

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
February 10, 1995

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — According to order the following petition has been reviewed, and pursuant to rule 11(7) is hereby read and received.

Of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to allocate adequate funding dedicated toward the doubling of Highway No. 1.

And the petition of the community of Avonlea, citizens of the province of Saskatchewan, petitioning against unfair treatment and discrimination against the community by not giving Mrs. Krieger a licence to build a multi-bed personal care home.

And the petition of citizens of the province of Saskatchewan humbly praying that your Hon. Assembly may be pleased to allocate funding toward the maintenance and capital costs of Saskatchewan roads.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the other members of the Assembly, Bernie Juneau and Mike Doherty who are sitting in your gallery, Mr. Speaker.

Bernie lives out at Siltou and Mike lives right here in the city. And they've come to observe part of the day, I guess just to watch what takes place. And I would like to ask everyone to welcome them to the legislature today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, allow me to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly a former colleague of ours, a member of this Assembly, who is sitting behind the bar, and we would like to welcome him — Mr. Joe Saxinger

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

17th Annual Pipe Si-Cana Regional Winter Games

Mr. Scott: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last weekend over 1,200 participants of all ages gathered in Wolseley and nearby communities of Sinteluta and Grenfell for the 17th Annual Pipe Si-Cana Regional Winter Games.

The games were a great success, offering people of all ages the opportunity to demonstrate their skills and talents in a variety of 19 events ranging from darts and cribbage to figure skating and slow pitch. Colourful opening ceremonies, pancake breakfasts on Saturday and Sunday morning, a cabaret, medal presentations, and closing ceremonies, and the passing of the torch to Rocanville who will host next year's games, rounded out a very busy weekend.

In the usual Saskatchewan spirit, volunteers were the key to the successful and enjoyable weekend. Co-chairmen Tim Taylor, and Dave Edgar of Wolseley and the dozens of volunteers and sponsors who helped out in numerous ways in hosting the games are to be congratulated for their many efforts in a job well done. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Langenburg Students - International Development Week

Mr. Knezacek: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we reflect on International Development Week, I would like to add to the list of examples of how Saskatchewan residents are having an impact in a third-world country. This story has its beginning in a community in my riding.

We have all seen the images of the tragedies taking place in Rwanda and other dismal African stories presented each night on television. It's enough for some people to give up hope. Although successes in Ethiopia are just beginning, they have had an impact to the farmers there. Damota 1, a project funded by 30-hour famine participants from the Langenburg area, is one of those success stories.

The Damota region had been stripped of trees for shelter and firewood over the years, but through education and village-organized tree nurseries there are thousands of trees. New soil conservation techniques and a practical irrigation project have given the farmers the upper hand in fighting droughts which plague Africa. The work was done by Ethiopian villagers but the funding came from the Langenburg area, right here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, last year students from across Saskatchewan raised \$92,000 by fasting for 30 hours in this annual fund-raiser which was spearheaded by World Vision. This year the 30-hour famine will be held across Canada on February 24 and 25.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of how a group of students in a small Saskatchewan community can make a difference around the world. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Heart and Stroke Month

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This member's statement is relevant to the constituency of Meadow Lake

because, with possibly the exception of the MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly), everyone there does have a heart.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, February is Heart and Stroke Month, and activities to promote awareness of this cause are taking place in cities and small towns all across Saskatchewan. I just came from a breakfast this morning where there were 4 or 500 people present to kick off the fund-raising campaign here in Regina.

There are about 3,200 Saskatchewan residents who die each year from heart disease and strokes. And so, Mr. Speaker, the work that the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Saskatchewan does is vital in trying to decrease these numbers. And there is good news: recent statistics show that 40 per cent of all deaths in Canada were attributed to these causes. This represents a steady decline since the mid-60s when the figure was over 50 per cent.

Last year, the heart and stroke foundation raised more than \$2.1 million here in Saskatchewan. Fifty-three per cent of that total was designated to support research and development projects at the University of Saskatchewan and 28 per cent was committed to community development and education programs.

Mr. Speaker, the odds are improving in the fight against heart disease and strokes because of the research programs. Over the next few days, thousands of volunteers will be giving their time and energy during a province-wide canvass to raise funds for the heart and stroke foundation. I encourage you, Mr. Speaker, and everywhere in Saskatchewan to donate generously. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

North Battleford Citizen of the Year

Hon. Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, the 1994 citizens of the year for North Battleford were honoured on February 3 at ceremonies which celebrated their contribution to the community. Robert Erickson is the citizen of the year, and Jennifer Olson the junior citizen of the year.

Both have quite a list of achievements, too numerous to all be listed. For the past three years Robert Erickson has been busy raising funds and obtaining hockey equipment for underprivileged minor hockey players. He spends more than 40 hours each week driving these young hockey players to and from practices and games. When his name was put forward for this honour, it was noted that now, in his retirement, Bob spends more time volunteering in the community than the average person does on the job. He is also involved in recruiting swimmers for the 1995 North American Indigenous Games to be held in Minnesota.

Jennifer Olson, a grade 12 student at North Battleford Comprehensive High School, also has quite an impressive list of accomplishments, Mr. Speaker. Jennifer helped organize the schools' food drive for the Salvation Army. She's participated in the 30-hour famine to raise funds for starving children in third-world countries. She chairs the student Crime Stoppers

program. She is president of the drama club and president of the Students Against Drinking and Driving.

We congratulate both the recipients of the citizen of the year honours for making their community a better place in which to live.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Prince Albert Citizen of the Year

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tonight in Prince Albert the people of Prince Albert will honour its citizen of the year, Myrna Nagy, at a banquet, Mr. Speaker. Myrna Nagy has a long list of achievements, and I'm sure everyone will agree that Prince Albert is a better place to live because of her involvement in so many activities.

Myrna was born and raised in Prince Albert and has been a member of the business community and an active volunteer for over 30 years. She is a community leader and is a role model for women throughout north central Saskatchewan. Myrna has served as president of the Kinette Club of Prince Albert, has served on the executive, and was the first life member of the Prince Albert Kinette Club. She also served on the board of directors of the Kinsmen Foundation in connection with the distribution of funds raised through Telemiracle.

Myrna also had a role to play in the 1994 western Canada figure skating championships, the 1992 summer games, performing arts committee, and served on the United Way board of directors.

Other organizations where she has been active include the downtown business association, the Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce, Waskesiu Chamber of Commerce, the Council on Ageing, the YWCA, and a member of the Victoria Union Hospital board foundation.

And my colleague, the Minister of Energy, the member from Prince Albert Northcote, will be attending the banquet in Prince Albert tonight. I want to congratulate the *Prince Albert Daily Herald* for continuing with this very worthwhile event annually.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Seniors Commemorate our 90th Birthday

Mr. Keeping: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is having its 90th birthday this year and activities are continuing to escalate province-wide. One of these projects involves one of Saskatchewan's great resources — our seniors.

Saskatchewan seniors were recently recognized by *The Guinness Book of Records* for making the world's largest quilt. Now throughout the province seniors are attempting to make the world's largest birthday card. This project is being launched by the Saskatchewan Seniors Association and its 350 affiliated seniors' clubs throughout the province. And it's being done to commemorate our 90th birthday.

This huge card would be unveiled in June at the annual convention in North Battleford. And the finished product will include individual cards that are being made by seniors' clubs throughout the province. Everyone in the province is being asked to contribute by contributing a loonie to have their name placed in the card from their community.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this project headed for *The Guinness Book of Records*, but a major portion of the money raised will be kept in the local community.

Congratulations to the province's seniors on another innovative idea which promotes Saskatchewan and enhances the lives of thousands of our people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to introduce guests.

The Speaker: — Order. I'm not certain if there are any other members who want to make private members' statements. We're not finished with private members' statements yet . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . She may ask for leave, but we have not finished with private members' statements. If anybody else wishes to make a private member statement at this particular time, they can do that. If not, I recognize the minister.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm extremely pleased today to be able to welcome a number of special guests to the legislature. I will introduce a number of chiefs and other first nations' members who are here with us today.

If I could ask the chiefs to stand when I call your name and remain standing so the members of the legislature can recognize you. Chief Harry Lafond, Muskeg Lake Cree Nation; Chief Alphonse Bird, Grand Chief, Prince Albert Grand Council; Oneill Gladue, Vice-Chief, Meadow Lake Tribal Council; Terry Lavallee, Chief, Cowessess Cree Nation; Joe O'Watch, Chief, Carry The Kettle First Nation; Edward Bill, Chief, Pelican Lake; Tom Bear, Agency Chiefs Tribal Council; Vice-Chief Alan Adam, FSIN (Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations); Vice-Chief Dan Bellegarde; and Chief Louis Taypotat, Kahkewistahaw. And I'll now introduce the other people: Dorothy Thomas, Hickson Weenie, Herb Fiddler, Don Deranger, and of course Chief Blaine Favel, Chief of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce a group of Regina business people who are with us

here today. And I want to first introduce Gord Staseson and the chairperson of the Regina Economic Development Authority; Jim Kilkenny, the president of Regina Tourism; Gerry Norbraten, the president of the Regina Market Square; Brian Kinder, representing the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce. Brian's with us in spirit; he was with us earlier. Michael Phelps, the president of Sask Architectural Heritage Society; Larry Bird, past president of the Regina hoteliers' association; and Mark Hanley, representing the Regina Market Square.

I would like all members of the Assembly to join with us in welcoming the group with us today who are here for the announcement that will be heard later in the Assembly, I'm sure in question period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, allow me the privilege of, as well, introducing and making welcome our native folks from the FSIN and in fact Chief Favel, and certainly chief from the area that I represent, have known for a number of years, Louis Taypotat and everyone who is here, we welcome you on behalf of the official opposition.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Haverstock: — Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that on behalf of the Liberal caucus I welcome these very distinguished guests today, not only from the first nations of Saskatchewan, but the business community of Regina as well. We're very, very pleased that they are here today.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Yes. Mr. Speaker, I also ask for leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I will introduce the guests with due respect to our languages. Mr. Speaker, I will entitle you, Otayamiw, meaning Mr. Speaker.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree.)

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Casino Expansion

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I direct the question to the Premier and I wish that he could answer. Maybe Madam Minister will pick it up.

Mr. Premier, Madam Minister, today your government has opened the floodgates for Las Vegas-style casinos, shortly after swearing that no more than two casinos would be built. Only half an hour ago the opposition learned some of the details of that so-called agreement. We contend that your government has caved in to the pressures of a pressure lobby group. So now we have up to five to six casinos that are going to be built in Saskatchewan and that is a betrayal upon the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Premier, or Madam Minister, will you show us the studies that you have done that show that up to five or six Las Vegas-style casinos will be economically viable? Can you, Madam Minister, show us your due diligence on this megaproject?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I'd like to thank the member from Rosthern for his question. As you know, any of these developments would involve business people and they are not going to proceed without due diligence and without study on the viability of these projects.

The operating agreement that we have signed today requires market study viability. So I would think that neither ourselves nor the first nations are interested in getting involved in economic development that doesn't fulfil their objectives of improving their community circumstance. And I expect that they would do everything required to make sure that happens.

In regards to the Las Vegas-style casino, I have never quite understood what that was all about anyway. But the agreement specifies community, low impact, scaled to what the community is able to handle and what seems reasonable for that market and that location. So these are low-impact, community-scale operations.

As you understand, when the decision was made not to proceed with Saskatoon . . . Saskatoon was part of the original agreement that was negotiated with the first nations, so what we had to do was enter into a renegotiation in order to deal with that fact. And what we have done is set out an agreement where the total amount of gaming activity would not exceed what would have existed under that agreement.

