

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Solomon: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you, and to my colleagues in this Assembly, some students from St. Angela Merici School in my constituency, situated in the Speaker's gallery - grade 3, 4, 5, and 6 students, about 78 in number. I would also like to introduce three teachers which are with them: Laurie Ruhr, Lil Schroeder and Reg Becker.

I look forward to meeting with the students after question period to answer any questions that they have with regard to government or with regard to perhaps lack of answers we have in question period. I look forward to getting pictures taken with them as well. I would ask all members to join me in welcoming them to this Assembly this afternoon. Thank you.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — It gives me pleasure, as well, to introduce guests I have from my constituency. Sitting in my gallery I have the honour of having with us here this afternoon the Chief of Standing Buffalo Indian Reservation, Chief Melvin Isnana; members of his band council, Stella Isnana, Harvey Yuzicappi and Lloyd Isnana. I am very pleased to have them here. I had the opportunity to meet with them at 11 o'clock and later on to have lunch together. They have had a tour of the building and now they're here to watch question period, and I'm absolutely certain they were more than impressed. I ask all hon. members to please welcome them in the normal way.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Family Relationships in Regina Elphinstone

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, and it has to do with a speech which you delivered last night at your Elphinstone PC nominating convention saying many things of interest, but one of the things of which you're quoted as saying in the Leader-Post today is as follows:

While the family structure and sense of caring remains strong in rural Saskatchewan, it seems to break down in city ridings like Regina Elphinstone, Devine said during his address.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in our judgements this is a shameful address because the reality is that the people in Regina Elphinstone, the families there, have a commitment to families just as strong as it is in rural Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — What they see is no commitment by your government to their families when you take away the prescription drug plan, the dental plan, take away their jobs, attack the unfortunate and the poor. You owe these people an apology, Mr. Premier. Will you apologize and retract those comments?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I do with the hon. members had joined us last night at the meeting and they could have heard the whole presentation. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I will be glad to, and will take the opportunity after question period to provide a little bit more detail with respect to families, and with respect to fairness, and with respect to the whole question of buying votes in Elphinstone that the NDP are caught in, and they look so sad. In fact it's an embarrassment to the entire province, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Elphinstone are coming forward and saying that to me . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I will just say to the people of Elphinstone, I know that they feel badly that a political party would be caught buying votes, and I can only apologize for all members of the legislature that a political party would get into something like that.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I do know that the concern for crime, the concern for drugs, and the concern about families and life-styles is a major concern in Elphinstone, represented by the NDP. It's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad to put our views up against their views on the family any day of the week, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Nobody on this side of the House needs a lecture from you, sir, or your government about family, given the record of your government in the last five years. Nobody does.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — We can talk about family in that sense, but my question to you, sir, is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Please allow the hon. member to ask his question.

Mr. Romanow: — My question to you, Mr. Premier, is this. In your remarks as quoted by the Leader-Post, is you've identified all of the families of Regina Elphinstone, a blanket condemnation of the people of Elphinstone as having no caring for their families. I say that is wrong. I say to the Premier: you are the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan; will you do the right thing and retract that kind of blanket condemnation and apologize to the senior citizens and the families who are struggling to make a go of it in Elphinstone?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP will not weasel out of this one. You are caught on this one, and you've been blowing through your teeth. You've been talking through your teeth on this one, and you tried to get out from under buying votes, and you've tried to get out from under your lack of stand for families, and you can misquote the newspaper or you can misquote all kinds of things, and you can try to weasel your way out from under it, but you're not going to get away with it.

The people and the province of Saskatchewan are going to know the truth about what went ... happened and on in your nomination, your views about families and the concerns that you have. And I'm going to go on, Mr. Speaker, today - I won't in question period - but I'm going to go on and talk about your views of families low income families, and what you do to them; your views about rural and urban families and how you look after them; how you foreclose on them; how you take their homes; how you take your farms. Mr. Speaker, by the end of this afternoon the whole province is going to know what the NDP really does with families.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Call for By-Elections

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. He has all of us just quaking in our shoes waiting to hear this great speech that he's going to deliver.

But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is very clear. Nine months ago today your Progressive Conservative member from Saskatoon Eastview resigned - nine months ago today. You've given this province and this legislature so many excuses, ranging from family to explaining the uranium and the potash, before calling the by-election, and still no by-election, sir.

Now that Elphinstone has been nominated, nine months in Saskatoon Eastview, what in the world is holding you up? If you think you're so right, why don't you call the by-election and call it today in both of those ridings?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, see how quickly he changes his tune. See how quickly he goes from the ethics and the moral and the family questions to the by-election questions, Mr. Speaker, as if that would justify everything.

Mr. Speaker, he will not get away with this. This will haunt him for weeks and months and years, Mr. Speaker, because you cannot, you cannot get away with buying votes of people who are poor in this province, whether they're in Elphinstone or whether you used to do it in Shaunavon or whether you used to do it Humboldt or wherever you used to do it.

People in this province know that there are principles associated with democracy, and this side of the House is going to stand up for them, Mr. Speaker. And I will make sure that he is the first to know when there's an opportunity to participate in a by-election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. I think most of us on this side are prepared to be judged on our morals and ethics, but not by the Premier. We'll be judged by the people of the province of Saskatchewan, not by the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Look, Mr. Premier, if you say - this is my question to you - if you say, as all of your members have been saying for all of these days, that the Speech from the Throne is the blueprint for families and the blueprint for economic development, if your budget of tomorrow, you have confidence in that, if you say all those things and you mean what you're saying and say what you mean, then why don't you call those by-elections today and fight them on the basis of your record and the Speech from the Throne and the budget? Why not do that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, he will be the first to dodge all around it. And when Manitoba NDP lose and I say to him, that's on the basis of free trade, he'll say it has nothing to do with free trade. He'll be all over the place. When a whole province rejects the NDP on their stand on free trade and I level that at him, do you know what he will say? It had nothing to do with it.

So I mean, you can't have it both ways, my friend. You go back to the issues, come right back to the issues again and again about families, about ethics, and about morality and about buying people's votes. And if the NDP are going to sit in this legislature and they're going to smile through their teeth and say, we can buy the votes as long as the people ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order, please. I think hon. members on both sides of the House are obviously in a good mood today. Would you please allow the questioner and the minister answering to make their remarks without constant interruption.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Premier in this area. I said to the Premier that we won't be judged by his standards of dodging based on that last answer any more than we will be by his standards of morality and ethics. And some would say, Mr. Speaker, not me, that the Premier's refusal to call a by-election for nine months might reflect that he's a spineless political playboy, but I definitely won't say that. I have more political sense than to say that, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Premier is this: if you won't take the test of the by-elections based on the Speech from the Throne or the budget speech, if you have no confidence in those, if you have no confidence in your record to defend it, if you have no confidence or respect for the people of Elphinstone - you can malign them in any way you want - if none of that will bring you to your senses, if none of that will bring some decency to your office, sir, then do you have any decency for this institution, the legislature and the voters? Nine months without a voice to

speak up for them on jobs and health and education - how about some respect and integrity for this institution? Call those by-elections; don't keep hiding behind the rhetoric; call them now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, again I remind the public, see how he's moved off the topic of buying votes; see how he's moved off the topic of families and ethics and morality, and the people in Shaunavon . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, you can always tell when the opposition is some troubled, they ask for an election. After '82 they asked for elections, and after '86 they asked for elections. Then when they finally got elections - and they can call us all the things they like, Mr. Speaker. After the elections and they lose, Mr. Speaker, then they come back and say, well we need another election just to prove our point. We will have by-elections in the province of Saskatchewan, and you can say all the things you like about them.

My point to the Leader of the Opposition is this: your record and your principles with respect to how you vote, how you encourage people to vote, the examples you set for young people - all those things are going to be evident, and the people of Saskatchewan will know them only too well, Mr. Speaker. And they will be able to judge for themselves for years and years and years to come, not just for months to come.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Racist Comments in Government Publication

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, one of the most disappointing and discouraging aspects of our society is the promotion of racism. Mr. Premier, again I am disappointed - no, I am thoroughly appalled, insulted, and disgusted with your government's actions in this regard yesterday.

I opened a widely circulated magazine and found a Saskatchewan government ad which links a famous Indian leader with American crooks and criminals like Al Capone and Butch Cassidy. Why are you, why are you allowing your government to provide such racist and offensive material?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of the question. I have not seen an ad that described Butch Cassidy or an American cowboy or a North American Indian. I will just take notice.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I will provide that information to the Premier, but this morning, Mr. Speaker, The Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations sent your government a letter which expressed a complete and utter rejection of such an outrageous linking of a famous Dakota Indian leader, Tatanka

Yotanka, with criminals. Many descendants of the Dakota nation live in Saskatchewan. They want an apology. Will the Premier apologize?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said I will take notice. There are all kinds of heroes, Mr. Speaker, that have been North American people that have been native and/or American or Canadian, and I cannot respond any more until I see the magazine.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, a final question. For the record, the Premier wants the name of the magazine. It's in the Canadian Geographic.

But the final question, Mr. Speaker. This ad was used to promote tourism in this province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, last year you slashed Indian economic development by 66 per cent, yet you increased Saskatchewan advertising dollars to promote racism. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, why will you increase expenditures on promoting racism and not increase funding to improve the economic well-being of Indian families?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — If you want to get on economic development, my friend, we'll talk about economic development in northern Saskatchewan.

This party stands for the continuation of mining in northern Saskatchewan, uranium mining, which means an awful lot of jobs, and exploration in northern Saskatchewan, which means jobs for hundreds and hundreds of people. Please let it be on the record that the NDP, which is your party - your party - is to close the mines down and not provide those jobs.

