

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the address in reply which was moved by Mr. Neudorf.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to participate in this debate. I would like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on the overall throne speech that was presented to us this past week, and then I would like to spend the majority of my comments in the area of education.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech that has been presented to us left a lot to be desired, and it is more significant, Mr. Speaker, in what it didn't contain than in what it contained.

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody will agree that we are in tough economic times in this province. Some of it is due to international circumstances, but much of it, Mr. Speaker, is due to the policies that have been implemented by the members opposite in the last five or six years.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, at the outset say that I do not intend to support the throne speech, and I will make it amply clear as to why I cannot and will not support it.

Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech the people generally expect that the government will set out its future plans to that the people will know, in general terms at least, what they can expect from this government in the next little while.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, refer to the remarks made by the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster this afternoon. And I hesitate to do this, Mr. Speaker, but he read from an article in the Leader-Post of Dale Eisler on March 23. He wrote the following, and the member quoted from Mr. Eisler the following:

Back during the 1982 election campaign when Grant Devine was weaving a spell over Saskatchewan people, it was often fascinating to watch him operate.

Mr. Speaker, what the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster didn't read, however, are the following. Mr. Eisler writes:

Compared to the situation six years ago, the farm economy is in a far more desperate situation.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eisler goes on to say, and the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster forgot to read this, "the total farm debt in Saskatchewan today is approximately \$7 billion, . . . " And he goes on to quote the member from Kelvington-Wadena and this is what that member had to say. He said, " . . . there is now a mountainous debt on the backs of farmers." Mr. Speaker, this is the Legislative Secretary to the Premier and to the Minister of Agriculture who said " . . . there is now a mountainous debt on the

backs of farmers." That mountainous debt, Mr. Speaker, has been incurred by the farmers while these members were in office, while these members were in office. And that's exactly what the member, the Legislative Secretary for the minister of Agriculture, indicated.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to quote the article. And this is what he says:

In the case of the land bank, a farmer who rented from the land bank because he couldn't afford to buy the land was certainly in no better position five years later when values had inflated and he had no option to purchase.

That is correct, but let's go on.

But these days there is a far greater crisis of ownership facing farmers than was ever posed by the government land bank. There are thousands of farmers today who face the threat of losing their land to creditors. For them, the emotion has not gone out of the pride of ownership.

Mr. Speaker, and neither has the fear that comes with the prospects of being tenants on what was once their own land.

That is, Mr. Speaker, the position that these people have put the farmers of Saskatchewan in. They are going to become tenants on their own land and the land is going to be owned by the creditors, not just of this province but of Canada and internationally. That's what these people have done, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to . . . Mr. Speaker, the other day when the throne speech was read, members on both sides of the house chuckled and smiled when the Lieutenant Governor read the note on dangerous dogs. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the members here that I think the problem of dangerous dogs must be addressed, and should be addressed.

However, having said that, Mr. Speaker, having said that, when you look at the throne speech and he mentions not a word on native people; not a word has been mentioned of job creation; not a word has been mentioned as how the government is going to address the problem of private schools; not a word has been mentioned as how the government is going to address the problem of francophone rights in this province; not a word was mentioned as to how the Minister of Health was going to address the problem of 11,000 people on the waiting list in Saskatoon; could one help but wonder why members on both sides of the House thought it was rather funny that the government, that the government would emphasize that they would address the problem of dangerous dogs, but wouldn't address these other very, very important items?

Mr. Speaker, the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster this afternoon also said, oh, the members opposite, you

should stop scaring people. Don't put the fear into people.

Well I will ask the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster. Somebody should have put the fear into the highway workers that lost their jobs. They would have been better off. Why didn't someone warn the dental nurses that they would be losing their jobs — summarily dismissed. Someone should have addressed the problem also for the Department of Education workers who the Minister of Education summarily dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, what about the Kelsey workers, STI (Saskatchewan Technical Institute) workers? What about those people that were simply told to leave their offices after years and years of service — dedicated services? Someone, Mr. Speaker, someone, Mr. Speaker, should have warned these people. And that is not scaring those people.

Someone, Mr. Speaker, should have warned the young people that there would be no opportunities for them to attend technical school or universities because of the policies of this government. That is not scaring people. That is telling the people the truth of the effects of your policies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few of the remarks made by the member from Rosthern. and the member from Rosthern, and I will quote, he says there has been amazing growth in difficult economic times. And, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member from Rosthern. There has been amazing growth in this province, but the wrong kind of growth; the wrong kind of growth.

What has grown in this province? Well I'll just give you a few. In 1982, the debt in this province, the total debt owed by the people of this province, was \$3.5 billion. That has grown to over \$10 billion under this government.

Mr. Speaker, in 1982 there was no deficit. that deficit has grown. In fact, Mr. Minister, we left you with a surplus of \$139 million.

Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please, order. Order. Order.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I know it hurts the member from Turtleford to hear the truth, but he has to accept the responsibility for creating that large deficit of \$3.4 billion. He is sitting on the treasury board; he has created that deficit. Mr. Speaker, that is a growth that has occurred.

Mr. Speaker, another growth that occurred under this government is the welfare rolls. We have about 39,000 or 40,000 people on the welfare rolls. Yes we've had growth, but what else has grown? Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please, order. I ask the hon. members to please allow the member to continue.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction here. I stand corrected. It's not 40,000 people on the welfare rolls; it's 60,000 people on the welfare rolls.

And, Mr. Speaker, what else has grown? Well, the unemployment list has grown. We now have 40,000 people seeking employment. The member from Rosthern is absolutely right; there has been amazing growth.

But it doesn't stop there. What else has grown? Well the Premier's personal staff has grown. It is doubled to what it was under the former premier.

What else has grown? Well the political advertising budget has grown to about 20-some million dollars . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it doesn't stop there. Mr. Speaker, the hospital waiting lists in Regina are now well over 5,000; in Saskatoon, they're well over 11,000 — triple to what it was when we were the government.

Oh, there's growth, but it doesn't stop there, Mr. Speaker. What else has grown in this province. Mr. Speaker, in this province, Mr. Speaker, the out-migration of our young people has simply gone up almost at a right angle. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the out-migration in this province is about 9,000 a year, almost 300 people every day.

What else has grown? Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you what else has grown. Taxation has grown — gone up last year by \$265 million and the Premier and the Finance minister indicate it will go up again next week in the next budget. So yes, the member from Rosthern is absolutely right. We've had growth, the wrong kind of growth.

Mr. Speaker, when you talk about growth, there has been other kinds of growth also. Taxation on schools . . . by school boards, implemented or made necessary because of the lack of finances by this government in education. In 1976, when you take into consideration the property improvement grant, the province paid 72 to 73 per cent of all educational costs. Today it's less than 50 per cent. That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of growth we don't need.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this province grow from the province that had economic stability to a province that has economic disaster. Mr. Speaker, if that is what the member from Rosthern was taking about growth, I certainly agree with him 100 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to education. Mr. Speaker, people in this province have always been proud of our educational system. We have attempted, we have attempted, Mr. Speaker, to offer quality education in this province and it's always been done on a co-operative basis, the co-operative basis between parents and trustees and teachers and the government. Those were the four components of our educational system. Those were the people who worked together to make sure that we have top-notch education. We've always been fortunate in this province in having dedicated, loyal, and well-qualified teachers, and the government and the parents and trustees have recognized this by making certain that they were well remunerated for their work.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the last little while we've seen a change. This consultative process, this co-operation that has existed, has changed. And I say, Mr. Speaker, it has changed basically when the present minister became the Minister of Education and his deputy minister was hired to run that department.

Mr. Speaker, if you say that I am picking on the civil service I'm telling you I am picking on one individual and that is your deputy minister. Mr. Speaker, when I go around this province there is one name that comes up more than even the minister himself, and that is the deputy minister and his attitude towards people who have spent their life in education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this: the deputy minister, we can't hold him responsible, because his immediate boss is the Minister of Education, and he is accountable to that minister and that minister is accountable to the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my travels in the province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, if you could please call the minister from Turtleford to order, I would like to continue with my deliberation.

(1915)

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order, please.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I want to simply say that if we are going to develop a top-notch, quality education as we always have done, Mr. Speaker, we in this province need to make sure that that co-operative way continues throughout our developments.

I want to say to the minister that in 1982 we established a committee to re-examine the goals and objectives of education. And that committee came forward with the Directions report, and it's fair.

In 1982, we lost the government, and the then minister of Education, the member from . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Swift Current, thank you. The member from Swift Current appointed a new committee, and that committee came up with the core report, the core curriculum report. And on the whole, as I travel Saskatchewan, the majority of the people are satisfied with that report. They like the goals; they like the objectives; but there are some refinements that have to be made.

One of the problems, Mr. Minister, that I hear time and time again is that they wish that some simulated projects had been carried out on the core program in our high schools so that we could work out the kinks, see what some of the problems are before we implement it full-fledged throughout the province. This has not been done. And why, Mr. Speaker, was it not done? Because the Minister of Education, the present Minister of Education, when he looked at that report, didn't like some of the directions and the recommendations that were made, and he wanted to change them. So what did he do? He fired all the people or retired all the people — force retired them — who had anything to do with the core curriculum. And then he went about rehiring some people who believed in what he wanted to have done,

and he has made some of those changes. And it has caused some problems out in rural Saskatchewan and in urban Saskatchewan.

I say to the minister: please, if you want to have the consultative process, go out to the people; listen to them. Don't tell them what should be done; listen to them. You and your deputy minister can't go out there and be the arrogant couple who knows everything and say to people, this is the way it's going to be done, and it's going to be implemented in September of 1988 without any simulated projects and without any experience at how this is to be carried out.

I say to the minister, as I have indicated before, generally speaking, the people accept the program. I think it can meet the needs of the 1990s and possibly to the 2000s. But I'll tell you that there should . . . that some of the changes that you are making are not going to be well accepted.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I want to, however, congratulate the minister. As I go about the province I also hear one other name that is mentioned quite often lately, and that is the name of Fred Renihan. Now I don't know Fred Renihan personally, but from what I hear out there, I want to congratulate the minister for hiring this person who has, I think, a rapport and a confidence with the teachers and the trustees of this province. From what I can gather . . . and that's the good news that I hear in the province.

But, Mr. Speaker, one man alone can't do all the work that is necessary before this program is implemented in the fall. And I say to the ministers in the rural Saskatchewan, there is a real concern about some of the implementation facilities that are needed. In rural Saskatchewan you cannot ask the people to carry out all the practical arts when they don't have the facilities to do it. How are they going to have all the teachings in the arts when they don't have the facilities to do it? And that is needed. So that means there must be additional funding for facilities, additional facilities, if you expect the people to carry out this program.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the deputy or the minister must make available to teachers funds for inservice training. That has got to be done this summer before the fall begins. And we need that money now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'm simply saying, Mr. Minister, what the teachers out there are telling me, and I'm sure that you must have heard that by now.

Mr. Speaker, my time is running out very quickly here and I want to make several other comments. One of the comments, Mr. Speaker, that came to me lately, or questions that were asked of me, was whether or not I could get a copy of the survey that was being done by the Department of Education, a survey, for example, on teachers. And the question — this was done by Tanka Research apparently, asked by the Department of Education to carry it out — and the question went something like this. The first question was: are you a teacher? If you said yes, that was the end of the survey. If you said no, then the question was: are you related to a teacher? If the answer was yes, the survey was ended. If,

however, you said no to that, then the survey started. And I only know some of the questions because I couldn't get hold of a copy of the survey.