I would say we have not caved in. We have proceeded with an agreement that's been negotiated for a considerable time now with the replacement provisions for Saskatoon. And although it specifies that up to four casinos could be built, those all require market study and community approval.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Madam Minister . . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You say that there are some things about the Las Vegas-style casinos that you don't understand. Well, Madam Minister, I submit to you there's a lot more that you don't understand. And more unfortunately, there's a lot more that the people of this province don't understand.

Now I thought for a while that it was dishonourable for the Premier not to go to the people of Saskatchewan to talk to them and ask them what they thought about these styles of casinos. And I thought it was a shameful display of weak leadership that the Premier had, in spite of his personal objections to go ahead with such a project.

As a result of your agreement, Madam Minister, the money generated by these casinos will be spread around. Seventy-five per cent of the money from the new reserve casino goes to Indian bands, the government 25 per cent, and area charities

and exhibitions get nothing. They have to go to the FSIN for their funding. What's more, the 25 per cent that you gave to charities from the Regina casino will be significantly reduced because your own studies show that there is only one casino that could be economically viable.

So I say to you, and Mr. Premier, people don't want your casinos. Charities and exhibition associations are going to be devastated. Tell the people of this Assembly, tell the people of this Assembly what mandate you have to accomplish this major shift and change of direction within the province of Saskatchewan where you undertake this . . . when you undertake this. Where is your mandate? Where is democracy?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I thank the hon. member for his question. I'm always amazed at the short memories in this House even though we have *Hansard* to refer to, but bingo expanded under your administration by 2,500 per cent. I don't remember the community consultations that took place when you made that decision. Obviously you had reasons why you made that decision and I'm not going to debate today whether they were good reasons or not. I know they affected the organization that I worked with considerably but we're not here to discuss that right now.

The new model in this agreement is based on a partnership which includes revenue sharing, so even when a casino is built on a reserve, if in fact it passes all the other criteria, there's a requirement that those revenues don't go just to that reserve but they get shared throughout the reserve community, with the government, and with charities, who I might add are desperately in need of these kinds of revenues to create the same level of service in those communities that we appreciate in our communities.

We've had a continuing commitment to protect charities in this province and I think our two decisions before Christmas and one subsequently have illustrated that we've kept with that commitment.

In Regina, the first nations negotiated with the exhibition association and the exhibition association's level of revenues has been protected. I understand that if they were operating in other communities, that would be part of their discussions that they would have with the communities that they're interested in participating with.

There is a flip in the funding arrangement and once the first nation share from reserves . . .

An Hon. Member: — Is that a flip or is that a flop?

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — You might be interested in understanding this. If not, okay, we'll answer it next time. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, it's our understanding that your government and FSIN are going to

present the federal government with proposals that give the Indians full jurisdiction in relation to all forms of gaming on reserves, either through amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada or through new federal legislation.

Madam Minister, is this not an admission that the first nations do not presently have jurisdiction over gaming on reserves? And if this is the case, why are you allowing this casino megaproject now to go ahead?

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I thank the hon. member for his question. It is true that there have been discussions about jurisdiction around this issue. There's nobody here, including yourself, that isn't familiar with the situation that developed around White Bear. Now the problem there was that the province and the FSIN had a differing view of how we could do this. The FSIN's position is that inherent right enables them to regulate gaming. Our position was that we had a responsibility under the Criminal Code to do this. Now as you know, jurisdiction has been the subject of long discussion in Canada, many constitutional rounds, and we feel it will take a while yet to sort these things out.

In the meantime, rather than taking an adversarial approach and having a great deal of conflict within our communities in Saskatchewan, we've decided to work in partnership and to agree to a regulatory framework where the province still retains responsibility for the Criminal Code, but the Indian first nations' licensing authority will take responsibility for charitable gaming on reserves. And many municipalities have had this same ability to have responsibility for charitable licensing.

So I would just say that we see this as a great improvement, and the first nations see this as a great improvement, in control and regulation. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Mr. Speaker, Madam Minister, your government's actions in gambling have been nothing short of incompetent since the very beginning. Saskatoon has already said no to a casino, and now you're saying they may get one whether they want it or not.

Madam Minister, what's the hurry with this casino megaproject? Why not support a motion in this legislature which would allow a referendum during the next provincial election? If you're so proud of this agreement and you're so willing to stand up and defend this defenceless position, why not put it to the vote of the people of this Saskatchewan? Why not allow everyone the opportunity to say yes or no to this development?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I can see, hon. member opposite, why we've had five ministers of Gaming; you just wear them out asking the same questions over and over again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — I'll go back to the beginning. We have had gaming in this province since 1969. Not any time in that time period has this issue seemed to be so pressing to either of the parties opposite, and I'm not sure why all of a sudden you've decided it is.

We have proceeded with a responsible development that went through the proper procedures in Regina, in terms of city council. It's been debated to death, both in the media and in this House. There's been plenty of opportunity for people's elected representatives to question these decisions. We feel it's time to get on with it.

However, in recognition of the kind of concerns raised, the only casino that's proceeding at this time is Regina. All other developments do require community approval. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Minister, with answers like that we will likely have a sixth minister before very long. No question about it.

Madam Minister, Chief Favel of the FSIN has said, and I quote . . . From your very press release, from your government's press release, I quote of Chief Favel: it will be the key priority of the FSIN to ensure that all people approve of casino developments before they begin. Before they begin, everyone will be given the chance to have approval.

That's what the chief is allowing his people, Madam Minister. Will you also allow the people of Saskatchewan the same opportunity, Madam Minister, and have a say in casino development across this province?

Will you allow the same thing that the chief is allowing the Indian bands across this province — a vote, Madam Minister? The people of this province deserve a vote. Will you allow that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — To the hon. member opposite, my understanding of this legislature is that we are elected to represent people and to make responsible decisions on behalf of all the people of Saskatchewan.

Now obviously it's important to consult. And obviously it's important to deal with social impacts. However, we feel that Saskatoon has spoken. We feel that Regina has had plenty of discussion on the topic. And you do know that nothing will proceed without band approval, without approval of the municipality in which the casino would be located, without the nearest market community, and the agreement of the provincial government. So there is a great deal of approval mechanism in there. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Social Assistance for the Disabled

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, I know that you have received correspondence from a young woman named Bernie Juneau regarding her mother, Mrs. Genevieve Doherty of Lake Lenore.

She recently sent us a letter with some questions she wanted to be asked in the legislature, which are as follows: why is it that in Saskatchewan people who are born disabled are treated the same as people who are not disabled under the social assistance program? People who are permanently disabled have no choice but to be on social assistance for they are not capable of working, whereas people who are not disabled are capable of working but just don't want to and they get the same amount of money if not more. Other provinces have special income for people who are disabled. My mother has cerebral palsy and is unable to work, and her total income, Mr. Speaker, is 471.56 per month.

Mr. Minister, the question is: how do you justify how someone can live off of that amount of money?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I really do appreciate the member's question and I know it's an important question. But I want to tell him that I would very much appreciate if you would share the information.

There's some technical numbers there that I just didn't quite get, but if you share that with us I will make the best attempt to get the minister in charge of Social Services to respond to you in the Assembly when we find out exactly what the situation is.

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I thought the question was very specific. The lady is asking how do you expect her mother to live on \$471.56? How do you expect that? At the same time you give as much money or more to people who are not disabled. I don't know what you're talking about when you're talking about specifics. How more specific can the lady get?

And, Mr. Minister, I want to point out to you, this is exactly what Social Services was meant for — to help those that are unable to help themselves. That's the whole idea of Social Services . . .

The Speaker: — Does the member have a question? I'd like the member to get to his question.

Mr. Britton: — And the question is, Mr. Minister, if employable people were put back to work, we would actually have more money for Mrs. Doherty who has a serious disability that she can't help herself. She was born with it. These are the people who our programs were meant for, Mr. Minister. And I would like to ask you what are you going to do about the 80,000 people who are on welfare today. What can you do for those people that are on welfare, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer that question because it relates directly with a question that isn't being asked today and that's the January job numbers,

that I notice neither of the opposition parties are asking about, which clearly show that the number of people working in Saskatchewan in January of '95 is 12,000 more than it was in January of '94.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say specifically to the members of the opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party, who likes to refer to StatsCanada, that it's little wonder that she is not asking a question about jobs today when the record of the business community in creating jobs in this province is second to none anywhere in Canada for November, December, and January.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to, Mr. Speaker, comment on the member's comments that welfare rates are too low. I understand his concern, I understand his concern, but I want to say in light of the huge deficit that we have in this province and in light of the fact of what is happening in Alberta with welfare recipients under Mr. Klein, where they are being treated in a very, very shabby manner, your arguing for higher welfare rates or better treatment for welfare recipients flies in the face of what is happening to the west of us in Alberta.

And I'd ask you to compare, with people who are handicapped or on welfare, what is going on in that province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Britton: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, Mrs. Doherty's daughter and son, Bernie and Michael, are here today. I know they would appreciate an opportunity to meet with you to discuss this.

Could you meet with them this afternoon to see if you could do anything to assist these people? Would you meet with them after question period, Mr. Minister, and see if there's something that you could work out for these people?

Hon. Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I or one of my colleagues will certainly meet with the individuals you mention. I say as well that I compliment the member for raising this issue and maybe there is one member in that Tory caucus with a heart. I wish that he were running again to continue that influence, because what I see from other members is a shift to the Reform Party and the Ralph Klein style of government. So I want to say to you: of course, we will meet with them and do our best to deal with the issue.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

First Responders Program

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Health made a comment in the House that he had a fear he wouldn't receive any questions during this session, so I just want to put those fears to rest.

Mr. Minister, in the past two years you've been part of a process that has closed down hospitals, displaced hundreds of health care professionals. Now only one-third of the nurses in this province are full time and we have lost 50 doctors in the last six months — eight in Melfort alone. First responders, as you call them, are now expected to take the place of these health care professionals.

Mr. Minister, how does having people with one week of training responding to life and death emergencies fit into your version of wellness?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, let me say to the member's question, in regard to the first responders program, he must be one of a handful of people across all of Saskatchewan who does not welcome the first responders program, Mr. Speaker.

This program was pioneered in and around the districts of Regina and Saskatoon. It has now expanded across the province. By the end of this year we will have trained 700, Mr. Speaker, 700 more first responders. These are neighbours and friends in the community given those basic skills to respond immediately to an emergency.

Already, because of the first responders program, lives have been saved in our province. I can't believe a member would stand in this House and criticize the first responders program. I can't believe it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, that is the problem. You're replacing doctors and nurses with people with very little training.

Mr. Minister, as the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg stated in a letter to you and the last minister of Health, and I'll quote:

Just keep your fingers crossed that when you have a heart attack you're standing next to a volunteer who has completed his 40-hour course and will help you for free, because so many nurses have been fired that you can't get any professional help for a long time unless of course you live in Regina close . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. We have about 10 people talking at the same time when the member is trying to ask his questions. I wish the members would please give him the respect at least to ask the question.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll finish the quote:

So many nurses have been fired that you can't get any professional help for a long time unless of course you live in Regina close to the minister. Talk about doing things on the cheap.

And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the letter so other members can have a copy of this.

Mr. Minister, would you and your colleagues, colleagues in the front rows, feel safe having your family and your friends' lives in the hands of people with as little as one week of training?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, as much as I appreciate the member's questions and always will, I do find it passing strange — and I'm sure all members of the House find it passing strange — that on a day when there is a major casino announcement, on a day when the job statistics in Saskatchewan are going straight up, the Leader of the Liberal Party does not raise those issues in the House, but instead has one of her back-benchers raise a variety of other issues which we'll have a whole session to debate and discuss.

Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. There's got to be some relevancy from the answer that he's getting to the question.

