

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Wiens: — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the other members of the Assembly an old colleague of mine from university, Gerald Langner, who I think is the principal of LCBI, the Lutheran Collegiate Bible Institute, at Outlook, but is for sure the choral director there.

It was delightful on our way to the House now to hear much more harmonious a sound than often arises from here as we were coming and I want to thank him and his students, the LCBI concert choir, for their contribution to a wonderful atmosphere here and welcome to the House. Thank you.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also on behalf of my colleague, the member from Arm River, would like to welcome the group that are in the gallery today. Mr. Muirhead couldn't be with us today and he just wished to pass on his regards to the students and their director from Outlook, Saskatchewan, and I would echo the words of the member from Rosetown-Elrose that it certainly is a nice melody to hear in the legislature on Tuesday. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. MacKinnon: — Yes, I'd like to introduce two guests. My sons, Alan and William, who are off school this week and have been down yesterday and today trying to get over the sadness of not being able to go to school by seeing the lights of the big city. And I know they're looking forward to their bus trip back to Saskatoon today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the Assembly through you, a group of ladies who are here. They're wearing white ribbons signifying their concern regarding some of the legislation that is going to be coming forward . . . or is brought forward in this House. And we'd like to welcome them to the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hospital Budget Allocations

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question this afternoon is to the Minister of Health. Madam Minister, I understand that you will be announcing today, perhaps even as I am speaking, the

budgets for the hospitals in the Midwest Health District. Madam Minister, will you announce the date that you will be releasing the 1993-94 operating budgets for the other rural hospitals in Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been a number of hospitals who have been notified as to their operating budgets already. And the Department of Health is meeting with hospitals throughout the province and giving them information as to their '93-94 budgets.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Madam Minister. It would be interesting to have an understanding of why you're going piecemeal around the provinces, picking here and choosing there as to who gets their budgets and who don't.

Now, Madam Minister, will the eight hospitals in the Midwest Health District have the opportunity to determine how this funding is to be distributed or have you already made that decision for them?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to Midwest, it's my understanding that the Department of Health is meeting with the Midwest board today, will be telling them what the budget allocations are, and there will be consultation with the board and representatives from the facilities within the Midwest district. It's my understanding that this meeting is taking place today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From that answer then, Madam Minister, would just confirm that they will have sole discretionary powers within that budget to spend as they would then like to and feel the need for?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the Midwest board will be funded globally, and it will also be advised of the department's guidelines with respect to hospital funding. It will also be . . . have to meet provincial standards and deliver services in an adequate fashion throughout the district.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, can you confirm that they will have discretionary powers within that global budget? Or are you saying that they will have to be operating within the parameters of your guidelines — the department's guideline — is that correct?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, there are provincial standards that have to be met with respect to providing health care services within a district. The Midwest district will be expected to do that. The Midwest district will also be advised what funding is available for each of the institutions within the district and will be expected to operate in accordance with those sort of guidelines.

The Midwest district however will be funded globally, Mr. Speaker, and will be making decisions for the district as to where they want to provide specific services. They will do a needs assessment to determine how many acute care beds are needed, for example, how many long-term care, and through discussions with communities will be coming forward with suggestions as to how the funding is to be allocated within provincial guidelines.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Madam Minister, for confirming that the people will really have no say as to the direction which they're going, that they will have to operate by your predetermined guidelines. And your magic new resolutions and your new criteria, I would be very interested, Madam Minister, if you could table that for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, these new, so-called new guidelines that you're talking about. Could you table them for us, Madam Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the Midwest district board will have a lot of say in terms of what services are provided, where they're provided, and what sort of allocation will take place. They are being advised however, as they have been all along, that what they will be funded with is the funding these institutions would have received on their own if they were not in a district.

There will be cooperation between the Midwest district board and the communities involved in determining what services are to be provided and where they are to be provided, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Madam Minister, I do believe that we are making some progress. It's like pulling eye teeth out of a chicken, I guess, as we pull out one at a time, one hospital budget at a time, Madam Minister. So you are to be commended for gradually coming out with some of these budgets.

But having done that, Madam Minister, would you then also say that you will give these hospitals time to consider what they are dealing with? Will you withdraw, Madam Minister, your closure motion and postpone further debate on this Bill until the hospital boards around the province have had a chance to figure out exactly what these numbers mean in terms

of hospital closures and bed cuts. Will you do that, Madam Minister? Will you allow time for full consideration and a full public debate about the implications of your so-called wellness plan? Will you do that, Madam Minister?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, hospitals will have time to consider — particularly those facilities where there may be a role change — to consider what sort of role change will take place. They will have time to get organized with other communities on a district basis and to come forward with a plan and a needs assessment. There is time being given to the people of Saskatchewan and to many of our smaller hospitals to look at these issues and how they're impacted and to deal with it in the context of a larger community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Again, Madam Minister, I just remind you that the people across the province are asking us to ask you to whoa up, to give them more time. This is being rushed, Madam Minister.

But, Madam Minister, you are continually suggesting that opposition members are somehow spreading misinformation. Madam Minister, the facts are, that we are putting out before the public, are coming into us from the public.

Madam Minister, on Thursday we received a letter from the chairman of the Preeceville Union Hospital, and I'd like to make a little quote:

The government plan indicates that for the 20,000 people in our proposed Kamsack, Canora and Preeceville district, of the present total rated active treatment beds of 157, only 20-30 will remain after the dust cloud settles. Due to the health care needs, geography and large percentage of elderly in our district, those numbers of beds are totally unrealistic.

He goes on to say that it's . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I want the member to ask his question.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He goes on to say that this is giving . . .

The Speaker: — Order. I asked the member to ask his question.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, the people in this area are asking us to ask you: will you please do away with the closure motion and closure on closure that is coming up, so that they will have time to actually, practically assess and reassess the implications of your cuts that you are proposing on the people within that area and indeed across the province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to the

bed targets of 1.5 per thousand, I have said on numerous occasions, repeatedly, that those are targets on a provincial-wide basis; that they will take into consideration geography, it'll take into consideration distances, it'll take into consideration the availability of community-based services. It's something for the people of Saskatchewan to work towards, Mr. Speaker. So the many people across this province understand that. Unlike some members opposite, many people do understand that.

So I want to say this with respect to the 1.5 per thousand. They are targets. We're asking people to analyse their needs within the context of those targets. There will be time to do needs assessment within Saskatchewan and for people to come forward with their plans. We have said that repeatedly. Holding up the district legislation, preventing the passage of the district legislation, Mr. Speaker, is going to hurt our small communities.

The government has made budget decisions with respect to the institutional sector which will be implemented. It will help many of our communities.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Next question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Talk about a contradiction of ideas and principles, Madam Minister. We are asking you that something that the people across the provinces are asking us to ask you — time, you say they will have time. You've got closure in the House. You're trying to ram the thing through. You're trying to push it through so that there cannot be timely debate and yet you say there will be time, Madam Minister.

I'm going to quote again from the chairman of the Preeceville Union Hospital. He says:

Implementation deadlines are too quick, the cut backs overly severe and will significantly affect the health care, economy and morale of rural Saskatchewan (Madam Minister).

Madam Minister, the doctor from Dinsmore says, and I quote: If you don't care for people in their communities it will increase the migration of people out of rural areas.

Madam Minister, what studies have you done? What studies have you done on the economic impact of your wellness plan on rural Saskatchewan, on rural communities? How many jobs will be lost? How many businesses will close? How many people will be forced to move and what alternative means will you be putting in place to keep communities in rural Saskatchewan viable and to keep people in rural Saskatchewan?

What studies have you done, Madam Minister, that gives you the assurance that rural Saskatchewan will be taken care of?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to rural Saskatchewan being taken care of, the long-term plan by government is to develop services in Saskatchewan that actually enhance the availability of the needed health care services for rural residents. It's a question of need as opposed to wants.

With respect to moving more slowly . . . the members opposite say move more slowly; don't . . . you know, don't pass the district Act legislation.

I want to say this once again. We have certain guidelines we have to meet with respect to budget, and therefore budget decisions will be implemented, Mr. Speaker.

Getting into a district is going to . . . getting into a district will protect our smallest communities, Mr. Speaker, and will allow people to develop plans in the context of a district, to develop plans that in the long run will enhance the services that are available to people in rural Saskatchewan. Getting into a district is going to save medicare and improve health care services for people in the future, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From your answer it becomes apparent to the people of Saskatchewan that your wellness plan is not about people — it's budget. And yet even there it is counter-productive, Madam Minister.

Madam Minister, last week I invited you to a number of public meetings that will be taking place throughout the province in this week. Over the weekend, many new communities have decided to hold public meetings. There will be a meeting at Herbert tonight, Rocanville Wednesday, Moosomin and Kipling on Thursday, and in Macklin on Monday.

And because of your government's heavy-handed introduction of closure last week, the public meeting in Kindersley has been moved up to tonight. These meetings are in addition to those already scheduled in Kerrobert, in Eston, and Codette.

Madam Minister, will you and your Premier be attending these meetings to explain your action to the people of those communities and listen to their concerns? Will you do that, Madam Minister, before you use this closure motion to ram this legislation down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Ms. Simard: — Mr. Speaker, the legislation is not being rammed down the throats of the people of Saskatchewan. Many people are asking for this legislation to be passed. In fact if it hadn't been for delaying tactics opposite, we could have passed it last year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, people want this legislation because they recognize across Saskatchewan that they need it in order to preserve medicare for future

generations. They realize that we have a very expensive infrastructure to maintain in this province and that we're not using it to its full capacity, that we don't need all these beds, and we should be spending our money more effectively. The people of Saskatchewan know that, Mr. Speaker.

And they are asking us to pass this . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I was not cutting the Minister of Health off; I was simply going to ask members not to interfere with her answering the question. There was a barrage of interference coming. And I'm asking you, please don't interrupt. I don't think the member was interrupted when he asked his question.

Government Tendering Practices

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, over this last long weekend I think most people in the province of Saskatchewan were looking for an open and accountable government. Obviously from the answers we get today, all they found were Easter eggs and not an open and accountable government.

Mr. Speaker, the Property Management Corporation of this province recently invited tenders for the provision of photocopier equipment to the Government of Saskatchewan. In spite of this government's pledge to have open and accountable tendering, Mr. Speaker, we find that this contract, which will be worth tens of thousands of dollars, is closed.

My question is to the minister responsible for closed tendering. Mr. Minister, in closing bids you fly in the face of what public opinion has said to the Government of Saskatchewan, that they want fair and open tendering. Mr. Minister, you have cancelled a long-time practice. Would you tell the people of Saskatchewan that you will change that practice and open these bids up for this particular tender? Would you do that, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the member's question, first of all let me say that unlike the former administration, this government is determined to see fair and honest tendering in this province, and that includes the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the circumstances or of the bids with respect to photocopiers. I will take notice of this question and respond in due course.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the minister's information, the reference number on it is ITT69194.

Mr. Minister, this flies directly in the face of what you and your party promised the people of Saskatchewan in the last election campaign. What we see instead is a government drunk with power, that simply says, we'll do what we want; we can break whatever promises we want. We saw it in the case of the aerial spraying contract which your government just took the highest bid, \$150,000 over.

Mr. Minister, the public is demanding of you, they're demanding of you that you open the process up. Would you give the commitment today that this tender will not be done in a closed-door session but will be open for public tender? Will you do that, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would have to admit to the member opposite, I'm not aware of the tender. I'm not aware of the circumstances surrounding it. But as I've indicated, I will take notice and I will get back to the member with respect to the details of the process.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, people in this province and in this House demand that you have a more open approach than your Minister of Health has done on the health care issue.

Recently we have seen proposals let for the installation and maintenance of services for Saskatchewan government's network of video lottery terminals and site controllers. Mr. Minister, can you tell me why, given the serious perception problems your government's handling of the gaming industry has had, given your promise of fair and open tendering, can you tell this Assembly why you have chosen to open the bids for the maintenance of video lottery machines behind closed doors? Why the secrecy, Mr. Minister, given that you have risked \$20 million of taxpayers' money on this particular project?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the tenders and the proposals for the supplying of the VLTs (video lottery terminal) in this province, I think the member is well aware that two companies have been short-listed, and that the Gaming Commission is in the process of determining price and other factors. And as soon as those have been determined and an agreement has been struck with the two companies, a contract will be signed. And that, I'm sure the member is well aware, is the process. It hasn't changed from last week.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the minister had too long a weekend and his ears are still plugged. Mr. Minister, what we're talking about here is the maintenance of the machines. We're not . . . you can't hide behind your hidden report on these two companies. We're talking about the people that are going to do the maintenance on these machines, Mr. Minister. You have put an open . . . you've put a tender call out for it that you say that you're going to hold behind closed doors.