One of the major economic opportunities for northern Saskatchewan, we will maintain. In fact, we're putting together a joint venture with SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) and Eldorado Nuclear to expand and have a head office here in this country, in this province, in Saskatchewan, to provide those kinds of opportunities, and you're against it.

You should know something about northern Saskatchewan and the opportunities that are there in mining. And you want to close them down, and we want to open them.

So you want to talk about tourism and you want to talk about economic development, you want to talk about expansion - I'd be glad to review that in as much detail as you want to look at.

Sale of Saskatchewan Minerals

Ms. Atkinson: — My question is to the minister of privatization and it has to do with economic development and it deals with what you termed a good deal for Saskatchewan people, and that's the sale of Saskatchewan Minerals.

In 1982, Mr. Minister, the assets of Saskatchewan Minerals were pegged at \$23 million, not including inventory. Even your own annual report from 1986 pegs the worth of the assets as much as \$30 million, including inventory, yet you sold that corporation for less than \$16 million.

Can you explain to the people of this province how that's a good deal, and will you know table the independent appraisal?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, certainly in looking into these deals we had third-party evaluations of the properties and they were . . . the sale is in excess of those.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. I don't think it's acceptable for a member to speak constantly from his desk while the minister is trying to answer the question. I'm sure he realizes it; he's been here in this House a long time, and I'm sure he'll want to let the minister continue.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — As I said we had a third-party evaluation, and the sale price is in excess of that evaluation, which I think was a fair evaluation. As my seat mate had mentioned, you're dealing with book values entirely, and I think the people on the other side would be well-advised to do a little more homework before they try and mislead the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, on this topic I just want to draw to the attention of this House an attempt to mislead the other day, where the opposition critic - this is very important as to what the discussion is, Mr. Speaker - the opposition critic was criticizing Dickenson Mines, saying that they'd been in Saskatchewan, in the uranium business, operating mines and closing them down. It was not Dickenson Mines; that happened to be Denison Mines, and I think they should apologize to the people of Chaplin for that kind of misleading.

And today we see it again . . . (inaudible) . . . When we have an independent appraisal which the sale was in excess of that. And I will . . . (inaudible) . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — The minister knows not what he talks of. The minister knows not what he talks of. Check the record, Mr. Minister. I have a supplementary.

Mr. Minister, it looks as though you have sold a Saskatchewan asset by reducing the price of that asset by at least \$10 million, if not more. And you told the news media, Mr. Minister, that some of this money would be used to reduce your huge, massive deficit. Any one can see that this is a quick and dirty sale to get you some quick cash. With a \$3.4 billion deficit, \$16 million won't go very far. In fact that will probably pay about 18 days' interest, and Saskatchewan people will be left without an asset that has paid over \$50 million to the people of this province to pay for health and education.

Mr. Minister, isn't this like selling off the best quarter

section? And every farmer in this province knows that that's a bad business deal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me the misinformation that that critic tries to put out into the air waves of Saskatchewan - completely misinformed.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that we had, and I say again, a third-party, independent appraisal which indicated that the value we're getting in this sale, and will be tabled in this House - I gave that commitment to the Leader of the Opposition the other day - will be tabled in this House, and it will indicate that the sale was in excess of that evaluation.

The member opposite chooses to ignore - chooses to ignore - the possibility for diversification, new products. She chooses to ignore that the new deal with Sask Minerals with Kam-Kotia at Chaplin has an employee profit-sharing component to it. She chooses to ignore those. She prefers to come into this house, misquoting, naming companies that never were in Saskatchewan, and also using the wrong figures to indicate that the deal was not well put together.

I tell you, and I stand in this House and say that this deal has brought money into this province from other provinces, which indicates to me a sense of growth and development, an optimistic viewpoint by others towards this province. It's money that's brought in here which is going to allow diversification and growth. And I stand on that and I say to the member opposite: before you get up and start trying to mislead and confuse the public of Saskatchewan again, please do your homework.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — New question. My personal integrity is not on the line here. What's at stake here is your sell-out of Saskatchewan, that's what's at stake.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Now, Mr. Minister, if we weren't talking about a legacy to our children, your business sense would be laughable.

Mr. Minister, last week you went to Carrot River and Chaplin to consult with the employees about the closure of three plants . . . or the sale of three plants in this province. Yet the prospectus filed by Premier Cdn in December of last year identified the company's intention to purchase the Carrot River operation for \$3.9 million, not the 3.4 you received. Can you explain the discrepancy?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the member opposite talks about the consultation meeting that we held out in Chaplin, Saskatchewan, because I'd like to elaborate on that, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I went out to Chaplin. I went to meet with the

employees and I went to meet with the people of the town, but the party opposite chose to make it a political forum.

I went into a town meeting, Mr. Speaker. I had more press there than at a press conference. And were the people of Chaplin allowed to ask questions to me? No. The critic opposite was there giving her political philosophy, spouting off about things. Not only her; her seat mate from Moose Jaw South was there. And that wasn't enough. They brought the NDP federal candidate from Moose Jaw, turning a public meeting . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I went there to talk to the people of Chaplin, to the mayor of Chaplin, to the farmers who worked in the sodium sulphate mine, to those people. And what did these people do? They had a forum here to debate the political issues of this province. They went there and they stole the time from the people of Chaplin, and I think they should apologize.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Supplementary. Why did you wait until last week to consult with the people involved in Saskatchewan Minerals when Premier Cdn was announcing its intentions to purchase the peat moss operation as early as December of 1987. Are shareholders in Quebec entitled to more information than Saskatchewan workers and Saskatchewan taxpayers?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I went to Carrot River. I think we had a very good meeting there. We combined the two of them because the NDP weren't there to try and grandstand. I sat down there and talked to the workers and the people of the town. I think we had a very productive meeting and a good consultation.

Also when I was announcing at the press conference in here, their member, the member from Carrot River, was right there with the workers and the people of the town explaining the deal, and I believe that's the kind of consultation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a bit, because she raised the point about book value. And just to illustrate this point: I imagine the book value of the land, the land bank land, in Saskatchewan that they bought is at \$400 an acre, and we know what it would sell for today. So I think that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Supplementary. I'd just like to remind the minister that that question was asked four questions ago, Mr. Minister.

Now, Mr. Minister, I want to go back. I want to go back to Premier Cdn Enterprises Ltd. of Quebec, and I want to ask

you this, I want to ask you this: why were shareholders in Quebec, In December of 1987, aware of your sale of a Saskatchewan peat bog to a Quebec company before Saskatchewan taxpayers and Saskatchewan workers knew? How is that consultation when you have promised this province time and time again that you - you, Mr. Minister - would consult with the people of this province before any sale of the public's assets?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I don't know, again, where the critic opposite is getting her information because the sale was not completed until just about three days ago - that's when the sale was completed - so what she knows about people in Quebec six months ago I have no idea. I know, I know that the deal was completed about three days ago in Saskatchewan, and I know that I was in Carrot River consulting with the employees and the people of that town prior to the close of any deal - I know that. Now what she knows about Quebec, I have no idea.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Faculty Strike at the University of Saskatchewan

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have taken the liberty of providing the member of the Legislative Assembly for Prince Albert, the advanced education critic, a copy of my statement.

I would like to make a short statement, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the strike by faculty at the University of Saskatchewan. Let me begin by reviewing the situation to date.

The previous contract came to an end on June 30 last year. Negotiations for a new contract have been under way since that time. Last Friday the faculty association gained a strike mandate by a slim majority from its members and the strike began immediately on Monday of this week. Final exams, Mr. Speaker, will begin at the end of next week and in some cases exams are already in progress. The university administration asked for the assistance of a conciliator, and Mr. Sterling Gilmore has been appointed, and Mr. Gilmore is currently meeting with both sides and negotiations are continuing.

In the interim, the university has put in place a contingency plan to try to keep classes going and to try to maintain the schedule of exams. While this has met with partial success, Mr. Speaker, the university is unable to guarantee that all students will be able to write their exams. I want to make it clear today, Mr. Speaker, that students being unable to write their exams on time is unacceptable.

Our government's commitment to our students and to their future is absolute and unshakeable. We are talking here about the most important event in the academic lives of 18,000 young people. Beyond the anxiety and the stress that is self-evident, there are practical considerations as well. Many students stand to lose summer jobs if they're late getting away. Others graduating face the possibility of jeopardizing opportunities for new careers. And still others face

deadlines for training at other universities. Above all there's the uncertainty, the worry, and the anguish of not knowing, Mr. Speaker.

And this is a difficult time for parents, too - parents who have encouraged and supported very often through the years of these young students. These parents fear for their children's future and now they don't know if their sons and daughters will complete their courses.

I talked earlier this week with representatives of the faculty, the administration, and the students. I asked both faculty and administration to find a way either to conclude the negotiations or, failing that, to call off the strike at least until the exams are over. Today I advised both parties that whatever happens, the exams must proceed on schedule, and that means must be found in the next few days to ensure that.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by assuring faculty that I sympathize with their desire to conduct contract negotiations freely and without hindrance. The issue here is one of timing and the impact of job action on the lives of some vulnerable young people. I am hopeful that this request will lead to at least a temporary postponement of the strike, and preferably to a successful outcome of the negotiations, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would first of all like to thank the minister for providing me with the ministerial statement prior to making the address. It gave me a minute or two to collect my thoughts and I hope to be able to express them to him at this time very cogently.

Mr. Minister, you have addressed the issue, partially at least. You've addressed the issue from the point of view of students. I'm appreciative of that. I think that it's the 16 to 18,000 students at the University of Saskatchewan whose academic year is at stake here, and that certainly must be underlined.

The issue that you didn't address in your statement that I had asked earlier was the underlying cause for this particular impasse, and I submit to you that the underlying cause has been the steady and continual underfunding of the university. We know now that the staff-to-student ratio has decreased. There has been an increase of 50 per cent in students since about 1980, whereas there has not been an increase in staff, and the equality of education is very much at stake, Mr. Minister. The students are aware of that and so is the staff.