Order, order. The minister can refuse to answer a question. But if the minister does answer there has to be some relevancy between the answer and the question that is being asked.

Mr. McPherson — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously I'm shocked and amazed that the Minister of Health . . .

The Speaker: — Will the member please ask his question.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This question is so important to the members of our caucus; it may not be to the Minister of Health but, Mr. Minister, the previous minister of Health had no understanding of the fear and anxiety created by this move. Even a member of your own government could not support this attack on rural Saskatchewan by further stating: God help us, every one.

Mr. Minister, the ball is in your court. You have the ability to return to the people of rural Saskatchewan an adequate and safe and reliable health care system. Will you commit to doing this today?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I want to respond very directly to the member's question. And I want the member to know not only is job creation happening across our province, it's happening in the medical profession.

I want the member to note these figures. In December of 1991, practising in rural Saskatchewan, we had 221 rural family practitioners. Today, as I speak, we have 242.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — In addition, we have literally hundreds of Saskatchewan people in communities who have volunteered their time, volunteered their care for their neighbour to serve as first responders, and that is good news for all of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the Minister of Health has the same problem as the Minister of Economic Development with the jobs and numbers that they were so confused with, because when you travel throughout rural Saskatchewan and you find out that there's one thousand displaced health care workers in rural Saskatchewan, and we have doctors leaving at an alarming rate, and you stand up and say we have a better and more health care in rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Minister, what you have done in Saskatchewan is created a two-tiered health care system. People of rural Saskatchewan are being treated as second-class citizens, Mr. Minister.

Will you stand in this House and guarantee the people that you will give them back what they rightfully deserve — a proper health care system? Can't you stand and do that today, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify in the member's mind some facts so that he should have the facts. I will refer again to the supply of physicians in our province, Mr. Speaker. Now listen. In December '93, we had 740 — this is province-wide — family practitioners. December '94, 752 family practitioners, rural and urban. Mr. Speaker, in 1993 at December we had 437 specialists in our province. In December '94, 455 specialists, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about doctors fleeing the province. It's simply not true, Mr. Speaker, it is simply not true. These are the facts, and I hope now that's clarified the member's mind.

Now I also would want to clarify in his mind, and in the minds of all members of his caucus, the opposition caucus, because the member in his question talks about jobs. Mr. Speaker, he should know that year over year from January 1994 to January 1995, there are 12,000 more jobs in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the member on her feet?

Hon. Ms. Crofford: — To ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to table the agreement that we just negotiated today with the first nations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — ... doesn't need leave ... (inaudible interjection) ... I don't think it's the opposition that I'm concerned about. If the Government House Leader, by pointing his finger at me, is threatening me in any way, I will take whatever action is necessary.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day, I would ask leave of the Assembly to revert to condolence motions for Dr. Jack Wolfe.

Leave granted.

CONDOLENCES

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's with a great degree of hardship that I rise today in recognition of a former member of this House, Mr. Jack Wolfe. The majority of our members were able to pay our last respects to Jack on Tuesday. The attendance of ourselves and the whole community, Mr. Speaker, at the service indicated just how many people admired, respected, and liked Jack Wolfe. Perhaps not yet but in time his family will take comfort in the fact that hundreds — hundreds — of people attended Jack's funeral in support of his family and in respect for Jack himself.

Although I did not have the opportunity to work directly with Jack, I was well aware of his reputation of honour and integrity.

Jack Wolfe will be sorely missed by all, but particularly by his young wife and family. Pastor Rick Aupperle gave the eulogy on Tuesday last, and in it he spoke of the kind, decent, honest man that Jack Wolfe was. But probably the comment that touched me most was when Pastor Aupperle spoke directly to Gail Wolfe and her children when he said to them, Mr. Speaker, Jack just made a mistake. He just made a mistake, and we should allow him that because we all make mistakes. And I think that summed it up very nicely I think for the people at the attendance at the service that day. Jack Wolfe just simply made a mistake, and we should allow him that.

May our thoughts and our prayers be with Gail and her three children at this most difficult time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move this motion, seconded by the member for Thunder Creek:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of this Assembly and expresses its grateful appreciation of the contribution he made to his community, his constituency, and this province.

John Thomas Wolfe who passed away on February 2, 1995 was a member of this Legislative Assembly for the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg from 1988 to 1991.

Seconded by the member from Regina Dewdney.

Hon. Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to second the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. And I want to do that and join with members of the House, on both sides of the House, in expressing our sympathy to the family of Jack Wolfe and share with the members here some of the contributions that our former colleague made to this Assembly and to the province of Saskatchewan.

I therefore rise, Mr. Speaker, to speak of the tragic death of a former colleague and a member of this Assembly, Dr. Jack Wolfe, who died suddenly at his home in Rockglen on February 2.

Mr. Speaker, I think it needs not be said, but words are hardly sufficient to express this Assembly's grief and sympathy for Dr. Wolfe's wife Gail and their three young children, Tricia, Katie,

and Steven. Our hearts also go out to the many other members of Dr. Wolfe's family and the community from which he came.

As a member of this Assembly, as a minister of the Crown, Mr. Wolfe conducted himself with sincerity and a strong sense of duty to his constituents and to the people of Saskatchewan. He represented the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg from 1988 to 1991 and held several posts in the previous administration, including associate minister of Health and minister of Urban Affairs and Community Services.

The passing of a friend and colleague at the prime time of his life is a tragedy, and his contribution will not be forgotten. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in expressing the appreciation of my colleagues on my side of the House for his contribution.

I know that the motion will read, and reads:

That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the passing of a former member of this Assembly and expresses its grateful appreciation for the contribution he made to his community, his constituency, and to the province.

John Thomas Wolfe, who passed away on February 2, 1995, was a member of this Assembly for the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg from 1988 to 1991. Before that and before he became a veterinarian he studied biology at the University of Saskatchewan. And in 1979 he graduated with distinction from the Western College of Veterinary Medicine.

He practised as a veterinarian in Alberta for one year before returning to Rockglen. There he established a veterinary clinic with his wife, Susan Gail Snyder, whom he married on January 26, 1980. Mr. Wolfe also practised veterinary medicine at the thoroughbred and standardbred race tracks in Regina and Saskatoon. Mr. Wolfe was extensively involved in community economy development projects and was chairman of the first Rural Development Corporation in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Wolfe was first elected to the Legislative Assembly in the by-election in 1988. He held the post of associate minister of Health from 1989 until his appointment as minister of Urban Affairs late in 1990. On January 1, 1991, Mr. Wolfe was appointed minister of Community Services and was also responsible for Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation and Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. He ran again in the 1991 general election but was not successful in retaining his seat. Nevertheless Mr. Wolfe's interest in Saskatchewan did not diminish, and he remained active in his political party.

In recording its own deep sense of loss and bereavement, this Assembly expresses its most sincere sympathy with members of the bereaved family.

And I want to say personally, Mr. Speaker, that I had the privilege of getting to know Mr. Wolfe when I was re-elected to this House, and I had a great deal of respect for the contribution that he has made. And along with the members of this Assembly, I also personally want to join in expressing my sympathies to the Wolfe family, his wife and his children, and I am pleased to second the motion that has been moved by the member from Kindersley.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I join other members in this House as we pay tribute to the former member, Dr. Jack Wolfe, who served three years in this Assembly as the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

On behalf of my caucus, I extend to the family of Jack Wolfe our most sincere and heartfelt sympathy on this very tragic occasion. Jack's wife, Gail, is left to raise three young children, Tricia, Katie, and Steven, on her own. I know that the members of Jack's and Gail's extended families will be of great help to her in this lonely and daunting task. But I also know that the people of Rockglen will be there to be supportive, caring, and helping neighbours, as Saskatchewan people are known to do.

My deepest condolences go out to Gail and her children. Theirs will be a long and difficult recovery from this very tragic event.

Although I didn't know Jack well, I had heard many moving tributes to this man in this very Chamber throughout the past five days. Adjectives such as kind, hard-working, and dedicated have often been used to describe Jack Wolfe. He has also been lauded as someone who left this office the way he came to it: unjaded and his priorities intact.

His family, his friends, his colleagues, and his constituents have every reason to be proud of his accomplishments and his many contributions that he made in his short life. Let the message of Dr. Jack Wolfe's service to his province be that he served quietly, competently, and diligently. We are all very proud of his service.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I never once dreamt that during my service in this legislature that I would be standing giving a eulogy to my friend and former colleague, Jack Wolfe. Jack and I were very similar in age and when one thinks about your late 30's, early 40's, you think about the prime of life. Your children are born and growing. You have established yourself in your community. You have started to build upon your life's dreams. And to have someone removed from those dreams and from their family and from their community at that age is something, Mr. Speaker, that is almost unfathomable to think about.

There was nothing more shocking than to pick up the phone a week and a half ago to chat with Jack about some mutual concerns and to have Gail have to inform me that Jack had passed away. It's not something that you ever wish to happen, Mr. Speaker, and I'm amazed at the strength that Mrs. Gail Wolfe has shown over the last while.

(1100)

Jack was one of those people that had a tremendous zest, Mr. Speaker, for doing things, and one quickly saw that during the by-election campaign in 1988 when Jack was first elected to this House. By-elections, for anyone that has been through one in this province know that they are very stressful because you often have the entire attention of the province focused on you. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we in this province take our politics very seriously. I think one reason that Jack and I felt a comradeship very early on was that I had gone through that process three years before he had in a by-election represented . . . or in a constituency that had been represented by a high-profile politician, in Jack's case a former member of this House, now the Hon. Ralph Goodale; in my case, the former minister of Energy, the Hon. Colin Thatcher.

When you're put into that situation, you soon find out about politics in this province, and you soon find out about your own skills, about your own ability to operate in the public milieu of politics in this province. And Jack just shone, Mr. Speaker. It was evident right from the minute of his nomination meeting, right through to the end when victory was his, that this was a man who was born to be in the public eye.

He relished the contact with people; he relished the challenges that were brought before him very quickly by the constituents of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. And it was no surprise that after a very short time in this House, Mr. Speaker, that Jack Wolfe was asked to join the cabinet and take on some very major tasks.

Certainly, as we know, Health and that portfolio is one that people in this province take an extreme amount of interest in. And Jack just delved into it. He immersed himself, Mr. Speaker, in his duties, like few others that I've seen in my political experience.

And it was nothing to see Jack Wolfe put in a full day in this building, being here very early in the morning. The House would rise at 10 o'clock at night, and you'd see him actually almost running down the hall back to his office. And you'd say, where are you going, Jack, in such a hurry? He said, I've got to get on the telephone. There's people in my constituency. There are people around this province that need to talk to me about things. And he would go back to his office and sit on the telephone till midnight many times and be back in this building again very, very early in the morning. It just amazed me that a person could have that kind of constitution that you could be so immersed in your duties that you could keep up that regime.

But people in his family and people around Rockglen tell me that that wasn't unusual for Dr. Jack Wolfe because as he grew up, first in Killdeer, Saskatchewan and then later attending school in Rockglen, off to the U of S (University of Saskatchewan), back to the community of Rockglen in the veterinary business, that that was his whole life. That was . . . it was achievement, and it was being part of people's lives.

And I think the monuments, if you will, of Jack's endeavour are there for people to see. That constituency, Mr. Speaker, had felt for a long time that because they were far removed from the centres of population and power in this province that they perhaps deserved more facilities, and particularly for seniors.

And it was mentioned at Jack's funeral, Mr. Speaker, by the pastor, that there are innumerable people in that riding today that will always be reminded of Jack Wolfe and his contribution because he listened to those people, and he helped them in their communities to build things that serve for generations to come.