Now, Mr. Minister, it's one thing to hide behind your officials' secret report as far as spending the \$20 million. We're talking about fixing these machines and you don't even want to do that in public, Mr. Minister. What is it about fixing your video lottery terminals that you don't want that tender opened in public, Mr. Minister? What is there about that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member opposite that unlike the former administration, this proposal will be tendered and we will choose the most appropriate one to accept the bid. I want to say that this is not the kind of government . . . and I think the member is stuck prior to 1991 to the system that the front-benchers on that side used. This government doesn't operate that way. We have indicated that we want people to propose a contract for tender and we will have a look at those bids, and I would suggest to you that the appropriate person will be chosen, sir.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, this flies directly in the face of the statements made by the member from Riversdale in the last election campaign. The tender call is number 032693-01 and it says: there will not be a public opening of proposals. Mr. Minister, what have you got to hide? Why do you have your officials go out with a request for proposal and then tell the public that they have no business in being part of that proposal when it is opened? What is it that you're hiding, Mr. Minister? Why do you have to do it this way in the face of all your promises?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member opposite that the request for maintenance — for the maintenance of the VLTs — is open. It's open to any corporation or to any individual in this province to put forth a proposal. I think that that is a fair way of doing things. We want to get the best dollar value that we can and we want to have the best service provided with respect to these VLTs, and that is exactly what this request for proposals is about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SGI Agreement with Glass Repairers

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance). Mr. Minister, on March 16 SGI sent a letter to all the auto glass dealers in Saskatchewan together with an agreement negotiated between SGI and the Glass Dealers Association.

The letter stated that only glass dealers who signed this agreement and returned it by March 25 would have direct billing privileges with SGI and that SGI would recognize only those who sign this agreement as SGI accredited glass repairers.

Mr. Minister, it's my understanding that the Glass Dealers Association of Saskatchewan represents only a small number of glass shops and that the majority of the auto glass shops in Saskatchewan are not represented by this association.

How many auto glass shops are represented by Glass Dealers Association of Saskatchewan? And why does this group have the mandate to negotiate such an important contract with SGI on behalf of all the auto glass dealers in Saskatchewan, most of whom do not even belong to this organization?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — In regards to the specific numbers that you've asked for, I'll get that back to you, you know, later on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for a response that he will provide this information, but what is the reason for all of this?

You negotiated an agreement that is absolutely essential to the viability of the auto glass dealers with your hand-picked association, and you gave the dealers a week, a few weeks, to sign up or you essentially said that you won't deal with them any more.

Most dealers signed this agreement because they simply had no choice. This intimidation happened to SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association); it's happening to hospitals and to others across this province.

Is this the sort of intimidation tactic which is acceptable business practices for SGI these days? Why didn't you allow more time so that other auto dealers, not those represented by the Glass Dealers Association, would have some say in the terms of this agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — In regards to your comment on intimidation, I'm really surprised at your comments, you know. The Glass Dealers Association, you know, have been working in this province for a long time and

it's really disappointing to hear your negative comments here in this legislature today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Mr. Speaker, the minister may be disappointed in my comments but the people in Saskatchewan, the auto dealers in Saskatchewan, are very disappointed in the way he's running SGI and telling them, either you sign this agreement by March 25 or you will not be a representative of SGI any more.

Part of the agreement reads, Mr. Minister:

I therefore agree that in every circumstance involving repair or replacement, my account upon being submitted to SGI will reflect my lowest advertised offered price in effect at that time.

Mr. Minister, a number of people we have spoken to in the industry indicated that this means if they ever lower their price below the standard SGI rate even for a one-day sale, SGI will only pay them that sale price for any similar work from that point on.

You're dictating the business practices and you're imposing your idea of communist central planning. Isn't this an attempt to restrict competition in the auto glass industry? And why do you place such restrictive limitations on the operating practices of auto glass dealers in this province in favour of your hand-picked few?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — In answer to the member, we're trying to have the fairest system possible out there, and that's the decision that we have made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1430)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 02 — An Act to incorporate the Bethany Bible Institute and to amend An Act to incorporate Mennonite Brethren Church of Saskatchewan

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that Bill No. 02, An Act to incorporate the Bethany Bible Institute and to amend An Act to incorporate Mennonite Brethren Church of Saskatchewan be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

Motion agreed to, the Bill read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Resolution No. 5 — Economic Development Partnerships

Mr. Cline: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'll sit down right now. But seriously, at the end of my remarks I will be moving a motion:

That this Assembly recognize the efforts of the Minister of Economic Development and his department to revitalize Saskatchewan by developing, through partnerships a coherent, comprehensive and realistic economic strategy.

On November 3 of last year, the Minister of Economic Development released a document called *Partnership for Renewal — A Strategy for the Saskatchewan Economy*. This is an important document. Its release in fact has not gone unnoticed even beyond our borders. Recently the *Worldbusiness* magazine, in its February 1993 edition, gave an award in the category of industrial economic development organization. And *Worldbusiness* said:

Our 1992 Award in this category goes to the Government of Saskatchewan under Premier Roy Romanow and Economic Development Minister, Dwain Lingenfelter . . . the Government of Saskatchewan has done a remarkable job of encouraging industry to locate in the province and in supporting industry that is already there. The Province has created a high level of awareness and responsiveness to industrial development opportunities and needs, has maintained a tolerable regulatory legislative environment . . . and, with a necessarily modest budget has promoted Saskatchewan as a fine place from which to do business.

So when we're speaking about the minister's strategy for economic development, Mr. Speaker, the praise for that strategy does not just come from members of the government caucus, it comes from people who are quite knowledgeable beyond our borders and in fact who look at these matters from an international perspective.

But also within our borders many commentators from a wide range of diverse groups have recognized the leadership that the minister and his department have shown.

The business editor of the *Star-Phoenix*, Mr. Paul Martin, on November 7, a few days after the release of the document, said that:

The . . . paper . . . was the second major foray on the economic front. By all accounts it has won glowing praise.

First and foremost it shows the Romanow administration understands the way this economy works.

Then he goes on to point out that the paper recognizes that Saskatchewan is a trade dependent province and he indicates that the call for a new economic environment by the paper is drawing favourable reaction from the business sector.

He goes on to say:

It marks a departure from the policies of previous administrations — including the Conservative Grant Devine who outspent all Saskatchewan politicians — that government . . .

And he goes on to say that it marks a departure from the idea that the government can lead economic development through massive spending.

As we've heard Premier Romanow say so often, it's time for business to stimulate economic development because government can't afford to. By recalling the pioneering Saskatchewan spirit — a belief in self-reliance — Romanow has not only dealt with this fiscal reality, he's thrown down the gauntlet. It's time the rest of us did something about our economic situation. And that's the way it should be.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — And in fact the government's position has been warmly greeted in many sectors. The *Leader-Post* called the paper a practical compromise the day after it was released. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business called it a pragmatic document. The Saskatchewan Construction Association called it a good plan with a good chance of succeeding. The Saskatchewan Federation of Labour called it a realistic plan. The chamber of commerce said the document was workable and made common sense, and the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce calls it an excellent starting point.

Now the question might be asked, why organizations which are so diverse from labour to business within Saskatchewan, outside Saskatchewan, media, have greeted the paper so favourably. And I think the reason why the government's blueprint for economic development, which is what the *Partnership for Renewal* is, has been warmly greeted, is because it was drafted in partnership with Saskatchewan people. It was drafted with the cooperation of hundreds of business, labour, co-op, aboriginal, and other groups who came together with the government to come up with a blueprint for economic development in this province.

And I think it's very commendable, Mr. Speaker, that the minister, his staff and officials went all around the province over a period of six to eight months and listened to people and developed the strategy in concert with them. The process itself was key to coming up with a good document. And it was a process of partnership, not dictatorship. It was a process of not telling people what they need, but asking Saskatchewan people what Saskatchewan

needs.

And that process involved dozens of Saskatchewan people and hundreds if not thousands of people . . . I should have said dozens of Saskatchewan communities, and many, many more people.

I think as a result, Mr. Speaker, the plan is very realistic; it's flexible; it's capable of being changed as circumstances change, but it provides a sense of direction and hope and renewal for our economy.

One thing it recognizes is that government cannot lead economic development by itself. It is not something that government can or should be doing in a vacuum. Economic development is something that requires the cooperation of people all the way down to the local level. And I would say of all sectors of our economy, whether big business, small business, cooperatives, labour, working people, other organizations working together and identifying the strengths that we have here in Saskatchewan. And we do have many strengths and we have to build on them.

The approach is one of partnership. And I should point out that anyone who wishes to have a copy of the *Partnership for Renewal* can obtain one by calling a toll free number which is 1-800-665-3366, and the Department of Economic Development will make that available to them.

The document recognizes that we do face a tough situation in Saskatchewan. For the last 10 years we've seen very irresponsible spending by government in the province. We have been spending more than we have been earning. Now because of the situation we're in, we have to face reality and have a realistic and workable plan to create new wealth.

We've learned over the last number of years that economic development does not mean the government throwing money at large megaprojects thought to be quick fixes to all our economic problems. That strategy has been tried and we have all seen that it has failed. That strategy has left the province in a situation where we are in a strait-jacket of debt.

So we have to look beyond the quick fix. We have to realize that 70 per cent of our jobs, for example, are created by the small-business sector. And we have to appreciate that all sectors of the economy are vital to economic renewal.

The *Partnership for Renewal* recognizes this. It says that economic leadership goes beyond government to small business as well as big business, to cooperatives, to working people, aboriginal people, and communities. And it says we have to work together. It is not intended to be a detailed plan. Instead it is a statement of goals and objectives and strategies to achieve each of them. It does identify key sectors in which action is required. I think most importantly it contains firm targets and ways to measure our success in achieving them.

The strategy contains three broad goals, 23 specific objectives, and 31 strategies for achieving them. And very importantly, a time line for implementation is attached to each one. And I think that is important, Mr. Speaker, because the government is not simply saying we should do these things; it is saying how we're going to do these things and when we're going to do these things. It's like the provincial budget. It doesn't just talk about the need to reduce the deficit and balance the books, it tells us how we're going to do it and when we're going to do it.

And in concert with that approach, the Minister of Economic Development in his document has said: we're going to do these things to improve our economy, and this is how we're going to do it, and this is when we're going to do it. It isn't a document that just contains words, it's a document that has a plan of action.

And the vision of the document, as I said, comes out of consultation with the people. The vision stated is quite straightforward. It is that we foresee a province where by the year 2000, government, business, cooperatives, working people, and communities will have worked together toward prosperity and security. That's a very broad and general statement, but the document goes on to detail specific objectives and strategies to obtain that vision.

The vision itself I think is realistic. It indicates that if we face the tough choices that we have to make, stick to our decisions, and if we can maintain some harmony in our province instead of promoting disharmony between different groups in our province, and regain the sense of purpose and confidence, then in the '90s there's no reason why we should not be able to turn Saskatchewan around.

(1445)

One of the most impressive things I think about the document is that anyone is in a position to judge the success of the government's economic strategy by looking at the deadlines imposed in the document itself, and seeing if the government has done what it said it was going to do. At page 20 of the document the minister and his department have said that:

The consultations leading to this strategy have encouraged the province to set specific measurements of progress toward the established goals and objectives. Success should be measured by:

And then they set out seven measuring sticks, the first being whether the economy has been returned to a period of sustained, real growth. In other words, whether you do have growth in your economy. The second is whether the government has balanced the provincial budget over some reasonable period. The third is whether we have stopped out-migration from the province. And I might add in that regard, that in the first quarter of 1993, the population of Saskatchewan increased. And of course out-migration was considerably slowed in 1992, after five years of very

heavy out-migration under the previous administration.

And there are some other measuring yardsticks set out in the document. But the point is this: that the government has said to the people — and anybody can read the document — here's our plan, and not only are we going to say what our plan is and adhere to our plan, but you can be the judge of whether or not we have been successful. Because here are some tests that you can apply to us.

And I think that's very courageous. I think that for the government to say to the people, you can be the judge; this is how you should judge us, and if we don't live up to what we say here, then you can judge that we will have failed — and it's very ambitious, it's very courageous. And to me, it's an indication that the minister, the department, and the government, are serious about trying to improve the economic situation in Saskatchewan. And I think that's very commendable. And that's one of the reasons why I think the minister should be commended for the approach that he and his department have taken in formulating this strategy.

The first major objective outlined in the document is to bring business, labour, co-ops, farm, and aboriginal communities and government together in a provincial action committee on the economy. And although the document was only released last November, the committee has already been formed. It's already met three times to provide input to the government with respect to budget, agriculture, trade, and labour policies. So as I said, the document says what should be done, but it doesn't stop there. The government is actually doing what the document says should be done.

The second objective stated is to introduce a plan to restore fiscal integrity to the provincial government; to balance the books so that we have greater capacity to take action when we should be taking action at the government level.

And as we all know, a plan has already been introduced in the budget, introduced by the Minister of Finance on March 18, to balance the budget over the next four years. And this Assembly has passed that budget, so that objective is well on the way to being met.

Now the strategy document states that our efforts to improve the Saskatchewan economy will be judged largely by our success in creating greater job opportunities. And I think we all recognize that, that the bottom line is being able to stay and live and work and raise families in Saskatchewan.

And to do that, we need entrepreneurial spirit. We need people with ideas and people who will act on them. And in fact there are people all over the province doing all kinds of interesting and innovative things. And we have to encourage them as much as we can.