The other question was: do you know that the average teacher makes \$35,000 a year? Do you know that a teacher only works four or five hours a day? Totally erroneous. And this, Mr. Speaker, was done during the negotiations, when negotiations were carried out. And I can only surmise that it was done by the Department of Education to undermine the teachers of this province, while very, very good negotiations was going on. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister to table that survey, to table that survey so that everybody can see what all the questions were that were contained in that particular survey.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister, also, to please come forward, soon in this session, on a position on the francophone rights in this province. The Wimmer report has been down for some time. I know that you people have appealed it and the francophone association have appealed it, but the francophone association have only appealed it because they were afraid that the government was not going to be taking any action. And I say to the association, negotiate a position as is acceptable to them, and that is acceptable under the Meech Lake accord, and come to some agreement. There is no need, Mr. Speaker, to go for a further appeal to . . . and come to some conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, I also say to the minister, please come forward soon on your position on private schools and how they will fit in this whole situation. I would like to know the government's position on private schools and how they will fit in this whole situation. I would like to know the government's position and so would many other people. Where do you stand on private schools? Should they be funded or should they not be funded? Will you make the Dirsk report available to everyone? And I ask the minister to come down with a decision soon.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to just refer to the collective bargaining situation. I ask the minister again to please use his offices, his good offices so that we can have a resolution to this collective bargaining.

The Minister of Finance did not hesitate to intervene, and that, Mr. Speaker, was the problem for 22 meetings — well over a year. The government trustee team could make no offer because the Minister of Finance had intervened. I ask the Minister of Education now to use his office. You have a mediator now; let's resolve this situation. Offer the teachers a fair and reasonable contract. That's all they are asking of you, a fair and reasonable contract.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — It is not reasonable, Mr. Minister, it's not reasonable for you to offer zero, zero and three when you offer your managers of Crown corporations 5 per cent, and in some cases that is close to \$10,000 a year increase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — That, Mr. Speaker, is unacceptable.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for those people who I may have misled yesterday when I said in the question period that the Minister of Finance had sent out \$1,000 to those employees. The words I should have used was "to SaskPower employees," because if you grammatically look at it, it would include SaskTel and SGI employees, and that was not my intention.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to say to the minister again: look at the quality of education. The quality of education is at stake. The quality of education is at stake, and it is your responsibility to see to it that these negotiations come to an end, and that they are resolved amicably and in fairness to the teachers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I notice that my time is up. I want to say to this House, I cannot, I cannot accept the throne speech, not for what it contains, but mostly for what it does not contain. It has not addressed the serious problems of this province, and the direction that the government is taking is simply the wrong direction at this particular time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Muller: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take great pleasure in entering into this debate, and just before I do so, I'd like to welcome all the members back to their regular seats. And of course I'd like to welcome the new Leader of the Opposition back to an unfamiliar chair.

The throne speech covered some broad territory, Mr. Speaker, but I was particularly interested in the comment it contained to proceed with the government's policy of public participation wherever economic rewards and social benefits justify it.

I have that interest because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, in my riding the great possibilities thoughtful privatization policies can produce. I am, of course, speaking of the Weyerhaeuser pulp and paper plant that is located in Shellbrook-Torch River, although members opposite fail to recognize it being in that seat. That's where the paper mill is, and I'd like to mention to the member from Humboldt, he probably doesn't know where it is either.

In 1985, Mr. Speaker, PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) suffered a \$33 million loss. Now that wasn't the fault of the employees; it was the fault of the financial package that was put together to purchase that mill. The money was borrowed on what they called bridge financing at 17 per cent interest from the banks. There was no money ever paid towards the principal or the interest, so the debt kept climbing and climbing.

So it wasn't the fault of the employees that the PAPCO pulp mill was losing money. It was the financial package that the former NDP government put together to purchase it, and they never made a payment on the principal or the interest. And at 17 per cent interest, fellas, it builds up pretty fast.

But anyway, the taxpayers were paying heavily to

maintain a boondoggle, and a boondoggle was helping no one. The jobs of the employees were under serious threat with a corporation suffering such losses. And so the Progressive Conservative government decided to have a go at turning things around.

Now we could have thrown some money at it, like the NDP would do. We both know where the NDP members from Prince Albert and Prince Albert-Duck lake were coming from. They didn't want to see the paper mill there, or Weyerhaeuser. They were against all those good things. They could have thrown some money at it to keep it in operation.

We could have ignored it like the Liberals would have done. But no — we could have taken some decisive action like the Progressive Conservatives do.

So, Mr. Speaker, we took a losing proposition for the people of my constituency, a losing proposition for the people of Prince Albert, and a losing proposition for the people of Prince Albert, and a losing proposition for the people of Saskatchewan. We found a committed buyer — a buyer, who, as part of a hard bargain, agreed to build a paper mill to produce a fine paper for an international market — an international market — a buyer committed to maintain an expanding work-force to create jobs for my people back home, Mr. Speaker, and for the people who have to be represented by a couple of NDP naysayers; and a buyer, Mr. Speaker, that has delivered, from losing in excess of \$90,000 each and every day, to making a substantial profit.

(1930)

I want to emphasize once more that that wasn't the employees' fault that those losses were being accumulated. They were losing markets — a government-run pulp mill was losing markets. They didn't have the management ability to capture those markets that were necessary to make that mill very, very profitable.

I'll tell you . . . I'll go into another little story for the benefit of the member from Prince Albert. And he won't believe this one, but it's the truth. And I got it from one of the former NDP members out of Manitoba that I met with in Fredericton here some time ago. I imagine he's out there trying to win his seat back right now, but anyway . . . He told me that in Manitoba they have two pulp mills, two pulp mills in Manitoba. One of them, one of them is privately owned. One of them is privately owned. The other one is government owned. He said to me, that government-owned pulp mill is killing us, we're going to have to sell it. It's losing money every year, and on a daily basis it's losing money. He was an NDP member. The deputy chairman of the House told me this, that we have to sell that pulp mill.

Well isn't that funny. The people across the way here from Prince Albert and Prince Albert-Duck Lake and from Humboldt are saying, we should have never sold that pulp mill because it would have ended up making a profit. At this time in Manitoba . . . at this time in Manitoba where there's a private pulp mill and a public pulp mill, the only one that's really making money is the private one. The government one is losing money.

So I think that that proves the point. And it came from one of the members of the NDP party from Manitoba that told me this. So . . . I mean, that proves the point that the government-operated pulp mill wasn't making money. And certainly they can't afford to expand it into a paper mill in Manitoba as Weyerhaeuser is doing in Prince Albert . . . or Shellbrook-Torch River. I'm sorry, I made a slip.

The members over there are certainly against the paper mill, and it's well-known. They said it would never be built. That's all well-known in Prince Albert. You can ask anybody on Main Street. But anyway . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Muller: — And from the profit, Mr. Speaker, the new company has instead of taking money out of the pockets of taxpayers, is putting new money into the public treasury. Very significant amounts of money. From being an operation where people's jobs were uncertain at best, and soon to be gone at worst, to being an enterprise that will be employing some 250 more people, Mr. Speaker, that's what privatization can do and I support that.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Riversdale likes to rave a bit how these out-of-province companies come in here and don't do business with our people, but somehow slavishly connected to buy their supplies from out of province. The NDP try and promote that idea, that these multinational companies come in here, as what they call multinational companies — Weyerhaeuser is Weyerhaeuser Canada. They say they buy everything from out of province. It's no benefit to Saskatchewan or the Saskatchewan taxpayers. So let me help them become aware of how the real world works, the world in Shellbrook-Torch River and Saskatchewan and not the world of fantasy textbooks and socialist planning.

In the real world, Mr. Speaker, the new company purchased 75 per cent — that's three-quarters, three-quarters — 75 per cent of all its needed materials right here in Saskatchewan. Now 75 per cent doesn't seem like they're buying most of it out of province, not according to some textbook, but according to sound business decisions and with a sense of commitment to the community in which it conducts business. And I want to tell you people here, you people here aren't probably in Prince Albert quite as often as I am. Everybody up in that area is very, very happy with the good corporate citizens that Weyerhaeuser are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Muller: — About a year and a half ago there was a major fire up North and some buildings burnt that were housing children. Weyerhaeuser, what did they do? Immediately they moved in some mobile accommodations for those people on the old Molanosa road. I was right up past there just shortly after, fishing, and I seen them. They moved them in a cluster so they had some decent accommodations. They do those kinds of things in the community.

When they first bought the pulp mill in Prince Albert . . . A

lot of the rural municipalities north of Prince Albert of course are tourist-based. Tourist-based, — of course, I'll explain this to some of the fellows from the South — tourist-based means they have lakes and trees and a kind of a beautiful setting that people love to enjoy in the summer-time, with golf courses and things like that.

Some of those rural municipalities were a little worried, and some of the resort villages were a little worried, now that, as the NDP would say, this big multinational is in here, and they're going to take all the trees off of the land, and they're not going to leave anything for recreational purposes. Well let me tell you, Weyerhaeuser went up to the Lakeland R.M., designated all the land that was previously designated by PAPCO, and added 5,000 acres — 5,000 acres added to the outside circumference to make sure that the parkland is protected, make sure it's protected. These people are really good corporate citizens. They're really starting to mix into the real rural and urban fibre of central Saskatchewan. And this is important, very important.

These people across the way can say all the negatives they want about it, but they are not saying so many negative things around Prince Albert now because the positives are starting to come out, the positive things that our people on the street are saying about Weyerhaeuser. The member from P.A. and P.A.-Duck Lake are not saying so many negative things. No, they've quit using the scare tactics that the paper mill won't be built.

I toured it the other day. I toured that paper mill the other day, and it is something to see. And I met . . . I met a lot of my friends on the floor, working at that paper mill, constructing it.

An Hon. Member: — All Tories.

Mr. Muller: — And there certainly are all Tories. They're from Shellbrook-Torch River, the member from Regina North West is saying.

Some Hon. Members : Hear, hear!

Mr. Muller: — Anyway, it's great to see Tories and NDP working side by side, building a paper mill, and I'm sure that the member from Prince Albert will finally see the light and come out and say what a positive group of people Weyerhaeuser is. I'm waiting for him to say that in his speech. I'm sure that he will come out and say he's in favour of the paper mill, he's in favour of the people up there that are building it, and in favour of how Weyerhaeuser is being good corporate citizens in the area. I'm sure that he will apologize for any of the negatives that he has used in previous speeches of his . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . He says he won't apologize. Well I'm sure that he'll have second thoughts about that before he gets up to give his answer to the throne speech.

So let the Leader of the Opposition make no more unjustified claims about the Weyerhaeuser plant. I'm sure that if he was here tonight and could hear all the positives, that he may even change his mind.

Mr. Speaker, I was also impressed with the commitment of the throne speech to pursue the opportunities

presented by the free trade agreement with the United States. That is one of the things that's really dear to my heart, being a farmer all my life, giving me access in the red meat industries. That has always been a great concern of mine, of not having access to the southern markets.

I refer you back to my observation on the . . . I'm sorry, I just started over. Well I seen the member from Saskatoon South got mixed up in his notes there, too. But anyway, I see that I have certainly got mine mixed up. But anyhow, I have to go on a little longer about the free trade agreement and its positive side.

As you know, the basic framework . . . The Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition is totally against free trade, totally against access to our southern neighbours. But I have to be in favour of the free trade agreement.

He says that we're going to lose our sovereignty. He says we're going to lose our sovereignty. The member from Riversdale says we're going to lose our sovereignty to the United States. We won't be able to control our own exports; we won't be able to control what we charge for our export products. Well as you very well know, the basic trade framework for this country is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or the GATT, as they call it. And this is the agreement that the Leader of the Opposition said we should use exclusively, exclusively as our vehicle for developing our foreign markets. Don't try to deal with the Americans, he has said. Put all the eggs in the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) basket.