So no matter what people may think, Mr. Speaker, about the circumstances surrounding Jack's passing, I think for a very long time to come, people — certainly in Rockglen and area — will understand his passion for achieving and for their lives.

As my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, said, Jack probably made a mistake that day. And I know that Gail was the one that explained to her children that their dad had made a mistake that day. But I think Tricia and Katie and Steven know, Mr. Speaker, that if Jack had it to do over again, I'm sure he wouldn't have made that mistake because he was an individual who didn't make many. He was an individual that strived not to make mistakes.

And I don't understand the pressures that he was under because only Jack understood. But, Mr. Speaker, it says something to all of us in this province that those types of pressures perhaps are not acceptable to people in public life. I think we in this Assembly, as the pastor said that day, need to really think about public life and how we relate ourselves to the people we serve because it is a true tragedy when someone with so much talent and so much to give feels so much pressure that they make that one mistake in life that can't be reversed. All of us owe my friend Jack Wolfe the opportunity, I guess, to have made that mistake.

Mr. Speaker, Jack's service in this legislature is something that I'll always remember, as all of us will I believe. And I think it is right and proper that in the years to come when Gail and Tricia and Katie and Steven and the baby to be born can review the proceedings today and know that their dad, a husband, and a colleague of so many of us contributed a lot and really was appreciated by the province of Saskatchewan.

So it's indeed a privilege for me today, Mr. Speaker, to be part of this condolence motion.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I shall be relatively brief. The incident surrounding the former member from Assiniboia is a reminder of what a terrible price this place extracts upon the people who serve in it. It also reminds me that sometimes those who care very deeply are the real victims. If there was a fault in Jack's character, it was that he cared very deeply. And sometimes such people are the victims of this process.

I really rise to my feet not to comment on Mr. Wolfe's contribution to the legislature. Although I was here during that period, our critic areas never crossed, and our paths did not cross much. I really rose to contribute one thing to the debate, and that is a comment on his work as a veterinarian.

It's easy to forget but there was a time in my life, Mr. Speaker, when I did earn an honest living. At one point in time I was a lawyer — and I guess it's all relative. I did practise law. I did go down to Coronach, the branch office in Coronach once a week.

And Coronach and Rockglen are 40 miles distant. I can testify to the warmth and respect in which he was held in his community. He was thought of as the best veterinarian the south country ever had.

Indeed it was kind of ironic; when he decided to run, it was assumed in that district that he would win, even by some of us who didn't necessarily wish him well in his political career. It was assumed he was going to win. That was met with as much regret as joy on the part of many of the farmers and ranchers down in the south country because they would express the comment that politicians, even good ones, are a dime a dozen. But good veterinarians are darn hard to find. And they were concerned about losing this veterinarian in their community. He was respected. He was conscientious, and just a good citizen and a good veterinarian.

And I think perhaps, although the events surrounding his death are tragic — shockingly so — I suspect in the end he'll be remembered as he deserves to be remembered, and that is as the best veterinarian that country ever had.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too want to join in this morning, and it's with a great deal of pain and sadness that I address the legislature this morning and the Wolfe family. I want to also express my shock and heartfelt sadness on the passing of Jack Wolfe to Gail and to her family and to the extended families as well. These events, this tragedy, is hard to accept. And I find, Mr. Speaker, that the finality of the situation to me is still not comprehensible.

I believe I knew Jack as well as most politicians, even though our friendship lasted a relatively short period of time, a few years. I met Jack first of all in the fall of 1988, I believe it was, during the by-election in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. And quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that by-election has been one of the highlights of my political career, namely because I met the candidate, our candidate, Jack Wolfe. And it was because of his enthusiasm and dynamics and just go-go-go type of an attitude that spurred on all the rest of us there that were there politicking on his behalf. And it was largely to his credit that we were able to squeak out a very thin victory in that by-election, which I believe was for the betterment of the entire province that Jack got elected at that particular time.

So Jack and I served together as an MLA for a number of years, and we also sat shoulder to shoulder around the cabinet table. And when I reminisced this morning and tried to determine what I should talk about and how I should put my thoughts down in writing and then verbalize them, something that came to my mind is kind of surprising to me. But the classical characters in some Shakespearian tragedies that I used to teach about in school came to my mind, like Macbeth and Hamlet, where each of these individuals were inexorably drawn to their deaths through uncontrollable outside forces and what also turned out to be inherent, fatal characteristics and traits from within.

And so, Mr. Speaker, at times I am led to believe that Jack was not really meant to be a politician. Bill, a close friend, told me after my first election . . . said to me, he says, Bill, you will now

have to develop a thick skin or a sense of humour to survive. And, Mr. Speaker, in the ensuing years I have tried to develop and maintain both of them.

(1115)

The Jack that I knew did not have a thick skin. In fact, Mr. Speaker, at times I feel that Jack was too nice a man to be a politician. Not that he didn't enjoy politics, not that he didn't live it, not that he didn't breathe it, but he was too nice a man to be a politician. He was very, very sensitive. He was perhaps too caring. He was perhaps too uncompromising on his convictions and relentless in his pursuit of perfection, and he was impatient of bureaucratic roadblocks to action to solving problems.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's further my opinion that he was totally abhorrent of any suggestions that could impute dishonourable motivation on any of his actions. That's the Jack that I knew.

I also, Mr. Speaker, I also sensed that Jack had a very high need to be accepted by his peers, in fact by his friends. It was almost a compulsion of his to have the reassurance that what he said and that what he did met with approval of those around him. Sitting beside him around the cabinet table for those countless hours reaffirms in my mind that Jack was vulnerable — oh, so vulnerable, Mr. Speaker — to what people thought of him. Nothing but perfection seemed to do. The word I heard most of all in any conversation that I had with Jack or any discussion or any arguments was: Right? Isn't that right? Don't you agree?

Jack, quite frankly, was so brilliant, so far ahead of me, had such a firm grasp on any situation that arose that I just simply usually said, yes — not because I understood, but because he was probably right anyway.

And I believe deep within our hearts, deep within our hearts, we all know that Jack did not do the right thing. As my colleague from Thunder Creek has pointed out, Jack made a mistake. And I'm sure that now all of us wish that we could have known him a little more clearly, a little more fully, understood him a little bit more fully so that we could have dissuaded him.

But to Gail and the family, Jack acted out his code of honour. That is why I believe he did what he did. But more significantly, as opposed to the code of honour I think Jack acted out of love — love for you, Gail, love for your family. It was his way of protecting those around whom his life revolved because honesty, honour, and integrity meant more to him than life itself.

Members of this legislature, Gail and her family are going to have a rough time ahead. But to Gail, I say, she is fortunate. She has a very supportive family. She has the support of the people of Saskatchewan, I believe, and certainly she does have the support of this caucus in particular.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the pamphlet that was handed out at Jack's memorial service because it's poignant to me. It's memorable to me, because in this print there is a poem entitled *Footprints*. And it is the same poem that was included in my brother's funeral a few years ago, so it is

especially meaningful to me. And as Gail is going to go and set a new direction in her life and get her life into order, this poem on *Footprints* that she has chosen to include in Jack's memorial is very meaningful.

Where it is footprints in the sand, two footprints for most of the time, occasionally there is only one set of footprints. And when this individual who saw this in his vision was before the Lord, he said:

I don't understand, Lord, why when I needed you most you would leave me and there's only one set of footprints. And the Lord replied: "My precious, precious child, I love you and would never leave you. During your times of trial and suffering, when you see only one set of footprints, it was then that I carried you."

And to Gail I say, the Lord's grace is sufficient for you as well. Thank you.

Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to address the members of the legislature and to extend my sincerest sympathies to Gail Wolfe and her children, and to the Wolfe family, and to all the friends and relatives of Dr. Jack Wolfe.

One thing that I would like to point out — and I'm sure will be shared by the members of this legislature — is the fact that I believe one of the most tragic consequences of the early passing of Dr. Jack Wolfe was the fact that the province, and not just his colleagues, won't have Jack Wolfe involved in the community and, from my vantage point, in public life . . . because of his vision of what Saskatchewan could be.

And I say that because I got to know Jack fairly well, and we really liked each other. We had some things in common because we grew up on the farm. We went to university for a long time. We decided to leave a profession as an academic or as a doctor of veterinary medicine, and we'd sit and talk about that. Why would you put that behind you? Why run the risk of a tenured professor going on to politics or a very, very valuable person in the community, as my colleague, Mr. Shillington said, with respect to being a doctor of veterinary medicine and very good at it?

And we came to the conclusion — and Jack would reinforce it, and I just loved to listen to him talk about it — because, he said, we honestly believed — and he did — that you can make a difference. And this Legislative Assembly and being involved in the democratic process was perhaps very risky and very difficult, but you could do it. And he really believed that.

And believe me, from what I know, he loved being a doctor of veterinary medicine, and he was extremely good at it, but he said there's more that I could do.

And you won't find anybody in this Legislative Assembly or in the province, Mr. Speaker, that would disagree with that. They knew Jack was very good at what he could do, and he stepped up to the plate and says, I think I can maybe even do some more. And that's the tragedy of taking a man that's 39 years old

out of Saskatchewan life and Canadian life and preventing that full contribution to take place.

Jack loved rural Saskatchewan, and it drove him. I mean he was involved, as we all know, with lots of economic projects and in health care projects, and he fought politically over them and he enjoyed the debate. And for him it was just the tip of the iceberg. He believed so strongly in his roots and his family and his vision for the province of Saskatchewan that he couldn't wait to get onto the next project. And he certainly enjoyed the debate whether it was in this Legislative Assembly or in the community or with family members.

My wife Chantal will readily admit that Jack Wolfe was one of her favourite MLAs. She said she never campaigned with anybody quite like him because he would just stop and visit with anybody about any of their political problems or anything else at the drop of a hat. It was there. He wore his heart on his sleeve, and you could see it, and he was proud of it, and he defended it. And that's the way he was in his community life and the way he was in his family life.

We are short enough of really good people in public life across Canada as it is, and that's why it's so difficult for members of the legislature to acknowledge the fact that we're missing a colleague with such intensity and such vision and such interest in public life.

A colleague has said that maybe Jack wasn't cut out for public life. I think Jack was so close to being perfect for public life that in some cases it was to a fault. And as we know, it led to a decision that ended his life and indeed his service.

I want to say that when we attended the funeral services in Rockglen, I'm not so sure that anybody has seen anything quite like it. Had the services in the hall, and they had microphones in the Catholic Church and microphones in the United Church, and there were people in all three facilities, and there were people that were turned away, and there were people that just drove into town to pay their respects. And they were coming from the South and the North and across the hills and from across the province, because they respected this young man to such a large extent.

As a husband, and as a father, and as a brother, and as a doctor of veterinary medicine, as an MLA, as a cabinet minister, and as a friend, he was one of the most respected individuals that I've come across. I had the pleasure and indeed the opportunity to invite him into politics and invite him into cabinet, and to work with him at the cabinet table and watch him grow. I believe I was 37 when I was elected and took the chair of the premier's office in the province of Saskatchewan. Jack had the potential to be a leader in all kinds of things for the next 50 years. And at 39, it's just an unbelievable tragedy that we have to stand here and acknowledge.

He was a decent man, an honest man, trustworthy, conscientious, and for those of us in politics who would really appreciate it, he was just extremely loyal. He was a loyal friend, a loyal husband, loyal to his colleagues, certainly loyal to his leader. And he believed in it. He was loving and fun and

interesting and intelligent and respectful and competitive and compassionate and proud, and he had ideals. And to his loved ones, and to his parents, his mom and dad, and to his brothers, his wife Gail particularly, and to his children Tricia, Katie, and Steven, and the child yet to be born, I can only say to you that we were and are and will continue to be extremely proud of the person, Dr. Jack Wolfe. He was one of the finest young men Saskatchewan has ever raised: well educated, well intentioned, well respected, and the kind of person that could really make a difference.