So I would ask, and I have asked you, Mr. Minister, that in addition to this, that you provide the information as soon as possible, preferably even today if possible, to the administration, so that they can go ahead and know exactly what's in the budget - I'm expecting that you have provided in the budget - so that they can go ahead with their negotiations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Program to Encourage Use of Seat Belts

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, I rise as minister responsible for the auto fund, and I'm both pleased and proud to announce in the House today a new program to help protect the lives and health of Saskatchewan motorists and passengers. Beginning on April 2, 1988, a comprehensive program to encourage drivers and passengers to use their seat belts will begin. I'm pleased to tell the members of this house that since 1986, seat belt usage has increased to 72 per cent from 60 per cent. This we all should be proud of, but we must not stop here.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, seat belts save lives. It could be the life of a child, a spouse, and a loved one. The chances of serious injury or losing a loved one in a vehicle accident can so easily be reduced by buckling up.

I see this program as a real step in the direction of protecting the future of Saskatchewan motorists. Mr. Speaker, we owe this to our children, our youth and our families.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, let me just make a very brief comment on the minister's statement. It is not of any surprise to the members on this side of the House that seat belts do indeed save lives. That is a statement that was made several years ago when it was the former government, the New Democratic Government, that introduced a legislation which has saved all these lives. And I think for the record, Mr. Speaker, and the record will show that each and every one of those members opposite, including the member who just spoke, voted against that.

Now I'm pleased, I'm pleased - yes, it's right, Mr. Minister - I'm pleased that there has been such a major conversion. It is nice to know that even those dinosaur-like people on that side of the House will from time to time admit that they have made a mistake. If only they would do the same with regard to the destruction and the havoc that they have caused on our health care programs and our education system, I think, Mr. Speaker, this province would be far better off.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Hopfner: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to review the remarks from the hon. member that has just spoken. He had pointed out that each and every one of us on this side of the House had stood and voted and spoke against seat belts in this province. I think that you will find that there were many, or most of us, 99 per cent of us, were not, on this side of this Assembly, or in opposition at that particular time, that did not vote or speak against that seat belt legislation.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order. I have listened to the member's point of order with care, and I believe that he has made his point and we'll move on to

the next order of business.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to take this opportunity to say a few words in support of the Speech from the Throne, and the mover and the seconder.

I also want to say to all Saskatchewan people who may be watching this proceeding today in the legislature, to listen very carefully to what I'm about to say with respect to democracy, with respect to families, about decency and fairness, and about the many challenges and, indeed, the alternatives that we face today in the legislature and in society.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, is about families. And many people in the province are worried about what threatens families today - what are the dangers; what do we need to do, particularly in this legislature; what are the temptations; what are the rules; what are the guile-lines that we're going to provide our children with respect to fairness, with respect to decency, with respect to principles that hold families together? That, Mr. Speaker is the essence of the Speech from the Throne.

This Speech from the Throne is about families and communities in a province built around family values, and about the respect that family members have for themselves and each other. The family is the corner-stone of this country, and sound families are the corner-stones of this government.

We had a prime minister from Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the late Hon. John George Diefenbaker. Mr. Diefenbaker understood Saskatchewan families, he understood pioneers, he understood them rural and urban, and he put forward a significant Bill of Rights in this country. And the first paragraph of his Bill of Rights, if I can paraphrase, said this: this country is founded upon the principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity of man, and the role of the family in a nation of free men and free women.

That man was from Saskatchewan. That was the prime minister of Canada, the only prime minister we have had in this country, and he talked about values. He had the courage to say that this country is founded upon the principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God and the dignity of man and the role of the family in a nation of free men and free women. And it meant rural and urban, it meant youth and senior, it meant poor and wealthy, it meant all religions, it meant all races and it meant fairness and decency and respect, and it meant ethical.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, talks about our priorities, it talks about health and education and agriculture and employment opportunities - jobs. That's what it's all about. And it also talks about building communities for strong families and protecting families, which is the essence of this legislature as far as I am concerned - rules for fairness, rules for decency, and rules to protect families, and indeed individuals.

I'm not going to reiterate everything that was in the Speech from the Throne, but I want to touch on four or five things and then I want to comment on the alternatives and some of the challenges that we face.

On those four issue, I want to say, in health care, clearly nobody can deny that we have practically doubled the funding going into health care in this province since we took office - from \$700-and-some million to over \$1.2 billion. There has never been a stronger commitment to honest, straightforward, fundamental, scientific medicare than we see today in this province of Saskatchewan.

We have taken it on, Mr. Speaker, and we are defending it and we are building on it and we are spending indeed one-third of our entire budget on health care - for seniors, for the youth, for children. And we are building hospitals, we're building nursing home capacity like it's never been built before. In new technology, we removed extra billing for seniors and for people all across this province.

We spend almost \$1,200 per man, woman, and child. We spend it. That's the largest, if not the second largest, in the entire nation and in the history of this country and indeed the history of Saskatchewan - total commitment.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say . . . just add this. And we have such a commitment to medicare and health care in this province that we have the courage to fix it where it needs to be fixed. And they'll raise the issue, well for Heaven's sake, you're charging people now differently than you did before with respect to drugs and prescription drugs, and you shouldn't have touched that.

I have yet to meet a health care professional who didn't say we shouldn't examine that. Almost a hundred million dollars a year on free prescription drugs, and the number one challenge we have in society is drug abuse and crime that goes with it, and we're going to turn out a hundred million dollars a year on free prescription drugs. Have the courage to face it and get a hold of it - that's honesty with respect to health care. And we have, and we're proud of it, and we're going to do more. And that's part and parcel of an entire task force that we're going to have on health care.

So I mention it, Mr. Speaker, health is number one, and the health care system and the hospitals and medicare, and the seniors and the youth and all the challenges they face, have never had such a financial commitment ever in the history of this country that they've got right now. And you're going to see it again when the Minister of Finance delivers his budget tomorrow.

(1445)

A massive commitment to health care and facilities and the right things in the right places, and new technology dealing with drug abuse, dealing with rehabilitation, dealing with housing, dealing with acute care, dealing with all the demands - and I mention it so that nobody can say that it's not the case.

And if you want to argue about how we deal with drug abuse, that's fair argument. But let there be no argument that we deal with it. It's extremely important we deal with it, because if you don't deal with it you could pour hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars and just patch up a problem that is deep rooted like a cancer. We've got to get at it.

Secondly with respect to education, I can only say the same. You've never seen so much money dedicated to education and the proper facilities, whether they're new technical schools like we've seen in Prince Albert, or new university facilities; whether they're geological sciences or a new agriculture college or new high schools, the combination - distance, education, and training - we are prepared to educate and we are prepared to have our children compete with the rest of the world. And they should be able to read and communicate and know mathematics at least comparable to those in North America and the major competing parts of the world.

And we're going to do that, Mr. Speaker, dedicated to doing that - spending the money, doing it right. And if we have to change the curriculum, and if we have to change what's taught at technical schools, that takes some courage, but you should do it to be relevant - to be relevant, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would just hope that the member from Moose Jaw North would just bear with me as I go through this. Thank you.

And, Mr. Speaker, the third is agriculture, and we said, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture is the backbone of the province, and we are going to put our treasury on the line, we're going to put our reputation on the line and build in agriculture. We have done that, Mr. Speaker, and we're going to continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, our commitment to agriculture is unlike any other commitment you've seen in the history of the province or in the history of the country with respect to money, with respect to facilities, with respect to new programs, with respect to the balance between livestock and grain and the new technology an biotechnology. Not only a new College of Agriculture, and not only billions of dollars that we have out from the provincial treasury to agriculture, but we have done it across the board in terms of education, technology, contributions to agriculture, contributions all across the piece, Mr. Speaker, and it's extremely important to this province and it fits with health care with education, and with the backbone for the people and the families of Saskatchewan.

The fourth one, Mr. Speaker, is the whole question of jobs and employment. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that we have if not the best record in western Canada, it is among the best record for job creation in the last six years. New jobs, economic opportunities, and we have focused heavily on those with all kinds of programs in every

community involving the public sector, involving the private sector, involving all kinds of programs, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that we can compete. And I'm going to list some of them later.

But I would go back and look at the record - and I just throw it out to the members opposite and to the public generally - if you want to look at health care and education, agriculture and jobs, those four, and compare it to anything else that has happened in the history of Saskatchewan, or anything that's going on across the country today, I would say that our commitment is number one. And you'll see the financial commitment is phenomenal, Mr. Speaker, and we dedicate ourselves and our treasury and indeed our entire political reputation on those four, on the corner-stones of the Saskatchewan families.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on a couple or three things that I believe that are worthy of noting. I say this because whenever I get into the essence of what Saskatchewan is all about, I want to have the ear of the Saskatchewan public and indeed the ear of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite will keep telling the public that there is no commitment to agriculture, there's no commitment to education, there's no commitment to health care. And if you add up all the information and all the statistics and all the financial endorsements and policy that we've put together, Mr. Speaker, it's massive. And they will go on to say that you can't believe this. And they said it in '82 and they said it in '86. And when they get into real trouble, Mr. Speaker, then they even go a little ways beyond telling the facts as they are. They'll stretch it sometimes, Mr. Speaker, but they've sometimes stretched the rules too far. We've seen it in here, and we see it in the public.

And I just want to remind the people of Saskatchewan what's important to Saskatchewan people. I started this presentation by saying, it's families and it's fairness and it's decency and it's honesty and it's principle and it's leadership for the rest of the community. And they want to see that in the way we operate. They want to see it in education, in health, in agriculture, and the kinds of things that we're doing building communities. They want to see that, Mr. Speaker.