There were some measures taken in the budget to assist small business and manufacturers, and I think that that's the right approach, that little by little and looking at the small businesses in larger communities but also in small communities, that is really the answer to having a healthy and stable economy. The answer is not to put millions and sometimes hundreds of millions into megaprojects which provide a few jobs but at a great cost per job.

The three broad goals of the *Partnership for Renewal* are, one, to create a positive environment for renewal, which I think we're doing for the reasons I've outlined; two, to secure and build on our strengths, which have been identified; and three, to seek full employment.

And to achieve those goals, we need to take the strategies that are set out in the document itself. I've indicated what some of them are already. Others are to review the tax structure for those proposing productive investments. That was in fact announced in the budget. To update labour legislation — that is under way, and some legislation will be introduced this session.

The balance of legislation necessary to rewrite all of our labour laws will be introduced in 1994, so that by the end of 1994 we should have reformed our labour legislation, which of course has been very badly needed after 10 years of neglect by the previous government.

An education council has been appointed and a target date for new education policy has been set as 1994, because the document recognizes that we have to improve education and skills training as part of improving our economy. It also says that we have to promote community-based economic development by building on regional strengths and opportunities. And \$1 million was allocated in the recent budget to engage in community consultation toward implementation of that goal.

Another thing the *Partnership for Renewal* says is that we have to develop a new agriculture and food policy to focus on markets and processing. And as in other areas identified by the *Partnership for Renewal*, the government is taking active steps to pursue the goals stated in the document.

I said a few minutes ago that the document says we should have a balanced budget. So the Minister of Finance has introduced a plan for a balanced budget.

The document also says we should have a new agriculture and food policy. Well the Minister of Agriculture recently released the paper "Forging Partnerships in Agriculture" and one of eight public meetings planned to discuss that document has already been held. So that is under way as well.

The document states we should develop a comprehensive energy strategy. And as we all know, the energy and conservation institute in Saskatoon is up and running and recently the budget allocated

\$1.5 million toward that institute. And that is a very positive thing to my way of thinking for this reason: that this government has not said that we're putting all our eggs in one basket in terms of deciding how we're going to meet our energy needs.

The previous government was prepared to sign an agreement which would commit us to building a CANDU 3 reactor when we don't even know if we will need the kind of energy a CANDU 3 would produce and we don't know if it's economically viable because that kind of energy production requires an enormous commitment of capital and is very expensive to produce, not to mention environmental and other problems that are yet to be worked out.

But the point is that this government has said: look, we're not going to prejudge the issue. We're going to have an institute which is going to look at all of the possible energy options and come up with a comprehensive energy strategy for Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the only sensible, responsible approach to take. And I've very pleased that the government is taking that approach which is also supported by the *Partnership for Renewal* document.

The document also says that we will work toward expanding mineral development. And I think as most people know, we have three uranium companies which now have their head offices in Saskatoon, and that resource is going to expand, subject to the appropriate approvals at the provincial and federal level. And one project has now been approved to proceed.

The document also says that we should identify new forestry opportunities, and that is under way. I understand that the Department of Economic Development is actively pursuing different opportunities in the area of forestry, working with industry. And I think that that is one of the industries that can help us get Saskatchewan moving the way we would like it to be moving.

The Crown corporations can also be used to foster economic development, and that is recognized by the document. In fact SaskTel International is doing a lot of work around the world to develop telecommunications services in other parts of the world using expertise developed right here in Saskatchewan. SaskPower is going to be undertaking some co-generation activities with local suppliers in Saskatchewan and working with business. And I think that's a very positive thing, both in terms of local economic development and in terms of exploring other ways of producing energy.

Also the Crown corporations are going to be committing approximately \$500 million this year toward construction. And I think in concert with the \$162 million committed in the provincial budget, notwithstanding the fact that it was a restraint budget, but \$162 million was committed toward construction. That is going to help people get to work in

Saskatchewan which is really, at the end of the day, the most important thing that we have to do and what we should be most concerned with as legislators.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — The document also says that SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) will be replaced with the new provincial economic development institution which will work with the private sector. And my understanding is that that is being examined by the department and the government and plans are under way to achieve that goal.

It says that we should coordinate a Saskatchewan trade and market development organization to target key markets. It also says that we should streamline business development programs to reduce overlap and provide a single window that anyone can call for information. And I think the department has already put into place a toll-free number and a single window and has almost achieved that objective, if it has not entirely achieved that objective.

Other positive developments are occurring on the economic front as well. The western Canadian environmental industry capabilities survey has been released and will form the basis for project development. A draft federal-provincial immigration agreement has been negotiated between Regina and Ottawa and is waiting cabinet review.

And Premier Romanow . . . I'm sorry, I should say the Premier, Mr. Speaker, has signed and sent a memorandum to all permanent heads in departments and Crowns instructing them to develop local supplier programs. And the Premier did that on December 11. I understand that Economic Development is working with departments to assist them in that regard. And I think that that is a very sensible approach for the government to take, that if we can use our procurement policies to take advantage of the labour and ideas and work and manufacturing of Saskatchewan people, then that's what we should be doing.

I might add that under the previous administration, I think too often work to advertising firms, film companies, and others who were out of province was undertaken which really should have been undertaken in Saskatchewan, if at all, so that we could develop some of our industry here.

(1500)

Now I've gone on at some length identifying things that the document says we should be doing, but actually I've only named some of the concepts laid out in the strategy. There are others.

As I said before, it's fine to have documents with nice words and laudable goals, but what is really impressive about the *Partnership for Renewal* and what shows that the government is serious about rebuilding and is accountable to the people is the fact

that the government has set out a test for itself at page 20 of the document which anyone can read and anyone can be the judge of.

It's not every day that governments say to the people, this is what we say we're going to do and here's how you can judge us to see if we've done what we said we were going to do. But in this document the government has set out seven specific tests and they've invited the public to watch the progress made by the government and to then decide whether the government has in fact done what it said it was going to do. And I think that's highly commendable.

The department has committed itself actually to measuring its success on an annual basis and reporting to the people how it is doing in meeting the tests set out in the document. So it is courageous leadership because we're saying to the people, don't just listen to what we say, but judge what we do and make us deliver and make us accountable. And the standards are set out and they can be judged.

There are some very positive economic developments occurring this year. And I wouldn't say that they're all because of what the government does, but I would say that generally speaking, given the situation inherited from the previous government, things are looking better in Saskatchewan and we are in fact on the right track.

Some of those indicators are that the population in Saskatchewan increased by 300 in the first quarter of this year. Well that's not a great many people, but the point is that out-migration that has been going on has been considerably slowed. And I think that's very, very important and very encouraging. Employment has increased by 3,000 people in transportation, communications, and other utilities February 1993 over '92, and by 2,000 in the same period in the finance, insurance, and real estate industries. Retail trade increased 1.1 per cent in January. And new motor vehicle sales for commercial vehicles manufactured in North America were up 5.4 per cent. Exports in Saskatchewan were up 15.5 per cent last year. And in terms of manufacturing, the value of manufactured goods in the wood industry rose by 27.7 per cent; machines up 12.9 per cent; electrical products up 7.7 per cent. Total value of manufacturing shipments was up 3.1 per cent in December of last year and total refinery production rose 16.7 per cent last year.

On the resource side, all of the resources were up, whether crude oil which went up 7.2 per cent last year; natural gas up 3.4 per cent; coal up 7 per cent; sodium sulphate up 3.3 per cent; potash 3.1 per cent. Zinc sales were up 208.9 per cent; silver up 5.9 per cent; cadmium up 51.5 per cent. Uranium sales were up 38 per cent.

In construction the . . . Saskatchewan led the way last year in terms of housing starts. They were up 87.3 per cent. And that is not the case across the country. In some places housing starts were not up that much at all, but certainly Saskatchewan led the way. Dwelling

completions were up 154.7 per cent in the fourth quarter of last year. Building permits were up last year and industrial permits also were up, in each case over 70 per cent.

So all is not doom and gloom in Saskatchewan. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that what all of this indicates, and the figures are a bit tedious, but the point is that we do have a government that people have confidence in. They have confidence that the government has got the situation under control, has a plan to deal with a very difficult situation, and generally speaking is moving in the right direction. Not to say that the government is perfect or that its decisions are always correct. But generally speaking we have an honest, competent government and I think the people recognize that.

I believe that we have a sensible and effective economic development plan that builds on our strengths. I think that the *Partnership for Renewal* document has done a good job of identifying our strengths. We need to let people know about the good things happening in the province, and we need to consult with people and work with them in areas where improvement can be made.

The budget delivered on March 18 is a good one. For the first time in over a decade the budget gives us a plan to create jobs and strengthen our economy. It does this through the most effective job creation tool we possess and that is strengthening small businesses and co-ops. Two thirds of all new jobs created in the past 10 years have been created by these two groups. Jobs have not been created by give-aways, sweetheart deals, or megaprojects. Jobs have been created by Main Street, Saskatchewan, and it's time to give them the recognition they deserve.

Things are beginning to turn around. On March 18 a document was delivered before the legislature. This document contained many things but it did not contain income tax hikes, it did not contain sweetheart deals, megaprojects, or wasteful government spending. It did contain reduced government spending, breaks in small business corporate tax, manufacturing and processing tax credits, rationalization of government services.

It also contained a plan to create new jobs and end our operating deficit in four years, and that's a plan that I'm quite proud of. It utilizes our most effective job creation force, and that force is Main Street, Saskatchewan. And there are many examples of job creation that are occurring in Saskatchewan. I have a rather lengthy list of them here. I'm not going to go through all of them, but in my own community of Saskatoon, Hitachi has expanded and I believe it's a \$9 million investment, 25 new jobs. AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) will bring 140 jobs to Saskatoon. DSG Communications Inc. and APRO, Applied Robotics Inc., will be doing work for the Canadian Space Agency. Mercury Graphics Corporation has expanded, an increase of 30 jobs. Flexi-Coil implements, which manufactures farm implements in Saskatoon, is doubling its workforce to 800 employees and that's very encouraging.

There are encouraging things happening all over the province and we should recognize that. We have to have a positive attitude as part of rebuilding our province and its economy.

Some of the specific ways that the budget helped secure our future with job creation, I think, are the fact that the budget commits \$162 million to capital projects which, as we all know, goes a long way toward producing construction jobs.

The small business corporate income tax rate has been reduced by 20 per cent. There is a temporary manufacturing and processing tax credit for co-ops and small business. We're phasing out the education and health tax on direct agents used in manufacturing and processing, and investing \$51 million in research and development, high technology, export, tourism, and industrial development.

Another significant development, I think, is the improvements to the venture capital program; that is, the labour-sponsored venture capital program whereby tax credits can be obtained for investing in Saskatchewan businesses.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cline: — In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the people in Saskatchewan are hard working and individualistic, but they have an instinct to work together as a team and that is why I believe we will rebuild Saskatchewan.

And with that, I am pleased to move the following motion, seconded by the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster:

That this Assembly recognize the efforts of the Minister of Economic Development and his department to revitalize Saskatchewan by developing, through partnerships a coherent, comprehensive and realistic economic strategy.

And I'm very pleased to move that motion. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Stanger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join my colleague from Saskatoon Idylwyld in seconding this motion, and I support him wholeheartedly.

The Romanow government has unveiled a . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Before the member continues, I think she . . . I just want to draw to her attention, you refer to the member's constituency, not by the member's name, when you're referring to a member in this legislature. If you refer to the Premier, you refer to the Premier or the member from Saskatoon Riversdale.

Ms. Stanger: — Sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. I should

know that by now. I will continue. I'll try to remember.

The Premier's government, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, has unveiled a solid, common-sense, no-nonsense strategy for rebuilding the Saskatchewan economy. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that common sense hasn't been that common in the last 10 years.

In our strategy there are three goals for renewing our provincial economy. Number one was creating a positive environment for economic renewal. Number two was securing and building upon our existing economic strengths, and that always makes sense. It's a common-sense approach — build from your strengths. And number three is seeking full employment in the province.

(1515)

In order to achieve these lofty goals, the *Partnership for Renewal* outlines specific objectives and strategies, complete with target dates for implementation. And I think that this is so important. People in my constituency of Cut Knife-Lloydminster want to know, when governments put out a strategy, when these will be possibly to be met.

And I think that that is one of the things that I was so pleased when I read the *Partnership for Renewal*, was that there was going to be dates specifying the meeting of the goals. And I think that's very important.

The objective and strategies are far-reaching, ranging from the development of a strong education system, which I believe in, to rejuvenating Saskatchewan's labour market policies and the creation of a provincial action committee on the economy which we call PACE (Premier's Action Committee on Economic Development) that will oversee the plan.

I want to congratulate the Minister of Economic Development for the work that he and his department have done and the work that all of the colleagues in the caucus have done. Our approach is to focus on smaller community-based projects. No more megabucks for megaprojects; we know where that led us in the last 10 years. In this way, economic development is being distributed fairly across the entire province, and I am hopeful for a couple of projects in my area.