We will miss him, Mr. Speaker, and members of the legislature, in this province, and I believe jurisdictions across the country will acknowledge the kind of contributions a man or a woman like this can make and could make are so large if given the opportunity. The tragedy here is that it was cut too short, but we hope not in vain. For those of us that served, and for those of us who plan to serve now and in the future, the vision of what Jack Wolfe could be, and was, should be there before us as long as we live.

Our sincere sympathies to Mrs. Gail Wolfe and to her family and to all the members of the Wolfe family. We so much would like to provide the kind of comfort that you need. And all we can say is that we loved him dearly, and we will miss him dearly. God be with you at this time.

(1130)

Mr. Toth: —Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm as well pleased to be able to stand this morning and just give a few of my thoughts about the man, Dr. Jack Wolfe.

As my colleagues have indicated, the attendance at his funeral on Tuesday was certainly indicative of the respect Mr. Wolfe had gained in his community and certainly across the province. I will always remember Mr. Wolfe, my friend Jack, for that quick step. I will remember and picture him . . . I can picture him walking down the hallways of this Assembly with his cowboy boots on, with a broad smile on his face, ready to tackle any problem that may come his way, ready to reach out to any constituent or any individual, be it in this Legislative Assembly or outside or anybody in this province, to indeed attempt to do his best to serve their needs.

I will remember Jack as a man of honour, a man of integrity, a very intelligent individual, a very vibrant person, full of life, ready to face the challenges of the day.

Mr. Speaker, Jack was a community man. He was not only a community man; he was a family man. And having had the privilege of just chatting on occasions with Jack and his wife Gail and meeting their family, they were indeed a couple that you enjoyed being around, a couple that you enjoyed visiting with, a couple full of vision, looking to the future. To Tricia and Katie and Steven, our hearts go out to them.

Mr. Speaker, it's circumstances such as we have just faced and we, facing Dr. Jack Wolfe's life, we will always ask the question: why? Why a man with so much for him, so youthful,

so vibrant; his family needed him. His community needed him. Why, at 39, his life is tragically ended?

But I can assure you that the legacy that he has left will live on. I believe Gail, her family, and the Wolfe family realize that. I believe they saw it, and it was evident at the funeral. And as we reflect this morning, that will live on.

We can only speculate as to what we as colleagues or maybe even the system we have developed failed to do in offering Jack the support he needed before he made that fatal decision. As I heard the news, to be honest with you, Mr. Speaker, I had some anger in my life, to think that a life was snuffed out so quickly.

I chatted with some constituents, and I think Jack had a bit of my character. I believe when Jack was elected, Jack came to this Assembly to serve the public, based on the view that he felt he could do something, not only for his community but for this province. And as my colleagues have already indicated, he sometimes became frustrated with the red tape of government.

One of my constituents said to me: Don, remember this. You may feel and may like to and may desire to change the world, and you may feel like you're carrying it on your shoulders, but remember this. Do your best but never give up your integrity.

And I believe that's what Jack felt he needed to preserve and made a choice that we all regret that we didn't have the chance to just sit down and chat with him about.

I appreciated the eulogy and the thoughts the pastor shared with us. I can only say to Gail, to Trish, Katie, Steven of the Jack Wolfe family, reach down and draw from the strength within. As your pastor said, remember that there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother. As I can only say on behalf of myself and my wife and my colleagues, as we've indicated, our thoughts and prayers are with you at this time in your life. Thank you.

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to acknowledge the fact today that Jack Wolfe was my friend. He was my friend as a politician, and as of my friend as a politician he was in my view an example to me as a hard worker. He was an example to me in integrity.

And what I characterized Jack Wolfe as, as my friend, was that he liked to visit with me. We sat in that back corner for the first session of the Legislative Assembly. He sat right behind me and we visited. And everything that went on here, he had to know and understand every detail of it. And so we would visit about the content and the context of all of the things that were going on in this Assembly.

He not only wanted to know why it was that way, he wanted to know the history behind it all. He was a person who was extremely pointed and he was extremely detailed in all of the things that he did. He wanted to know the history of why this was done and why that was done. He wanted to know, he wanted to understand it, and he wanted to understand it completely. He loved politics. Many times we would talk about the things that would develop as a tactic in this Legislative

Assembly and then he would want to know the history of that. Why it was done that way. Why it could be done that way.

He loved to talk politics in every facet of his life. Politics was his menu, and as my friend he would sit there and tell me about his aunt and an uncle in Swift Current, Mrs. and Mrs. Don Krueger. And he would tell me about how they'd discuss politics because the Krueger family were strong Liberals, and he would tell me how he would discuss that with them. And then he would say to his aunt Pat, this is what I would say to her. And he would do that over and over again.

And for my friend Jack, politics were his life. And then there was the other side of Jack that was my friend the veterinarian. And Jack and I share a lot of the common kinds of things that he did as a veterinarian and that I did as a rancher. And health of animals was his life. Health of animals was the thing that my friend Jack liked to talk about, and it was in that context that he first met me.

I didn't know he was in the crowd. But I stood and talked to the exhibition association and the racing associations in Regina here, and as I spoke about the various things that Jack was interested, he was the veterinarian that did all the testing for all the horses in the exhibition association here and in Saskatoon. And he loved to do that. And that's the first time I met him, although I didn't know that.

When I went down to Rockglen one day to deal with an anniversary of an RM (rural municipality) in Rockglen — I was asked to speak there — and then this guy sitting right behind me tapped me on the shoulder and introduced himself to me, and he said, my name is Jack Wolfe. And I said, well I've never met you before. He said, I've met you, and then he told me about his involvement with the exhibition association in Regina here.

He loved to talk about those days and he loved to talk about the horses, but his most conscious effort was to talk about the people that were involved in that association. He loved to work with both of them. And I believe my friend Jack understood them both.

And then there is Jack Wolfe, the family man, my friend. He had a high regard for his brother. He talked a lot about his brother in Regina and he said this about my brother; he said that about my brother. He was a family man. He loved his children; he loved his wife.

One of the last days that I talked to him, he told me about how he had come to Regina here from Rockglen with his father and how they had travelled together. His father had just suffered a heart attack. And he said, I don't know how we kept him alive, but we drove and we drove and I don't even know how we got here or how fast we got here. But that was his life. That was his involvement with his family, and my friend Jack would do that for you and he would do that for me.

And so today, Gail, as you and your family try to bring your life together after this tragedy, think about the vision that Jack had. Think about the vision that you have for the future and never let

that die within you; nor as you transfer that to your children, never let it die. And we will be careful, very careful, to pray for you during this time of bereavement. Thank you very much.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Boyd: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move this motion as well, by leave of the Assembly:

That the resolution just passed together with the transcript of the oral tributes to the memory of the deceased be communicated to the bereaved family on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

And I move that myself, the member for Kindersley, seconded by the member for Regina Dewdney.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before orders of the day, I would, by leave, request that we move to motions for substituting members on standing committees. I have a series of them to make.

Leave granted.

MOTIONS

Substitution of Members

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Speaker, thank you members opposite. I move, seconded by the member from Thunder Creek:

That the name of Harold Martens be substituted for that of Mr. Gerald Muirhead on the list of members composing the Standing Committee on Estimates.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — The next motion is: I move, seconded by the member from Thunder Creek:

That the name of Mr. Don Toth be substituted for that of Mr. Boyd on the list of members composing the Standing Committee on Non-controversial Bills.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I further move, seconded by the member from Morse:

That the name of Mr. Dan D'Autremont be substituted for that of Mr. Bill Boyd on the list of members composing the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member from Morse:

That the name of Mr. Don Toth be substituted for that of Mr. Bill Boyd on the list of members composing the Standing Committee on the Environment.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move:
That the name of Mr. Rick Swenson be substituted for that of Mr. Bill Boyd on the list of members composing the Standing Committee on Municipal Law.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And lastly:

That the name of Mr. Jack Goohsen be substituted for that of Mr. Bill Boyd on the list of members composing the Special Committee on Regulations.

Motion agreed to.

(1145)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to rise in response to the 1995 throne speech, this day on February 10. Today is of course a historic occasion for us, Mr. Speaker, because today we signed a document on casinos with the first nations and the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that because on the throne speech we had talked very strongly about jobs and economic development in the province. We had talked about the \$1 billion investment in oil and gas. We had talked about the 10 per cent rise in retail sales. We had talked about the new mines opening up in northern Saskatchewan. We are seeing tremendous, tremendous progress, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to therefore say that this government does not only talk about it; it does move to quick action. I want to move on this idea because on the casino issue we have been doing a lot of partnerships and planning for the past two years. We have done a lot of consulting. We have done a lot of talk with the business level, with communities throughout the province. And indeed on this very touchy issue, we have finally come out with a positive solution.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I was very proud of this agreement. I was proud because we see the politics of confrontation and conflict throughout the world. In this agreement today we see the politics of honour and respect between the first nations governments and the province of Saskatchewan . . . Because you have only those two choices: you either move towards partnership and cooperation, or you move to conflict and confrontation. I think that it is a very good sign for the province of Saskatchewan that we're moving towards the politics of honour, respect, and a working together between all citizens and of the province.

I want to be able to look at this in context, Mr. Speaker. I want to look at this as indeed an opportunity not only for people working together, but that it is economically and fiscally sound. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because of the experience that I have seen. And I will be mentioning this a little bit later on because even as I heard the royal commission report last night on suicides, a lot of people forget that there have been positive examples of building by the businesses of this province and by the first nations businesses in this province.

Mr. Speaker, last year when we had signed the agreement and moved toward the concept of co-management and sustainable development in forestry with the Indian and northern communities, we saw positive progress. Rather than seeing the endless and negative criticism only dealing with welfare cases, we saw very positive images of Indian and Metis people working in the forestry sector. A lot of these people were very proud to work in the forestry sector. They were proud to say that we were putting food on the table for our own children. They were proud to say that they did not have to rely on the welfare system that costs a lot in regards to the tax purse. They were proud to say that yes, we are contributing members to the province of Saskatchewan.

When I look at the mining sector, Mr. Speaker, I saw the developments that we were doing in agreements with northern businesses. But I'll pinpoint the agreement that we signed in regards to Cameco but also from there which flowed the tremendous cooperation between Cameco as a corporation and the Indian businesses of the North. And I'll give this one example.

NRT (Northern Resource Trucking Ltd.) in the area of trucking which is owned 51 per cent by the Lac La Ronge Indian first nation . . . that indeed it has been a champion of progress in the North. Not only are they an effective transportation and the best transportation business in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but indeed they have made their money which they could turn back to their citizens so that they could create jobs, further jobs, in their community.

They have also, Mr. Speaker, extended the partnership. It was not only a partnership between the corporation, but it was a partnership between . . . on the first nations it was a partnership which flowed from the first nations and the municipalities, many of them Metis communities in northern Saskatchewan. What they have done, Mr. Speaker, is this. They have joined a partnership with communities such as Cumberland House and

other communities in the North in regards to the share structure of their company.

What they were saying, Mr. Speaker, is that when we have moved in that one mine from 15 per cent employment to now 45 per cent employment — Northerners at all the mines — in the North, that that was good progress. A lot of people said it was good progress. But when this agreement came about on partnership with other communities on the share structure of ownership, they said yes; we have finally got good jobs, and we are also owners of businesses. We are able to manage and own businesses as well. And that was indeed an important development.

