—A—Home program, Mr. Speaker. Hundreds of people worked, and thousands of new houses were built. They have now, Mr. Speaker, for senior citizens, we have the Senior Citizens' Home Repair Program. Over \$5 million to date has been spent. There's been several hundred jobs created, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, a very needed project.

I'd like to just touch on the Department of the Environment for a few moments here. Mr. Speaker, as Minister of the Department of the Environment, I'm very proud to have the most efficient and respected environmental department in North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. HARDY: — The Department of the Environment has come a long ways, Mr. Speaker, to become an efficient, regulatory agency. In keeping with our government policy as a whole,

we believe the consultative process is best for resource and industrial management. Through out assessment process we involve all those affected in the development stages of the guide—lines. We develop a no—nonsense approach towards dealing with our clients. Our administration allows our employees to show their abilities and to help develop initiatives and policies based on their expertise, and particularly their experience in the environmental field. It is our goal, Mr. Speaker, to become a department which is precautionary, rather than reactionary.

(1215)

Some of the activities which have taken place within the Department of the Environment over the last year, Mr. Speaker, are as follows. Seven regional offices throughout the province to provide our communities with technical advice and assistance in operating their sewage works, water works, and land fills; also, a site selection committee for hazardous waste and treatment disposal facilities. Revisions and upgrading of The Air Pollution Control Act and its regulations has been sent out to clients for review and comments, and they're starting to come in now. New regulations governing land fills and hazardous wastes have been sent out for their review and comments.

The Department of the Environment is working with industry to encourage reduction of the amount of hazardous waste being generated and encourage recycling.

Another very important feature is the upgrading of regulations governing water quality, control of water pollution in the department.

Two ecological reserves in the province are in the process of being designated.

Mr. Speaker, coming from the North—east and the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation, the forestry sector is one of my personal priorities. Last spring Saskatchewan signed an agreement with Canada outlining a federal—provincial forestry development agreement that outlined a long—term strategy which will facilitate the more practical use of our forest resource.

Our government recognized the deficit state that the former administration had left our forestry sector in when we took office, Mr. Speaker. The previous NDP government was informed, by the employee and the department, of a void that had to be filled. And I was really shocked when I saw how little had been done there.

The former administration had no long—run plans, and were allowing the timber to be allocated in a haphazard and certainly a very near—sighted manner. It shortened our timber supply by many years. And because our annual cut, we had wastage of almost 20 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the need for such an agreement to deal with long—term issues, one only has to look at what the forest industry means to Canada and to Saskatchewan. In Canada there are more than 300,000 Canadians working directly in the forest industry. There are 700,000 indirect jobs, which boils down to one out of every seven manufacturing dollars being forestry related.

Many forestry operations are the sole employer in rural and northern areas, and certainly the member from Athabasca will agree with me. In fact, 300 communities are one—industry towns.

Mr. Speaker, to give an idea of the need to support and look for growth, or at least stability, in the forest sector, just take note of the fact that a decrease of 1 per cent in the forest sector in the long run would cost at least 3,000 jobs and \$20 million in taxes.

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, 55 per cent of our land is forest. of that, 58,000 sections are commercially vital and viable for timber. In Saskatchewan we have large stands of poplar and

birch hardwood which have been basically untouched. The potential for hardwood furniture marketing development could be greatly facilitated with the right government and right investment attitudes.

For example, Mr. Speaker, Meadow Lake residents recently took advantage of a venture capital program and banded together to keep the Premiere Furniture alive. This development plans to make full vertical use of integrated wood furniture projects and develop a uniquely Saskatchewan furniture style.

In Saskatchewan our small operators are very labour intensive and supply many secondary and primary incomes to our areas where we have historically low employment. Mr. Speaker, the small contractor should be guaranteed a stock in the future of our wood supply. He will, in turn, supply thousands of man—years of employment.

In Saskatchewan we must begin to look at our wood supply, as a renewable resource, with the amount of respect it deserves, and given its far—reaching effect on our province and our industry.

The need to look seriously at farming the forest, Mr. Speaker, as an approach to get maximum utilization from the resource, can never be overstated. Our present levels of reforestation, although better by leaps and bounds than under the former administration, still can be improved. Mr. Speaker, we must ensure that good reforestation practices are abided by, as well as ensuring that our current woods resource is used to its full potential.