We . . . Mr. Speaker, let me say that I continue to support the GATT and the negotiations that we are going through with GATT nations. But let me also point out, the member from Riversdale, the ramifications of recent GATT rulings. They have ruled that our wine and beer industries must be subject to the regime they have decided upon, not the one that we have decided upon. And I was waiting for the Leader of the Opposition to start telling us how this is proof positive that the GATT has injured Canada sovereignty, that we have given our independence to a group of international trade officials.

Because here we have a Canadian policy, and when it comes to breweries, Mr. Speaker, really a provincial — a provincial policy. Here we have an internal policy, and this GATT things, the Leader of the Opposition wants us to rely on 100 per cent — 100 per cent. This GATT things has told us that we cannot set our own policies. Why is the member from Riversdale is silent on this, Mr. Speaker? Why does he not ask questions about that?

His preferred option has been demonstrated to infringe our sovereignty, and I think we should hear what he has to say about it. Because, Mr. Speaker, there are a significant number of jobs that depend upon the breweries in this province, a significant number. And in the negotiations with the Americans that the Leader of the Opposition does not want us dealing, in those negotiations we obtained full exemptions for our breweries — full exemptions for our breweries.

The deal with the Americans protected those jobs. And

now those jobs are threatened by the member of Riversdale's policy. I think this whole thing points out clearly just how narrow and illogical and purely ideological the stand of the Leader of the Opposition is. And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I much prefer to have the fate of the paper mill in Shellbrook-Torch River be in the hands of a panel on which Canada has full and equal voice than I would a panel where your voice is one in a very large crowd.

(1945)

But lest anyone try to portray me as opposed to the GATT, let me just repeat that I do support the trade mechanism. I point these things to show the hypocrisy and inconsistency of the member from Riversdale. And, Mr. Speaker, after entering the third decade in this House he should know better.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that members on the opposite benches now want to take some advantage of what I've said in my speech, to give some rebuttal, and maybe some apologies to Weyerhaeuser and the people who have put together the free trade agreement. After this fiery speech of mine I'm sure that they want to make some apologies for what I've said.

Well let me finish my remarks by congratulating His Honour the Lieutenant governor on his fine delivery of the Speech from the Throne, and in expressing my support for the contents of that speech. And let me thank the government for its continued commitment to the people of my constituency and clearly to the people of the entire province of Saskatchewan.

And certainly I have to make some comments again, just before I finish off. You know, I got into the large projects in my area, the Weyerhaeuser, and of course the larger project is the free trade agreement. But I really have to compliment our fine Minister of Health from Meadow Lake, and the support he got in supporting me in the new 30-bed nursing home that I'm getting in Canwood — of course I like to flog that one a little. And it is . . . I've been there and I've gone through it in the construction phases. I understand it's going to open in sometime in July . . .

An Hon. Member: — Just in time for you to move into it.

Mr. Muller: And yes, like the member from Souris-Cannington said, I'll be able to get a room.

But anyway . . . Mr. Speaker, I obviously will be supporting the motion of my colleague from Rosthern, and thank you for your undivided attention.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to take part in this throne speech debate, and to speak on behalf of my constituents in my riding of Saskatoon University, and it's also, I think, good luck for me, Mr. Speaker, to be following in this debate on the remarks of the member from Shellbrook, because it gives me an opportunity to rebut some very serious inaccuracies in the member's remarks. I want to take a moment to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I was intrigued, Mr. Speaker, by the remarks of the member from Shellbrook when he referred to the hard bargain that the Government of Saskatchewan drove with Weyerhaeuser corporation of Tacoma, Washington. I was equally intrigued, Mr. Speaker, to see the reference that the member made to Weyerhaeuser corporation inheriting a publicly owned company, PAPCO, that was losing \$90,000 a day, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight. I challenge the member from Shellbrook to table documentation that will support his accusation that the Prince Albert Pulp Company was losing \$91,000 a day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table, for members of this Assembly, the consolidated statement of income and retained earnings for the Prince Albert Pulp Company for the years 1980 and 1981, the two years before the PC government took office, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to lay these on the Table, but before I do, Mr. Speaker, I want to read into the record what the net income of the Prince Albert Pulp Company was under the NDP government.

Mr. Speaker, in the 12 months ended March 31, 1980, the audited consolidated statement shows that PAPCO made \$23,461,879, Mr. Speaker. That's not a loss of \$91,000 a day. That's a very substantial profit, Mr. Speaker. In the year 1981, Mr. Speaker, the audited statement of the Prince Albert Pulp Company shows that PAPCO under the NDP made a profit of \$24,132,000, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this \$91,000 a day is fictitious loss perpetrated by the PC Party opposite.

They advertised, Mr. Speaker, on public radio across this province, claiming that PAPCO under the NDP was making a \$91,000 a day loss when they knew that that was a total inaccuracy, Mr. Speaker, a total falsehood, in complete contradiction, Mr. Speaker, to the audited financial statements of PAPCO. And I lay those audited financial statements on the Table right now, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge members opposite that if they have any documentation that refutes these audited financial statements, that they should bring it forward now. I'll be handing these to the page, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The member for Meadow Lake, the Minister of Health, asks me if I read the three volumes that he tabled last year. Yes, Mr. Minister, I did read the three volumes you tabled in December of 1986, and what that showed, Mr. Speaker, is that in addition to the inaccuracies that I already mentioned, this government sold an asset that was worth at least 350 million to \$400 million. They sold it, Mr. Speaker, for \$250 million. They sold 12.5 million acres of northern forest rights, the Prince Albert Pulp Company pulp mill, the Saskatoon chemical plant, and a number of smaller operations for only \$250 million, and then, Mr. Speaker, they didn't collect one penny in the form of a down payment — not one penny.

And, Mr. Speaker, in the last fiscal year they provided the company that purchased the pulp mill, Weyerhaeuser, with \$9 million in revenue to build highways under your Highways budget Mr. Speaker. A colossal give-away. No requirement for interest payments or principal payments unless Weyerhaeuser makes a 20 per cent return on their equity.

Mr. Speaker, that's what that agreement was all about. Those were the details of the agreement and when the Minister of Health asked me if I read the agreement, it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that I did, and that it constitutes a massive — perhaps the most massive — give-away in the history of Saskatchewan politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on the remarks, at that point, that I intended to make in this throne speech debate, and say that in these past months many people in my riding have been expressing dismay over what they see as the steady erosion of public services at a time when provincial taxes on individuals and families are at record high levels.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents say to me this government is destroying our province. There will be very little left if they get another term in office. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my constituents are correct, because the very infrastructure that generations of Saskatchewan people have built to serve the public good is being dismantled piece by piece by the PC government.

In dramatically cutting medicare, education, and social services the Premier is allowing the very fabric of Saskatchewan society to be eroded and he is creating untold suffering by thousands of Saskatchewan residents. People in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are going without essential medications because they cannot afford the cost of the deductible on prescription drugs and the high up-front cost of many prescriptions. Thousands of people are suffering unnecessary pain and discomfort because they can't get access to a hospital bed in this province, Mr. Speaker. There are 11,000 people waiting for entry to hospitals in my home city of Saskatoon alone.

Here is a government, Mr. Speaker, who does not even have the compassion to provide the resources needed to feed hungry children in our province. The hunger crisis is so desperate in Saskatchewan that many food banks in our province cannot keep pace with the demand. Yet this government refuses to expand school lunch programs and continues to slash away at allowances for welfare recipients, ignoring the reality that half of the recipients are children, Mr. Speaker. Child hunger, which was virtually unheard of six years ago in Saskatchewan, is one of the deepest blemishes on the free market capitalist economy this government has sought to create. It is the most obvious manifestation of economic injustice in our province.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the last two or three years in this province, as the economy gets worse under this government and as the social safety net that used to exist in this province collapses as a result of the cuts of the PC Party, an unprecedented crises in Saskatchewan, both in terms of homelessness and inadequate housing in our province and in terms of hungry people and hungry children in this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, if there is any manifestation of economic injustice in Saskatchewan, it is the manifestation that is demonstrated to us in the long line-ups at Saskatchewan food banks, and in the many children in this province who go to be hungry and wake up hungry and go to school hungry, and face a

Department of Education that won't even provide the 18 cents a day that it costs for each child to get a school lunch program in this province. And I say, Mr. Speaker, shame to a government that won't respond to that kind of basic need. The time has long since passed, Mr. Speaker, when any government of this province ought to accept child hunger as a reality in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we've also seen a serious deterioration in the last year in the quality of education in Saskatchewan. We have a government that has sacrificed educational quality for small, short-term financial savings. The crisis in accessibility to post-secondary education has now reached a point, Mr. Speaker, where students with an average of 75 per cent or less will be turned away at the College of Arts and Science at the University of Saskatchewan this fall. That's what the enrolment quota that has been imposed by the University of Saskatchewan will translate into this fall, as a result of the cuts in funding by this government to the universities of this province. The accessibility crisis is equally evident in our technical institutes where last year 3,600 students were turned away from Kelsey alone at a time when the government had just eliminated 550 student space at Kelsey.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our intention in seeking a mandate to govern this great province is straightforward. We want to rearrange the priorities of this government to put people and humanity first again in Saskatchewan. We intend to take the funds the government is spending on empty office space and use them to expand school lunch programs in Saskatchewan. We intend to take the \$140 million that the Premier is wasting on the unnecessary and environmentally unsound Rafferty dam project and instead invest those funds in restoring the prescription drug program in Saskatchewan and providing the funding that is necessary to reduce hospital waiting lists in this province.

We want to force Weyerhaeuser to make interest and principal payments on its \$250 million debt to the people of Saskatchewan, and use those funds, Mr. Speaker, to provide the support that is necessary to abolish enrolment quotas at our university in Saskatoon, and to provide the quality of education and the quality of post-secondary education that is needed in educational institutions throughout this province.

Mr. Speaker, we want to see the \$300 million oil royalty holiday that this government established for the oil industry over the past several years at a cost of \$400 a taxpayer in this province. We want to see that oil royalty holiday abolished; and we want to see that money instead, Mr. Speaker, used to eliminate the annual deficit that this government has been running up in the province of Saskatchewan so that we don't face escalated interest payments year after year on a growing debt that again is becoming of crisis proportions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to two issues that particularly affect my constituents and that relate directly to employment opportunities in my riding. One of these is the unfortunate announcement by SED Systems in Saskatoon that it was going to be laying off staff and that its future in the province of Saskatchewan was questionable. And the second, Mr. Speaker, is this

government's failure to introduce and announce already, at this point in the year, a student summer employment program for the province of Saskatchewan.

(2000)

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we saw the PC government sell 450,000 common shares that it held in SED Systems of Saskatoon, and to sell those shares for a mere \$1.1 million. And for that minimal benefit, Mr. Speaker, the PC Party gave up control, the control that it had in SED systems. And in giving up that control, Mr. Speaker, it essentially meant that a Saskatchewan presence in the most important and significant high-tech company in the province was lost.

SED systems, until that time, Mr. Speaker, had always been a Saskatchewan company. And I think it is noteworthy that the PC government decided to give up its holdings in SED systems despite the fact that there were millions of dollars of public money tied up in the company. I remind members opposite on the government side of the House that the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation has put \$6 million in term financing into SED systems and has provided an interest-free loan to SED systems of \$1.9 million for the construction of its new office and manufacturing complex at Innovation Place.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan government departments and Crown corporations have major research and development contracts with SED Systems. Now, in effect, what is happening at this point, Mr. Speaker, is that because the Saskatchewan government has given up its control in SED systems, large amounts of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money are being used, in effect, to accommodate and finance an Ontario-based firm in St. Catharines, Ontario.