Mr. Speaker, when I see this agreement with the first nations people today, I see it in that sense. It's a partnership between governments, the province and the first nations governments, as well as the communities from whence they will have to do partnerships with because they will need approval from the communities. It is a true partnership looking to the consideration of the province, the communities, and the first nations. I think that is tremendous progress for the province of Saskatchewan, for the first nations, and for the communities. I think this is the way to go in many situations as we deal with the future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to contrast this with the usual report that we hear on the press. These are tremendous examples in forestry when Indian people and Metis people are given the opportunity for business ownership and for jobs. They become successful like anybody else in the world.

When I saw this agreement therefore, Mr. Speaker, it was important because this idea of governments working together and the partnership of the business sector between Indian and Metis and also non-aboriginal people, that was progress. I wanted to contrast that to the history of poverty that has been in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we well know the history of poverty in this province. Everybody in this province that looks at their children that now have their own children well recognize the impact of the Dirty Thirties. People know the severe strain people had in regards to poverty at that level. A lot of the people know that in some cases they took their own lives when they were put under tremendous strain. Later on, as we looked at the history of the province and we moved forward and we saw some dips and turns in the economy, unemployment always affected the suicide rates in the province. We saw that when the farm gate was struck hard. We saw a tendency for suicides to rise.

When the Canadian Mental Health Association did a complete survey by 1982 . . . when the Canadian Mental Health Association did a survey, what they found out when they examined the history of Canada was this. For every 4 per cent rise in unemployment . . . for every 1 per cent, excuse me. For every 1 per cent rise in unemployment, there was a 4 per cent rise in suicide rates. The suicide rates climbed with the unemployment rates. And it was something that a lot of people had known before, but now the research, you know, provided that proof.

When I listened to the comments by George Erasmus on TV last night and he was talking about the report on suicides by the royal commission, he reflected what many Canadians knew. They recognized that suicides stem from unemployment. They recognize that suicides stem from social despair. They recognize that suicides come from the fact that people do not have hope — hope to find jobs and hope for training.

Mr. Speaker, this is the direction we're moving. We're challenging this whole concept of despair. We're challenging this idea that welfare is the way to go. We're saying no. People don't want to see the welfare system climb; they want to get jobs. Many people say, we would rather fight for those jobs. Many people say, we don't want welfare cheques; we want pay cheques, like everybody else in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1200)

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — So, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this historic agreement on casinos with first nations people, we have to look at the fact that there is tremendous cost in the system already in regards to welfare. Everybody, aboriginal and the non-aboriginal, says the same thing. We want to get into the job side of the equation. This is where we want to be at.

When I looked at the casino agreement, Mr. Speaker, this is what it addresses. It addresses that jobs question. We are saying on the Regina casino that there will be approximately 400 jobs. What we are setting as a standard is the employment of Indian and Metis at 50 per cent. Mr. Speaker, that is 200 jobs.

When we look at the casino and the expansion of the casino on an equivalent level to the maximum of four in the first nations community, what we will be seeing there is approximately another 400 jobs. So in total we will be most likely looking at 600 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, when we are looking at 600 jobs, a lot of people will say that it is not enough. These same naysayers, who are very negative about everything, who preach doom and gloom, will say those 600 jobs at \$20 an hour in northern Saskatchewan are not good enough.

But what I say, Mr. Speaker, is that we have moved from 15 per cent employment rate for Northerners, now to 45 per cent. We are moving in the area of employment of Indian people and we are creating a standard in this agreement that it'll be 50 per cent employment. And I think that is an important step forward.

When we look at these 600 jobs, Mr. Speaker, we are not only looking at 600 people. When we look at our family, we usually have four or five people in a family. When one person works, we are usually taking care of four or five other people. In this case, Mr. Speaker, we are not only looking at 600 people, we are looking at approximately 2,500 to 3,000 people. That is what we are talking about when we have made this effective type of decision.

We are talking about children. We are talking about babies that need proper nutrition. We are talking about our grandparents. We are talking about people, people in the same capacity that we have learned to exist in proper standards in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel very proud indeed about this agreement.

I want to turn back a little bit, Mr. Speaker, because I think that I sense a bit in the sphere of politics some negative criticism. And I have been in the legislature long enough, since 1986; it's important for me to tackle that negative criticism. And I want to focus on a couple of points that were made yesterday, and I want to tackle them head on.

When I heard one of the members from Rosthern — actually, yesterday — he said that the decision by the first nations was pseudo-legislation, as if saying that it was phoney legislation. To me it really hurt me a lot to see that it was the old politics of confrontation; it was the politics of disrespect.

How can you expect people to respect you if you do not respect them as well? This is the type of politics that we cannot stand for. And when I come to the legislature, I will show that that is the wrong way to go. If you want Indian first nations to respect us, we have to respect them as well. We cannot say only respect ourselves. We have to respect them.

The member should recognize that he is part of this legislature, part of this respected institution of democracy. He should respect not only this institution and the people of the province; he should respect those democratic institutions.

The chiefs are elected by their own people. The chiefs are our Legislative Assembly that they have agreed to. This is a respected institution that has grown. I think it also shows that it is a unified position. The chiefs, when they pass something, passed it unanimously yesterday. That is true respect. That is the way to go. That is 100 per cent consensus. That is the way we should be acting in this legislature, not to try and play the old politics of divide and rule. This is the old politics of divide and rule that I will expose.

I also noticed in a statement by the member of the Liberal Party. When I read her and then I listened to her comments yesterday, it troubled me. It troubled me because she has been wavering on this issue. We know that she owns or owned her racehorses. Sometimes we don't know whether she's riding the racehorses forward or she's riding them backwards. Sometimes she falls off them, and sometimes she dances on the racehorses.

The racehorse of gambling she is very uncertain about. And when I looked at the situation, I sensed the dangerous rise of the politics of division because she seemed to be saying that when the first nations have an equivalent number of machines, the same number as Regina, that all of a sudden it would jeopardize the Regina casino. She seemed to be saying that indeed the viability of Regina casinos . . . the casino would be at stake. And I will quote this from the radio and television news service. She said: so if there are going to be four besides White Bear that are now introduced in the province of Saskatchewan, what are the viability of opening up a large casino in Regina? So her point was that she was worried about the Regina casino only.

Mr. Speaker, that's the old politics of divide and rule. This side of the government is worried not only about the economic viability of the Regina casino, but the economic viability of the first nations' casinos. I think we are making sure that the community is on side in both cases. We are not saying that it is only the viability of the Regina casino. We are saying, look, we positively support the Regina casino — the biggest community near us properly supported.

There has been plenty of debate in this context. But what I was scared of, Mr. Speaker, was the old politics of divide and rule. What we are doing in this case is the politics of partnership and the politics of respect, the politics of honour, the politics of cooperation. This is the essence of democracy in action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, there was an implication too that — from the members across — while the Tories talk about crime and the slashing of programs, knocking away kindergarten just like that, half of it, in Alberta, centralizing the control of education by hiring all directors, no concern for community or regional control, when I see them really slashing in the area of Social Services, what I hear them say on the other side is criticizing the fact that the jobs are going to be there. They have to make up their mind. Either the 600 jobs that are going to be there are going to be good, or they're going to be negative. We say on this side of the House that it is better that indeed we provide and work with them in partnership on the 600 jobs.

To us that is the proper strategy. If we don't do that, it expands the area of Social Services. We want to get away from Social Services and going to the jobs end of the scale. And that is exactly what we're doing in this case.

And I see the Liberal member from across saying something. I would say this much to the Liberal member.

The Liberals in Ottawa are not very much different than the old Tory policies of divide and rule. They talked the great line of honour and respect for treaties before the election last year, but they continued the old process of offloading, offloading Social Services which got \$35 million in the province. Definitely, we get back half of it through \$17 million. But indeed, that type of strategy is a safe strategy. They have not changed that strategy.

Notice in the past while, when there's a debate between Martin and Axworthy, Axworthy is backing down from social reform. Actually, he's chickening out. And I think that in many cases they talk a good line before the election, the Liberals, but they will give in to other sectors of the community before they work positively with Indian and Metis people. And that has been the record.

So when I look at the Liberals, I worry about their challenge, you know, to the agreement and the Tories. It's the old politics of divide and rule. I think that they should take it amongst themselves, rethink what they were doing yesterday, re-examine their position, re-examine it in the light of the positive aspects of the agreement.

Even when I see the first nations' agreement in the area of sharing, it shines through. What we are saying is this. When we look at the aspect on the sharing, on the Regina casino we get 50 per cent. On the first nation's casino, they will get the 50 per cent. But what is very important is that we have 25 per cent to associated entities fund, to the communities of the province, a significant aspect in the Regina agreement, 25 per cent going to associated entities fund for the province and Metis community.

Now if you look at the agreement on the Indian side, you will see that if they have the reserve, when they have their place off-reserve and they open a casino off-reserve in partnership with the community and they get an okay from the community, what will happen is that they will provide 25 per cent of the money in regard to the associated entities fund.

So I think that's very important that the first nations off-reserve, if there is a partnership with the community off-reserve, will provide 25 per cent to the associated entities fund.

So they're sharing with the communities at large throughout the province. And I thought that was a true reciprocity, the principle of reciprocity, truly at hand. I think that there was a sense of fairness and balance when they acknowledge, you know, that principle, to us.

I wanted to go back a little bit on the history of the province in the context of economic development. Whether it was with the Potash Corporations during the Liberal years and the tremendous amount of what people used to say, give-aways, during that period, the large scale, you know, corporations. And then later on we had the Tories come in and we weren't talking about 5 million or 6 million, which is the essence of this agreement on sharing, on the Regina casino and also on the associated entities fund.

(1215)

What we were talking about on major agreements when the Tories were in power was \$250 million agreements, \$100 million agreements, tremendous agreements — no wonder we were in debt to the tune of \$16 billion in this province. There was tremendous amounts, and I'm not only talking about, you know, the debates, you know, that we had, the usual debates we had, at Joytec and GigaText, I'm talking about major agreements.

Some of these have proven to be very positive, but some of them have not been. I acknowledge, you know, the fact that when positive decisions were made, I would agree with them.

An Hon. Member: — Name some of them.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — I would say that . . . I'll give you an example. The member says, name something that was positive.

We were concerned about the Cameco decision when it was privatized, you know, by the Tories. We were worried that . . . We saw the trend that the employment rate had dropped from about 50 per cent at Key Lake to about 15 per cent. We were

worried that the considerations of jobs for the communities was going to be, you know, pushed to the side. And when the '88 agreement came, we were worried.

But I'll tell you something. Through the development that we did in the '70s there was people within the mining sector that were very positive and proactive. We saw the Key Lake mining agreement person was like Bernard Michel. You know, working very favourably to keep the rates at 50 per cent over there.

There was another operation in Key Lake and that had gone down. Bernard Michel took over Cameco and we were very happy. Chief Cook, Harry Cook from the Lac La Ronge Indian Band, the Lac La Ronge Indian first nation, became part of the board of Cameco. Allan Blakeney became part of the board of Cameco. In that sense we saw a partnership with the mining community and the province, and also the first nations and the communities of the North.

Now we see this partnership with the lease agreements in northern Saskatchewan. We have the mining companies and the businesses of the North getting \$25 million worth of the contracts. We also get for Northerners 8 to \$9 million worth of salaries. This is indeed highly positive.

When I compare the tremendous downturn in regards to trapping over the many years from 2 million to less than a million dollars a year, it is significant that at the time when even the fur trap prices are up, we will still make less than a million dollars. But in the mining sector for people of northern Saskatchewan who make up to around \$20 an hour, they will indeed be making 8 to \$9 million, you know, worth of salary.

So when you ask me a question about what examples, then you see that the principle of partnership — which this government started when we were first elected in 1991 — has built from the areas about 15 per cent employment now to the area of 45 per cent employment in northern Saskatchewan. That is true partnership, rather than the divide and conquer approach that the Tories did.