Well it bothers us, Mr. Speaker, to hear, and in the media, that we have people who have been cabinet ministers and people who have been elected to this legislature, stand up and give an example of some of the worst kind of politics that we can see. And the children ask: is that what we should be doing? The young people ask: is that the example that we should set, that we should follow? And the senior citizens ask: is that what the NDP Party is all about? Is that it? You know what I'm referring to, Mr. Speaker.

Last week the president of the NDP Party of Saskatchewan admitted that there was vote buying, admitted that they were buying votes. And he went on to say, which is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that not only was it evident that this was happening, but he went on to say that it's okay to buy the vote as long as the people are

poor. So he acknowledged the principle, the principle for all the children and all the seniors and all the families to see, that yes, we got caught buying the votes; and yes, we've been doing it in the riding of Shaunavon for some time, but it's okay as long as the people are poor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne is about families and about decency and about fairness and about example. And the president of the NDP Party of Saskatchewan, who want to talk about helping the poor and helping families and helping natives and helping all kinds of people, says it's okay to buy their vote, which is not fair in democracy; and then he goes on to say, and not only did we get caught - not only did we get caught, Mr. Speaker - but in fact it's okay if we do this, it's okay.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order. Order, please. Order, please. I ask the hon. members to allow the Premier to continue. In the forum of this Legislative Assembly the odd interruption, when emotions run high, of course we overlook, but not the constant type of interruption which we've been getting.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the member from Quill Lake won't want to hear this, but let me just go through the argument. Let me just go through the argument.

Mr. Speaker, when the president of the NDP Party of Saskatchewan says it's okay to buy the vote as long as they're poor, what do the children ask? What do the young people ask in this province that are looking for guidance; what do they say? Is it okay to buy votes as long as we can find the poor? One young person asked, they said . . . well imagine the next campaign strategy school put on by the president of the NDP Party of Saskatchewan. They're going to hold a school for all the candidates and he's going to say, now here are the rules, kids; here are the rules we play when we get into campaigning. He says, first of all it's okay to cheat as long as they're poor. And a young person puts up his hand and says, well, Mr. President, who are the poor, which ones? He'll say, well it depends on how many you need. How many do you need?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Who are the poor, who are the poor, Mr. Speaker? People on welfare could be poor - people on welfare. Students could be classified as poor, so it's okay to buy their votes. Is that what he teaches them on campuses at the University of Regina or the university of Saskatoon or technical schools or in high schools - it's okay to buy their vote because they're poor?

Immigrants, Mr. Speaker, immigrants could be classified as poor; senior citizens could be classified as poor; high school drop-outs. What about single parents? We could go through the riding and find the single parents. Whether they're in Elphinstone or whether they're seniors or whether they're natives, Mr. Speaker, they could be classified as poor, and it's okay to buy their vote as long as they're poor.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker? Can you imagine the president of a democratic party standing up in front of

television, and I saw him do it; in the newspaper, and I'm going to quote from him, saying, it's okay, we've been doing it in Shaunavon for a long time, and it's all right to buy the votes as long as the people are poor. And that could include virtually everybody - volunteer groups, religious groups. How many do you need, Mr. Speaker?

And so now the great - once - party of soul and heart, the CCF, is now reduced to this - the New Democratic Party, no down payment; NDP, no down payment. We'll buy your votes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — And it doesn't matter what income category you're in - no down payment, we'll buy the votes, and we'll find a way to classify you as poor. It's disgusting, Mr. Speaker. It's pathetic. What an example for democracy. The whole country should be, and will be, made aware of this.

And the people of Elphinstone who elected a man - and I say this in all sincerity - of integrity for years must be . . .

An Hon. Member: — Devastated.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — . . . well, devastated, to think that this president of the NDP will stand in his place in front of television and radio and say, it's all right for us to buy the votes of the poor, only if they're poor. Well obviously you can extend it, Mr. Speaker, to almost anything - 15 per cent of the poorest ridings. I mean, it's all relative. Whatever is necessary, the ends justify the means.

And history is full of atrocities, Mr. Speaker, full of atrocities by people saying: the end justifies the means; we'll do this on behalf of the poor; we'll confiscate land on behalf of the poor; we'll take all this and do it on behalf of the poor. We'll tear down cities on behalf of the poor because it convinces them that they're self-righteous and that they can do these things. And they're sitting in the place, in 1988, and saying it's okay. And the children of this province are looking - are looking at the NDP and saying, where is the principle? Mr. Speaker, I know they don't want to hear this, but I believe they should hear it. You should listen very carefully, extremely carefully because the principle of this goes to the heart of democracy.

(1500)

Well, let me just read how bad it can be. On a CBC interview, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gruending was interviewing an Elphinstone couple, and I quote:

Was it when Mr. Lingenfelter himself came here that you decided to take out a membership? The man said, "Yes, I did."

Gruending: Was it a big sacrifice to buy a membership? Was it a difficult thing to spend your money on? The woman said, "Well we were a little short at the time, but it will help maybe get a vote for him and get him so he can help us."

Mr. Gruending: Did you actually have the money to buy the membership from Mr. Lingenfelter?

The man: Not really; we didn't have the money to buy it, but we did to help him out.

Gruending: So what did he say when you wanted to be a member but didn't have the money? What did he say about that?

The man: It's okay. I'll collect later on.

Gruending: Has he been back to collect?

The man: No he hasn't.

Asked, Mr. Lingenfelter said this: My recollection is that they purchased their memberships and they're excited about coming to the convention and getting involved in the process.

Mr. Gruending: They told me they were short of money. The lady said she was short of money, then the man said they didn't have the money, and that you purchased it and said it would be all right and they could pay for it at some time in the future.

Mr. Lingenfelter: Well that's right, and that's the discrepancy that I'm talking about, Dennis, but I think there may be circumstances here that, if we were to go back there, could get this sorted out.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lingenfelter goes on to say, and this is the president of the NDP Party of Saskatchewan, the president. This is not somebody that hasn't been involved in politics. And he goes on to say that we have been doing this as party policy in his riding of Shaunavon for some time, in his former constituency. And I quote the Leader-Post, March 23, 1988:

In his former constituency of Shaunavon, Lingenfelter said the party had a policy of paying the membership fee for those who couldn't afford it.

Mr. Speaker, here's Mr. Lingenfelter:

I would be very disappointed if we were excluding people only for the fact they didn't have enough money to buy a membership. It seems like a silly thing for a social democratic party to be concerned about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, even, even some members of the NDP found it appalling. Gloria Blanchard found it appalling. Mr. McKeown didn't believe it was honest. He said, I think it's foreign to us, and it's never been cleared up, and I would not want to use that. And I would suggest anyone using it has got motives other than joining up for the party. I mean everybody can see through it.

But the point is, he says it's okay as long as they're poor. The principle of cheating is okay as long as they're poor. And **Mr. Romanow** said, and the leader, the leader of the NDP, Mr. Speaker, went on to say, and this is classic:

My own personal belief is that the party memberships should be paid for by individuals on their own. On a party basis there may be an argument for subsidization based on need.

Well is that what you call cheating, subsidization based on need? If people have low income, Mr. Speaker, if they have low income, we can have subsidization based on need to get a hold of their votes?

Mr. Speaker, I can't recall, I can't recall at a time in Saskatchewan's history, or indeed the country's history, when people have stood up that were prominent people and said, it's okay to cheat, and justified it. Not only did they get caught, but they said it's okay.

And I said last night to the people of Elphinstone and the people of Saskatoon Eastview and to the entire province. I know that a large number of you have voted NDP in the past, but look at what your party stands for, look what the president stands for, and look at what the leader stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I take the president of the NDP Party and his principles, they're his principles, and then I go to the leader of the NDP Party, Mr. Speaker, the new leader, and I look at his principles, and I look at the poor, the poor, and I want the whole province to look at how the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the NDP treats the poor.

When they were in trouble at 20 per cent interest rates, Mr. Speaker, the NDP and the leader was government, and people were losing their homes and their farms at 20 per cent interest rates, and the poor were suffering, every family was suffering, and they didn't raise a finger to help them, not one dime, one dime, okay.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition might not want to hear this, but I'm going to go through it with them anyway. Okay, you want to hear this. When they were in trouble, the NDP didn't help and the people threw them out, okay; they said they wouldn't help. They talked about the poor all the time, but they wouldn't help, and then there's some evidence that shows up later why maybe they didn't help them, Mr. Speaker, why maybe they didn't help them.

Do you know what they did? They'd go in and they'd buy their farm land - designed by the new NDP leader - buy their farm land from the folks that were poor, right; hard up; they'd take their land and then they'd offer it to the children at twice the price. That's how they treated the poor. They bought a million acres. They went in there and they'd buy it, Mr. Speaker, and they would offer it at twice the price. So as long as they could make some money on it, if they could speculate on the backs of the poor in agriculture, it was okay; it was okay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here's the real rub, here's the real rub - and they don't want to hear this, Mr. Speaker, but I have to share this with the public. We found out, Mr. Speaker, we found out that the leader, leader of the NDP, the new leader, was responsible for, and with his partner, initiating foreclosure actions against people who were poor, against farmers and home owners who couldn't pay their bills, and they did that as long as somebody would

pay them enough to do it.

And they got a contract with the Bank of Nova Scotia and the law firm - I'll use the name of the law firm. Can't use the name of the law firm, but we all know the name of the law firm - the name of the man from Riversdale and the name of the man from Regina Westmount. And, Mr. Speaker, they would initiate foreclosure actions. I've got letters on my desk, Mr. Speaker, from farmers who said that same law firm initiated foreclosure action again. And it's all right to do it for the poor and on the poor, if you get enough money.