Mr. Speaker, the new forest management licence agreement we are working on will address some of these problems. It will outline our saw log and pulpwood commitments for many years, whether private or Crown companies are involved. It will guarantee a place for the small contractor in our province, at the same time will reap the tremendous spin—off effects that these small contractors generate. It will allow the private interests in the forests to plan long—term and thus guarantee many jobs which they effect. This long—term management agreement will allow many employees in the forest sector to breathe easier, knowing that their children will have a forest industry in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in my area, the Kelsey—Tisdale constituency, many changes have taken place over the past year as a direct result of government funding. For instance, let's talk about jobs. In my area there have been a total of 60 new businesses in the expansion taking place over the past year. Mr. Speaker, more business means more jobs. Mr. Speaker, in Tisdale alone there was a recent opening of a new Tisdale mall. There have been 200 new jobs generated there. That doesn't include the jobs which are necessarily in the construction of the complex, and the added businesses which was generated to the local merchants as a result.

In Porcupine Plains, Mr. Speaker, the construction of a Porcupine opportunities program building to train handicapped people in Porcupine and the surrounding areas with five R.M.s involved — 35 to 50 person—jobs per year for the handicapped, Mr. Speaker. That's jobs. Jobs for those who need it.

Saskatchewan Forest Products recently brought on a third shift to the plywood plant in Hudson Bay, supplying jobs around the clock — 25 more jobs, Mr. Speaker. Many of these jobs, both in the bush and the mill, provides supplemental income to the families and do much to alleviate some of the severe weather and economic factors that have prevailed in my area. It is this sort of care and concern that we as a government, Mr. Speaker, have, and which is keeping with our whole government philosophy — that is, of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, our government's priority is to channel those local capital projects into jobs for local people, and I could cite a great many examples from my area — from low income housing, senior citizens' home facilities, the Archerwill school, the Bjorkdale gym, many number of highway projects, an upgraded facility at the Tisdale airport — all making the North—east more accessible.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in the Kelsey—Tisdale constituency 14 jobs were covered in the Saskatchewan Access program, with another 68 jobs in the opportunities program. The total government expenditure in Kelsey—Tisdale for all these jobs is only \$115,000. Mr. Speaker, that's spending our money very wisely.

The diverse effect of this program in our area, Mr. Speaker, is best shown by the wide range in individuals and companies and organization will certainly receive these benefits — the number of farmers, store owners, towns, municipalities, and other business operators receiving the subsidy showing broad and positive effects in the coverage on this program.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to again quote another NDP resolution that was in the fall seminar they had here where the opposition and its party state:

The quality of rural education has been sharply declining during the past two years as a direct result of provincial under—funding.

Mr. Speaker, in the opposition's 10 or more years in government, the rural educational institutions in my constituency were certainly badly neglected. Now I reiterate, it was the government which provided a new school in Archerwill, a new gymnasium in Bjorkdale, an expansion to schools in Tisdale.

The Archerwill school alone is providing 20 jobs in the area, which usually are exports of winter employment to Alberta or B.C. And I certainly get the comment very often, "it's sure nice to be able to have a job and stay at home."

Now we see Alberta and B.C. people coming to Saskatchewan to obtain work. I feel that this is more significant proof that we are not only eroding our rural education base, Mr. Speaker, but improving upon it.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other area that I'd just like to address for the next couple of minutes that I think is very, very important, and it was brought out by the member from Cumberland when he was speaking here last night. And that was an area where he talked about jobs for people in northern Saskatchewan. What he didn't tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that since we became government, there has been a wild rice factory established at La Ronge; that there's 700 rice permits in northern Saskatchewan. Most of those are Northerners, Mr. Minister. Seven hundred jobs for northern people. Their own jobs, self—employed. Not on welfare. Not hand—outs. Making their own living. That is terribly important. Those are long—term jobs for northern people. Mostly northern people there.

Mr. Speaker, he talked about the uranium mining in the North. What he didn't tell you about at Rabbit Lake or up there, was that there's 254 northern people employed there. Two hundred and fifty—four northern people employed there.