I remember when I first got elected in 1986. I looked at the 1986 agreement and they had this highway sign, highway and highway map that was shown to all the province. It said, the Tories were saying at that time, northern Saskatchewan is full of beautiful lakes and rivers but no people. They had the gumption to say that there was no people. And of course with their policies they treated us as if there was no people. All they wanted was extraction of minerals and they didn't see us, you know, whatsoever. So we have changed that type of policy to a policy of partnership.

And I knew the same thing in regard to the Liberals. When I examined the whole government *Public Accounts* documentation, I recognized that during the '60s, when the Liberals were in power to 1971, for Indian and Metis people the total amount of budgeting that they did for Indian and Metis people was approximately 2 per cent. When the Tories come in, they dropped that to about 1 per cent.

When we were in power in the '70s, we had that working around 4 per cent, which is the basis of where we're working today. We had to fight back up to that level basically because people did not want the welfare system; they wanted to have pay cheques and jobs and businesses like everybody else in this province.

I think that is the essence of this agreement. I think that when we look into the future and we see those people getting the accounting jobs and other jobs that flow through in gaming, we will see a positive sight. We will see people being very, very proud of their work. We will see them say yes, this is the way to go.

Of course the Tories, they want to knock, and the Liberals, they want to slash people away, even from the welfare system. They want to knock them out of their jobs. It's always a conflict, conflict approach. We are sending a true example on the spirit of honour and cooperation and respect. And this is the way they should go.

In conclusion I would say this: yesterday I heard them in regards to these comments. But I didn't enter politics to be simply negative or to be critical. I want to present a constructive critical argument for the Conservatives and for the Liberals.

I would say to them, why don't you join in partnership with us? Why don't you join in partnership with the first nations, the communities, the Government of Saskatchewan, in regards to the policy that pays to respect in regards to jobs and regards to revenue sharing? Why don't you create a partnership? Why don't you get away from the divide-and-rule strategy?

Why don't you stand up and say yes, that is a good job; it is better than being on welfare. Why don't you say that? Why don't you stand up and say that? Why don't you stand up and say yes, rather than sending in the police or the army like they did in Oka, why? Why, rather than doing that, why don't they join us on the area of partnership?

I think this is the way of the future. This the way that we have to do things. We see the conflict in Europe; we see the conflict elsewhere. We should learn our lesson and we should learn that this is the place to go. That is the way of the future — cooperation and partnership is the way of the future.

You cannot have true respect unless you respect the others. It is the essence of respect. That is how you have to do it. So I would say . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I think there is too much interruption from the member from Shaunavon when the member is speaking, and I'd ask him to please refrain from doing so.

Hon. Mr. Goulet: — So, Mr. Speaker, with respect, you know, to the agreement on the province of Saskatchewan and the first nations, as an aboriginal person, Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to stand up today in this legislature to support that. I think it is a sign, and a positive sign, of the future. I certainly hope that the

tenor of the argumentation that I heard yesterday shifts and changes. I hope it does become more positive.

But I didn't enter the legislature just to be simply on the critical side. I know and believe that people will work together. I firmly believe in democracy and I firmly believe that people in the end result will say yes, this was a good agreement; yes, we have made business agreements with the business sector which turned out to be good. Yes, we can say this could be a good agreement when the Indian businesses, when they start their own — not only in the casino sector, but in the mining, the forestry, and every place else. And I say, Mr. Speaker, as a Metis person, I know that we will also, you know, partake in this development. And I know that we will make those decisions that will also flow with Metis communities as well.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, again I am indeed honoured and proud of this agreement. It's a sign that in the throne speech when we said jobs and economic development are number one, and we see the positive sign in the province that we could immediately come out with agreements like this. That this is the stuff of government. This is the stuff of respect for jobs. This is the stuff of respect for businesses. This is the stuff of respect for governments at the community level, also at the first nations level, and at the provincial level.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, I definitely strongly support the throne speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is not with a great deal of pleasure that I rise today to respond to the Speech from the Throne.

Listening to the member from Cumberland, I find that he had very little of a positive nature to say in his speech. And I can certainly understand that, Mr. Speaker, because with this particular government there is very little of a positive nature that you can find to speech about.

Mr. Speaker, the member in the latter part of his speech talked about Oka — about the guns, about the police, and about the military. Well I'm not sure if he was talking, Mr. Speaker, about Oka or if was talking about my own constituency when his very government had the police, had the guns drawn, and raided the reserve at White Bear.

His own government, Mr. Speaker, did exactly the same things that he was criticizing the federal government for. They were the ones that dragged Chief Bernard Shepherd to court. It wasn't the federal government. It was the members opposite, of which that member is a cabinet minister of the government. And that's why, Mr. Speaker, that government and that member have nothing of a positive nature to speak about in this province. Because they are the ones that are doing the heinous acts that he himself described.

And there are many other things wrong with the government's plan, Mr. Speaker, as laid out in this throne speech. But I want to be brief. The first issue I want to focus on is one that the

government speaks a lot about but ignores when it comes to doing something, and that is jobs.

Mr. Speaker, rather than standing here and taking all day and taking weeks to discuss the Speech from the Throne, I think we as an Assembly would be much better serving the people of Saskatchewan if we were to move on from the Speech from the Throne and deal with the real issues that face the people of Saskatchewan. And that is indeed the lack of jobs in this province. As it's been noted before by other members, that it's appalling that the government would try to boast of its accomplishments in job creation even when the revised Canadian StatsCan figures show that the government is off on its job projections by over 10,000.

I would like to just repeat that one figure. The new figures, just so we all know once and for all that we're reading from the same page, StatsCan just recently came out and made a change. They admitted that their figures previously were perhaps not as accurate as they could have been so they came out with new ones. But what did those figures show? What did those figures show?

Those figures showed that in 1992, Mr. Speaker, that in the province of Saskatchewan we lost 8,000 jobs; 1992 we lost 8,000 jobs under this administration. In 1993 they gained back 5,000 of those jobs. In 1994 they gained back another 2,000 of those jobs. And the members opposite are agreeing with me. So what at the end of the day do we come up with?

We come up with a net loss in Saskatchewan of 1,000 jobs; not the increase that the government is promoting of 12,000 jobs. In fact is, Mr. Speaker, the government in every throne speech and in every budget, has been projecting 16,000 jobs this year; 5,000 jobs this year; 4,000 jobs this year. In total they've made a promise of 30,000 new jobs in Saskatchewan and the net result, Mr. Speaker, to which they have admitted from their seats, is a loss of 1,000 jobs since 1991 in the province of Saskatchewan.

In this throne speech they're claiming that they've created 12,000 jobs in the past year, 12,000. In that same time period, Mr. Speaker, in the same time period, the province of Alberta has created 36,000 jobs, 36,000. Yes. Alberta is larger than Saskatchewan. They also have a different government, but a net loss in the three years in this province of 1,000 jobs and a net gain in Alberta of 80,000 in a two-year period.

In spite of the government's attempts to paper over the problem with extravagant statistics and by exaggerating the importance of its 2,000 low wage jobs, it's clearer to everyone that there's still an employment crisis in the province of Saskatchewan.

(1230)

And, Mr. Speaker, this problem of lack of jobs in this province is at a time when the economy is outstripping the rest of the other provinces. This economy is doing better than the other provinces, but we're not doing better when it comes to jobs. You know, it's the jobless recovery, that's what it is, it's the jobless recovery . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I've been listening . . . I don't want to point out individual members, but if they don't want to listen to a general command of the Speaker, then I'm going to have to point out people. And I ask the member from Biggar to please quit interrupting. It's been at least a half a dozen times since this member has gotten up that you've interrupted loud enough to interfere with him giving his address. So I ask, please refrain from doing so.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was discussing, as I was saying, that we have here a jobless recovery. And in the terms of the ordinary people of Saskatchewan, what we have here is an omelette without eggs. And it's quite clear to everyone, except for the members opposite, what the cause of this crisis is. As Professor Eric Howe of the University of Saskatchewan observed in the *Leader-Post* on February 1, and I quote:

"The NDP is getting us out of our provincial budget deficit through higher taxes and higher utility rates," . . .
"The effect of both of those things is to weaken job growth."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the government opposite is not ashamed of that fact. The fact is they're very proud of it. They love to tell everyone who will listen how they have balanced the budget without the deep government spending cuts of the Ralph Klein has undertaken in Alberta.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — I'm glad you like that. I'm glad you like that, members. They love to portray the Klein government in what they term hard-hearted and uncaring with a slash-and-burn policy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D'Autremont: — Again they agree. They especially compare that to themselves and their thoughtful preservation of the state of over-government in this province. And yet all the government's propaganda on this subject . . . Ralph Klein's government has created, as I said, 36,000 new jobs in the past year.

And, Mr. Speaker, that's without legislating or regulating a jobs-for-unions-only policy such as the government opposite is practising in this province, a policy that is being brought forward by an NDP (New Democratic Party) government whose Premier is the member from Riversdale who admits that he isn't even NDP. You have to say: only in Saskatchewan that you would get a leader of a government party who would admit that he doesn't belong to that philosophy.

In talking about the humane approach, I would suggest that the Premier and his ministers of Finance have a more . . . that it is a more humane fiscal policy to reduce the burden of government on the taxpayers and thereby creating that 36,000 jobs than it is to kill job growth and to throw tens of thousands of people onto the welfare rolls by pushing taxes and utilities through the roof.

Mr. Speaker, if Alberta has a slash-and-burn policy, then the policy of this government is to rob and pillage.

It has been the frequent charge of the government that the Tories in both Saskatchewan and Alberta adopt policies only out of ideological zeal without regard to the practicalities. In looking at the job creation issue, I can easily see that this is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. It's not bad enough that the members opposite are so ideologically wedded to the idea of big government that they will not suffer their bureaucratic empire to be diminished in any way, and as an example of which was the recent purchase of DirectWest by SaskTel — a private corporation that was doing well but now has to be owned by the provincial government. Again they're contributing to the growth of their infamous family of Crown corporations.

And on top of that, Mr. Speaker, they're still caught up in their socialist ideas of labour reform. They refuse to even consider that perhaps during an unemployment crisis it's not the best time to be introducing radical new labour reforms that are bound to have a chilling effect on job creation in this province.

It took months for the grass roots protests from small and medium business owners for the province to back off on the most radical aspects of their labour bias. But even after backing off, such that we see the sham alienation of their labour friends, they still can't get the full support of the business community.

As Joyce Reynolds of the Canadian Restaurant and Foodservices Association said in the *Star-Phoenix* on February 4:

We are still very concerned that the legislation will ultimately harm more than it will help.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of comment that the business people have been making from the beginning and which the former minister of Labour has sneered at continually. You really should have to wonder why this legislation exists. In fact we'll be submitting a Bill this session which says it should not exist. After all, labour claims it does not like this Bill, no one in business favours it either, so just whose interests does this particular piece of legislation serve.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can see, the only reason this Bill exists is so that the former minister of Labour can say that he didn't back down on his ideological principles. Well the Hon. Associate Minister of Finance is no longer the Minister of Labour since he so bravely switched portfolios the day the legislation was proclaimed.

So now that this member's honour has been upheld, perhaps the government can now begin to be a little more reasonable. Perhaps they can begin to see that a government that creates 36,000 jobs is maybe doing something right, something that they should try and imitate.

Those policies from Alberta that are creating the environment which has created 80,000 jobs in two years, is an environment, Mr. Speaker, that we need in this province, not one that has created a negative 1,000 jobs in the past three years.

But somehow, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much that that will happen. I doubt that the Associate Minister of Finance is the only one over there who has the blinders on about the subjects like big government, taxation, job creation and the economy. This blindness is reflected in this throne speech which offers the province no hope for change in the coming session.