Two-thirds of the jobs were created by small businesses and co-ops. And this is vitally important, that we keep our people in the smaller communities working. When you talk about people . . . The members opposite talk about being so concerned over rural Saskatchewan, but when you think about all the millions of dollars that were put into projects that weren't based on our natural abilities — millions of dollars just being thrown at big companies that came in here — and they were wondering why rural Saskatchewan wasn't growing and didn't survive.

We have a sensible and effective economic development plan that builds on Saskatchewan

strengths. We have been able to assist economic development in spite of the major problems that we have had financially.

So this plan goes in a common-sense, goal-oriented, logical sequence. I won't go into details about some of the projects that have been started, but I'd like to name some of the few: Norquay Alfalfa Processors, 45 jobs; Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, 375 jobs; Goldenhill Cattle Company in Viscount, 24 jobs.

These are the kind of projects that we're talking about — small economic development that's driven locally. Prairieland Pork Farms in Birsay, 12 jobs; Dartmore Processors in Aylsham, 16 jobs. This is all rural Saskatchewan. Sask-Can Fibre in Canora, 4 jobs; Babcock & Wilcox Canada in Melville, 35 jobs; Phillips Cables in Moose Jaw, 8 jobs. And I can go on and on. There is a whole line. I won't mention the ones in Saskatoon because the member from Saskatoon has mentioned these.

But one that I'd like to specifically mention though, that he mentioned, was Flexi-coil implements from Saskatoon, doubling its workforce to 800 employees. Some great gains in the hard economic times.

So we are securing our future. Some of the specific ways this budget helps secure our future with job creation strategies are — and we are very proud of these — reducing the small business corporate income tax rate by 20 per cent. My colleague has mentioned these, but I think it's worth mentioning them again because these were contained in the budget and I think it doesn't hurt to repeat them.

Introducing a temporary manufacturing and processing tax credit for Saskatchewan co-ops and small businesses.

An Hon. Member: — Never hurts to repeat . . .

Ms. Stanger: — No, it sure doesn't.

Phasing out the E&H (education and health) tax on direct agents used in manufacturing and processing.

And here's another one that I'm particularly impressed with. Investing 51 million in research and development; high technology; export and tourism; and industrial development. Tourism, an area that is going to grow by leaps and bounds in Saskatchewan. And I think that this is an area that we can develop.

An Hon. Member: — The sunny province.

Ms. Stanger: — The sunny province is right, as my colleague says. More hours of sunshine in Saskatoon than in any other place in Canada.

Spending 162 million in capital projects, as my colleague has mentioned again; this will get our construction industry going.

Consolidation of rural development and co-op directorate which further the government's efforts

towards community economic development. Let's get the community involved. And later this month we will be meeting in some . . . the Minister of Economic Development, the chair of our caucus, MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) like myself will be meeting with local communities to talk further on how we are doing in our partnerships for renewal.

Business resort centres will be merged and reduced within new regional service systems which will provide a single window for economic development. If there's anything that small-business people were frustrated with, it was going hither and yon to try and develop their business plans. I think this single-window development is a good step in the right direction.

Removal of E&H on 100 . . . on 1-800 telephones services, which my colleague also mentioned, but I am again hoping to get people's attention by mentioning it more than once. Improving Saskatchewan labour-sponsored venture capital program to encourage new investment.

And last week we had a news release. And these are the kind of news releases that bring us good news and that we are proud of. And I'm going to read part of it:

Economic Development Minister Dwain Lingenfelter today announced that a government/industry partnership has led to pork sales to Cuba totalling \$2.35 million.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Stanger: — These are the kind of partnerships that we are talking about — industry, government, and local people working together.

Lingenfelter was speaking at the 10th annual meeting of SPI Marketing Group, an industry umbrella group.

And he explained the sales.

Lingenfelter said that the sales provide an example of what Saskatchewan companies can accomplish in the international marketplace.

And I want you to note the next two sentences because I think they're very important:

Most export development activity is a patient, step-by-step process that goes on largely behind the scenes, in confidential negotiations.

I think this is very important because I think that people somehow imagine that sometimes things happen overnight. They don't. It takes a common-sense approach, a slow, methodical approach, meeting many people, making contacts all over the world for this kind of economic development to happen.

I think the Saskatchewan home builders will be happy to hear this bit of news. When we were at their

convention last month they said that they were very pleased at the home starts last year, but in March it had slowed down. But again, that has picked up. And by this Saskatchewan housing start report, and I read from it:

Regina, April 8, 1993. Home building in the province continues to be ahead of last year said Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). While March activity was slower than last year, total, year-to-date housing starts ahead of 1992 by more than 20 per cent.

And we know that they were ahead of 1991. So that certainly was good news.

So when we released our *Partnership for Renewal* we were, like I said, we had target dates on our objectives and how are we doing so far.

Well here's a progress report dated March 25. And these are the kind of things that I'm very pleased about. Put out a blueprint, put your main three goals in the blueprint and then keep the updates coming so people can see how you are progressing. As the mover of this motion said, my colleague, it's not that you are going to be perfect and right on target, but if you have the goals and the targets, people can see in which direction you are progressing.

Here is something . . . remember I mentioned the three goals the *Partnership for Renewal* outlined? — improving the climate for business, building on our strengths, and seeking full employment. Well here's a little bit of a progress report on how we're meeting those goals.

PACE, the provincial action committee on the economy, has met three times to date to provide input on the budget speech, agriculture, and trade policies, and the labour agenda. So this is progress.

The 1993 provincial budget on March 18 laid out a four-year plan to eliminate the deficit — very important for the government. It included a small-business tax package, which I have referred to just previously, and announced an ongoing business tax review.

The new regulatory code was announced on March 8 for implementation effective April 1. The 1993 labour agenda is set. The provincial minimum wage was increased to \$5.35 an hour effective December 1, and the new occupational health and safety workers compensation Acts have been announced.

Now this is a very important Act. It's going to secure workers when they are in need of help, but also it's going to assure the business people that they have a healthy and an effective workforce. And I think what we have been able to do as government is to get the two groups together — the business people and working people — and this is another example of partnerships and are very important.

The educational council has been appointed and will

begin to review findings from the eight reviews of the system. Four of them are complete and the education system is being reviewed, and we'll see where we are going once the committee has been able to do its work.

Economic development has assumed the lead for native economic development. Now this is vitally important. The native people want to begin to be partners in economic development. They want more employment. In many areas the native unemployment is very high. And this economic development has set priorities and it has held meetings with both FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations) and the Metis and so on. That's improving the climate. All of those things have been done.

And how about building on strengths? What have we done in this area? A public discussion paper on agricultural policy, "Forging Partnerships in Agriculture", has been released and the first of eight public meetings has been held. And I was to the meeting that was held in my area — extremely well attended and a very, very good input from local farmers. And all of these suggestions will be taken into consideration.

Uranium development is proceeding. The new NDP (New Democratic Party) policy of proceeding with uranium mine development in the North, combined with the announced AECL (Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.) move to Saskatoon and recent sales to Ontario and Korea, have improved expectations.

McArther River, the first of five mine developments under federal-provincial review, has been approved for underground exploration and the province has been given approval for this 35 million project to proceed this spring.

SaskPower — again, mentioned by my colleague but worth repeating — SaskPower has announced a competitive bidding process to award contracts for a 25 megawatt co-generated power, a big project for SaskPower and good for economic development.

Now how about the third objective — seeking full employment? The single window is being introduced through budgetary and other processes. Along with a 1-800 number and a new coordinated regional service centre, Economic Development is negotiating to develop a pilot co-location office in Saskatoon.

(1530)

A draft federal-provincial immigration agreement has been negotiated and is awaiting cabinet review. Sears announced plans to locate its new western regional calling centre in Regina, with a total employment of 900 expected by 1995.

The Premier signed and sent a memorandum to all permanent heads in departments and Crowns instructing them to develop local supplier programs. Economic Development is working with departments to assist them — a very important step.

Now many people are talking about depopulation. Well I am glad to tell you that in the last quarter of . . . in the first quarter of 1993, our population has increased by .03 per cent. Not a huge increase but at least we've plateaued and we are not decreasing. This is very important for people to know.

Employment — employment has increased by 3,000 in transportation, communications, and other utilities in February 1993 over '92 levels. Employment increased by 2,000 in finance, insurance, and real estate industries during February 1993 over 1992 levels. Total retail trade increased by 1.1 per cent. These are modest gains but important if we can . . . In these hard economic times, if we can attain gains like this, I think it'll . . . we'll be doing very well in four years.

Motor vehicle sales. This is something important. Sales of commercial vehicles manufactured in North America up 5.4 per cent. Total domestic exports originating in Saskatchewan are up 15.5 per cent.

An Hon. Member: — That's progression.

Ms. Stanger: — Yes. In the agriculture sector, cash receipts from farming operations up 7.3 per cent from January to December in 1992.

These next set of statistics . . . Some people think statistics are boring; I find them very interesting. Livestock sales up in January to October, cattle is up by 22.9 per cent, calves by 146.4 per cent, sheep and lambs by 45.4 per cent, and hogs by 6.2 per cent . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes.

Members opposite are always so pessimistic. Look at these figures. Manufacturing — value of manufactured goods in the wood industry up 27.7 per cent last year; machines up 12.9 per cent; electrical products up 7.7 per cent. Non-metallic mineral products up 8 per cent, and chemical products up 4.2 per cent. These are substantial increases in a slow economic recovery. Total value of manufacturing shipments up 3.1 per cent; total refinery production up 16.7 per cent.

Like I said, I find these statistics very interesting and I hope the members opposite are listening. Crude oil — production up 7.2 per cent. My area of this is very important. The oil patch is doing very well. And the gloom and doom that people predicted during the election — they went from oil company to oil company trying to scare the oil workers: if the NDP get in, we'll shut down the oil industry — well this hasn't happened in my constituency and the oil workers are very pleased about it.

Natural gas production is up 3.4 per cent; coal production up 7 per cent; sodium sulphate, 3.3 up; potash, up 3.1 per cent — too bad we don't own some of the mines any more, but . . . I don't know what happened to those, or do we know what happened to those? — zinc sales up, zinc sales up 208 per cent from January to September of '92; silver up 5.9 per

cent; uranium sales up 38 per cent.

Now how about construction, housing? Dwelling starts up 87.3 per cent from January to December in 1992; dwellings under construction up 71 per cent in the fourth quarter of '92; dwelling completions up 154 per cent in the fourth of '92; urban housing starts up 6.1 per cent in January of '93; value of residential permits up 70 per cent; value of industrial permits up 73 per cent. This is all in 1992.

I can tell you that this is a totally different approach that was used in the last 10 years. We are using an economic development approach that's sensible. We are not giving away millions and millions of dollars for poor projects. And I think if you would read the annual report of SEDCO we can see where all the losses were: they were all in the Tory years.

Now what is the difference between our plan and the Tory plan? Dare I mention some of the projects that ... the megabucks that they threw at these megaprojects? GigaText, 3.5 million lost; Supercart International failure, 8 million lost; Joytec failure, 5.2 million lost.

How about the High R Door Manufacturing failure? Half a million dollars lost. How about the Austrak Machinery Corporation failure? — 700,000 lost; the Pro-Star Mills failure, 490,000 lost. And how about the Nardei fabrication limited closure? With only six days left in the 1986 election campaign, the member from Estevan officially opened a \$300,000 plant for this company in Regina. Three days after the election, the plant closed for ever. I can't believe this. I'm reading it but I can't believe it.

The Canapharm, medical textile division joke. With only five days left in the 1986 election campaign, the member from Estevan announced a new \$12.5 million bandage plant for Swift Current. To date this plant has not been built, half a million dollars lost. I think it was more than the folks from Swift Current area that needed bandage. I think the former government needed a bandage.

Anyway I can tell you that I am proud to stand and summarize our economic development scheme, and I'm happy to support my colleagues and the minister. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm happy this afternoon to rise to discuss this private members' day question. As I conclude my remarks, I will pass a motion to try improve it a little bit so that the fruits of our labours for the day will be more productive in the eyes of the general public. And I'm sure that the government members will want to join us and go along with my motion of amendment in order to get the best possible return for our dollars for the day that we're spending here discussing these matters.

What I do want to do first of all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is to reply to a few of the remarks that have been made by the members opposite in their opening remarks to

the question.

The member indicates that the economic development of our province is somewhat enhanced by the actions of our government, and she goes on to quote some very important names here. I see Hitachi and AECL. Both of these, unfortunately, were started by the past administration and have very little to do with the present government except that they've managed to survive them so far in spite of the fact that we have a socialist government.

We've got things mentioned like the space agencies in Saskatoon, the program started by the federal government that has had absolutely nothing to do with the provincial government whatsoever, survived again in spite of the socialist government here.

The Phillips Cables over in Moose Jaw, been there for years. I mean, they've been producing cable for many, many miles throughout the province and for sale in other places. How this government could ever hope to claim Phillips Cables as one of their enterprises is more than I can understand.