Mr. Speaker, can you . . . do you get the scenario? When interest rates were really high, they didn't help, but they knew that it would help them, okay? They bought land from farmers that were hurting, and they could speculate on it and then sell it to the kids and make money, and they went around talking about how they were profiting on this speculation with farm land.

And then when they're in opposition, they'll go out and they'll foreclose on the poor - home owners and farmers that the Leader of the Opposition is involved with his law firm, and he's never answered any of those questions. How many has he foreclosed on? How much money is it worth? How much money does that law firm donate to the NDP Party? How much money does that firm, Mr. Speaker, contribute to buying votes from the people as long as they're poor?

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Leader of the Opposition answer the questions that have been put to him in the public newspapers. I want to know how long has the Leader of the Opposition's firm been paying a salary to the member from Riversdale? How long? And do they still pay a salary? And how much? And just because he's not a partner, is he still associated with that firm? How long has your firm had a contract with the bank, Mr. Leader? What kind of a contract is it with the bank, Mr. Speaker? Were you part of the firm when you signed that contract? When he signed a deal with the bank to go foreclose on people and work on behalf of the bank, was the Leader of the Opposition in the law firm? Was he? Was he a partner in the law firm?

An Hon. Member: — People have a right to know this.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well they have the right to know the answers. This is man of principle. This is a man who said: vote for me, he says, and I'll protect the farmers. I want to know the answers to these questions. How much . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Speaker, I will just hope that the members opposite could sit in their place, and they'll get a chance to speak when I'm finished.

Listen, listen to the truth. Listen to the truth.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order. I am sure the hon. member knows that he must refrain from constantly interrupting him and I ask for his co-operation to do so now.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I just want the Leader of the NDP to answer these questions for the public, Mr. Speaker, because they've been caught cheating and they've had

their hands in the cookie jars too many times.

How much money does the firm, the legal firm, make from this contract with the bank, and what per cent of its income comes from that contract with the bank? What per cent of your income is derived from the contract? What's the most money per annum that the Leader of the Opposition got from the bank? How much? I want to know, Mr. Speaker, and I mean the public should know.

How many farmers and farm owners and home owners has your firm acted against - that is foreclosures actions - on behalf of the bank since the contract was given to the bank? How many people, how many home owners, how many farmers?

And I also want to know, Mr. Speaker, and I'd ask the member from Riversdale, the new leader, the man of principle, to answer this. The man from Riversdale refused, in the legislature when he was deputy premier, to help people against high interest rates. He wouldn't help the farmers; he wouldn't help home owners; he wouldn't help small business against bank interest rates. And I want to know: was his firm under contract with the bank, and was he contemplating this lucrative contract with the bank when he refused to help people against high interest rates?

Did he have another motive? What was his reason for not helping people against 20 per cent interest rates? Was he already under contract with the bank? How long had he been in contract with the bank? And was that party responsible for him saying: there's nothing you can do; it's international interest rates?

Because today we find that people are going broke and they're being foreclosed on by a large firm in Saskatoon that has two members - both NDP, both sit in the legislature - who wouldn't do anything to help the poor, Mr. Speaker. Nothing to help the poor.

In the Speech from the Throne, his response, the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Riversdale, stood and said, he said: Mr. Premier, do you know that people are suffering because of financial stress? They're suffering because of difficult times. Mr. Speaker, how much remorse, how much remorse does the member, and the member, and all those members that belong to the law firm, feel when they go out and initiate foreclosure action against home owners and farmers? How much remorse? How do they feel?

Well, Mr. Speaker, they don't want to hear the fact that the principles of the NDP Party are nothing but a vacuum. There's nothing there. They can buy the votes if the people are poor enough. They can foreclose on the poor if somebody pays them enough. They can treat the poor any way they like. They can pick the kind of poor they want to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, when I saw the member of Elphinstone, the former premier, resign, I said to myself: that man has integrity; he has contributed to this province; he has contributed to this legislature; he has contributed to this country. And now, Mr. Speaker, to sit back and watch the NDP take over that party, to watch them and their

principles, or lack of principles, Mr. Speaker, it's something to see, Mr. Speaker, and it's a disgrace to the decency and the morality of real families in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this legislature understand the role of families. This legislature understands the role of decency and treating people fairly.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition didn't admit and didn't talk about any of the things that the president does, didn't talk about any of the things that he has done. He never answers any of the questions, Mr. Speaker, he never addresses them.

(1515)

Wouldn't you think it would only be fair to public questions that have been issued that the NDP would answer them, just come out and answer, tell us the truth, fill in the blanks? They just sit there and hold their heads down. The whole province can look at them. They will not answer the questions - just answers about your leader and about your president: how long has it being going on; how much money did it cost; how much money have you made; how long have you been in contract with the bank? Just answer the questions; answer them. Well I think the public deserves to know, Mr. Speaker. And when we're talking about where this province is going to go in the future, it deserves to know.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, stood in here and said, there's three engines of growth, three engines of growth in this province. And he said, this government doesn't deal with the co-operative movement, this government doesn't deal with the public sector, and this government doesn't deal with the private sector - all three.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he didn't mention a brand-new upgrader in Regina. He failed to mention it - in co-operation with the co-ops, the largest single project in the history of Saskatchewan, and the Leader of the Opposition failed to mention it. Is that fair to the public, Mr. Speaker? And he says I am not dealing and working with the co-operative movement. How can people believe him? He doesn't tell the whole story. He's got his president doing a whole bunch of things that the people of Elphinstone and the people of this province find very, very appalling. And then when he talks about the co-op movement, he never mentions the fact that we've got the largest single project in the history of this province taking place right here with the co-operative members all across the province, and they're so proud of that project, very proud of that project with the federal government and the provincial government - and the co-op refinery is an asset right there - very proud of it, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the member, the leader, speaks up and he says, and there's nothing going on in the public sector. He fails to mention a natural gas distribution system - \$350 to \$400 million that wasn't here before. He didn't mention it, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, he fails to mention individual line service. All across this province, private telephones, he fails to mention it - public money. He says, where's government? Burying power lines, water projects, power projects, irrigation projects - government - new agricultural colleges, new technical institutes, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition doesn't mention any of those.

And he says, the three engines of growth are gone. And then he says, well the private sector, the new small-business people, nothing for them. And he links them to trade and says, nobody supports the trade. Well I'm going to spend a couple of minutes on the trade, Mr. Speaker.

Small business support trade 9:1 - 9:1. And our initiatives of small business have created more economic activity and more jobs than anybody in the history of Saskatchewan, and those are the three areas of economic growth: the co-operative movement, which is the biggest in history; the public movement, which we're doing right across the province; and the small business and private sector.

Mr. Speaker, he doesn't tell the whole story when he has the chance. He doesn't answer the questions of the public when he has a chance, and, Mr. Speaker, he even condones the president of his party. He even condones it and said, well for the party this would be okay, this would be okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they don't want to hear about it. They don't want to hear about it. It's not . . . Mr. Speaker, it's something that, in public life, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody in democracy can treat people that way just because they can call them poor. And I don't think they can tell half the story and say that there's nothing going on with co-ops when the biggest project in the history of Saskatchewan is right there. People won't buy that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when we go back and we look at families and what we've done for the poor, Mr. Speaker, it's one of the more significant things that you will find in the history of the province with respect to people on low income.

I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that our party has been working with people on low income to provide the opportunities that have been missed for an awful long time, Mr. Speaker. I want to touch on three or four of them to provide the kind of information that much of the public would like to see.

I'm going to give you an example - the Saskatchewan Pension Plan, Mr. Speaker. The poor never had an opportunity for a pension. People on small business couldn't afford one, the public couldn't afford it, seniors - particularly women - couldn't afford a pension. We put together a program, Mr. Speaker, the first in North America, to allow the public to participate in a Saskatchewan pension program.

We've got over 40,000 people participating in that, and they are the poor, Mr. Speaker, or those on low income. Significant help, significant help - 40,000 of them, and

over 80 per cent of them are women that have asked us to help them.

We have increased the supplementary payments to people on low income, Mr. Speaker. We have doubled it to \$50, and then we added a 33 per cent increase. Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with them in terms of homes, in terms of income, in terms of facilities, in terms of legislation, their retirement.

We brought in chiropody programs. We have dealt with them across the piece, Mr. Speaker, to provide the most comfort that they have seen for generations in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne focuses on families, it focuses on decency, it focuses on fairness, it focuses on the rules, and it focuses, Mr. Speaker, on the principles. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, has not take a position on a whole range of issues that face the family.

We've said, Mr. Speaker, we will defend - we will defend children, Mr. Speaker. We will defend them from abuse, we will defend them from pornography and, Mr. Speaker, we will defend children against abortion on demand. We've said that, Mr. Speaker. I have said it; this party have said it.

The NDP stand there and they say they support families and rights and fairness, and their party is for abortion on demand - clear and simple. Clear and simple. Let's make it very clear. Their party, the NDP Party, is for abortion on demand and has passed resolutions to say . . . They don't want to hear that, but I want to make it clear. There's a clear-cut distinction here, Mr. Speaker. We are not for abortion on demand, and we protect families and innocent children.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite favour abortion on demand, and if they were in power, they would legislate abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I once more ask the members to refrain from loud outbursts and intervening in the minister's message.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'll come back again. This Speech from the Throne is about families and about values - families and values and ethics and principles. Mr. Speaker, they don't want to hear about it.