SED Systems is now totally owned by Fleet Aerospace of St. Catharines, Ontario, which in turn is owned and controlled primarily by George Dragone, the head of Fleet Aerospace. And the member for . . . I notice members opposite shaking their heads. I invite them to check the record, and they will see very clearly that Mr. Dragone has, in effect, control over Fleet Aerospace, and because Fleet Aerospace owns SED systems, has control over SED Systems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point that I'd like to make is simply this: that for a mere \$1.1 million worth of Fleet stock, the Saskatchewan government has given up its ability to exercise influence over the destiny of Saskatchewan's most exiting high-tech company. And in handing SED systems over to Fleet Aerospace, what this government has done is handed a high-tech company over to another high-tech company who is well-known to have a track record of buying up small high-technology companies around North America, cutting the parts of those companies that don't fit into their overall corporate plan, laying off staff frequently in the companies that they purchase, Mr. Speaker, and then in effect consolidating parts of the operation into St. Catharines, Ontario.

If you look, Mr. Speaker . . . I invite members to look at the record of Fleet Aerospace in North America, and they will

see that it is a consistent record of buying up other small high-tech companies, selling parts of those companies off, laying off staff in the companies that have been purchased, and consolidating operations to a significant degree in their corporate headquarters in St. Catharines, Ontario.

And, Mr. Speaker, for the Government of Saskatchewan to hand over SED systems to Fleet Aerospace, with its corporate record being what I just described, was a highly, highly irresponsible thing to do, and it's no surprise at all — it should come as no surprise to members of this Assembly — that SED Systems is now saying that it will lay off staff in Saskatoon. And my fear, Mr. Speaker, is that one day we may see a situation in Saskatchewan where SED Systems is no longer part of the Saskatoon employment picture and job creation picture at all, because if times get tough in the high-tech field it would not surprise me at all if George Dragone would fully consolidate SED Systems operations into St. Catharines, Ontario.

I warned members for the government side of the House a year ago that this would happen and at the time the minister of Economic Development, member for Kindersley, denied that that would happen. The member for Kindersley said that he had received guarantees from SED systems that they would continue to maintain full employment at their plant in Saskatoon.

And I say to the Minister of Economic Development that he could not possibly have received those guarantees in writing because he has refused to provide me with that written documentation. He has refused to lay on the table of this House any indication of a guarantee between Fleet Aerospace and the Government of Saskatchewan that Saskatoon jobs in SED systems would be guaranteed. And now it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that there was no such guarantee. It's clear that Fleet Aerospace and George Dragone have a free hand to lay off as many people of SED Systems as they want to. And the responsibility for that action lies squarely on this government and its decision to sell out Saskatchewan people's interest in SED Systems for a mere \$1.1 million when there's over \$9 million of taxpayers' money alone at stake, tied up in SED Systems in the form of loans and interest-free loans and other forms of assistance from the Government of Saskatchewan, plus millions of additional dollars of Saskatchewan taxpayers' money that is tied up in Crown corporations and government departments entering into research and development contracts with SED systems.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that this demonstrates the folly of the PC plan to privatize, to privatize companies in which there is a public presence in this province; and in so doing, to give up our ability to have any real control over job creation in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address a second question that is very important to the constituents of Saskatoon University in terms of employment opportunities. And that's the issue of a summer job-creation program for students in the province of Saskatchewan, and this government's failure at the end of March to have at this time provided any indication to students and to employers about, first of all, whether there will be a

summer job creation program for students; and secondly, what the budget will be and what the criteria for applications will be, Mr. Speaker.

We are in effect three weeks away from university students getting out of university in this province and coming onto the job market. We will have over 25,000 post-secondary education students graduating in a short period of time, looking for jobs — and at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, we still have no job-creation program in place for the summer for students.

Now last year, just to briefly review the record, Mr. Speaker, we saw a government that cut summer job-creation funding from \$10.5 million in 1986 to \$4 million in 1987. We saw a government last year, Mr. Speaker, that cut off all volunteer non-profit organizations from being eligible for funding under the summer job-creation program for students. We saw a government last year that, in effect, cut 4,000 job opportunities for university and technical institute students in this province to obtain employment last summer, Mr. Speaker, over the period 1986.

And the question is, Mr. Speaker: what is the opportunities, what is the government's plans for summer job creation this summer? Will they reinstate funding to non-profit organizations? They ought to, but we've had no indication at this point in time that they will. Will there even be a program? We don't know whether there will or not, Mr. Speaker.

And this is highly irresponsible, because the government's decision not to announce a program by this time in the year means that thousands of employers across this province, even if a program is put in place, will not be able to put jobs in place quickly enough for students to be able to take advantage of them when they come out of university and technical institutes in three or four weeks' time. Mr. Speaker, it takes at least two months' notice for employers in Saskatchewan to be able to put jobs in place, summer jobs for students, and this government isn't even giving employers three weeks' notice before it will expect jobs to be put in place if there is to be a program at all.

So I say to the Minister of Employment that it is his responsibility to announce in this House tomorrow a program for student summer employment in the province of Saskatchewan. And for the throne speech to fail to make an announcement about such a program is highly irresponsible,

Now, Mr. Speaker, the final point that I want to make before closing my remarks in the throne speech debate relates to the decision that this government made, since this Assembly last sat in November, to approve three new uranium mine operations in northern Saskatchewan — to approve the construction of three new uranium mines in north-eastern Saskatchewan, at Wollaston Lake, Mr. Speaker, which is our most valuable commercial fishery resource in the province, which is, Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful lakes, without question, in the province of Saskatchewan. A magnificent natural resource, Mr. Speaker, and the government is going to new lengths, Mr. Speaker, in not only approving new

uranium mines but actually approving the construction of uranium mines out in the middle of that lake, Mr. Speaker.

This government is now saying, not only is it acceptable to construct new uranium mines in the province of Saskatchewan, but it is acceptable to build a new open-pit mine, the proposed Collins Bay A-zone mine, 250 yards out into Wollaston Lake, in water depths that are currently 45 feet deep. This government says that its acceptable to mine thousands of tonnes of radioactive materials out in the middle of a valuable commercial fishery recourse.

Mr. Speaker, it's not only approving one such mine out in Wollaston Lake, it's actually proposing to build two such mines. A second mine will be located approximately 100 yards out into the lake in water depths 25 feet deep. And it should be just common sense to anyone in this province, Mr. Speaker, that the construction and operation of those two open-pit mines out in Wollaston Lake, in a major, beautiful, and highly valuable lake in this province, is going to be . . . poses a very serious pollution threat to that natural water resource, Mr. Speaker. It is almost assured, in my judgement, Mr. Speaker, that Wollaston Lake will be polluted either in the short term or the long term as a result of the approval of these two open-pit uranium mines out in the middle of the lake.

And in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, this government has approved a third uranium mine underneath Wollaston Lake, known as the Eagle Point uranium mine, which it's proposed will operate for the next 20 years, Mr. Speaker. this mine will be located as far as 1,500 feet out underneath Wollaston Lake.

The government, Mr. Speaker, has done nothing to examine, first of all, the combined impact of all these mining developments on Wollaston Lake. Each of them have been examined only independent of one another. And it has done nothing, Mr. Speaker, to take steps to ensure that in the long term, these mines will be properly closed down, properly decommissioned, and that the radioactive tailings from these mines will not pollute the lake in the long term. There isn't even . . . In the environmental impact studies that were filed with the government, there isn't even a decommissioning plan, a closing down plan for these open-pit uranium mines that are to be built in Wollaston Lake.

And, Mr. Speaker, the environmental impact assessment that was filed is totally inadequate. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that any other government in this country would allow such a highly inadequate environmental impact assessment on such a controversial development out in the middle of lakes to ever be found acceptable by the Department of Environment.

Mr. Speaker, this environmental impact assessment should have been the subject automatically of public hearings in this province. These three uranium mines should have been the subject of public hearings in the province of Saskatchewan.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the government received dozens and dozens and dozens of letters from concerned

people across this province asking for four public hearings on these three major uranium mine developments. And the government refused to hold public hearings and immediately approved the projects as quickly as possible with a short press release statement being the only announcement that these projects were being given the green light. And, Mr. Speaker, this shows that the environmental impact assessment process which this government has set down and the legislation that governs it has become thoroughly impotent under the PC Party.

(2015)

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the members opposite have not read a recent report that was filed by the Standing committee on environment and Forestry of the House of Commons in Ottawa titled *The Eleventh Hour*. It's a study of high-level radioactive waste in Canada. And it's a document that came down in January, 1988 with representatives, Mr. Speaker, from all political parties in the House.

And this document, Mr. Speaker — among other things — recommends a moratorium on nuclear power development in Canada until the problem of high-level radioactive waste disposal is solved in this country. And every ounce of uranium that we mine in northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, will become high-level radioactive waste that no government in this country or in this world community knows how to properly dispose of.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's folly to be developing either new uranium mines or new nuclear power plants in this province until the problem of high-level radioactive waste disposal has been resolved. And herein Saskatchewan we have also not resolved the problem of lower-level radioactive tailings disposal in this province — and we have over 30 million tonnes of radioactive tailings in northern Saskatchewan which have not been properly disposed of — and yet this government goes on approving new uranium mine projects in this province without even laying down a plan for the proper disposal of these radioactive tailings, Mr. Speaker. And I think that that is thoroughly irresponsible of the members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to, in closing, comment briefly on one other item that I think has been a matter of controversy, and is a matter of importance to all members of this House and all members of the public, and that is the recent statement, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier of Saskatchewan, when he referred to one for the minority groups in this province namely people who are homosexuals in Saskatchewan, as people who are akin to criminals and bank robbers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked that the Premier of this province would make such remarks about any group of people in the province of Saskatchewan, about any minority group in the province of Saskatchewan. It was totally uncalled for, Mr. Speaker. It's akin to the kind of statements that we saw the Nazis in Germany make about minority groups there, including Jewish people, Mr. Speaker. They were referred to, Mr. Speaker, as being no better than bank robbers and criminals.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this province,

in effect, degraded and betrayed all people in Saskatchewan when he referred to a group of people in this province — a group of people who among them have outstanding men and women of great public service to the province of Saskatchewan — when he referred to them, Mr. Speaker, as being no better than criminals and bank robbers.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that his remarks demonstrate why there is a need in this province to have protection for people who are homosexual against being discriminated against, because the Premier himself, Mr. Speaker, demonstrated adamantly such discrimination. And I say that the kind of an attack on any minority group in this province must be opposed by all members of the Legislative Assembly; that it is simply improper and uncalled for and unacceptable for the Premier of this province to launch an attack on any minority group in Saskatchewan and in a totally unfounded manner to compare them to criminals and bank robbers.

And I call on the Premier of this province, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents in Saskatoon University, to withdraw those remarks and to withdraw them here in this Assembly. And on that note, Mr. Speaker, I say that I will not be supporting the throne speech. I will be opposing the throne speech and so will all members on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to respond to the Speech from the Throne back to my constituents, back in the Shaunavon riding.

I would like to begin my remarks today by welcoming all the members to this 21st session for the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. I'm sure each of you are as anxious as I to have Saskatchewan benefit from the new, exciting legislation this session will implement.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that each member will take heed to the remarks made by my colleague from Rosthern, the remarks that dealt with respect and responsible conduct so worthy of this institution and, indeed, so worthy of the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in His Honour's throne speech, government direction from this province's key issues were touched on. These were trade, agriculture, resources, public participation, diversification, education, and the family unit, health — many, many others.

Today I would like to focus on the PC government's strong commitment to one of its most vital industries — Saskatchewan agricultural sector. There's no question that Saskatchewan's farm families have been faced with some of the most difficult financial challenges imaginable, Mr. Speaker. And I shudder to think of where those families and this province would be if they were

governed by a party with agricultural policies 25 years old, led by a man who can't even distinguish his back from the front with a cowboy hat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — But, Mr. Speaker, fortunately for the farmers of this province, they have a Premier and a government who understand agriculture. They understand because the good majority of these folks are farmers themselves.