I think maybe what you ought to do if you're going to stimulate some economic activity in the province, instead of trying to lay claim to things that other people did, maybe you ought to talk to some of your ministers like the member from Melfort that keeps preaching doom and gloom in this Assembly and outside of it as well, and tell them to get a smile on their face and act a little bit optimistic about the province instead of always telling us how terribly bad off we are.

And now I want to also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, refer to some of the comments about the job creation that's been going on. It looks to me like my old neighbour's relative, Jack Lloyd and Oren Reiman, are about the only two people that can be laying any claim to having gotten a job in Saskatchewan lately, because everybody else has been out of work and having to go to Alberta to get a job, or some other place.

So it looks to me like maybe we'll have to take another look at this whole proposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to see where the real benefits are if there are any.

We laid claim to community projects here a minute ago, from the member from the government. Community projects I suppose mean things like community bonds which were started by the past administration as well. Maybe they're referring, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that they were able to harmonize the tax burden for Sears and company, here in the city of Regina. Which of course they fail to mention the fact that in order for that deal to be swung for Sears, they had to close most of the rural offices in the small towns throughout the province and kill just thousands of jobs and thousands of opportunities for rural people in order to bring one of the biggest companies in the country some prosperity that they did not really need.

I wanted to suggest as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that

when the member opposite wants to brag about things like building projects in the province, they ought to remember that in the city of Medicine Hat people are boasting that there's more building contracts in one city of Medicine Hat than we have in the whole province of Saskatchewan. Now I haven't checked those figures out exactly, but it seems to me like they're probably pretty well close to right.

We've got things happening that don't seem quite as cheerful as the member would indicate with regards to things that are being started and supposedly going on in our province. For example, we have the government claiming that they've got economic diversification going on in our province and that they're making such great gains for our dollars invested. And here we've got, from the *Leader-Post*, an article that says: "Staff may lose (their) pay."

Now can you believe it, about two months back or so the government ploughs a half a million dollars into a rabbit farm and here the whole thing has gone up in smoke according to this article. It says:

Not only have they lost their jobs, but 30 former employees of a nearby rabbit processing plant may also be out \$20,000 to \$30,000 in severance pay . . .

Now that's from a labour standards officer.

Well there's no use going on through the whole article, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because it is self-explanatory that here we have another venture that has gone rather badly. And we are going to be asking some serious questions when we get into the various departments in the budgetary process to try and find out where these monies have gone to.

When we're going to talk about things like the economic advantages that this government is trying to bring about in our province, I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have to look at what they really are doing. I'm going to read you a whole bunch of things. The member opposite wants me to read some more of the articles. I'll read some articles for you.

The member opposite wanted to talk about the benefits, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm just going to go into some of the things that were mentioned with regards to what's happening in our labour and our statistics as far as our province is concerned.

Now you may be interested in hearing these statistical facts, Mr. Member from Rosemont. The attached highlights sheet taken from the March issue of the **Sask Trends Monitor** shows a dramatic increase in social assistance case-loads — 16.5 per cent increase in case-loads for Social Services in 1992 as compared to 5 per cent in 1991.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a few minutes ago the member boasted that they've managed to stabilize the population of Saskatchewan, that it's no longer going down. Well let's take a look at what really is happening in the province with the real figures as they

have been produced by people that do statistical data. Now if they're going to play with figures, let's play with the right ones and let's use them in the proper way.

(1545)

You've got 16.5 per cent more people on case-loads for welfare in '92 than you've had in '91. The cost of social assistance benefits rose by more than 18 per cent in 1992. And the number of new recipients increased by 4,500 per month, of which an average of 3,000 were considered fully employable — fully employable people.

So what's happening? The people now are not leaving the province as fast as they did before, but they're going on social assistance faster than they ever have before and becoming a drain to the taxpayers. That's because this job creation program that this government sits here today trying to brag about is a failure, an absolute, total disaster for this province.

The people don't have jobs, they don't have a place to go. They're going on social assistance. And the figures are here by the statistics provided by one of these reputable companies that does this as their workload.

This article goes on, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Unemployment statistics are interesting as well. The unemployment rate in Saskatchewan for 1991 was 7.4 per cent. In 1992 the rate rose to 8.2 per cent. By February of 1993 the rate had reached 9.6 per cent.

The number of people employed in 1991 totalled 449,000 as compared to 425,000 in February of 1993. Now if my mathematics isn't totally wrong, that's 24,000 people less working now than we had before.

So where are all these magical jobs that this government is creating with their economic diversification? Where is all of these great benefits that are coming about? I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think that the minister in charge of Economic Diversification must be very embarrassed today. I'll bet you he's sitting in his office with a red face, wondering who turned this guy in the back benches loose to bring those whole matter up today to allow us the chance to discuss it.

Certainly he must not have wanted this to happen because it exposes everything that he's doing wrong, taking credit for everything that everybody else did in the past administration and producing nothing new absolutely whatsoever except a lot more welfare.

Now that's a great claim to fame for any government, isn't it? — to increase your welfare recipients by those kind of numbers and create no jobs whatsoever that are physically visible to anyone.

Now all of these statistics, Mr. Deputy Speaker, prove that the NDP's economic plan is a no plan. I've got a whole lot of other things I want to go into, but I've got to show a few more of these statistics just to make the government aware of the fact that they are not

following the realities of what's going on.

It says here, migration patterns, Statistics Canada says, simultaneously released revised immigration and emigration population flows from the province for the new fourth quarter population counts. The changes to the international migration estimates resulted in a small downward adjustment in the province's population.

Now isn't that an amazing kind of a thing here And this is for the fourth quarter, the very same period of time the member opposite a few minutes ago was talking about and was claiming had actually turned around and went up. Obviously they don't have the same statistician.

So I want to just go to the back page here and say that **Sask Trends Monitor** is published monthly by the QED Information Systems, and reproductions of the newsletter in whole or in part is prohibited unless credit is given to **Sask Trends Monitor**. And I'll take that opportunity to give that credit to them at this time because I want to quote further from their documents.

And I believe that they must have done a pretty good job. But obviously the government doesn't agree. They must have somebody else doing their statistics. I wonder who they hire and how much they pay them. Well that'll come up in another day.

But let's go on to a few more things that are mentioned in this statistical report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because we want to get some of this stuff on the record.

Housing prices. Because of the increased housing activity and partly because of the increase in the price of plywood and dimensional lumber, new houses are costing more. Compared to January 1992, the cost of building a new house in Regina is now 6.7 per cent higher, and it's 1.4 per cent higher in Saskatoon. All that tells me is I guess you better buy a truck and go to Saskatoon to buy your lumber.

The resource production. Some interesting things we heard from the member opposite, but let's take a look at them to be fair about it. The primary production estimates for most resource commodities are in for '92 and they represent a mixed bag. Oil production increased 8 per cent, while the natural gas production was down 2 per cent.

Now isn't it amazing that the member opposite was able to remember the 8 per cent increase but she couldn't remember the 2 per cent decrease in gas. Well I guess it depends on what suits you.

The coal production increased 7 per cent and sodium sulphate production increased by 4 per cent, and the potash production declined by 2 per cent.

Now isn't it interesting that a few minutes ago we heard the member say exactly the opposite. Now I wonder again, where did she dig up her statistics from. I've quoted who at least produced this set of figures, and you can go right ahead and challenge them if you

like, Madam Member. But the reality is that your figures have been contradicted — totally opposite to what you've just said.

And the final figures for uranium are not in, but it looks like a record year, up 38 per cent in the first three quarters. In spite of the fact that this government has been threatening to shut the mines down, they're doing well and they're showing that they can make money for this province, because you tax uranium and you take in revenue from it.

So we wish them well and we hope that the government continues to see the light of day in why you have to go ahead and allow these mines to operate. Quite realistically, if we don't produce the uranium in this province and sell it, somebody else is going to do it anyway. And so you may as well wake up and smell the coffee, build a CANDU reactor, and sell the power to the Americans because they want it and need it.

So don't worry about having too much power. You'll get rid of it if you have any business sense at all. There's lots of people hungry for cheap power to make their economies and their industrial machine, metaphorically speaking, work.

Let's talk about the social assistance that goes on in this report. Social assistance case-loads increased sixteen and a half per cent last year after an increase of 5 per cent in 1991. Now this is really sad news for the people of this province, Mr. Speaker.

More than 3,000 of the average 4,500 new recipients per month were considered fully employable according to this document, fully employable people. Benefits expenditures rose more quickly than the case-loads which was up to 18.4 per cent. Now I don't know if that's an increase in the cost of living or the increase in the depth of the poverty of the people that are concerned. I suppose maybe it's a combination of both.

But it's a sad, sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, when we find the people of our province having to go on social assistance with no chance of finding jobs for very working-minded people that are totally capable — 3,000 out of every 4,500 totally capable in this assessment — of being able to work.

But they can't find jobs because this economic plan that this government has got is an economic plan and blueprint for disaster. It's creating no jobs whatsoever for anybody.

Now for the first time . . . we want to talk about here for a minute, motor vehicle sales in the province. For the first time ever, it says here, at least in my records, according to this statistician, there were fewer than 2,000 vehicles sold in Saskatchewan during a one-month period. The 1,980 units sold in January was 12 per cent lower than a year ago, and 23 per cent from five years ago.

Now here again this sounds like an economic plan

that's not working too well. I haven't heard anybody say anything about spring seeding money — let's go find some dollars for the farmers; let's find some money for fertilizer or spray. We haven't heard anything like that. All we hear about is these great economic plans that this government has got to reinstate a list of things that are working well, and the problem of course being for them that they have to dig up things that the last administration already had in process.

Well let's talk a little bit about these numbers that they like to throw around. I want to just quickly go through a few numbers here about the labour forces in thousands from the province of Saskatchewan labour force and employment data, the annual and monthly averages from 1990, 1991, 1992 and 1993.

Now under the both sexes, and that's obviously the combination of the figures from men and women, in 1990 we had 483,000 people and in 1993 that's down to 470,000. And of course there's a major loss there, but it manages to work out to a minus .2 per cent for the year to date.

And of course that doesn't sound so bad until you look at what happened to the men, they went down .4, a minus .4. Women were actually up .2 so they have fared a little better in the province for some reason. But the net figure of course is still down, which totally contradicts what the member opposite had just said.

Unemployment rates for the province, Regina and Saskatoon. We're looking at 7 per cent in 1990 for the province. And we're down — up to, rather, 9.6 per cent for February, 1993. Says here, right here, in this statistical data.

So where is all this great economic advantage and diversification that's going on in the province? Where's the benefit? What are we getting out of it? Where's the jobs? Tell me: has this guy got statistics here that are not right? What's happening to this economic diversification and this plan that was supposed to create all this work? Where are the jobs? Why do we have everybody on unemployment and welfare and the numbers showing very clearly that our numbers of people employed are going down? We've got the employment in thousands.

Well I've dwelled on that page long enough, because every one shows exactly what I've said. The member doesn't know what she's talking about because she hasn't used the right statistical data. Or maybe she dug up something that she planned.

I want to talk about the Social Services case-loads, though, on page 12 of this report. And just to very quickly show what we're talking about, we're going here from dollars in . . . receipts here for in the millions of dollars, and considering that these are millions of dollars, we go from 26 to 33 in 1991.

Now that is a significant increase in the cost of Social Services to our province and to our people. Increases of, as I said before, goes to 18.4 per cent increase. And

that's just a phenomenal load on the taxpayers of our province, Mr. Speaker.

Now the members also wanted to dwell a little bit on the great things they're doing. The first speaker talked about the labour legislation that's been through this process of this government last year and what's coming forth, he predicts, in a week or so or whenever it's coming, along with he predicts in 1994 they're going to do some more to us. Well and I mean they're going to do it to us. This is not for us. This is doing it to us.

Listen to this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Here we have from the *Leader-Post*. Again I'll just refer to an article: "Workers' Compensation costs to rise. Business groups opposed." Very simple headlines. So if it's so great for everybody, how come everybody's so excited?

The government plans to introduce changes to the Workers' Compensation Act within three weeks over the protests of business groups that say their costs will skyrocket.

They're not talking about increases, they're saying words like sky-rocket.

Labour Minister . . . (I won't say the name, but it's there) said Thursday that opponents of the changes are overstating the effect it will have on job creation and economic development.

"I think the negative impact it will have on the business community is overrated, so long as the assessments remain competitive with Alberta and Manitoba."

That's what the minister said. Okay? Giving him the benefit of the doubt. He's had his side of the story. And we estimate the assessment will go up by 15 per cent. Now even 15 per cent increase in costs in a depression sounds pretty significant to me. Now if that is not a substantial increase, on the other hand, as I've reminded business, it will be the second lowest in Canada.

But . . . (the minister's name again) word that contributions will rise by no more than 15 per cent has had no effect on the fears of business.

Well if it has no fears on the effects of business, we'd better go on and check what business has to say. They even give us an assurance of a proper actuarial study ahead of time. Okay . . . They can't, rather. It says:

"They can't even give us an assurance of a proper actuarial study ahead of time," said Dale Botting, director of provincial affairs for the Canadian Federation of Independent Business . . .

"We see a group of children playing with actuarial matches."