At Key Lake, Mr. Speaker, there's over 150 northern people employed, and at Cluff Lake, Mr. Speaker, there's over 200 northern people employed. Northern residents. Permanent jobs. long—term jobs. There's also, Mr. Speaker, — they're looking at gold—mine, as you know, north of La Ronge. More jobs for northern people.

So although, Mr. Speaker, maybe there has been some problems, I'm sure the members know that there's been some problems up there with welfare, lack of jobs. There has been a lot of jobs created over the last two years, Mr. Speaker, in the North, and it's terribly important. They're long—term permanent jobs for northern people, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there's more can be done up there. It can be done in tourism, and certainly in the wild rice industry. It has a tremendous potential for northern people who understand the North, who know how to do it.

One other area, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to talk about, and that is the area — and I think I bring it up every year — is the area where we have our hunting. Uncontrolled hunting certainly has been a problem, and probably will be for many years to come. We've made great steps in this area, Mr. Speaker. The amount of uncontrolled hunting by all people has considerably dropped. We've brought in new legislation where trespassing on private property, you're automatically trespassing on private property without permission. That has controlled some of our hunting.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect our wildlife for the future. It is terribly important that we do. Hunting out of season, hunting in the wrong time of the year deletes our amount of game for the future. It is terribly important that we work towards this goal, and I think all members in the legislature would agree with that.

We've made great strides with, certainly, the native community. I think they should be commended on the way they have reacted to it, to seeing the need as we see it or as we all see it. They too want it there, and it's terribly important. And, yes, in my area, Mr. Speaker, there have been many people who had hunted — uncontrolled hunting. Certainly all people were guilty, but it's certainly been controlled greatly, and I think all should be commended because we made great strides there. We will leave some for our future folks, and I think that's important.

One other area that I heard the member from Cumberland talking about last night, only that did concern me. He said in the 1950s he could go out and shoot game in the North, wherever, and bring it back for his family. Mr. Speaker, I too lived in the North in 1950s and that was a poor . . . There wasn't much wildlife in the North, not because of hunting or any other reason, because it was one of those there times of the season where the wildlife is down because of disease and other problems. There wasn't much wildlife in the North then, Mr. Speaker. We do have a lot of wildlife now, and I urge everyone to preserve that wildlife. It's terribly important.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I feel that our record since we took office speaks for itself. I've outlined a number of accomplishments that we can be very proud of. The initiatives taken in the throne speech will show that our true commitment is to the people of Saskatchewan and, as Minister of Environment, I'm very proud of the work my department has done in the last two years since I've had the privilege of working with them. They have developed a no—nonsense approach to deal with clients, using a process for consultation instead of confrontation.

In the area of the Saskatchewan forest products and my concerns for the forest sector, the positive steps taken by the government do much to allow the long—run viability of the industry and the subsequent guarantee of the job base.

Kelsey—Tisdale, Mr. Speaker, it is only truly my privilege to represent these fine people in our legislature. The initiative and the input of the people in the north—east is my constant strength, and I shall work very hard to live to the responsibility and keep their needs uppermost in my minds.

Mr. Speaker, with this, I will supporting the Speech from the Throne and voting against the amendment. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

(1230)

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 8

Blakeney	Lingenfelter	Shillington
Thompson	Koskie	Yew
Engel	Lusney	

Nays — 40

Muller	Hepworth	Hopfner
Birkbeck	Dirks	Myers
McLeod	Currie	Rybchuk
Andrew	Sandberg	Caswell
Berntson	Martens	Hampton
Lane	Young	Gerich
Duncan	Domotor	Tusa
Katzman	Muirhead	Meagher
Pickering	Petersen	Glauser
Hardy	Bacon	Sauder
McLaren	Hodgins	Zazelenchuk
Garner	Parker	Johnson
Smith (Swift Current)	Smith (Moose Jaw South)	Weiman
Baker		

HON. MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

THE SPEAKER: — I believe the House Leader has already adjourned the debate once . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The Table doesn't very often make an error, but I guess we did today. The House Leader has moved the debate adjourned. Debate continues. You need leave.

MR. SVEINSON: —I welcome the chance to enter the debate, this being the first opportunity I've had to speak to a throne speech since becoming a member of the opposition benches. I would like to congratulate the member from Saskatoon Riversdale and the member from Last Mountain—Touchwood who moved and seconded the main motions. So you will understand that, as the first time as a member in opposition, I believe my view of the speech won't be quite as clouded as those sitting to my right.