And it is because this government understands that we have led the way in commitment to a major agricultural program initiatives. Programs, Mr. Speaker, like that production loan program, a program which has approved over \$1 billion for 58,000 farmers to receive \$25 per acre at 6-per-cent money. The average loan works out to around \$19,000 per farmer. That's \$19,000, Mr. Speaker, that many, many of our farm families would have been in serious straits without — \$19,000, Mr. Speaker, to ensure crops got into the ground, to ensure our farm families remain viable; \$19,000, Mr. Speaker, to help farmers through the roughest point in agriculture crisis.

Well as you know, Mr. Speaker, under the original program, the loans were repaid over a three-year period, and in normal circumstances and for the many, many Saskatchewan farm families the three-year period term would have been sufficient. However, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Minister of Agriculture and the provincial government have received requests by some farm families and farm organizations to give him another option, an option that could extend the repayment schedule over a longer period of time. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, this government acted upon those requests. This government acted, Mr. Speaker, because this government is in touch with the people.

Saskatchewan farmers now have two options under the production loan program. They can, Mr. Speaker, number one, retain repayment schedule as per existing document over three years; or, Mr. Speaker, number two, select a 10-year extended repayment program — 10 full years to repay the loan, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP would like to say this is an awful thing, a terrible thing. Give a man a \$19,000 loan, they extended the time he has to repay if from three years to 10 years — very terrible, terrible. They don't like it. Back in my home town and in my towns surrounding my area, there's people that paid back their full term in one year; a big percentage is paid in three years; the rest had taken the 10-year loan program and are very happy about it.

The simple fact of that matter is, Mr. Speaker, the extension occurred at the request of farm families — not by this government — and farm organizations. And giving the agricultural sector of this province an option, as we have provided for in this program, is in fact the strong proof of commitment to listening to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

An example of that commitment are demonstrated through all areas of government agricultural programs and initiatives. For an example. The Farm Land Security

Act is one of those initiatives, an Act that severely restricts farm land foreclosures, Mr. Speaker. Over 14,000 notices have been received with approximately 60 per cent resulting in successful mediation with the creditors. Enacted on December 31, 1984, Mr. Speaker, we have extended its life to December 31, 1988 with provision for further extension to December 31, 1989.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a comparison here between the kinds of commitment of this government and the commitment of the government across the way. The Farm Land Security Act, an act designed by the government, has been proven successful in keeping farmers on the land and in control of their land. Compare that with the land bank Act in the NDP term, an Act designed and a proven success in taking the land away from the farmers and putting it in the hands of big government — taking the land away from the farmers and taking it and running it from this building here. Two very different kinds of commitments, Mr. Speaker — a commitment to the farm families demonstrated by this PC government; a commitment to government ownership and control demonstrated by the NDP.

Counselling and assistance for farmers is another program which this government is strongly committed to. Our PC government has provided nearly \$122 million in government guarantees on operating consolidation loans. That money represents a commitment to over 3,000 farmers, Mr. Speaker — over 3,000 farmers. And this program too was extended by our government to December 31, 1988 again with provision for further extension to December 31, 1989 if required. This program alone has saved farmers approximately \$22 million in 1987. Through the refund . . . (inaudible) . . . I'll correct it for you.

Mr. Speaker, another program is the livestock facilities and investment program, Mr. Speaker, the provincial tax credit of 15 per cent for renovations or construction of livestock facilities. That has since 1986, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say, provided tax credits of \$2.7 million to 1,186 producers. To break that down, Mr. Speaker, an average of \$2,240 per producer — \$2,240 per producer never even contemplated by previous NDP administrations, never even suggested by the previous NDP administrations. An idea whose time had come, but a party across the floor whose time has long since been over.

(2030)

For the benefit of the members across the way, I feel more examples are necessary to show them the full meaning of commitment to the agricultural sector of this province of Saskatchewan.

The livestock cash advance program — another commitment, Mr. Speaker. Twenty-three thousand, six hundred farmers have received \$223 million in interest-free money through the PC government since the program was introduced of July 1985.

The feeder association loan guarantee program — another commitment, Mr. Speaker. This allows feeder associations to borrow funds on the strength of

government guarantees and thereby making it possible to receive a better rate from the lenders. I believe it bears stating that 43 associations have received guarantees of \$22.5 million since 1984. And that, Mr. Speaker, that's \$22.5 million worth of guarantees that allows these producers to work together in co-operation with feeder associations to co-operatively manage their own operations. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what I call a commitment.

I would also like to mention the save our soils programs, Mr. Speaker, a three-year, \$500,000 extension-oriented soil conservation program to promote soil and crop management practices. By the way, I apologize . . . Deputy Speaker.

Farm families in our province are becoming increasingly aware of negative cost factor involved in poor grades due to soil lacking essential nutrients. This government is committed to seeing that our farm families are fully educated on practices best suited for our province — a final illustration of our Premier's and our Progressive Conservative government's commitments, not just in today's agricultural challenges, but to those of the future.

And I would like to say with that, we have another commitment that we have promised the people and we have done this very thing, and that is update the crop insurance program. Mr. Speaker, this program has been expanded to cover a broader spectrum. The cost to top up this crop insurance program amounts to 468 million, and this program benefits more than just a few farmers here and a few farmers there, Mr. Speaker. Last year alone through Saskatchewan crop insurance programs, this government insured more than 50,000 farmers — 50,000 farmers represents a good number of our farm families across this province. So it is clear for all you to see, Mr. Speaker, that this government recognizes the vital importance of agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gleim: — We recognize the thousands and the thousands of families that rely on the survival of agriculture for their livelihood. And we are committed to seeing these families through the way of challenges of today so that they too can look forward and ahead to their active participation in Saskatchewan's vibrant future.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my full support for this government's continued commitment to agriculture in Saskatchewan as stated in His Honour's Speech from the Throne. And I state my full support form the motion being debated today, the motion as read by the member from Rosthern, Mr. Speaker, and seconded by the member from Moosomin.

With that I would like to thank you for having the opportunity to speak this afternoon in support of the throne speech and the motion. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives

me great pleasure to rise in opposition to the Speech from the Throne. But before I get into the substantive portion of my remarks in dealing with the speech, I'd like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations to the office of the Speaker and to the office of Hansard. For those of you who are watching on television tonight in this province, I hope that people will realize that today is an historic day for the rights of minorities, particularly the rights of the francophone linguistic minority in this province.

I have here in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a copy of a bill entitled: Bill No. 1 of 1988, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Corporation for Saskatchewan Act, Second Session, 21st Legislature in Saskatchewan on one side, and on the other side, for the very first time in the history of this province, we see: Projets de Loi, numéral un, de loi modifiant la Loi intitulé The Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan Act.

We have, today, begun a process in which the francophone minority of this province has now access to the laws of the province of Saskatchewan. And to your office, sir, and to the courage of your office in following the law, the precedent set down in the recent Mercure case, I want to put forward my congratulations.

Having said that, there is not much else I can congratulate the government of this province for. When it comes to the throne speech we have seen, as the Leader of the Opposition has so correctly pointed out in this speech in reply, we have seen a vast wasteland of ideas, a document whose paucity of vitality is so evident that to use the expression "a government run out of steam" is an understatement, to say the very least.

This is a government who have not only run out of steam but whose engine, in fact, is rusted, broken, and worn out. It is a government who operates on one principle — one principle only — the principle of rhetoric, the principle in which form is used to replace substance, at least on the level of rhetoric, and which waste, mismanagement, and inefficiency provides the substance to its every action.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province — who takes delight, takes some political delight I might say, in attempting to pit one Saskatchewan group against another Saskatchewan group, or a Saskatchewan majority against a Saskatchewan minority — as my colleague and friend, the member for Saskatoon University has just pointed out, took what I thought was probably one of the most despicable acts of any premier of this province, when he took nothing more than a blatant political slice, slap, and attack at a minority, the homosexual minority in this province, and attempted to use that for his own political advantage.

You know, politics can get pretty low and pretty dirty sometimes. Politics can get pretty low and pretty dirty sometimes, but I want to say this to you, Mr. Speaker, that not since I have been elected and not since I have watched the political scene in Saskatchewan have I seen someone who is supposed to represent the interests of all Saskatchewan turn on one of its minorities and compare them to criminals, compare them to bank robbers. I think that the statements of the Premier in this regard are despicable. They are cheap politics — nothing more,

nothing less. And it does nothing more or nothing less than cheapen the office of the Premier of this province and it does nothing more or nothing less than cheapen the character of the holder of that office.

And I think, Mr. Speaker . . . I think that the Premier of the province owes an apology not only to the homosexual minority in this province but to all other minorities who may be next the victim of his attack. To compare them to bank robbers is ludicrous. To compare any minority to bank robbers is ludicrous.

The fact . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, we have, chirping like the bird on the wire, the member from Wilkie. Perhaps the member from Wilkie would like to stand up and enter into this debate. Perhaps he'd like to declare where he stands on the question of bigotry. Perhaps the member would like to declare where he stands on the question of intolerance. Perhaps he'd like to stand, enter the debate, and talk about whether or not minorities in this province have rights. Perhaps the member will have that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, perhaps that member will in fact show his true colours along with the colour of his red neck.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province compared a minority with bank robbers. Well I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are bank robbers in this province and they're sitting on the other side of the House. There are crooks and criminals in this province who are robbing the purses and robbing the future of the people of this province . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I find that language that the member from Regina Rosemont is using unparliamentary, and I would ask him to apologize to the House .

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the remarks that I made. I will withdraw the crooks and criminals remarks that I made, but I think, sir, but I think, if I may say . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I have asked the member from Regina Rosemont to apologize to the House.

Mr. Lyons: — Okay, I will offer my apologies on that, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The word . . . word, if I may, "rob," which is probably rather harsh but I think falls within the parliamentary tradition, I will use, seeing that a precedent has been set by the Premier of this province in accusing people of being robbers.

I will say that the people of this province are being robbed by that government. They are being pickpocketed by that government through its taxes, a tax structure which has taken hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of dollars more each and every year of the last six years that it has been in that office, from the pockets of Saskatchewan people; that it's taken tens and hundreds of millions of dollars out of the economy of Saskatchewan, out of the productive apparatus of this province, away from good productive use, and into the hands of its political friends through patronage, patronage appointments, plain old fashioned greed, and plain old fashioned pay-offs.

We only have to look in downtown Regina at the new Ramada Renaissance Hotel, built with the government's money, built with the taxpayers' money, built with the money of the people of this province, and which the government then turns around, rents out eight empty floors at \$125,000 a month for empty space in that hotel, in order to do one thing and one thing alone, and that's to pay off its political friends, the owner of the Ramada Renaissance — the owner of the Ramada Renaissance who happened, during the last election, to put up every Tory organizer in this province in his other little hotel establishments, the Imperial 400s around this province. That kind of waste, that kind of mismanagement, and that kind of straight inefficiency is nothing more than an example of political bagmanship which this government is well noted for.

(2045)

We can look at the case, if we want to use the legal terms, of another robbery of the people of the province and that's that case of Mr. George Hill, the president of Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. George Hill who is taking, it is reported, \$210,000 in salary each and every year from the treasury of this province. Mr. George Hill, who in order to cover up a 5 per cent increase — and a 5 per cent increase on \$210,000 is over \$10,000 a year in terms of a salary increase — and in order to cover up that increase put forward a \$1,000 buy-off bonus to the workers of SaskPower. And goodness knows the workers at SaskPower need it, as does every other worker in this province, but the political and economic justification for that act boils down to nothing more than an attempt by Mr. Hill and his gang of Tories at SPC to enrich themselves at the expense of the people of this province.