I don't think I need to read any more. That's the

statement of what business thinks about this whole process that you're going into. And I'll just paraphrase for them and say to you members of the government that businesspeople in this province believe that you're heading into a total disaster and that your costs and your downloading and the changes that you're making to these programs are in fact going to do nothing but drive people out of this province and shut business down. And when you shut down some small business . . . isn't that ironic, we talk about small business?

A few minutes ago in this very Assembly, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite laid claim to the fact that small business are the very people who are going to create the most work and the most jobs. And yet here we've got this government right on the other hand, introducing all kinds of labour legislations that's going to make small business so uncompetitive in this province that they will no longer be able to exist or continue to function.

They're going to go broke. They can't survive. They won't be competitive with the other provinces as long as we have free trade between our provincial boundaries, which of course the Premier of this province has himself said that he believes in and supports.

And if we're going to have that, and we're not competitive with the rest of the people in the other provinces, they're going to come in and do whatever work we've got to do because they can do the job cheaper. Our small businesses are out of business. That's what this whole plan is about — putting our small businesses out of business, not into business.

(1600)

I'll just talk to you a little bit more about this labour thing. I'm going to quote a little bit out of a news release here.

The Saskatchewan employers question Department of Labour proposals to amend The Workers' Compensation Act. These proposed amendments carry crushing costs at a time when many businesses in the province are struggling to maintain viability. Statistics clearly demonstrate the successful efforts by Saskatchewan employers to develop and implement programs that promote the safety, education and accident prevention, and that focus on recovery and rehabilitation.

Continuing trends indicate fewer claims, less lost-time accidents, and for shorter periods of time. Controversially there has been no empirical evidence to support the need for the changes. The reality of the changes proposed are creating a form of payroll tax on every Saskatchewan employer.

Listen to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They themselves, the small-business people of this province, are saying that this is in fact nothing else than a payroll tax on

every Saskatchewan employer that will ultimately have an impact on wages and the availability of jobs. An actuarial study commissioned by the Workers' Compensation Board indicates the proposed changes would create a horrendous unfunded liability and more than double assessment rates paid by all employers.

Now isn't that a very different story than what we've been hearing from the members opposite about economic diversification and creation of jobs and all these good things.

Well if we want these good things, we can have them. But you can't do it both ways. You can't stab them in the back and hope they're going to live. I'll go on just a bit more here:

Saskatchewan is the envy of every other jurisdiction in this country with respect to its workers' compensation system. Employees have the most comprehensive benefits, employers are assessed some of the lowest rates, and our Workers' Compensation Board is one of the only two fully funded boards in the country. We have a major comprehensive advantage in attracting much needed economic development in the province.

That goes according to the old methods that are being used. And those statements are made if we stayed with that kind of program. But here we have the Saskatchewan Business Coalition releasing a news release stating these absolute facts that they believe in. And I'm quoting from them and I'll dwell on it a little later in a few minutes in my own way of surmising, but I want to quote on:

Workers' compensation programs in many jurisdictions in Canada and in the United States are in serious financial difficulty, the results of liberalisation of benefits combined with recession. Programs for workers are deteriorating, employer assessments are sky-rocketing, and the boards have incurred enormous unfunded liabilities. Saskatchewan employers ask, "is this a model we want for our province?"

That's what they're saying to you about your economic development plans here and your changes to labour legislation.

I'll just finish off by quoting one more little bit out this letter.

Members of the Saskatchewan Business Coalition believe it is absolutely urgent that the number one priority in this province's agenda must be economic renewal and job creation. Changing a successful workers' compensation system for unsubstantiated reasons is very far removed from this objective.

That makes sense to me. And I'm not saying that there aren't some people, Mr. Speaker, who have not

received the kind of benefits from Workers' Compensation that they should have had. There are some problems. I'd be the first one to admit that in our society and in our workforce we have some things that don't work 100 per cent. But let's not throw the baby out with the bath water here. The reality is that those people that have individual problems should be given an opportunity to have their problems addressed realistically and very quickly. I'm appalled at some people having to take two and three and four years out of their life to fight the system and then of course win some compensation, but in the meantime they've suffered all kinds of mental anguish.

Well if you're going to have economic recovery and economic rejuvenation, you can't have an unhappy workforce to that extent. We've got to solve those problems. But we can't destroy the whole system in so doing. We don't want to go to a system like Ontario's where they've got \$10 million in unfunded liabilities. That is not economic diversification and development; that's going into more debt. It's an unfunded debt that the government of the province of Saskatchewan ends up picking up.

Nobody else picks up that debt once you've got it. It becomes the debt of the government. Workers' Compensation runs in the hole. If you've got a debt you will end up having to accept the responsibility as a government. And the very thing that you say you're fighting to stop in this province is the very thing that you're going to initiate.

Well I've dwelt on that issue long enough, Mr. Speaker, because there are some other points that we have to make here.

Now this private member's motion talks about economic diversification and wanting to take credit for and have pride in economic diversification. And I want to talk about a specific issue that happens to by a stroke of fate fall into my constituency, and that of course is the Cypress Hills and the wood-cutting problem that we have there.

We've got a government that's claiming it's got economic diversification on its mind and wants to go out and create some jobs. What do they do? They get a message from one person, one fanatic who says that we've got to save some little flowers out in the west bloc of Cypress Hills. They don't look into how you can save this flower. What they do is they cancel all the logging permits, put a whole bunch of people out of work, stop everything. They don't investigate how you could save the flowers and at the same time improve the forest by selectively cutting some of it that should be cut down because it's so old it's going to burn or it's going to be so badly diseased it's no good for anything.

That's the kind of economic planning we've got going on in our province. It's not planning; it's anarchy. You drive 25 families out of work, you've got no back-up plan, no contingency work for them, no job creation, no nothing for anybody, and you shut the whole thing down because you haven't got the intestinal fortitude

it takes to ask a second party for an opinion of how you could save the things that need to be saved out there.

And I'll tell you right now, members of the government, go and talk to a few of the ranchers that live out there. They'll tell you those flowers have been there for ever, as long as they can remember. They've been there for a hundred years, their families, lots of them. And they'll tell you how to save those flowers. You can put up a few fences here and there, a little bit of management, and you can have the \$2 million spin-off from the cattle industry without driving all the stock out. You don't have to set fire to the forest to clean up the bugs and the beetles. You can selectively cut the timber that needs to be cut and use it for some practical purpose.

But that's what this government has been calling economic development in our province — shutting things down. Well it happens to hit close to home sometimes. And when it does, I get a little bit excited, Mr. Speaker, but I'll get on to some of these other issues.

Let's talk a little bit about the development and economic lack of development in rural road construction. The government decides this year . . . one step further back. Last year they decided to cut the grants in the province for rural municipalities. And they way they did it — one of the ways they did it — was they took the futures grants that were owed by the government to the municipalities, they split them in half and said, we're only going to pay half back now each year instead of the full amount it was before. So if you were owed by the government for three years of futures, now it's going to take you six years to get your money back. That's the way the plan works.

Now in so doing . . . That wasn't so bad. Most of the municipalities were saying: okay, that's fine; we'll still try to put up some money to build some roads, to fix our road structure and keep the bumps out and keep some of the contractors working, and we'll take it in year five or year six or year seven, down the road sometime. That's okay; we're willing to accept that. We'll take on that responsibility.

Now the government decides to come up with a new accrual accounting system, and in so serving that accounting system they say ah, but we're going to put a limit of two years of futures that you can have in your municipality owing to you from the government — a maximum of two years after they split in half. In other words if you were owed one year last year and that was cut in half, that makes two years. Now you're out if you've got, even from the previous year, one year of futures coming. Because now it's two and now you're limited and you can't build roads.

So we've got a situation in eastern Saskatchewan for an example for you. Members of the government will want to pay attention to this. You just entered a program where you're going to split \$70 million to build highways in this province; the federal government's going to put up half the money. You ought to be singing the praises out on the street

corners and yelling it to all the news media.

Haven't heard a word. We've had to bring it out and have the media bring it to us and us bring it to them, so that you could even get the recognition for the little bit of good you are going to get as a result of making a deal.

Well what are you doing to these municipalities? You got 200 miles . . . or 200 kilometres — I'd better get in the right distances here — 200 kilometres applied for by rural municipalities in the east side of this province for reconstruction and 81 of those kilometres have already been turned down and quite a few more, I suspect, will be turned down because these municipalities can't meet the new criteria of the limitation on their futures grants. And that means that these roads won't be built and our rural road system is going to be going downhill. It's going to get deteriorated to the point where it's going to cost double the money to fix them later on.

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, in this conversation of this debate today, this economic diversification so-called plan, what it means is that our contractors are going to be without work. Our people that would be out there picking the rocks and running the machinery and cutting the weeds and filling the holes and all those things that go with the construction of these rural roads are all going to sit by idly doing nothing this year because the new rules prohibit them from going ahead with these projects.

We talk about creating jobs and economic diversification on one hand and we stab the whole system in the back on the other hand. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever. Everything that seems to be going one step ahead is two steps backwards. I'm sure that's not a new philosophy in this Assembly, but we saw it all back in the '70s before and we'll have to see it change again. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that this whole process is just going backwards.

I can talk to you about how the economic plan of this province has gutted the GRIP (gross revenue insurance program) program so there isn't any money for people to seed their crops and how people are phoning around these days trying to find other people to farm their land because they haven't got the money to put their machinery in the fields.

I could talk to you about specific people, specific instances, specific cases, but I'm not going to bother because the members of this government are perfectly aware of these situations. Half of them are involved in the agricultural industry themselves and they know very well what they've done to rural Saskatchewan in their rural revenge perpetrated by their leader, the Premier of this province.

But let's talk a little bit about health care because you all can say, well we heard about agriculture a long time. Okay, let's talk about health care. That doesn't just affect farmers, that affects everybody. And believe me, if the people in the cities of this province think for one minute that only rural hospitals are going to be

shut down and only rural people are going to be out of their jobs as nurses and doctors and have to get out of the province or go to the cities, believe you me, it'll happen in the cities very quickly as well. You're going to see a cut-back in your medical care.

This medical care system is shot, it's dead, and it's gone, and this socialist government is the one that's taken it away from you and nobody else. Medicare in this province is dead. All we got left now is to bury it; and they'll do that very quickly as well, you watch them. You just watch them. Health care will affect everybody in this province. You'll be standing up in line to get into Alberta to be in the hospital in Medicine Hat or Calgary.

The workers of this province, Mr. Speaker, have been absolutely betrayed. This was the government that was supposed to be their champion. This was the government that was not only going to make everything better, they were going to create all these great new things, and do so much more. This was the government that promised no more new taxes. This was the government that promised that everything would be better for everybody. And here are the workers of the province struggling with 16 per cent increase in welfare recipients. We've got unemployment up to 9.6 per cent from 7 two years ago. And this is the government that betrayed them, nobody else. The biggest betrayal in the history of this province.

And at the same time they have the nerve to stand over there today and talk about how they're going to negotiate with the native people to find them some new working conditions and some new prosperity and they can't even settle a little matter like White Bear. Now you tell me how they're going to negotiate with those folks to get anything going at all when they can't even handle one first situation that comes up. Blueprint for disaster, that's what this is all about. It's not a blueprint to help anybody.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the member opposite said small business creates 70 per cent of the jobs in this province. Most of her statistics have been proven wrong here today, but just on the surface I'm going to say let's take that at face value and say that it's true, because it probably is — 70 per cent of the jobs are likely created by small business. I don't know if she includes agriculture in that or not, but that's immaterial.

But the reality is that if you impose labour laws and labour regulations, if you impose 9 per cent tax instead of 7 per cent tax — which you've already done — if you impose such great burdens on that small business community that they can no longer exist, what is the first thing that they will do? Lay off a worker. That's the first medicine for a business that's starting to fail — you start trimming out your extra workers, you fire people, you reduce the labour force, you don't improve it or increase it.

And if you can't see that happening, go to Maple Creek, Saskatchewan, and find out what's happening

with people going over to Alberta to shop. They're going in droves because this government has made the situation totally unbearable. Small business can no longer survive in this province and it's not now just restricted to that hundred-mile line on the west side of the province. It's starting to go through the entire province.

The iceberg budget of this government, Mr. Speaker, has totally wrecked any kind of bright future. The Premier says, the train has left the station. Well I say to you that the train has left the station and there's a light at the end of the tunnel, and it's the train that's being driven by the Premier of this province and he's going to run over everybody that gets in his way.