I see the Speech from the Throne delivered last week as looking a lot like a hot air balloon. It's glossy, and it's pretty on the outside, Mr. Speaker, but inside, the Speech from the Throne, read last Thursday by His Honour, there's nothing. There's nothing. There isn't any substance; just a lot of hot air. And believe me, that's leaking a little.

Into this House in the last four or five days, they've read several Bills, including Bill 1, tabled to, in fact, deal with farmers and the problems they're facing with land foreclosures. They've also introduced Bill 2 which is an Act to establish an employment development agency.

The House has been in session for two weeks today, and the urgency of some of the legislation that they've tabled today has not been well demonstrated. The Act dealing with the unemployed in this province doesn't outline programs, doesn't outline opportunities, but simply deals with another Act which gives the responsibility to a tired old minister of that government, who, in fact, has been assigned to develop programs and opportunities for the unemployed.

Since we have sat in debate on the throne speech, 3 or 4,000 more people in this province have

suffered the plight. They have, in fact, suffered that pink slip. They are now unemployed. In the last month, as was today outlined very well in question period, there are an additional 6,000 people in Saskatchewan unemployed, who face a very bleak and a very black Christmas.

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hear from the Minister of Agriculture who suggests that after the next election there'll only be one more.

I can assure him, I think, that your benches will demonstrate that after the next election some of your policies on unemployment, of farming, and other areas in this province, will, in fact, be rejected outright by the voters in this province, who will look to the only alternative, the only alternative, not a tired old NDP party, not a tired old NDP party whose policies have not improved, and whose policies were rejected out of hand in 1982.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Tell us about the Liberal policies. They never were rejected . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — And I have a member opposite, to my right, another member in opposition, asking me to outline Liberal policies.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I said, outline how they were accepted . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — How they were accepted. I would like to indicate on one specific area, and it's dealing with the farmers in north—eastern Saskatchewan, dealing with the farmers in north—eastern Saskatchewan.

The federal government, a federal Liberal government, prior to the September election, did commit \$16 million to those farmers. It did commit \$16 million to those farmers. Subsequently, that \$16 million has been pared in half by this government, by a government in Ottawa that represents the same party name and the same philosophy.

What have you done to the farmers in north—eastern Saskatchewan? You have pared, you have taken from them \$8 million, and you've displaced it into the Ontario grape industry. You've displaced that \$8 million into the Ontario agricultural industry.

There was debate . . . There was certainly debate in the House of Commons over a Bill affecting the Ontario tobacco industry. That was rushed through. But the answer from members opposite regarding the \$8 million that has been refused to the farmers in north—eastern Saskatchewan has simply been that we haven't been the treasury board. We haven't been able to allocate the funds.

(1245)

Well they went to treasury board on behalf of the Ontario grape producers. They went to legislation on behalf of the Ontario tobacco producers. When are they going to act on behalf of the Saskatchewan wheat producers, or rape producers, or whatever they're producing in north—eastern Saskatchewan? That commitment was made. That was made prior to the election. That commitment has been broken, and that promise has been broken.

I can certainly . . . I'd like to just read, for a moment, a statement from the Hon. Brian Mulroney at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, on July 5, 1984. He suggests that:

Progressive Conservatives recognize the regional basis of Canada and the importance of a Canadian identity in all regions.

I don't think anybody in Canada wouldn't support that kind of a broad suggestion. He also alludes to the Hon. John Diefenbaker — the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker — suggests that of greater importance is the long—term spirit of western Canada which he managed to instil in the

Progressive Conservatives across this country.

I would like to outline, as well, in this same document, promises to western Canadians — promises to western Canadians. He outlined that a Progressive Conservative government — keep in mind this was before the election — will establish an agribond program. That's been set aside for study.

A Progressive Conservative government will abolish — will abolish — the imposition of capital gains tax in the sale of farm property. Again, set aside for study.

A Progressive Conservative government — now this is an interesting promise — a Progressive Conservative government — this again was a promise in stone, expected by the farmers of Saskatchewan by a government that's represented, certainly in Saskatchewan, by a good number of Progressive Conservatives — a Progressive Conservative government will reduce the price of farm fuels by 20 cents a gallon by removing the 9 per cent federal sales tax and by not collecting the current excise tax. That was not done. Twenty cents a gallon was not knocked off the price of farm fuels.