But that, Mr. Speaker, pales, that pales when compared to what is the largest, the biggest, the greatest, the most magnificent political patronage and boondoggle that has ever been seen in this province, the shafferty project — the shafferty project — Shand, Rafferty and Alameda.

Our leader, the member from Riversdale, has aptly termed it the shafferty project because each and every person in Saskatchewan is getting the shaft with that project. they're getting it on the economic level. This project costs \$1.2 billion — \$1.2 billion.

And let's talk about what we get for that. That \$1.2 billion is \$1,200 for very man, woman, and child in Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, who's going to pay for it? Is it going to be the George Hills? Is it going to be the Weyerhaeuser? Is it going to be the multinationals? Is it going to be whichever large company rips off Saskatchewan Minerals, takes it away from the people of this province? No. It's going to the average citizen of this province who will see their taxes increase to pay for the shafferty. They're getting the shaft; there's no doubt about it.

Who's going to pay for it, Mr. Speaker? They're going to pay for it when we see the power rates in this province double by 1993, double again by 1998. Those, Mr. Speaker, those are the figures given to me by people at SaskPower themselves. The people of this province are going to be hit with massive power rates the likes of which

they've never seen.

We have seen this government already, in order to pay off its mismanagement at SaskPower, in three years raise its rates by over 21 per cent. Well, I want to say this to the people of Saskatchewan. If you think that was bad, you ain't seen nothing yet. Wait till they make and force each and every person in this province to dig deep to pay off the shafferty. Let me tell you, folks, they're going to get the shaft — \$1,200 for each man, woman, and child in this province. For what? For what? For a power plant that we do not need, that every independent engineer in this province says is not required for Saskatchewan.

It is not needed for two reasons: one is because it is the peak-load. The peaking load of power can be purchased at 25 per cent of the cost from the North-East Basin Power Co-operative. Twelve cents from shafferty, 3 cents from north-east basin — one quarter of the cost. And when it's peak time coming, we're going to be paying base-load power when we need it for peak-load times — four times as much for power, each and every kilowatt, from shafferty as opposed to what we could purchase from a western power grid like North-East Basin. For what? For a power plant that we don't need.

In 1979, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Power put out a document from the conservation branch which Mr. Hill and the rest of his cronies destroyed after they had the coup at SaskPower — took it away, threw the engineers out, disbanded the branch. And why? Because the branch in 1979 put forward a program which would save Saskatchewan people 289 megawatts of power. Now for those who are not electrical engineers, and I'm not an electrical engineer, that's basically one power plant, one power plant that we could save, which adds up to a total saving of close to — if you have a 300-megawatt power plant — 589 megawatts.

And the electrical engineers tell me that the cost of production of power is about \$3,000 a kilowatt, or roughly \$1 billion for every 300 megawatts — \$1 billion which is, by the way, when we're talking Shand and Rafferty . . . Excuse me, \$1 billion for every 600 megawatts, which is the cost of shafferty, the cost of shafferty, \$1 billion. Not only would you save the billion dollars, we would reduce the consumption of electricity by that much, which would save consumers in total electrical costs literally hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

There is no economic sense to shafferty. There is absolutely no sense to shafferty on an economic basis.

Secondly, there is no sense to shafferty when we come to deal with the environment. You know, Nikita Khrushchev and John Kennedy had a discussion in 1960 in New York about who was the better politician, and Kennedy was talking about how they were much more representative. And Nikita Khrushchev's reply was:

You know, Mr. Kennedy, politicians are the same the world over. They promise to build you a bridge even when there's no river.

Well that, Mr. Speaker, is what the Conservative

government is doing, promising the people of Estevan, Alameda, Oxbow, and Weyburn to build them a dam for no river. Here we are in the midst of a drought — the third lowest year in history for precipitation, less than one inch in the Regina area, no water, no run-off, no flood problems, as it has been year after year after year after year. And yet the government is proposing to spend \$145 million of our tax money to build a dam where there is no river and there is no water.

This is not to count the environmental damage. This is the other environmental damage: the loss of productive agricultural land; the loss of the wildlife; the loss of the natural habitat; and finally the loss of what could be — if it was looked upon as a natural resource that could be used in a sustainable manner as a natural tourist attraction, as an area where we could show how agricultural development and wildlife habitat and wetlands development all fit in together — where we could use that as a tourist area where riding stables could be put up, where the ranchers would have some income. What do we have? Another government megaproject that makes no environmental sense whatsoever.

You know, the hydrologists tell me that using the government's own figures of rainfall in the century and water flows in the rivers, that if they built the Rafferty dam in 1912, that it would fill, and it would fill in 1940 — 28 years after it was built — but it would be empty again by 1944 and it would not fill again until 1974, the year of the last big flood, would be empty by 1978, and would remain empty to this very day. But still this government wants to build the dam where there is no river.

Some kinds of politicians are all alike. We know what kind of politicians are all alike when it comes to robbing the pockets of the people of this province. They are called bank robbers. They are called PCs.

And the last objection that I want to put forward, Mr. Speaker, on shafferty is a political objection . . . is a political objection. We have a situation in this province where the Government of Saskatchewan has gone down, or so it tells us — and I'll get to that in a minute — so it tells us, has gone down to the state of North Dakota and negotiated a water apportionment agreement with North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if such is the case it will be the first time in the history of this country that a province has taken upon it itself to sign an international agreement with a foreign power. What that does . . . And I have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, is where does that leave the rest of the people of Canada, the people of Manitoba for example, when it comes to talking about the sharing of water?

The Tory Minister of the Environment, Mr. McMillan, in Ottawa, says that there is a national water policy; that we cannot export water to the United States. But that is precisely what this government has done. It has said it signed an agreement that will allow the United States and the United States army Corps of Engineers to control the Souris waters, the Souris River's waters and the head-waters of the Souris River basin, to allow it to control it, to allow the Americans to control Saskatchewan water for the sum of \$41.1 million which hasn't come to Saskatchewan; not one penny of that money has come to Saskatchewan. But you know, Mr.

Speaker, the government opposite told us they signed that agreement. Yet, when I phoned North Dakota, when I asked Environment Canada, and when I finally asked the minister responsible, he had to admit that no agreement is in place; there is not one legal document which commits North Dakota or the U.S. Congress to that \$41.1 million. They're gone ahead to build these dams without one piece of paper with anybody's signature on it, guaranteeing not one red American cent — not one.

That's the kind of waste and economic mismanagement that we've come to expect from this government, and that's also the kind of bank robbery that the people of this province have come to expect as this government dips into their pockets deeper and deeper for tax dollars for projects which make absolutely no economic, make no environmental, and absolutely make no political sense — and, in fact, are dangerous, are dangerous in terms of the precedents they set for the politics of this country.

I don't think Canadians, and I don't think Saskatchewan people want to go holus-bolus in any agreement with the United States to shift water south of the border. And what we have here, what we have here is the first step in which this government, for \$41 million, have said to the Americans, okay, okay, for a promise of \$41 million, okay, you can control our water in perpetuity. And I oppose that. This is a bad deal for . . . Outside any other reasons, this is a bad deal for Canada and a bad deal for Saskatchewan because it sets a dangerous precedent. For where is Saskatchewan water?

I have a question that has yet to have been answered, and I have asked questions in this House on this project for the past 18 months. For the past 18 months, we've asked the question, what happens if there is no water? Where are they going to get the water from? And you know what I'm finding out, Mr. Speaker? You know what people are telling me around? Is that people, the people are saying that they are going to have to fill the Rafferty and the Alameda dams by draining the Qu'Appelle lake chain, and lowering the water levels in the Qu'Appelle lakes. And I'm quite sure that the cottage owners along the Qu'Appelle lakes, and particularly in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, are going to love it when the Saskatchewan Water Corporation starts digging the ditches to drain their water out of their lakes, you know. And they have not denied it; despite we asked that, they have not denied it.

(2100)

Now, Mr. Speaker, the final item I'd like to speak tonight concerns an item which is outside the partisan political level, and that is a question that was not addressed and a problem which was not addressed in the Speech from the Throne, and that concerns the drought which we in this province presently find ourselves in. It is a problem which is not a political problem in the narrow political sense. It's a problem which confronts each and every Saskatchewan citizen who is suffering from that drought: every farmer from Southey southward who's having to haul water for their cattle; every farmer who is looking at their soil and saying, we don't have the moisture for a crop; every farmer and every municipality in the southern part of

Saskatchewan which is saying, what are we going to do if we don't get the rains this spring. And it's a problem that this government has not addressed.

Now I'm not expecting the Premier of this province to make it rain. He's rained on enough people's parade. He has rained on us, he has rained on us from 1982. But I'm not expecting him to bring down the kind of rain that we all need. He has not . . . But he has not addressed the problem. Is there going to be some type of well-digging program? Is there going to be some kind of wetlands development program in a major scale? Is there going to be some kind of water catchment program to the creation of shelter belts? Is there going to be some kind of program put in place?

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier says, we're going to hold the water through Rafferty. That is precisely . . . According to the hydrological engineers and to every independent expert who has studied this program, what have they said, Mr. Deputy Premier? They said, in times, in the shallow valleys, in the Prairies, you don't build dams and reservoirs to hold water. In the case of shafferty, normal rainfall . . . Seventy-five per cent, 75 gallons for every 100 gallons that flow in will be lost through evaporation. The way that you store water . . . The way that you store water is, you create and you enlarge the wetlands district that holds water the natural way, nature's way, in order so the water can be held and dribble down and go down into the water table of the province. And that is precisely the kind of backward 1930s thinking . . . 1930s thinking that characterize this government.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they have not had . . . They have not had and not said one word about what they're going to do with the drought. They have not said one word about what kind of assistance they're going to provide for farmers, either in terms of well drilling, or in the providing of hay, or anything else. They have not said one thing because they're not aware of it; they don't care about it; and they're stuck in their 1930s thinking mentality, trying to pull blindly ahead with a project like shafferty which makes no economic, political, or environment sense.

But I ask all members, I ask all members on this side and the other side, that they'd better wrap their minds around what this serious problem is going to entail for this province. Because in May, Environment Canada is coming out with a report that says in 20 years southern Saskatchewan will be a desert, because in the last 10 years 30 per cent of the wetlands have been drained off — have been drained away out of this province — and there are no natural catchment areas left; that the habitat . . . The woods have been cut down because agricultural programs based on acreage have demanded that farmers, have pushed farmers into trying to get every acre under cultivation that they possibly can. And the result of that's been . . . The result of that, Mr. Speaker, is an ecological disaster which we are not going to face, that we're already in. That the drought, the lack of rainfall, is being compounded by the government's lack of action on things like wetlands development, on things like shelter belts. And they tell me that the government is even going to do away with its tree nursery program — this despite the fact that tree nursery development was one of the

things which helped stop the prairie soil from blowing away during the 1930s.

I haven't got much more to say on that, Mr. Speaker. I think the record of this government is clear. The paucity of its ideas is there for everybody to see. The vast wasteland of nothing but political rhetoric which one finds in the throne speech speaks volumes as to why this is a tired and worn out government, interested only in enriching itself, interested only in enriching its friends, and interested only in acting as the bank robbers of the people of this province, dipping into their pockets . . .

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order! I find that language unparliamentary. Order! I would ask that member to retract that statement and apologize to the House.

Mr. Lyons: — Bank robbers they are.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I name you, Bob Lyons.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I want to raise a point of order with you. It has to do with the enforcement of the rules of this House. It is a long-standing rule of this House, and there is plenty of parliamentary precedent to back it up, that when a member is asked to withdraw some comment that the Speaker or Deputy Speaker finds unparliamentary, the member is given ample opportunity to withdraw the alleged unparliamentary remark . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the member for Souris-Cannington would like to speak on the same point of order that I'm speaking on and direct himself to the point of order, which I'm doing.