I just said, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot endorse abortion on demand, and I believe the majority of Saskatchewan people will not support it either. But the NDP stands up . . . See, they don't want to listen, Mr. Speaker. They can't sit and listen to the truth, because the whole province can watch me say that the NDP supports abortion on demand - and you do, party policy. And one or two of you can stand up and say it's not the case, but I don't see a change in party policy. You don't change it. And if you had the courage, then stand up and change it. I ask you: stand up and endorse life and endorse families and endorse fairness and decency and protect those that can't protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, our family and the families that we protect in this province are very important. I don't see any change over there. They're not coming out and saying that they will support the life of the unborn, Mr. Speaker, and we do. And, Mr. Speaker, we have taken a clear position with respect to families and with respect to children and with respect to life-styles and with respect to adoption and with respect to families in general. Mr. Speaker, and the NDP is all over the map, all over the map.

Mr. Speaker, they can't change a thing. I just want - and I'll wrap it up with this, Mr. Speaker - I just want the public to know, I want the public to know that they have now come out and they've endorsed buying memberships, they've endorsed buying votes, they've come out saying that they can do all kinds of things to the poor if there's enough money in it, and certainly if there's enough power in it.

Mr. Speaker, I want the public to know, and I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition would answer the questions that the public has put to him. I'd hope he'd have the decency and the honesty and the courtesy to the public to answer those questions. And I hope he comes out and says, this is how I feel about buying votes, and this is how I think democracy should work, and this is my feeling with respect to all kinds of ethical questions and considerations, Mr. Speaker.

This Speech from the Throne talks about families, it talks about building, it talks about health care, and - major commitment - the courage to make the changes necessary. And the Leader of the Opposition said you can't have a task force over here. It's fine if he's on a task force, as long as he's getting a little bit of money to do it. Mr. Speaker, it's always a little bit of this, isn't it? Every time you look at these things, it's always a little bit of that, a little bit of this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this Speech from the Throne is about families, about health care, about education, about agriculture, about building, about technology, about vision for the future and - the most fundamental thing - protecting democracy and protecting families, Mr. Speaker. And that's why I'll be supporting this Speech from the Throne, and the mover and the seconder.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a custom in this Assembly, I wonder if the Premier, before he takes his seat, would accept a question about the very matters that he has raised?

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

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, today we witnessed a spectacle in this House the likes of which I never believed I would witness as long as I was here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I never thought that I would hear a premier of any political party bring the debate in this

Assembly to the low that it was brought here in the last hour, or some hour and one-half. Mr. Speaker, people have a right to expect more from their Premier than what we saw here today - hypocrisy, hypocrisy at its worst, and he knows it, Mr. Speaker. This is not a Premier, this is not a leader, this is the signs of a very desperate man.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The Premier spent 10 minutes - I timed him - talking about agriculture, talking about health care, and an hour talking about slurs and innuendoes and character defamation, Mr. Speaker. Never has any Premier sunk to such depths of desperation.

I want to say for the record, Mr. Speaker, that never, and the record will show, has the Leader of the Opposition acted on behalf of a bank in a foreclosure action in this province. Never. And when the Premier, who makes these accusations, is asked if he would take a question, he runs and he hides.

Mr. Speaker, we asked him the question, we asked him the question that in view of his condemnatory remarks, would he undertake to this House that if any one of his members, cabinet or private members, have acted or been associated with any action in a foreclosure on a farm home and a farm family and the farm . . .

An Hon. Member: — What did he say?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — He stayed mum. He hid. He wouldn't even respond. In the true tradition of this Premier since he became the Premier of this province, he runs and he hides. And we will ask that question again. We shall ask that question again.

(1530)

We listened here today, Mr. Speaker, to the preaching of a desperate man. And it was interesting because as I listened, I happened to catch an article here about another preacher who's been preaching. His name is Jimmy Swaggart. This man has been preaching somewhat the same kind of message as this Premier, Mr. Speaker, and his parishioners have told him that they will not allow him to preach for at least a year. I say to the Premier, he ought to at least give the people in Saskatoon Eastview and Elphinstone the opportunity to say that to him as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — That is not . . . it is not any sign of decency of commitment to democracy to keep people in a constituency, as has been the case in Eastview, waiting for nine months to elect their representative to this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I say to this Jimmy Swaggart of Saskatchewan politics that he should grow some backbone and show the decency that people of this province have learned to expect of their leadership, and call those by-elections so that the people could speak and make a judgement on his policies and the kind of statements that he has been making.

He spoke of democracy; he spoke of decency. And I ask, what is decent or what is democratic about one of his ministers saying to the people of the cities of Regina and Saskatoon and Prince Albert: I know you want the ward system, but I don't care if you want it, I'm going to take it away from you. That's not democratic.

The Premier, in those 10 minutes that he talked about policies of his government, spoke about families. Words, Mr. Speaker, cheap words. That's all. Because what is the record? Is it a commitment to families when government policies of lack of government policies are causing greater number of children and families to have to depend on the food bank to get their groceries? That's not a commitment to families. That's not moral. That's immoral.

Is it a commitment to families, Mr. Speaker, and is it moral that children in this province go to bed hungry at night? For shame. Is it a commitment to families when there are people in this province who cannot provide the essentials to their children because of either low incomes or lack of jobs? Is it a commitment to families when we have young people by the thousands, in the last three years, leaving this province, breaking up their families because they find there is no future for them here and they have to go somewhere else to find a job. Mr. Speaker, this is the reality and not the cheap words of the Premier opposite - hypocrisy.

He spoke of health care in those 10 minutes that he bothered to talk about policies of the government. But he didn't mention the 14,000 people who are in pain or in fear because their cancer surgery has been delayed. Fourteen thousand people in Regina and Saskatoon waiting to get into a hospital, but there are no beds for them. He didn't mention that. Thirty-four thousand dollars a day, the Deputy Premier will know, this government spends on empty office space in the name of privatization. If they would spend that money on hospital beds, it would provide 84 hospital beds a day for those people waiting on those waiting lists.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — But no, it's far more important, it's far more important to these decent folk over there to pay off their friends politically through this patronage system of government that they have established and created in this province of ours.

They tear the health system down, they destroy the children's dental plan so that thousands of children no longer have dental care. They destroy a prescription drug plan so that now there are many, many families and senior citizens who have to make a choice on whether they're going to go buy their groceries, or buy their prescription drug plan. Is that moral? Is that decent? Is that for the families, Mr. Deputy Speaker? No, no it's not. Now they say, well we're going to have a task force. They tear it down and they know they're in trouble and they put up a task force which has yet to be named, in order to try to provide some cover behind which the Premier can again go and hide.

They tear the health system down, they destroy the children's dental plan so that thousands of children no longer have dental care. They destroy a prescription drug plan so that now there are many, many families and senior citizens who have to make a choice on whether they're going to go buy their groceries or buy their prescription drug plan. Is that moral? Is that decent? Is that for the families, Mr. Deputy Speaker? No, no it's not. Now they say, well we're going to have task force. They tear it down and they know they're in trouble and they put up a task force, which has yet to be named, in order to try to provide some cover behind which the Premier can again go and hide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members of the government, and today in particular the Premier, have spoken a great deal about morality and about moral values, and I want to speak about that for a minute. And I say that's fine. We should all spend more time reflecting on policy issues, keeping moral values in mind. I don't argue with that. And I agree with those who say that politics in Saskatchewan is a very . . . in a very large extent about moral issues. But I say to you, sir, that simply to speak of morality and moral values is easy, but it can be very hollow, as I'm afraid the Premier's comments were today in this debate and his members before him, if there is nothing of substance to back up those comments. Talk is cheap. Action and policy is the real test.

Is it not immoral, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for political leaders to deliberately promote suspicion and intolerance and hate? We live in a society of many minorities - the ethnic minorities, economic minorities, and social minorities. And I have always believed that they had an equal right to share equally in the benefits of being Canadians without any kind of discrimination. I would have hoped that everyone who would be elected to this Assembly would believe likewise. The poor should be just as important in our society as someone who is wealthy. People who may be handicapped, or very old, or native, or have a particular sexual orientation should not be singled out for discrimination, as the Premier has so unwisely done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Our society, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it is to survive and grow and prosper, has no room for bigotry and prejudice and intolerance.

High moral values must include, Mr. Deputy Speaker, love and tolerance and understanding and compassion. And yet there are those who go around in the name of God, yet preaching hate and intolerance and misunderstanding. It is a sad statement on the leadership displayed by any major public figure when the leader of that particular political party or the government can find the time to meet with and support the likes of the Paul Camerons and the Reverend Paul Marx's, as this Premier has done, and provide them credibility, which he has done.

He can find time to meet with them, but he can't find time to meet with representatives of poor people who come to the legislature to speak on behalf of the people who they work for. They are not important enough, and they are of

no concern to this Premier and this government.

Now these people who I have mentioned, these two messengers, Mr. Speaker, are travelling this province as messengers of hate and intolerance, and I regret very much that members of this government have helped to give them more profile and helped to profile their message. There is nothing moral in that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And I regretted very much the other day, when I discovered and I read the newsletter, when the Reverend Paul Marx was attacking certain Roman Catholic clergy in this province, because I know them well. We has attacking them slanderously and unjustly and unfairly. And I know their commitment to the well-being of the people who live here and the people who they work for and with.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Are we to assume, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that since the premier has condoned these people and given them the profile, that he has therefore condoned what they have said about these leaders of the church in this province? There was a newspaper article which recently said that those who we listen to for advice say much about every one of us. And I say to the Premier, stop being the Jimmy Swaggart of Saskatchewan politics. Stop saying one thing and doing something else.

One of the things that Saskatchewan people want more than anything else out of their politicians is honesty. They haven't had that from this government for six years. Don't just talk about moral values; apply them in public policy. It's not good enough for politicians to say they are against or for abortions and leave it at that. That's cheap words too. That's cheap words too.

Now it so happens that because of my religious beliefs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't support abortion on demand. That's no secret, and people respect my right to have that. Others have a different view, and I respect the fact that they have a different opinion. But I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that regardless of what position some people take, and regardless of my position, and regardless of what the law might be, there will be those who will seek an abortion. And therefore I think we have a moral obligation to strive to reduce the number of those people who might seek an abortion for various reasons.