(1615)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to dwell on this topic as long as I have so what I want to do is to get on with my motion. The day goes on, and we have to get on to a more realistic approach to this debate so I want to read my motion. I move by myself, the member from Maple Creek, and seconded by the member from Moosomin:

That all of the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

condemns the Minister of Economic Development for his failure to carry through on any of his stated goals for the province, and in particular for failing the people of Saskatchewan by: abandoning any pretence of an economic development strategy for rural and urban Saskatchewan; refusing to pursue a nuclear industry; providing tax incentives to Sears resulting in the closure of rural facilities in trade for part-time jobs in Regina; repeatedly announcing the success of the Piper deal and repeatedly failing to deliver on his announcements; incurring a dead loss of \$47 million last year in SEDCO; expending \$50 million of taxpayers money on his own department with no discernible economic benefits; refusing to build an ethanol industry at no cost to the government; presiding over the collapse of Westank-Willock without any serious attempt at an employee take-over; failing to maintain a competitive climate for the Saskatchewan livestock industry; crippling the province's grain industry; undermining major industries through public campaigns of innuendo, coercion and threats; secretly spending \$20 million to go into partnership with organizations alleged to have mafia connections and activities under criminal investigation around the world; promising the relocation of 700 businesses to the province without delivering a single one; promising to increase 30,000 new jobs and instead losing 11,000 in one year; attacking the basic infrastructure of the province such as the effort to plough under paved highways; increasing all costs of doing business in the province from

utility rates to the paper burden involved in meeting government decrees; and the repudiation of Saskatchewan business in the government's proposed costly labour legislation agenda.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — This amendment has been moved by the member from Maple Creek and seconded by the member from Moosomin. It is not possible for me to check whether or not the amendment is in order. It's a fairly lengthy amendment. So I will allow the debate to continue concurrently on both the main motion and the amendment, and in the meantime I will check over the amendment.

But before I do so, I do want to just ask members that many of these arguments that are put in here . . . or the facts that are put in here should be used as arguments in debate and should not really be included in the amendments. But I do want to check it over, but in the meantime I'm going to let members debate the motion and the amendment concurrently.

Mr. Roy: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say it's a pleasure for me to engage in this particular debate. And I want to say that I wholeheartedly support the motion that was put forward by the member from Saskatoon Idylwyld and also the seconder, the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster, commending the Minister of Economic Development and the Department of Economic Development on doing a wonderful job and having the foresight to lead Saskatchewan into the 21st century with this particular economic development strategy.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into that strategy, I just want to comment briefly on some of the comments that the member from Maple Creek made here just previous. It ceases to amaze me, Mr. Speaker, how the members opposite can stand in this particular legislature and rant and rave against the government of the day, Mr. Speaker, when they know fully well that they are the reason, they are the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for the plight that we find ourselves in today in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you when they talk about rural revenge in Saskatchewan, I think they have to look at themselves in the mirror, Mr. Speaker, because for 10 long years they racked up \$1 billion of new debt each and every year. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason this government has to look at new economic development strategies, has to look at fiscal responsibility, and put priorities on those particular areas, Mr. Speaker. They are the reasons for rural revenge. They are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the rural areas of this province are having the difficulty they are having.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy: — Mr. Speaker, it also amazes me how this small Tory rump can stand up here and lambaste the government on its budget and on its economic development strategy, the *Partnership for Renewal*, Mr. Speaker, when right across this country and in fact outside the country there is accolades being shown towards the government.

The Government of Saskatchewan is being praised by financial consultants, accounting firms, lending institutions, other governments, other government departments. The Government of Saskatchewan is being praised on its initiatives and its . . . the responsibility, and also for tackling the huge financial strait-jacket and huge financial mess that we have in place in Saskatchewan. And that is what we are being praised on, Mr. Speaker.

How can the members opposite, how can the members opposite stand up and deny, deny that the government is really tackling these particular problems? Mr. Speaker, it defies reality. Don't they read the papers? Or do they selectively read what they want?

Mr. Speaker, I tell you that I was reading a few days ago quotes from right across Canada from some of the major newspapers across this country. They were commenting on Saskatchewan's budget and on Saskatchewan's economic plan. And I'll tell you that those were some of the most positive statements that have been printed in papers in the last six months to a year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the member from Maple Creek because he went on on various issues and various subjects with no authority whatsoever. And certainly some of the numbers and some of the information he was providing certainly is erroneous, and I want to correct him right here, Mr. Speaker, and in particular on one particular subject. He commented on the closure, or the closure of a rabbit processing plant in Swift Current, Mr. Speaker, and he laid the responsibility, or the blame, at the feet of the present government in Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the member from Maple Creek. And I will quote from the *Leader-Post* on April 10, in which it states the reason for the problem with severance pay is that:

The federal act was changed a year ago, but a crucial part of the new legislation — a \$50 to \$60-million wage fund, was omitted . . .

That fund would have paid out severance in the event a company declared bankruptcy and no money was left for employees after the sale of the assets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Maple Creek should pick up the telephone and phone his friend Brian in Ottawa and lay the blame at his feet, not at the feet of the New Democratic government in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy: — And I would also advise the hon. member that he should get his facts straight before he comes in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment about confidence, and in particular investor confidence. Now how do you build investor confidence, Mr. Speaker? First thing you do, Mr. Speaker, is you have to create a climate in which investors will be comfortable in coming to a particular region or a particular province or a particular state to invest. And, Mr. Speaker, the first pillar of that confidence, of that house of confidence, is to have your financial affairs in order.

Mr. Speaker, if you are a government in a province like Saskatchewan that has a \$15 billion debt, total public debt, Mr. Speaker, what that signal sends out to investors is that the per capita debt in Saskatchewan and the percentage of the gross domestic product is too high. And they want to see a government committing itself and doing things, concrete evidence that the government is serious about getting its expenditures under control. That's what you've got to do first of all.

Mr. Speaker, that's what the Government of Saskatchewan has done. In this budget which we presented in March, the Government of Saskatchewan has set a bold, new direction, a balanced budget plan which sets out a plan for getting . . . achieving a balanced budget by '96-97 fiscal year.

Now how much more of a solid indication to investors is there than that, Mr. Speaker? What we are demonstrating to investors is that we have got our financial house in order. We've reduced expenditures last year by a total of 3 per cent; this year it's going to be over 7 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, that is going to build confidence in investor markets because they're going to want to come to Saskatchewan because they know that we have the finances and the financial house in order. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the first part of building that confidence to attract investors.

A second part of that, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that some of the other areas are being addressed, such as economic development and the whole idea of stimulating the economy. Mr. Speaker, the history of Saskatchewan has been a mixed economic model. And, Mr. Speaker, we've had a balance of public, private, and cooperative investment in the province. Mr. Speaker, those have been the three main pistons in the economic engine of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, during the years in Saskatchewan's history, depending on the time, Mr. Speaker, there may have been more percentage of investment in one particular sector than others. But they balanced out over the years, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, what did we see when the previous government came in? They decided that they were going to rip out one engine . . . one piston of that economic engine, and that was the cooperative sector.

Mr. Speaker, it was shameful the kind of treatment that they gave to our cooperative organizations in this province. In 1987 the culmination was that they disbanded the Department of Co-operation. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, brought in the department of diversification and privatization. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, that was shameful.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have those three main pistons. And, Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to do now is trying to regain that balance. And one of the main parts of that is of course to make sure that the cooperative sector is brought into that . . . into this mix.

I want to just touch on the . . . our *Partnership for Renewal* strategy document which was released last fall, Mr. Speaker. And it has some basic approaches and principles to it, Mr. Speaker. And I want to tell you that our government and the Minister of Economic Development and the department went to great lengths to ensure that we would have consultation and we would bring all of the stakeholders into this consultation process. And I want to commend our government for going the extra mile to ensure that that consultation took place.

And I think we can be proud of the kind of meetings and the kind of input we had into this document. I think it's something that we have not seen in the history of this province, and I think that is why this document is so vital to moving Saskatchewan towards the next century, the 21st century.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1630)

Mr. Roy: — Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the 21st century and certainly moving towards a new world economy. And I think everybody recognizes that we are going through tremendous economic changes globally. There's no doubt that the former Russian country, now it's being . . . it's going through tremendous upheaval, economic and otherwise. What will happen at the end of that, I'm not sure of.

Mr. Speaker, we've also seen an escalation of regional trading blocks such as the European Economic Community. And, Mr. Speaker, we're now starting to see that move. We're starting to move towards that even in North America. We certainly are reluctant in wanting to move toward something in that nature but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is the direction we're going in.

So all of this, this new economic structure that will come out of this, is going to make it imperative that we get our economy prepared for that new competitiveness. And there will be new competition, Mr. Speaker, and it will be a very fierce competition, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that Saskatchewan businesses and the province of Saskatchewan will fare very well in the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit also about . . . a

little bit more about building a climate of economic renewal. And it's very, very important that we get the economy rolling again because that is the only way . . . it's one of the ways in which we are going to meet our trajectories. And, Mr. Speaker, I might add that if you take a look at the budget which we brought down in March, there is a plan, a balanced budget plan. And, Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at the *Partnership for Renewal*, there is a plan and it is a very structured and very defined plan.

Mr. Speaker, I think . . . I want to concur with what my colleague, the member from Saskatoon Idylwyld stated, that never before has a government put its credibility on the line by stating such an ambitious plan and stating it and defining it and saying to the people of the province of Saskatchewan: here is our economic plan; here's how we're going to get there; and you will be able to judge us. And if we do not meet that, then you will be able to render your judgement upon us. Telling you, that takes guts, Mr. Speaker. And that is what this government has done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that that is ambitious and it is certainly something that has not been seen in a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the role of government in economic development. And I think a classic case can be made by looking at the years 1982 to 1991 when the former government was in place, about how you do not get government involved in some of these large projects.

Mr. Speaker, we do not announce economic development projects from the top of Regina buildings. When it comes to economic development, Mr. Speaker, and the role of government in economic development, our two feet are firmly planted on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, the role of government — what is it? How far should it go in economic development? Well I think our partnership for economic renewal speaks of that, Mr. Speaker. We believe that government has a very important role in economic development. And the strategy also documents quite clearly how far the government should go, Mr. Speaker.

I want to tell you that the public sector in Saskatchewan has always played a major role in economic development. And as I said, it has been one of the economic pistons in the economy and we will continue to do that, Mr. Speaker, but we will commit our attention to small- and medium-sized, existing and new businesses in Saskatchewan. That is where 80 per cent of all new jobs in the last 10 years were created, and that's where we are going to focus our attention, unlike the opposite government that put millions and billions of dollars towards megaprojects — megabucks for megaprojects.

And we are seeing the results of that, Mr. Speaker. We are seeing that the bond-rating agencies across the world are pointing to some of the debt commitments, the guaranteed debts that we have that were

comprised or were made up by the previous government, telling you our government is not going to be taking that particular road. We are going to go where we get the best bang for a buck and that is with small- and medium-sized businesses.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I just want to commend our government. I want to commend the Minister of Economic Development and the Department of Economic Development for this particular strategy, for putting out a blueprint for the future.

I think it is bold. I think it's going to lead us to economic renewal, and certainly I would ask the members opposite to take a closer look at this particular document. Because if you look at it closely and look at the results that are happening out in the economy, you see that we are meeting our targets and they're right in this document. And you can compare them, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud of that.

I also want to compliment my colleague from Saskatoon Idylwyld and my colleague from Cut Knife-Lloydminster for their great presentations. And, Mr. Speaker, through the commitment and through the cooperation of all stakeholders in the economy in Saskatchewan, we will reverse this situation. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to obviously oppose the motion and support the amendment. I would like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by saying to the member from Kinistino, that I was just in Cudworth and there was an opening where Joe Saxinger, the former MLA from Kinistino, had a kind of a grand opening of his new store, where he sells farm machinery supplies and various kinds of short-line equipment.

And he's been very successful over the years and I suspect there's a 150 or 200 people showed up for this grand opening. And they were talking about the economic strategy in the province of Saskatchewan under the socialists, under the NDP. And I'm sure that the NDP MLA might have wanted to attend but he didn't bother to show up. And I can understand why he didn't show up because all I could hear, Mr. Speaker, was significant and severe criticism of the NDP administration. Not only on health care policy, and not only on agriculture policy, but particularly on their financial and their economic strategy, which is doom and gloom, and a disaster, and increased deficits, and declining credit ratings, and picking on rural people.

So the NDP from Kinistino, the NDP member, didn't show up at Cudworth for this grand opening. And there were people there who had voted CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) or voted NDP. And the recent ones that had voted NDP were not very proud of it. In fact most of them were hard to find because not many people these days admit they voted NDP.

Well there's one over here — the new cabinet minister from The Battlefords did admit it. He put up his hand; he admits that he voted NDP.

Well there's not many that admit it any more because they're so ashamed of the policy, they're so ashamed of the economic policy and the social policy and the health care policy that when you go out and talk to them at the rinks or at community functions, they say, well where's my NDP MLA? He doesn't show up any more. She doesn't show up any more. They don't come out to functions because it's so unpopular to be NDP.

So in Cudworth, Mr. Speaker, there was no sign of the NDP MLA. He wouldn't show up. Two hundred people show up and they have a nice barbecue and they have sausages and it's a grand opening and they say: he doesn't bother showing up at all any more; he just doesn't go to functions. And the reason is he's ducking and he's hiding.

And if you look at the economic strategy, he's getting his lead from the front benches of the NDP administration, because the health care minister won't go out and talk to the public. She went out to Weyburn. She went out to Weyburn with the new wellness model and she got thoroughly booed. And other cabinet ministers went along. It was a disgrace; it was embarrassing for them.