The member, by parliamentary tradition, is given ample opportunity to withdraw the remarks, and I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an examination of the record of the House at this point will show that you gave the member one opportunity to withdraw the remark, and then you named the member. And I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I would like you to examine the record of the House and find out if that is in fact true, and bring back a judgement at a later point on this particular point of order. And I stress to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this is a most important point of order, and it is not something that can be dismissed lightly. That is my point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't quarrel with much of what the member has raised in his point of order. The only thing that I would like to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that when the member was given his opportunity to withdraw and apologize, he instead chose to walk out of the Chamber. He instead chose, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to walk out of the Chamber after having been given the opportunity to withdraw and apologize, and Mr. Speaker, I think that, quite frankly, is contemptible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I find the point of order not well taken. The member repeated the remark, defied the Chair, and removed himself from the Chamber, and I named him, Bob Lyons.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a further point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The member from Saskatoon Westmount.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I asked you if you would examine the record carefully. I think there should be a Speaker's statement on this that is dispassionate and removed from the emotion of the moment. I asked you if you would examine the record of the House to establish clearly in your mind and subsequently in the ruling that what I suggested to you had happened did actually happen. And I want to know whether it's your intention to examine the record and do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — The point of order is not well taken. I have made my ruling and that will stand. I named him, Bob Lyons.

Order. The member has been named. According to rule 24(3) of the handbook:

If a member has been named under Rule 24(2), the Member shall be suspended from the service of the Assembly for the remainder of the sitting day. A motion without notice may be moved to increase the length of the suspension of (the) named Member and the motion shall be decided without amendment or debate.

So I'd ask the member to remove himself from the Chamber.

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to enter into this debate this evening, and I find it, I guess, somewhat interesting, to say the least, to see that it has been very spirited to this point in time, anyway.

I would like to personally commend the Lieutenant Governor on his fine performance on behalf of the Queen, and I'd also to commend the member who opened this debate, my colleague from Rosthern, for bringing forward so many important points and underlying principles.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the one thing that I think bears emphasizing, and some members have alluded to this already, one thing that is essential in the conduct of public business is the exercise of fairness and balance in debating fundamental issues.

There are a whole lot of things that we can fight about in this Chamber, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I know that we'll be haggling over free trade, and welfare payments, and this or that interest group, and a great many other things. But one thing that we should not be fighting about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one thing that should go beyond partisan politics is the health care of our citizens. We all — and I mean we all in Saskatchewan, not just in this Assembly — we all must work together, searching for the best solution, the most effective methods, and the highest quality answers to the major challenges we face in health care. And every citizen of this province has a right to be heard, and I suggest we all have an obligation

to have our ideas heard, not in a fighting, combative, insulting, or frightening way, but in a reasoned effort to find answers.

And I know as you do, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has made a contribution to discussing what the challenges are and what some of the responses to those challenges might be. His participation on a major task force for the Canadian Hospital Association should, Mr. Speaker, make him well prepared to participate in the discussions without resorting to trying to divide the province as he seems intent upon doing from his remarks so far.

Mr. Speaker, trying to frighten people, I don't think is a contribution; denying his own former work on the subject is not a contribution; and becoming almost hysterical, I don't think is a contribution. So I would ask him to show the leadership that should be expected of a man who so desperately wants to rule this province.

Mr. Speaker, I give him those thoughts because I think that when someone comes from a task force exercise the way that he did and tells us that we should not build more hospitals or other health care facilities, that that person clearly must think that there are serious challenges in the system, and clearly he has given some thought to those challenges.

(2115)

Is it too much to ask, Mr. Speaker, for this man, the member from Riversdale, to give the people the benefit of those thoughts when he wants them to elect him premier of this province. Can we not expect that he would be honest with the people? And, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, do the media not have as much obligation to seek his solutions and present his state of policies as they do to seek and present ours?

As for the solution of not building health care facilities, I am pleased that this government has not followed that advice. I am pleased because in the constituency of Pelly we have a new extension to the nursing home facility in Norquay. The total provincial commitment to that facility is in the order of \$700,000, Mr. Speaker — \$700,000 that was refused under the NDP because they imposed a moratorium on nursing homes. Seven hundred thousand dollars, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has advised shouldn't be spent.

And while I'm mentioning my constituency, Mr. Speaker, let me just say how grateful I am that the government has seen the need for seniors' housing in my constituency of Pelly as they have throughout the entire province.

In our constituency, the communities of Pelly, Calder, Rhein, and Togo are all seeing the benefit of having a government that is committed to ensuring the independence and quality of life of our senior citizens. Among those four communities alone, Mr. Speaker, this Progressive Conservative government is committing well over \$1 million to provide seniors apartments, that our parents and our grandparents may continue to spend their retirement years in their own communities. And yet another senior's project is, at this very moment, under

construction in the village of Stenen.

I'm also pleased to see the continuing commitment to Duck Mountain Provincial Park, a facility that is very important to me and to the rest of the people in our constituency and indeed the people of the province of Saskatchewan and right across western Canada and the northern United States. And this year our Progressive Conservative government will be providing extensive improvements to that park, and for that we are all extremely grateful.

It is continuing to provide the necessary funds to maintain our highways, our smaller airports, and the other basic infrastructure of our communities. Just a few months ago, runway lights were added to the Kamsack airport with the help of a \$25,000 provincial grant from this government; the government's general commitment to agriculture, its efforts at developing the social fabric of the province, including the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, which a large number of my constituents have taken advantage of and in its approach to trade and economic development — these things, Mr. Speaker, are all welcomed and encouraged by all of my constituents.

And now, Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the government caucus committee on public participation, I would like to focus on that subject for just a few moments. In this debate it was said public participation is about offering the greatest horizons of opportunity possible to our citizens. And that phrase stuck with me, Mr. Speaker. It's very appropriate and in tune with what this government is doing. The member for Regina North East and the member for Saskatoon Nutana, and indeed the member for Riversdale, have all stated that they and their party are not really opposed to privatization, and the phrase that is supposed to characterize the NDP position is that privatization is okay when, and I quote, "the economic and social reasons for holding those shares is no longer there."

This is very interesting to me as being the chairman of this committee, Mr. Speaker, because the NDP is opposing any and all actual proposals for public participation including any that include privatization. They say that they want to deal with each proposal on a case-by-case basis, and that is of course exactly what we are doing.

So let me ask the member from Riversdale: what are the social and economic reasons for the government to continue ownership of PAPCO? What was the social or economic benefit continuing to lose over \$90,000 a day for Saskatchewan taxpayers? There was none. On the contrary, there has proven to be great economic value in that example of privatization, as the losses have been eliminated, new taxes and revenues have come to the government, the economic base has been diversified, new economic markets have been opened up, and the spin-offs to the surrounding communities have helped the local and the provincial economies.

And I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the new jobs and the securing of existing jobs should represent a significant social reason for the privatization of PAPCO, even to the NDP. I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition: what are the social and economic reasons for continuing

ownership of the uranium mines? The economic benefits of the move to the private sector are again, I think, very clear, so the only reason that there can be for the NDP to so strongly oppose this one is the social reason, which they are opposed to uranium mining and committed to closing the mines. Their argument is, the government should keep the mines so that the government can close the mines. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it totally absurd, and again I guess one would have to have their mental faculties questioned, I think Mr. Speaker. I mean, after all, if all they want to do is close them, why did they borrow all the money to buy them in the first place.

The Leader of the Opposition should tell us, Mr. Speaker, what are the social and economic reasons for the government to continue to own the computer utility? With the restricted mandate of serving government and government-related institutions, is there not a powerful economic motivation to expand that enterprise's market, to expand its competitive base, to allow it to market its services around the world? The employees happen to think so, Mr. Speaker, and so do we.

What, Mr. Speaker, could the Leader of the Opposition have in his mind when deciding what the economic and social reasons are for continuing to own the pension services of the employees of the government. Surely there's a strong social argument that says that the people who depend upon those pension funds for the retirement income, that it is only right and appropriate that these people have the authority to manage those funds, to make the decisions that they will find in their best interest and have it removed from the political arena.

Mr. Speaker, on a case-by-case basis, the NDP have no case. They have no case on any example of public participation that has occurred or that has been even proposed. Will the Leader of the Opposition please address his own policy? Will he answer the questions that have been asked about the social and economic reasons for these public participation initiatives?

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think he will answer these questions. He has not been prepared to answer the questions that have been asked of him on the issues of health care, on the issues of agriculture, on the issues of rural development, or on any other issue for that matter, because he has no answers, Mr. Speaker. He and the rest of his people have only condemnation, criticism, complaint, and hysteria.

But I can tell them that the people of Saskatchewan expect something more of a potential leader than that, Mr. Speaker. They want honest effort and straight talk about honest options, so let the member for Riversdale continue in his ways. I encourage him to do so, and I consider it a great favour that he has chosen this course of action and this style of non-leadership. So I want to thank him again, Mr. Speaker, and of course I will be supporting the motion that my colleague from Rosthern has put forth. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure and an honour for me to be addressing this throne speech

debate tonight. There's a number of topics that I want to cover. One of them, not surprisingly, is agriculture; not one of them, surprisingly, is jobs and the lack of job creation. Another topic I want to touch upon is privatization or, as the government prefers to call it, public participation. And I want to talk a little bit tonight about the deficit. I think I have some things that can help set the record a little straighter for some of the members opposite. And of course I would not miss an opportunity to talk a little bit about our highway system.

I want to start off with agriculture, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting to note that the farm debt in Saskatchewan took a hundred years to reach \$3 billion, and it took less than six years of Conservative government and their acknowledged lack of effort in agriculture to see that debt grow from \$3 billion till today it's in excess of \$7 billion — small wonder farmers are out there and hurting, shaking their heads, wondering just what is it that this government says. They say, we're behind you. Well indeed, they're so far behind you . . . You're so far behind the farmers they can't find you.

What's their answer, Mr. Speaker? One of the answers that they have been touting is equity finance. Equity finance. That flies just about as high as a lead balloon, and the members opposite know it. I had the happy occasion to be at one of the equity finance meetings, one of the public meetings. I was amazed at how many times, when the government got into trouble, they would say, oh well, I'm sure that Mr. Trew and his colleagues in the opposition will have much to say about that in the legislature. And you know, they were exactly right on; we will have much to say about it, lots more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Equity finance, Mr. Speaker, is simply a process to make farmers share-croppers. It is simply a method of making farmers no longer owners of their land. There will be absentee landowners. It gives up the control of the land and what the farmer can grow.

Government members opposite will say, oh no, that's not the intention at all. But you tell me why a bank, why a large corporation, or why a wealthy investor would invest in some farm land. Two reasons: profit — they're going to make a dollar and it's going to go in their pocket, so profit; and control of the land. When they have driven that farmer into destitution, when he simply can't make the payments to this new landowner, this new shareholder in that farmer's farm, when the farmer can't meet the payments, who's lined up to buy the farm? The person whose name is on the other side of the equity finance piece of paper, that's who. And that's who's going to have the land, and farmers know it.

I've obviously struck a nerve. I'm getting a fair reaction from the members opposite. I thank them for that. Obviously I've struck a nerve. Obviously you even recognize what equity finance is all about. I'm happy to report to you, farmers are recognizing it too. And if you've been doing any polling, which I suspect you have, you know very well what I'm saying is dead on.