In April of '82, a Progressive Conservative government was elected in Saskatchewan with a . . . certainly a host of promises, some of which weren't broken, and I applaud this government for that.

I applaud them on programs like the removal of the gas tax. I think that's been debated widely in this House. I think even the members to my right will support them on that particular legislation.

I certainly supported the legislation which supported home owners in this province. The Mortgage Interest Reduction Plan — that was a promise made by this government. But many others, many others, with the exception of those two, have been broken.

And I think that probably the record holder respecting broken promises will, in fact, be our federal government. There was somewhere in the order of 350 promises made by the Mulroney government prior to the last election, a lot of those affecting western Canadians. As we can see already, we've only had the administration in place in Ottawa for four or five months, and already they've undertaken to break some of their commitments to, not only Saskatchewan farmers, but also Saskatchewan people from all stripes, from all walks of life.

Agriculture policy: the hon. John Wise, our new Minister of Agriculture — now he may have spoken to farm groups in Saskatchewan since the election. If he has been out here, I'm not aware of it. But he did speak, on November 27th, to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. And some of the points that I find very interesting — —he suggested on your farms, and in your organizations, and in government, that this is a time to put aside false dreams.

Well, they certainly developed on those false dreams during their election campaign. And a lot of the Canadians that heard those false dreams, those false promises, expected them to be delivered by the soon to be elected Progressive Conservative government. They have not been delivered.

He goes on to say that inflated hopes or self—serving explanations . . . Self—serving explanations, an interesting out, certainly an interesting outline by a minister, a Progressive Conservative minister, who, to the Ontario farmers just within months, has, in fact, enacted legislation offering these people, the Ontario grape producers, offering them support; the Ontario tobacco producers, offering them support; suggesting that self—serving explanations . . . Here's a minister, a key minister in the federal government, our Minister of Agriculture, from Ontario. Sure, it's a self—serving national government. They will, in fact, serve their own constituencies in Ontario.

He goes on to say that this is the time to get down to hard, cold facts of where we are and where

we're heading. Well, I think that the provincial Government of Saskatchewan realizes where we are. I give them that much credit. But I don't think their direction that they've taken, just in the last three or four days in this House, as to how the solution should be approached, is going to develop any relationship between the farming community and their difficulties, this Progressive Conservative government, and in fact, the institutions required to serve and give the credit required to farm in this province, any credibility. They have introduced Bill 1, which basically all it does is delay the problem. Fjordbotten, the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta yesterday suggested their government was not interested in this kind of legislation. He had the same political stripe as the government elected in this province. He suggested, yes, it's only a delay tactic. The farmers who, in fact, undertake to follow the legislation through and not make payments to the banks are going to face credit problems, and certainly there is no opportunity within the Act to waive the legislation. So it'll affect every farmer in this province who decides, in fact, that he would like credit from his bank or his credit union institution.

This government fails, I think, even with respect to legislation passed by the NDP in 1981 which was, again, a self-serving, very inexpensive method for a government to delay the inevitable, which was payment of home mortgages. At least they allowed the homeowners at that time to waive the legislation if, in fact, they wanted to buy homes in this province. All the banks — in fact, if you went into at that point in time to buy a home and required a mortgage, you had to sign a waiver. They weren't going to loan you money. Is this legislation going to dry up the sale of farm land that requires mortgage payments in order to buy the land? I would suggest to the government that, yes, it will. The banks are not happy.

In 1981, they certainly expressed in a headline, in fact on December 10, 1981, in *The Globe and Mail*, the banks expressed their dissatisfaction at that time for the Act passed by the former government, the NDP government. They indicated in that headline that they were angry, that they were angry, and that those who would suffer would be the residents of this province. And I believe for a short while they probably did suffer. They had to go with, certainly, hat in hand if, in fact, they wanted to buy a home in Saskatchewan and outline to the bankers who were, in fact, financing the purchase of these homes that, yes, we're willing to make our payments. Yes, loan us the money. We need housing.