And she had some colleagues who admit that they were along and they were booed as well. And they even said, well I might come back in four years to visit you. And they got booed even louder.

So they've decided, Mr. Speaker, that no sense going out and trying to justify or explain this new economic development strategy because it's non-existent. And it's not only non-existent, it's an embarrassment. It's an embarrassment.

And if they won't show up in Cudworth to a grand opening where 200 people show up, that tells you something. They speak here in the legislature, where they think it's safe, or they hide here in the legislature, defending their so-called wellness model, but you invite them out to the country or you invite them out to the town hall or invite them out to the new opening and guess what? — they either show up and get booed or they stay home and they hide because the economic strategy is non-existent. In fact it's worse than any strategy. In fact if they'd have done nothing, we'd be better off.

I'm going to quote, Mr. Speaker, the highlights from **Sask Trend Monitor**, which has statistics about the success or the failure of NDP strategy, the economic development strategy that they're so proud of.

Not only are people leaving the province, not only are towns and villages dying, not only are bankruptcies increasing in agriculture but in other parts of the economy, but the doom and gloom associated with the NDP's increase in taxes and the decline in the credit rating pervades the province now where people

don't even believe it will get better. In fact they don't believe now that the NDP can balance the budget. They don't believe that they will have any signs of success for bringing new businesses in.

And in fact, Mr. Speaker, what we're finding out, if you look at the polls coming forward now in the next federal election, that the NDP could virtually be wiped out — wiped out. They're down to 9 per cent, single digit, not just because of Ontario, not just because of B.C. (British Columbia), but because of the kinds of strategies that are resulting in the decline of economic activity here in the province of Saskatchewan and the kind of strategies that prevent NDP MLAs, like the member from Kinistino, even going to grand openings because he's ashamed to show his face. And that's what you see in the statistics coming forward. They're ducking, they're hiding.

Every once in a while they'll have a big clutch in here to say, oh we're really doing well. But they won't go out and meet the people because they either get booed or they get cornered or they get verbally abused for hurting farmers, closing hospitals, kicking people out of their nursing homes; generally providing the largest tax increases that we've seen in the history of Saskatchewan.

And they said, well we have to do this because this is the new wellness plan for the province. This is the economic wellness plan, this is the health wellness plan. This is the new agriculture wellness plan — can you believe that? No wonder they're afraid to show up.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they may not like to hear this, but I'll just give them their statistics so that they can revel in the joys of their success. This is the highlights of current Saskatchewan statistics, March 1993. It's from the recent **Sask Trends Monitor** published results.

(1645)

Social assistance case-loads. Try that one on. Social assistance case-loads increased by sixteen and a half per cent. Now this is the new socialist government that is going to provide assistance to low income people, help people on food banks, eliminate all kinds of problems that people face as a result of no jobs, and we find social assistance case-loads have increased sixteen and a half per cent last year after an increase of 5 per cent, which is a total of twenty

one and a half per cent increase in people who are looking for work but can't find it, need more public support, need more assistance.

And the claim to fame in economic strategy according to **Sask Trends Monitor** is the case-load for social assistance is up 21 per cent. And they're bragging about it. They have the audacity to stand in the legislature and say: oh we're really doing well; social assistance case-loads are up 21 per cent '91 over '93.

More than 3,000 of the average 4,500 new recipients per month were considered fully employable. And what that means is these were able-bodied men and

women who could be employed, who could be employed but were not employed in the province of Saskatchewan as a result of the economic strategy put forward by the NDP administration. So more and more and more people are on social assistance. The government has to help these people on social assistance because it has no economic development strategy.

And this motion brought forward is supposed to brag about the NDP industrial strategy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, the reality is more and more people in Saskatchewan are on social assistance as a result of the NDP economic strategy, and that's the facts. Those are the facts being published today by **Sask Trends Monitor**.

So how can they make all this up in here, Mr. Speaker? They stand up and say: we're really doing well; the farmers are happy and seniors are happy and there's lots of new jobs. Yet today the statistics say that there's sixteen and a half per cent increase in social assistance clients and most of them are employable but they can't find a job in the province of Saskatchewan.

That's why they're ashamed to show their face in the country or show their face out at town hall meetings, why they won't talk to other people outside the legislature, because they either get booed or they get beat on. And they're subjected to severe verbal abuse because the people know the truth — unemployment is increasing; social assistance numbers are increasing; taxes are increasing at the same time that we've got this new industrial financial strategy that's caused our credit rating to fall.

And on top of that they're nowhere near balancing the budget. They've added \$1.3 billion to the debt with the current deficit forecast to be just under \$300 million, added to the debt, added to the deficit, added to unemployment.

And then they turn on the people and say, well we really have to make this work and the new wellness model will take you out of your hospitals, will cut you out of your nursing homes, will take you off the farms, will reduce the number of rural MLAs so that we'll only have to worry about the cities. And then we know why they don't show up in places like Cudworth for grand openings, because even when somebody has the courage to open it up and to open a new business, the NDP MLAs don't even show up.

Mr. Speaker, benefit expenditures rose more quickly than the case-load. They're up to 18.4 per cent. In other words, people need — desperately need — help and social assistance as a result of the unemployment in the province of Saskatchewan. And the NDP just sit there and they laugh and they say, this is our new wellness model, associated with economic development. And you've got case-loads increasing like this?

And then they make up some sort of phoney motion about how good they are, how fancy it is, how nice it

is. Well I don't . . . and I know the people are not fooled. I'll tell you the people at Cudworth and surrounding area that came there to talk about economic conditions weren't fooled at all. And they weren't cheerleading. It wouldn't matter if the member from Riversdale or the member from any place else stood up there in front of them and said, well really, it's really good. They'd say, nope, not on my farm, not in my town, not in my province; maybe you think it's good here in the legislature but it's not good where we are.

Because they recognize Sask monitoring trends are accurate. This is what's going on. People are unemployed and people are hurt and people have lost hope. And this is sound economic strategy. This is the new socialist strategy, just like we saw in France, right? What do you think the people of France figured out? What did they figure out? Socialist strategy is a failure. I don't think they won a seat in the last elections. Kicked them all out of office.

Well I must have got their attention, Mr. Speaker. They say that there was one socialist elected in France, one. Well 83 per cent of the population didn't vote for the socialists in France because they said it's a colossal failure. No plan, no strategy.

They had a wellness model in France too. Real new wellness model. Fancy ideas. They're going to be competitive, create all these jobs, but do you know what they got in France? They got a big surprise. No wellness model, no balanced budgets, lots of talk, lots of plans, and more and more people on social assistance.

That's the facts in Saskatchewan as it is in France. More and more people on social assistance and it's costing the taxpayers more and more. And they've raised taxes in France. They said, oh we must do it. Got to raise taxes to balance the budget. They never balanced the budget, just like this bunch here — \$800 million deficit, then a \$595 million deficit, now almost a \$300 million deficit. And in four years they say they're going to balance it, and they've added 1.5 billion to the debt. And the credit rating continues to go down.

Look at the labour force, page 9 of **Sask Trends Monitor** — labour force in thousands, it's falling in the province of Saskatchewan. From a previous month it's down minus .9 per cent; from the same month last year, minus .9 per cent. The number of unemployed in thousands has increased by 17.9 per cent over last year.

The number of unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan has increased 17.9 per cent over a year ago. And they're bragging here today about their economic development strategy. So people leave, people quit, people go on social assistance, and these figures now say on top of that you've got a 17.9 per cent increase in unemployment.

Sask Trends Monitor, this is telling the people, or the NDP, the truth of how the people feel. They don't like

what you're doing. They've either quit the labour force, moved out of the province, or they're on social assistance.

Now if you take a 17.9 per cent increase and you do that two or three years in a row, you've got yourself a 25 to 30 to 40 to 50 per cent increase in unemployment among those that are left in the province. So the out-migration is increasing. The number of unemployment is increasing. The number on social assistance is increasing. And you are here bragging about your new-found strategy.

You've increased power rates, telephone rates, health care rates, SGI rates, every other tax you can think of. People know that there is now a 9 per cent PST (provincial sales tax) in the province of Saskatchewan and no provincial sales tax in Alberta, so that they're moving that way at least as far east as Regina and Saskatoon, shopping in Alberta. And you're standing here with this motion that you'll all cheer for and say, aren't we doing well.

Unemployment rate. The unemployment rate has increased 2.4 per cent over a year ago; 2.8 per cent in Saskatoon; 2.4 per cent in Regina; 1.5 per cent in the province. Employment in the thousands. And this is particularly difficult for young people, Mr. Speaker. If you look at 15 to 24 years of age, it's dropped 3 per cent from a year ago. So the young people, 15 to 24, graduating from universities, graduating from high school, graduating from technical institutes, looking for work, have not been able to find it in the province of Saskatchewan.

Employment by regions. And you look at some of this, it's really difficult — the south-east part of the province, the employment has dropped 14 per cent over a year ago, and that excludes the city of Regina; 7 per cent from the area of Yorkton and Melville, a decrease. Well, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite can make fun of this or they can say its 25 per cent increase in unemployment is not serious. But it is serious.

And the people in this province know the pain. And what they're finding out by watching this debate on television, is here the NDP members are standing up in this House, not reaching out to help people, but bragging in public about their new-found economic wellness model that is causing all this pain. I mean is this what this new administration is about? Brag about this new economic development strategy when you've got this kind of unemployment, this kind of pain in the farm community, this kind of fear in towns and villages where people are losing their hospitals and their nursing homes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, no wonder people want us to stop the closure on closure, to say take time and talk to people; want us to stand in this legislature and make very, very sure that at least the NDP, no matter how arrogant they can be, and they are, at least take the time to listen to the real concerns of people.

When the NDP were in opposition they said, my gosh,

if we had to pay \$50 deductible for drugs people would have to choose between food and prescription drugs. I remember them saying that and the Minister of Social Services said that. And now he charges them up to \$800 per quarter and it still doesn't matter. They said no, this is the new wellness model; we have a fine economic development strategy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they should be ashamed of their strategy. They should vote against a motion that brags about this callous disregard for people and their lives and their health.

We see here on page 12 as well, Mr. Speaker, Social Services case-load is up 18.4 per cent — 16.5 per cent in numbers, 18.4 per cent from a year ago. So the case-load is increasing by 18 per cent, the unemployment is increasing by 18 per cent, the number of farmers are decreasing, unemployment is increasing. They're adding to the debt, the credit rating's going down, and they say, well isn't this a nice plan?

And on top of all of this, Mr. Speaker, what we find out is that these people promised that if they just had a little bit of NDP good management there'd be no tax increases and everything would be just fine. They'd have increased money for health and education. They'd eliminate food banks. You'd have full employment.

And we hear of them call: they will, they will, they will. Well they've had now three budgets and they're going the wrong direction. They've added 1.3 to 1.5 billion in the deficit and people are unemployed and it's hurting, Mr. Speaker. And they're standing up here bragging.

Consumer bankruptcies from the previous period are up 32 per cent. Consumer bankruptcies are up 32 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and they are bragging about their wellness model.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to, I'm sure, have the opportunity to speak more about the wellness and economic strategy of the new administration, but looking at the time, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adjourn debate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — The member from Estevan has moved adjournment of the debate. But before I put the question on the adjournment, I have looked at the amendment that has been proposed and I find parts of the amendment not relevant to the motion and also parts of it which are argumentative. And I refer all members to Beauchesne's, paragraph 565, where Beauchesne says:

A motion should be neither argumentative, nor in the style of a speech, nor contain unnecessary provisions or objectionable words.

Secondly, I refer all members to Beauchesne's,

paragraph 568:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

Parts of the amendment I do not find relevant, and I have dropped those words. Therefore the amendment will read as follows:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and the following be substituted therefor:

condemns the Minister of Economic Development for his failure to carry through on any of his stated goals for the province and in particular for failing the people of Saskatchewan by abandoning any pretence of economic development strategy for rural and urban Saskatchewan; refusing to pursue a nuclear industry; providing tax incentives to Sears, resulting in the closure of rural facilities in trade for part-time jobs in Regina; repeatedly announcing the success of the Piper deal and repeatedly failing to deliver on his announcements; incurring a dead loss of \$47 million last year in SEDCO; expanding \$50 million of taxpayers' money on his own department with no discernible economic benefits; refusing to build an ethanol industry at no cost to the government; presiding over the collapse of Westank-Willock without any serious attempt at an employee take-over; promising the relocation of 700 businesses to the province without delivering a single one; promising to create 30,000 new jobs and instead losing 11,000 in one year.

That is the amendment and the member has moved adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the Assembly to adopt the motion?

Debate adjourned.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask for a point of clarification on your ruling? Not to be argumentative, but you did say that the sections that you decided to leave out, Mr. Speaker, were based on . . . some of them were argumentative, some of them were irrelevant . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I made my ruling and there is no clarification on the ruling. If the member wishes to discuss it further, he should come to the Speaker's office and I will discuss it with him privately.

It now being 5 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until . . . Oh I'm sorry. Oh I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — . . . to move adjournment, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:03 p.m.