I want to talk a bit about the farm production loan

program Mr. Speaker. We have a situation where before the election the government says 6 per cent money, \$25 per acre, your word is your bond, we trust you. Fair enough, fair enough, but tell my why now, why the turn-around? Why is it that before an election everybody's word was as good as gold. As soon as the election is safely out of the way, you make farmers sign a security agreement that entitles the Government of Saskatchewan to take everything, in case of default of payment, can take everything including the farmers' dirty socks — personal possession, vehicles, microwaves, ovens, fridges, stoves, literally everything, household furniture. Leave farm families with absolutely nothing in case of default.

(2130)

And the government says to farmers and says to us, oh but we would never, never use that provision of the agreement. Why, Mr. Speaker, why then have that security agreement written the way it is? Why that? If they have no intention of using it, don't ask farmers to sign it.

It's interesting. I held a meeting out in Grenfell — the member for Indian Head would be most interested in that, I suspect — held a meeting in Grenfell on that very topic. And there were a lot of farm people there that are very, very angry, and rightly so, as they should be. So there's some problems there. We will be dealing with that as legislation comes forward. I'm not going to dwell on that any more tonight.

I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, to jobs and the lack of job creation that we have seen under this government. Saskatoon has an unemployment rate of 13 per cent — 13 per cent. I don't see very many smug faces about that. Thirteen percent means that 13 people out of every hundred that could be working, want to be working, should be working, aren't able to.

We also have, as evidenced by the throne speech, no summer employment program for students, no summer employment program whatsoever mentioned in the throne speech — none. I'm sorry to members opposite, there's one — there is going to be a handful of students employed for the gas tax rebate program this summer. A handful — a handful of students for the gas tax rebate.

The gas tax which the government promised, before they were in office, never will we ever see a gas tax imposed on Saskatchewan people while there is a Conservative government. Well what do you call yourselves now? What do you call yourselves now? Very interesting. Never a gas tax as long as there is a Conservative government. What have we got now? Seven cents a litre, that's what we've got; a higher gas tax now than we had before the members opposite formed the government.

While I'm talking about jobs and the lack of job creation, I do want to not just be so negative. There was a job creation program in Regina, and it was the oil upgrader, created a good number of jobs, but I . . . and my thanks for that, a good number of . . . the member for Regina South, former constituents, now my constituents, are employed there. I suspect the member for Regina South even has a few constituents from that end of the city employed up

there.

But I want to point out to the government that the upgrader, the construction program is essentially done this fall. You're going to have 1,500 people out on the street looking for work. Think about it now. Think about how you're going to get some people to work, because the alternative is Regina will join Saskatoon with a 13 per cent plus unemployment rate. And that is simply unacceptable. Thirteen percent plus unemployment is a large part of why we have so many members herein the opposition now, and indeed my only sorrow is we couldn't get a handful more and then we would be the government. Then we would see some real job creation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, there's 40,000-plus unemployed people in Saskatchewan. That is a crime; that it totally unacceptable; that is something that we've got to be addressing. We're here in the legislature now; let's address the unemployment issue; let's do some things to get Saskatchewan people working again.

The government has done away virtually with any new jobs in one important engine of growth in our economy. I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't talk, at least briefly, about the co-operative sector of our economy. We have a government that mouths nice words about co-ops — they say nice things — but what's the record? They took the department of co-operation and co-operative development, moved it in with the department of tourism, small business and co-operatives with the "and co-operatives," of course, the third and distinctly minor part of that portfolio.

They transferred most of the employees into other departments. Then, within a year of doing that, they have another shuffle, another reorganization, and I defy anyone to find co-operatives or co-operative development, or even figure out who is responsible for co-operation and co-operative development in any government department. It's just not there. Members opposite have turned their backs on any help in formulating new co-operatives.

We have a desperate need right now, particularly in many of the members' seats. There's an opportunity for machinery co-ops, an opportunity to save many farmers tens of thousands of dollars per year — tens of thousands of dollars per year. You've chosen to turn your back on it and that's a shame. Many farmers are losing money on it. Some farmers may wind up ultimately losing their farms as their debt burden grows and grows and grows.

I had the happy occasion to be at the production co-operatives' annual meeting in Kindersley three weeks ago, and one of the gentlemen there was telling me he has a total investment in farm machinery — he says, nobody believes me. But he's got the books. "I know what my investment is. I know I have more than enough machinery to farm my land." But his total investment in tractors and combines and swathers and rod weeders and cultivators and everything else that he needs — his total investment is just a tad over \$27,000. Not one of them believe me, I bet. Not one of them believe me, I bet, but it's there.

That's the record that this government refuses to even look at — just put the blinders on, put the era plugs in, hunker down for three more years. Hunker down, enjoy it for the next three years because it will be your last three years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, the government talks of public participation and how that is tied to job creation. We, of course, refer to public participation as privatization. I wonder how the government opposite can respond to the former employees of Saskoil. You'll recall that Saskoil shares were sold on the open market. Within six months 25 per cent of Saskoil's employees were let go — 25 per cent, one quarter of the work-force let go, that despite the promise when the share offering was going out that there would be no loss of jobs. Well, of course, there wasn't for five months, but then the boom was lowered.

Then what did they do? Four months later, invested over \$60 million for an existing oil company. Where? In Alberta. In Alberta. Why do we have Saskoil? It should be Alberta oil. The question I could ask is: what jobs were created by that? Not a solitary one.

Then I read in the paper less than 10 days ago where Saskoil has just let go another 15 people — another 15 people from Regina let go — this despite the promises of no job loss under privatization. Wonder why the people of SGI are concerned, Mr. Speaker? Wonder about that? It's not much wonder that they're very, very concerned, and it's not much wonder that they don't trust this government in its privatization plans.

I want to go back to Saskoil just briefly because I think there's a fundamental problem with what the government has done, and it has very little to do directly with the money. It has everything to do with the mandate of Saskoil.

Saskoil is set up — or was set up originally — to do two things. One was to find new oil and new natural gas, new deposits where they were not proven before, prove those deposits, then when the oil lease goes up, the oil company with the sharpest pencil would get it. And Saskoil was free to bid on that same lease to keep the prices up. Saskoil knew how much oil and gas there was in there, so they knew what they could bid and still make a dollar. And if an oil company bid more, good, they're welcome to it, but we got the top dollar for the lease now.

The second mandate of Saskoil, Mr. Speaker, was in research and development. In Saskatchewan we have the largest heavy oil field in the world — largest in the world. Currently, with current extraction practices, we're getting somewhere between 6 and 7 per cent of the oil out of that heavy oil deposit. No small oil company will spend any meaningful amount of money on research and development on how they can increase that from 6 or 7 per cent to 8 or 9 or 10 or more per cent of that oil that we could get out. That's the mandate that Saskoil was ideally set up to do. And you think of it, Mr. Speaker; it would mean hundreds and hundreds of million of dollars every year for Saskatchewan.

What did they do? Bought an oil company that pumped oil in Alberta. It's a government, Mr. Speaker, that is totally devoid of any ideas. They've got the philosophical blinkers on, they want to go back to the 1930s. They want to, in fact, go all the way back to the 1700s and Adam Smiths. That's what this government wants to do. And the people of Saskatchewan are really seeing through it now, and your days are numbered.

Before I turn to the deficit, Mr. Speaker — I do want to talk a little bit about highways, and again I'll throw something positive out to the government. I am pleased to hear the member for Melfort talking about introducing legislation regarding all-terrain vehicles. It is legislation that, without having seen it, I'm assuming it's going to be good legislation and deal with the safety aspects — quite literally, tens of children, of Saskatchewan children, that are being killed on all-terrain vehicles every year. I am optimistic that this legislation will deal with that; my only regret is that it has taken six years for the government to wake up and realize that we have lost now close to 100 children in that time. That's unacceptable. But I welcome the legislation. We'll be looking at it very closely and indeed I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is legislation that we can support.

The member for Melfort also spoke of private road crews versus the Department of Highways road crews, and I say that's a totally phoney issue, it's just not here. The problem with the Department of Highways now is that the engineering department has been so gutted that they can't get out and supervise the construction; they can't see that what they're paying for is what they're getting; they can't go out and provide the expertise on how to stabilize soil conditions and, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Highways, at one time prior to the members opposite forming the government, had a crew that would be called literally all over the world to stabilize hard-to-stabilize soil. The expertise of the Saskatchewan Department of Highways was recognized world-wide. There isn't a continent in the world that they weren't called upon to go and do something regarding soil.

The question I have to ask regarding highways is: where is the twinning of No. 1 Highway to the Alberta border? Where's the twinning of No. 1 Highway to the Manitoba border? Where's the twinning of the Yellowhead, border-to-border, within four years, as promised in 1982? Elementary math tells you it's 1988, and that should have all been completed by 1986. It's unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, I'm reluctant to use the old 18-holes to the mile joke, so I won't. What this government is now doing, they've added an executive 9.

I want to turn to the debt of the province of Saskatchewan and the debt of Crown corporations just briefly, Mr. Speaker. Government members are very fond of saying, oh, we ran up a huge debt in Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. For the record, Mr. Speaker — and we all have this, it's in the Public Accounts — the total debt of Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan at December 31, 1981, when we were in power, was \$75 million — 475 million. The total debt at December 31 last year, \$781 million — ten times the debt, more than \$700 million of

new debt in PCS, and they say we fan up the debt in PCS. Well the people of Saskatchewan know the truth; they know that it is your mismanagement, your incompetence; you're the ones that are being hung with it. You'll see it at the next election.

(2145)

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, two more examples of Crown corporations. The government talks about us having run up a big debt. SaskPower borrows money when it builds dams, it borrows money when it has major line construction, amortizes it over 20 or 25 years so that the power rates didn't have to fluctuate up and down radically, just instead it was rather a steady increase in rates.

In 1982, December 31, SaskPower's total debt, total long-term debt, was \$1.2 billion; the end of last year, \$2.8 billion. That's \$1.6 billion more, more than double the debt, and what have we got to show for it? We've got a promise of the shafferty project; we've got the Nipawin dam, just over \$500 million — \$500 million. Where is the difference? Stand up and explain it, where is the difference? Our power rates have certainly been going up. Tell me, is the difference going to George Hill?

The total crown corporation debt, Mr. Speaker, has gone from \$2.9 billion, total of all the Crowns . . . at December 31, 1981 it was \$2.9 billion. The total debt of the Crowns has now jumped to \$7.7 billion — \$4.8 billion more. Almost triple, three times the debt in less than . . . well, in about six years.

The total indebtedness of the province, counting the Crown corporations and counting our own annual budget, total indebtedness in 1982 was \$3.2 billion; today it is \$10.5 billion — more than three times. Put another way, Mr. Speaker, the per capita debt in 1981 for all items, every man, woman, and child owed \$2,525 in 1981. This year every Saskatchewan resident, myself, my wife, and each of my three children, each of us owe \$10,506. That is disgraceful. That, the people of Saskatchewan have seen through. That, we're not going to stand for.

Mr. Speaker, because I respect the right of other members to say some things in this throne speech debate I will be ending my remarks, but you will be hearing much more on these and other issues as the session unwinds, as it progresses, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, it has been an honour for me to stand up on behalf of the residents of Regina North, my constituents. It's an honour to speak to this throne speech debate. I only wish that there was something in the debate that made more sense than this. There was one piece of paper that was left with us that really had some meaning to it in the throne speech debate, and that paper, Mr. Speaker, was the order of leaving the Chamber opening day, and it outlines that the Speaker, and the Clerks, and the Sergeant-at-Arms goes first, and went right through the list.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech was totally, totally devoid of any new ideas. it was so . . . almost silly. I felt

embarrassed to have my guests here. I feel embarrassed for anybody watching the throne speech on T.V. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the throne speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gerich: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the throne speech debate, but I have quite a few minutes in responding to this, and I would now beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:50 p.m.