And the way that that is done, Mr. Speaker, is by providing the kinds of support services and the quality of life in society which will achieve that - family life education programs of appropriate funding; the prevention of unwanted pregnancies by appropriate funding for programs for that; greater awareness of the alternatives to abortion - counselling; adequate support for women wanting to continue their pregnancies; making sure there are jobs; making sure that people have an adequate income so that their children don't have to go to bed hungry at night.

Those are the parallels that have to be made. In this province, under the leadership of this unstatesmanlike Premier, all of those programs in the last year have either

been eliminated, or cut back, or done away with altogether. And I say to you, sir, it is wrong. It is morally wrong to take the position that the Premier has taken without addressing these other important problems and the needs of people at the same time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I for one am determined to do both, and I know many others who do the same, and I regret very much that the Premier has ignored the needs that prevent people wanting to seek an abortion - in fact, has taken many of those programs away.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, there is something immoral; there is something immoral when the government allows policies which cause 11,000 people in Saskatoon and 14,000 in Regina together not to be able to get a hospital bed. There's something immoral about a government which wastes tens of millions of dollars on needless advertising and empty office space and patronage, while young people graduate from our schools - high school and post-secondary - in despair, in despair because there are no jobs available for them. And yet this throne speech made not one single comment about the need for job creation programs for these young people.

An Hon. Member: — No, but they're going to change the ward system.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — They're going to change the ward system, and they're going to legislate against made dogs.

Well last Sunday, last Sunday was an important day. It was an important day in the Christian world; it was Palm Sunday. And as I listened to the sermon, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was reminded of Jesus Christ who came to Jerusalem, and how the people stripped all of the palms and took the leaves and laid them on the ground so that he could pass over this carpet, and a few days later those same people stoned him and beat him and spat on him and had him crucified.

And I was reminded while listening to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of another incident that had just taken place in northern Ireland; it showed us that not much had changed. People at a funeral, using those teachings of our Lord Jesus at the funeral, turned on two men and they beat them and they stoned them and they spat on them and they shot them.

Let us remember from this, Mr. Deputy Speaker: simply uttering the words isn't good enough. And unfortunately that's all we heard from our Premier today, simply uttering of the words. Love and tolerance and understanding must be practised in all of our endeavours, including the political process and public policy. It is just not good enough to talk about families and yet turn a blind eye to growing unemployment, to discrimination against our native people and the likes of that.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I enter this debate on behalf of the constituency of Regina North East. I'm representing their views and their concerns here as they have been

expressed to me. And that constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has a cross-section of families, which is quite representative of probably anywhere in Saskatchewan by and large, and they have passed judgement on this government.

They have passed judgement on this government and they have said that they're concerned. They're concerned about the lack of leadership that exists here today. There is concern about the lack of jobs. There's concern about the betrayal of rural Saskatchewan and rural families, and there is concern about high and unfair taxes, and there's concern about dishonesty in government. There's concern about incompetence to important and essential programs which this government became identified with.

This throne speech said nothing to address any of those concerns. In all of my 14 years as a member of this legislature, never have I witnessed such a display of empty rhetoric as was evidenced in that throne speech on that throne speech day.

It was the sorriest speech I can ever recall. Do you know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because it is a speech of that government that is burnt out. It is a government that has nothing left. It is a speech that kind of indicated that there is a government that almost lives under a death wish - almost like an admission of defeat. Ministers are on the front benches simply putting in time and wishing that it would all get by and be over with quickly so that somehow they can go and do something else.

That speech showed no initiative. It showed no imagination. It showed no will to deal with the real issues of the day. And just a small point: the fact that most of the attention on that speech, the day of the speech and the day after, some proposed legislation to deal with mad dogs received more attention than anything else, I think speaks in a very strong way as a statement. The statement made was that there was little else of substance in this throne speech, and therefore that became the focus.

Now it may have been the great wizardly creation of the Minister of Urban Affairs, a little dictator, to put that into the throne speech, but I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it didn't go unnoticed by the public of Saskatchewan. They know that this government is done. They tried it last June. Last June they brought in a budget late, when it should have been brought in before April 1.

They knew that they were acting illegally, speaking of morality. They knew that they were spending money by the tens of millions by order in council without a budget, and it was illegal. But they were prepared to carry on until legal counsel said in a written statement that it was illegal, and then panic set in and they had to call a session when they would have preferred to leave it until the summer.

Why? Because once again they were running and they were hiding. They thought they could do all of these callous and cold-hearted things that the Minister of Finance's budget did, and if they did it in the summer time, nobody would notice. But they did. Everyone in Saskatchewan noticed, and everyone in Saskatchewan is saying that the government is wrong.

They're proud of the health system which they built by working together co-operatively. They weren't told that it would be destroyed if this government was re-elected.

Now that tells you something about why the throne speech was the way it was. They thought that they would down-play it, that somehow they would down-play the issues and they would go away and people would forget. They have not forgotten, because if this government thought that the people had forgotten, we would have an election in Eastview and Elphinstone today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Everywhere I go, everywhere I go, people are asking when is the next election? They're also asking, is there going to be anything left by that time?

These are not isolated pleas by a few stalwart supporters of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. No, the people of all political parties are saying it. That shows you why there was only about 100 people at the nominating convention of the Conservative Party in Elphinstone last night - because even the Conservatives have given up on this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It won't work. It won't work - this trying to hide from the people because they have made up their mind and they will deal with this government when it finally gives them a chance. It's a deliberate attempt to provide some kind of an opium which will cause them to forget.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying something which has been said by others. This province became great. It became great because the people who came here and were born here and grew up here built it co-operatively. They knew that if they worked together and helped each other that they could have one of the best education systems in Canada. They knew that if they co-operated and worked together they could have and pioneer the best health care system probably in the world. They knew that by dividing between small-business and working people and farmers, it couldn't be done, and so they built something wonderful here. And now it is being threatened, and they want to get back to that.

Now the members opposite, the Conservatives say that's old-fashioned. Well I want to say to you that being your brother's keeper is not any more old-fashioned today than it was seven years ago. Co-operation that built this province is the only thing that's going to continue to build this province. And simply to rely on outside people and interests to come in here and do it for us will lead us down the path of depopulation and economic depression.

But that's the path that these people are leading us down. They have given up on this concept that people should work together, and they've said to a company out of Quebec and out of Ontario: here, take Sask Minerals which has made money for Saskatchewan treasury, take the peat plant in Carrot River, close down the saw mill. Do it for us!

They said to SED Systems: Let Fleet Aerospace buy you and things are going to be great. The member over there from Kindersley sits, and he made this great statement about a year ago when that sale came through, and he said: ah, this is great, no jobs will be lost; it will grow and it will expand.

Well what's the result of this "letting somebody else do it for us" approach? The result is that 53 people were laid off. Now another bunch have been laid off, so now it's about 70. Fleet Aerospace is holding the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to ransom and it's saying to this government, you've got to give us millions of dollars or we're going to pull out.

An Hon. Member: — Where are they from, this Fleet Aerospace?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — They're from Ontario. What happened to this minister's guarantee, this high-flying minister who travels the world, and to weddings, and spends no time interested in the concerns of the Saskatchewan people?

I say to this House and to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this is what an Ontario company will do to a Saskatchewan company when it buys out, pull its management out and put it into Ontario, lays off almost 70 people, who says if you don't give us millions we're going to shut down, can you imagine what companies from the United States will do under the free trade agreement when they come in here and begin to buy up Canadian companies? We're going to become a colony of the economy of the United States and the corporations of that country.

And the member from Arm River knows that but he's afraid to admit it, because he is like that Premier who he serves. They don't have the backbone to stand up to the Prime Minister to whom they think they owe something and they're prepared to do anything to cave in if the Prime Minister says that they should.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by saying this: it took courage to build this province by working co-operatively, by using the public sector and the private sector and the co-operative sector. People have to decide that they could do this themselves, and they did. It doesn't take any courage to run away from that challenge, as this government is doing, and say, we're going to depend on corporate money from somewhere else, and do nothing else. That's going backwards. That's taking us to a time when there was a former Conservative government which did the same thing and caused a depression, was part of a depression, is going back to an antiquated, old policy that doesn't work - doesn't work except for those few who are wealthy and powerful and buy it up and use it for their own purposes at the expense of the citizens and the people.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up the time here. I know that there's other members, a member, who want to speak. I simply say this. This throne speech is inadequate. It says nothing because this government is no longer

capable of dealing with those important issues that face the people of Saskatchewan.

(1600)

They're so preoccupied with serving their masters in Ottawa and in the large corporate world in the United States and in eastern Canada, that they no longer can pay attention to the needs of Saskatchewan people, and that's reflected in that throne speech. It is a nothing speech because this has become a nothing government. I could not in good conscience possibly support that speech because of that, because people of Saskatchewan have a right to expect better and to expect more.

And so I close by saying I will not support the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a few comments in response to the opposition House Leader and some of the challenges thrown out by the opposition House Leader, and I will try, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to take these in order.

He began his remarks this afternoon, attacking the Premier, based on the fact that the Premier made statements with regards to the Leader of the Opposition and his law practice and somehow suggested that, is there someone on this side of the House or is there someone else that has done the same thing.

Now let's carry that through, Mr. Speaker, and let's look at the problem. The problem is now whether or not an individual acts for an individual or for a corporation or for a bank or for anything else, that is clearly the right of every citizen and clearly the right of every lawyer in this province. That is the right. The problem comes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the following way. When an individual stands up, or when his party stands up, and chastises everything that a bank does, or everything that a bank stands for, that they are robber barons from Wall Street or from Bay Street; that they're out to take the poor individual farmer's land away. And you don't hear that from people from this side of the House, you hear it from people on that side of the House.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is the word hypocrisy - the word hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. It is one thing to stand and act for an individual or a financial institution, it is quite another thing to go out of the other side of your mouth and say they are bad; they are rotten; they are always taking the farmers' land away; they are not good for agriculture. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker, and that's the Leader of the Opposition and that is the challenge for the Leader of the Opposition.