And the Minister of Justice suggests to me I should be talking about gun control. Well, Mr. Minister, I am prepared to talk about gun control. There's a very particular item, Mr. Speaker, missing out of the throne speech, and that is any comment about gun control. It's a topic that is very hot throughout Saskatchewan at the present time. It has been so for a considerable number of months, going back to the previous spring, because the previous session we had motions passed through this House that talked about gun control. And yet the government opposite didn't include it in their throne speech. It wasn't important enough or perhaps they couldn't muster the courage from some of the members opposite to talk about it. I don't know why they didn't include it, Mr. Speaker, but it is a glaring error.

Mr. Speaker, since the new year, since the new year alone, there have been rallies opposed to the federal firearms legislation held in Stoughton, in Carlyle, in Milestone, in Yorkton, in Prince Albert, and in Raymore on Tuesday night. There are more coming up next week, Mr. Speaker, in Meadow Lake on Sunday and in Kerrobert on Monday.

And, Mr. Speaker, the people who are attending these rallies are not the people that Mr. Rock and the Liberals should be concerned about; these are the hard-working, honest farmers, hunters, trappers, and sportsmen of this province. They're not the criminals; they're the honest people that Mr. Rock and the Liberals are trying to turn into criminals.

When the issue first came up last spring, Mr. Speaker, it was clear where we stood on the issue; we were opposed to it. Some of the members opposite also opposed it. Some of them didn't have the courage to stand and vote in this House on the issue, so they left. But the government did support the opposition and vice versa on that particular issue. The only ones who couldn't make up their mind were the Liberal colleagues opposite.

The Leader of the Liberal Party, when she came back from her convention in Toronto after having talked to Allan Rock, thought all of this new proposal gun legislation was a great idea. We should all — those of us who have firearms — should have to stick them in a warehouse some place and have them locked up and away from us so that we could only get them on special occasions.

But when the Leader of the Third Party returned to Saskatchewan she found out the politics was a little different here than it was in Toronto. She found out that the people of Saskatchewan were not real impressed with her ideas, and so she did the traditional Liberal thing — she straddled the fence and tried to play both sides.

Well, Mr. Speaker, she found out that the people of Saskatchewan were not prepared to allow her to straddle the

fence; she was either for or agin it. And so she wilted, and she came over to the same side that the official opposition was on and the government.

This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, not about guns. This is an issue of property rights. And property rights, Mr. Speaker, are a provincial jurisdiction and they must remain so. We have a tradition in this country of property ownership by individuals which is sacrosanct from government confiscation, and if the government does indeed need that piece of property, be it land or whatever, the government then compensates the owner for it. And that is not part of the Liberal proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the gun control issue is but one of the issues that the government opposite has left out of their throne speech. And they don't endear themselves to the public by doing so, Mr. Speaker. And fact is the public again becomes concerned. If they're prepared to talk about these issues but avoid the gun control one, where does that leave the government's commitment on gun control? Their omission, Mr. Speaker, is very obvious.

(1245)

The government opposite, Mr. Speaker, has the responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan to clearly state their views and to clearly state it in this House what they're prepared to do to assist the ownership of property in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the public will hold the NDP government equally responsible for their omissions, just as they hold them responsible for their extremely high tax rates, utility rates, and the lack of jobs for Saskatchewan people. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, like the member from Souris-Cannington, want to put my comments to the Speech from the Throne. I too note there's a great deal of things that I would say are missing from the throne speech. In fact overall it's probably one of or perhaps the most lacklustre throne speech that this legislature has heard in some time. Of course it has very little substance and the government intends to do most of its bragging on the fact that after, I guess it's 13 years, the deficit of the books of the province are finally going to be balanced and . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — And I think that's a great thing that's happened here, but we'll get into that in a moment.

Also in the throne speech I see some non-controversial legislation that I think we'll have to have a chat about.

What was disappointing I think in the overall view of this speech was the fact that Saskatchewan, having over 50 per cent of the farmers in Canada right here in this provincial boundaries, and this government is showing absolutely no leadership and no direction in what should happen in the field of agriculture.

They have a section on health care in the throne speech, which to me tells me that they're still . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I would ask members to please abide by the rules. When a member is speaking you simply do not cross between the member who is speaking and the Chair. If you wish to cross the floor, then go around the member who is speaking.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note the section on health care in the throne speech. What it tells me is that this government is still hoping that they can at the end of the day, fool people into believing that they actually have a health care plan. And I guess we'll have to get in and talk about that.

Basically I think this throne speech is, I guess, a lead-up to an election. I see no more than that.

I agree with the member from Souris-Cannington, that there's a lot of things lacking. In fact one thing that is very evident is what this government intends to do with the serious crisis that they've created with their gaming policies. The social effects on gaming which will be right in front of us now, but especially in the next year or two to come while they're trying to make this province of Saskatchewan into the province of Las Vegas. And I think that's going to come back and be a very big embarrassment to this government. And it should be.

Any government that doesn't have enough ideas to make a province work, short of having a poor man's tax, raising revenues from VLTs (video lottery terminal) to try and balance the books of the province, I think that in itself will . . . As the people of the province are going to finally say, shame on you.

But when we take a look, Mr. Speaker, at the section on financial stability in the throne speech, a few things actually stick out that I think are rather disappointing. In fact I've heard some of the speeches of the members of the government side commenting on the debt and the deficits for some years.

And I agree with them. I don't think the people of Saskatchewan are going to forgive or forget what the Conservative administration did as far as the financial instability they created in the province. But to still, after so many years, to keep hanging your hat on this, I want to remind the government members of a few things.

I recall back in the 1986 election when many of those members, people like the former minister of Health . . . Well I won't get into it. Most of those members over there were campaigning. And at that time there was only one member who travelled around the province trying to put some common sense to what was happening in that election. And that was our now current federal Minister of Agriculture who was saying, let's not get into a bidding war here; let's not try and spend all the money that we really and truly don't have. Let's get some financial stability to the province.

But the members over there, who are grinning about it now, well they were part of that bidding war with the Conservatives

and the New Democrats, and perhaps the reason for this one program that I'm going to mention is because I think there was only seven members at that time to sit back and try and make the policy of the day, or policy in the election.

But while the Conservatives were coming out with a program, a home improvement program, low interest rates paid back over a number of years, and which they're basically fixing up rumpus rooms, buying hot tubs, we recall all the speeches that were given in 1986 by those members. But let's not forget what they came out with. The seven members came out with a plan called the 7-7-7. All they were doing was bidding.

They talk about bidding wars today on the VLT issue. You were bidding for the election in 1986. You were prepared to run this province further into debt yourselves. So let's not play these games that somehow you're better than everyone else in the legislature, somehow that you're financially competent people.

We're going to talk about how you did take care of the books of the province and we'll get into this, member. But let's not try and fool the people that you weren't in a bidding war in the 1986 election.

As we said before, it's great to have the books of the province in order, but you know, when I take a look at the *Report of the Provincial Auditor* in the fall of 1994 — it just came out — let's have a look as to how the government perhaps did do so well, you know, with the finances of the province.

Now in the auditor's report on page 12, it goes on here, Mr. Speaker,

the annual deficit is \$45 million compared to the 1993 annual deficit of \$793 million, a decrease of 94%.

Well that sounds good. That tells me that the government is really bringing the deficit down, the yearly deficit.

But when you take the \$793 million and subtract what the annual deficit was for this year, what the report is referring to, 45 million, that leaves you with \$748 million that you actually reduced the annual deficit.

But it further goes on here; they talk about the revenues — revenue from user-fee enterprises increased 730 million or 26 per cent. And on the page previous, the auditor explains:

User fee enterprises of the Government included Saskatchewan Government Insurance, SaskPower, SaskEnergy, SaskTel, Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming . . . These enterprises raise revenue through direct charges for goods and services.

So it's a tax. What we're talking about here is taxes.

Now these taxes that the Provincial Auditor refers to raised \$730 million. So out of the 748 million that they've lowered the annual deficits, 730 million was raised through taxes in just those . . . in some of those Crowns.

But look on here. Now we're talking about expenditures on general programs. And by this I mean we're talking about programs in health care, perhaps the needs of highways, Saskatchewan drug plan. We can go on and on and on.

But things that the people require, things that meets the needs of the people of the province, now these expenditures on general programs in the 1994 budget year decreased 223 million or 4 per cent. What we're looking at here is probably \$200 million of money over and above the amount that was brought down in the annual deficit that these people aren't accounting for.

So we can talk about how well you've done. Fact of the matter is, in the auditor's report it clearly states you've done it by raising taxes and cutting programs. And in fact you should have done a lot better than what you are today, but you couldn't keep your spending in order.

The only way that you could find, Mr. Member from Elphinstone, the only way that you could do what you have done is through taxes and through cutting unnecessary programs, and you're short \$200 million . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well it's in the auditor's report. It's not me that's going to make this argument, it is the Provincial Auditor that's saying, shame on you guys, you couldn't get your act together, you couldn't get your act together.

And we look at some of the articles that have been in the paper in the last few days. "Playing politics with figures destructive", it says. Let me quote a line in here from Ken Juba, business editor:

The provincial government got its budget deficit under control — largely because it threw yours and mine into disarray and because 1994 was a year of economic windfalls. . .

So really when you take a look at these professionals and people that are business editors and provincial auditors, what they're essentially saying is that there should be a great deal of money sitting somewhere in a bank account and I'm not so sure there isn't, and if they're putting something away for an election they better fess up at this point.

We take a look at . . . keeping with the revenue argument for a while, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at some of the things that they said in the past about taxes because clearly the auditor is saying that you're doing it . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order. I think that was a prime example of interference in the House when a member almost from the back tries to get another member's attention 20 feet away when a member is on his feet. We just can't allow that in this House. And I wish members would respect that a little more.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few quotes right out of *Hansard* in the past few years that I want to remind these members of.

And I raise it because of the fact that they are doing as well on the deficit as they are because of what they've done, and that's to increase their tax.

But let's look at some of their quotes. Roy Romanow, MLA for Riversdale. It says here:

I say to you, Mr. Minister of Finance, and Mr. Premier
. . . you had a choice to cut back . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I hope the member was using a quote and was not mentioning the individual's name. Was that a direct quote? If it wasn't, then the member knows that he can't use it that way.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Knezacek: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order with respect to the last speaker's comment about using a name.

The Speaker: — What's your point of order?

Mr. Knezacek: — I believe the speaker from Shaunavon had used one of the member's personal names when he's not given that opportunity to do that in the Assembly.

The Speaker: — I think that's the problem we're having in this House. There's so much noise in this House that you couldn't even hear the Speaker ruling on it. I already ruled on that.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I apologize; that wasn't in a quote.
But I will give you the quote that was in *Hansard* on April 12, 1991:

I say to you, Mr. Minister of Finance, and Mr. Premier
(referring to the former government, of course) . . . you
had a choice to cut back and instead you taxed the
people and the farmers of Saskatchewan. Shame on you.
Where are your priorities?

An Hon. Member: — Who said that?

Mr. McPherson: — Well the MLA for Riversdale, the Premier said that when he was in opposition.

And it's disappointing now when you sit back and you take a look at what your government has done to the farmers and to what you've done to people in rural Saskatchewan; you should be owning up to some of these quotes.

And the member from Elphinstone has made several himself. Let me read you another one. *Hansard*, April 12, 1991:

. . . where in the world is your priority? Taxing electrical bills which affects our people in business and elsewhere, and certain medicines; or cutting out the waste and the expenditures . . .

We've got lists and lists of them. *Hansard*, May 2, 1991 . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. It now being 1 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 1 o'clock on Monday next.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.