Well, the farmers won't be given the same opportunity. The homeowner at the time could waive the legislation. The farmers, in this particular Act if they want money from the bank to finance mortgages or, in fact, finance anything else, they do not, under the Act that was tabled in this legislature, have the opportunity to waive the legislation. I think the principle that superseded this legislation regarding the same type of payment, the principle that was developed by a former government, in order to give those who needed financing, an opportunity respecting the banking institutions, should be given the same opportunity in this legislation. And I will be introducing into the House an amendment to the Act indicating that the farmers have the option to waive the legislation if, in fact, they need bank credit, and that will, in fact, enable the banks to allow the credit to go out to the farmers involved.

I think the principle is very important allowing the banks who are not in a position where they don't want to deal with Saskatchewan farmers. I think they've got a long and credible record in this province. I know that, off the record, one of the major banks indicated in the last couple of days that they only had three foreclosures that they were considering in 1985.

I realize that foreclosures and bankruptcies aren't the only way that farmers sign off their land, and the other way, of course, is quitclaims, and a lot of farmers, before they get to foreclosure, before they get to bankruptcy, have already quitclaimed any right to their farm land.

We don't hear about those cases. That land goes on the block, is sold by legal firms in Saskatchewan, and is done very quietly, and, I suppose, for good reasons. I've never heard the reasons, but I'll tell you the difficulties that face Saskatchewan farmers — and it's been reported recently that 19 per cent of the farmers in this province, Mr. Speaker, are facing grave financial

difficulties. Well, a slap at the bank isn't necessarily going to be the answer.

Is this government going to pay the interest, the interest that's accumulated over the next year? The farmer has to pay it or, in fact, if the foreclosure finds its way to fruition in coming years, the bank's just going to have to suffer the loss. I'm not defending the banks. I'm just suggesting that credit has to be forthcoming.

We've got 5 billion loaned out presently on farm land in the province. Those farmers who need credit for seeding next spring or for chemicals or whatever, are they going to find difficulty in getting that credit? Is this legislation going to create an aura where the banking institutions are going to look at farmers as a poor risk?

I understand that this government chose not to deal, or not to discuss the legislation with the banks. I suggest that they go back to the banks and reassess the legislation respecting the waiver of the legislation so that credit can be forthcoming to anyone who desires to pay their bills in 1985. And a lot of farmers out there aren't going to question the payment of their bills. They're going to undertake to pay their bills. They just would like additional credit to pay for the seed or the chemicals or the machinery that they require, and that is not allowed in this present Act.

Getting a little off the topic, Mr. Speaker, but certainly since the throne speech was read last Thursday, this Bill has been tabled, and I've heard from many farmers throughout the province on the merits of the Act.

I have also heard from politicians outside the province. I mentioned Mr. Fjordbotten, the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta, yesterday in the news indicated that, no, the Alberta government will not be considering this kind of legislation. And why? Very simply because it doesn't do anything to alleviate the problem. It doesn't put any cash into the industry. When Chrysler was in trouble in the '80s or in the '70s, did the government of the day, did they give them a loan or a debt moratorium? No. They supported them with loan guarantees. They supported them with cash. The question of, you know, of course, if the farmers are having — who are in a cash flow or a cost—price squeeze, as the Minister of Agriculture likes to refer to it as, is where do they get their additional capital for financing the operations on their farms, and is this Act going to make it more difficult to get the financing they require?

AN HON. MEMBER: — What would you know about it?

MR. SVEINSON: — The Minister of Agriculture hollers from the back of the room: what would I know about it? Well, I certainly would have a position that I think I know a lot more about financing than the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, it's near 1 o'clock and . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . A little heat and you can't handle it. Well, I find it interesting that the member from Moosomin would suggest that I eke out one more thought and strain my brain. I don't think he's contributed anything to this House in the two and a half years that I've been a member in this House — since he was elected, likely.

Getting back to the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, the *Leader—Post* headline on Friday read: "Throne speech draws bead on helping farmers and the jobless." Well, you don't have to pull a figure out of the hat, that these people are in trouble.

THE SPEAKER: — Order, please. Before calling it 1 o'clock, I'd like to make one very brief announcement to the House. The official opening of the legislative library's renovated reading and reference rooms will occur today at 3:15, and the librarian staff and I would extend a welcome to all of you to attend that opening.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.