It's one thing to stand up and say the banks are all bad. But how can you, in conscience and ethics, and to avoid hypocrisy, then turn around and take money by defending or acting for that very institution that you think is inspired by the devil. That's where hypocrisy comes from and that hypocrisy stands on the shoulders of the Leader of the Opposition.

There's others over there that I haven't heard that from that can consistently, if they wish, act for whoever they want; but not the Leader of the Opposition, when he wants it both ways. The Leader of the Opposition can stand up and say that, Mr. Speaker, then he deserves to be brandished as a hypocrite, because there's no other description as to what he is.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, or the opposition House Leader, in his statement says: number two, that there are 14,000 cancer patients waiting to get into Saskatchewan hospitals - 14,000 cancer patients waiting to get into Saskatchewan hospitals. Why is it in our system, Mr. Speaker, that people can make statements like that, that can go out into the world, not stand chastised, not criticized for saying something that he - a former health minister of this province, knows full well is not true - knows full well is not true. Why does he do it, Mr. Speaker?

Why does he do it? Does he do it to say, well this is what I believe. Does he do it because he is confused? Does he do it because he doesn't know any different? No, sir, that is not why he does it. He does it to mislead the population. And I ask any elected official: is that only how you see your function in this Assembly? Is that what your function is? Well if it is, Mr. Speaker, then don't stand up and lecture anybody else about ethics, because, is that ethical?

Is that ethical to go out and tell somebody - 14,000 people - with cancer, dying, cannot get into our hospitals. That's not true, Mr. Speaker. That is clearly false. The waiting time for cancer patients is perhaps two weeks. If a person has cancer or suspected of cancer, our hospital system, our health care system, takes them in. And well it should, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is designed for and, quite frankly, it is functioning very well.

But can we, or will we, as a society. And is that the nature of our society and how we as leaders of society want to lead our society - by innuendo and misrepresentation? Is that what we are about here? Is that what we mean to our people back home? Is that why they sent us here? Is that why they believed in us? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Regina North East, the opposition House Leader, says, well, the Premier talked about abortion and he talked about the principle of abortion on demand, and how folly of him, he says. But what did he then counter with, Mr. Speaker? What did he counter with? He says, I don't believe in abortion on demand. As if, well, that satisfies my conscience, now I'll get on with life, and while I don't believe in it, I guess it's okay for it to happen. That's what he said. Now he says, sure we need some assistance to seek family education, or to seek counselling, etc. And that's valid, and nobody disagrees with that.

The problem Mr. Speaker, is this: is that issue, is the issue of the right to life of the unborn, is it fundamental that we should deal with here, or is it not? Now if we look at us all, we tend to very often say, well let's not deal with that issue because it's too tough, and it's too political, and it's got too many sides to it, and there's no agreement. That's what we say and that's what he said. I can justify it in my

own mind because I don't . . . in my conscience are clean because I don't believe it myself. But then to sort of say, well, having said that now I will leave that subject. What does that make that issue in his mind? Are there various arguments on that issue? Clearly there are. Is it a difficult issue? Clearly it is, but it is not something you can simply walk away from and say, my conscience are clean because I said I was against it. And then to stand up and say, we are delivering leadership and you are not. Is it a fundamental issue? How important is it? What does it mean to me? Then you address the question.

Thirdly, the hon. member, the opposition House leader says, shame on you, Mr. Premier, for your statements about the homosexuals. They must have rights too, he says, and it's important that we guarantee their rights.

The issue, Mr. Speaker, is this. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is this. If we only ever look at but one thing and that is the rights of this person and not his responsibility to society, and not us as a responsibility as legislators to society, then what are we saying about that issue? Mr. Speaker, it's fine to say that we should consider the people who are homosexuals and give them the rights they ask. Should we give them the right to adopt children? Is that an issue? Is that an issue? Clearly it is an issue, Mr. Speaker, and clearly it is an issue far greater than the rights of that individual. Surely that is also a responsibility and an issue for society as a whole.

Is it the right and the right thing to do for us as legislators to condone people on TV holding hand and males kissing in the park in Stanley Park, and sort of say, well that's fine, that's their rights? And we should say nothing about it, because to say something about it you are attacking that person's rights? We are more than simply a society that gives rights to each other. We are a society that has responsibilities to each other as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take my time talking totally about those issues because there's an important distinction, I believe, also drawn by the opposition House Leader. Because you asked and look at what he said, and we are dealing with, I suppose, the fundamental philosophical direction of the party on this side of the House versus the party on that side of the House.

And while we've had the Leader of the Opposition touring the province saying, we have learned from '82; we no longer believe some of the things that we believed in '82. Perhaps Crown corporations wasn't the right way to go; perhaps some of them should be sold. Maybe business is more important than we gave it credit for. How shallow, Mr. Speaker, how empty the rhetoric! Because one after one of the members opposite stand up and what do they say? We don't want businesses coming to Saskatchewan. We don't want people coming here to invest, thank you very much, we'll invest ourselves.

Now who is going to invest by the theory, who is going to invest here if we totally shut our walls to any outsider? Who will it be, Mr. Speaker? And it will come to the same conclusion that they came to from 1971 to 1982. It is the

government.

They stand and say, you should not have sold the pulp mill in Prince Albert - oh, but we have changed our philosophy, but you shouldn't have sold that one. And you shouldn't have sold another one. And we really don't want outside investment; no thank you, no thank you. They're not welcome, they're not welcome here. And, Mr. Speaker, I think we've heard that song before. They wish to somehow sort of lull people into thinking, with their leader, by saying, we have changed folks. but have they really changed; have they really changed? What do they really stand for; what do they really stand for?

(1615)

They want, Mr. Speaker, more Crown corporations. They want the ones that they had because they were right. The people didn't understand that, but they were right. We want all the Crown corporations that we had and we want to build more. And then they want to have . . . and how they would deal with the farmer. And did you hear the member from - the opposition House Leader say one word, one word about the farmer. No, you didn't. Not a word. Not as much as a word. Never even mentioned the word farmer, or agriculture, and then stands up and says, you people are not listening, do not care about Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people - not so much as a single word.

But he does say, Mr. Speaker, we believe the old way is the only way. We want to go back to 1982 and before, because that's what they believe, Mr. Speaker. They try to tell you they have changed, but what have they said that would in any way suggest that they have changed, Mr. Speaker? Nothing. They still want, Mr. Speaker, more government to run business, and they want government to own the farms. Why? Why, Mr. Speaker, do they want that? They want it because their exercise and sense of power belongs only to those who run the government.

Now I say to the members opposite, and some of the new members opposite, check what is happening around the world. Go to New Zealand, socialist government in New Zealand, and what are they doing? They are selling off their nationalized industries, their Crown corporations. Why? Because they no longer have the capital in government tot put into it, number one; and number two, they have discovered that it works better if private capital does that job. That's in New Zealand, Mr. Speaker.

Go to Australia, go to Australia, socialist government again, doing exactly the same thing, Mr. Speaker, socialist government. But even if you don't even believe in those, Mr. Speaker, go to the Soviet Union. Gorbachev even is saying the system doesn't work when government owns everything, and what we have to do is put it back into the hands of private entrepreneurs. Go to China, and that's exactly what they're doing in China today as well.

So the world has discovered that, and what do the members opposite say? Keep the world away from us. Don't let the world in here with their investment dollars. Don't let the world in here with its trade. But you know

what the worst thing is? Don't let the world in here with new ideas, because that's really what they're saying. That is really what bothers them more than anything, Mr. Speaker.

They want to stay . . . you could take the speeches of the members opposite over the last seven days, Mr. Speaker, take the speeches of the members opposite, go back 10 years, go back 20 years, go back 30 years, and you will see the same words, Mr. Speaker. You will hear the same ideas, Mr. Speaker. You will hear the same principles, Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly where they are. What they believe in - larger government, more Crown corporations. They believe in land bank, and they believe in the government saying and telling people, we will plan your world for you, we will plan your economy for you, and we will go forward as we always have before, Mr. Speaker. Then they stand up and say, you guys over there, you're not listening.

The people over here listen, Mr. Speaker, because they are not driven by dogmatic principles that were written 150 years ago and put into practice in the 1940s. That is exactly, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the problem with the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying this. The day after Allan Blakeney left this institution, and Allan Blakeney was a - while I disagreed with his economic philosophy, Allan Blakeney was a credible, credible individual that served very well in this Chamber. But even Allan Blakeney, the day after he left this Chamber was interviewed on a local television station, and said: I have no problem with the government selling Crown corporations. I have no problem with that. But the members opposite did not hear, or perhaps you must leave the party or leave the legislature before you are entitled to make those kind of statements.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps they should listen, because the words that have come from their mouths, the words that have come from their mouths have been nothing more than more government, more Crown corporations, and for the farmers they say, we will give you back the land bank.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer of Saskatchewan have said to them, no thank you. The farmers of Saskatchewan in the future will say to them, no thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, the throne speech is consistent. It deals with agriculture, which he never mentioned. It deals with Crown corporations in a new direction for them. It deals with a new area in health care in education. It deals with a new area in health care or in education. It deals with the question of trade and whether we will become a colony and the borders will go up around Saskatchewan, or whether we dare to go out into the world. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are not afraid to go out into the world. We are proud of the men and women that work and produce and build in this province, and they have done lots of it.

And for that, Mr. Speaker, I support the throne speech, and I would hope all others in this House, even some of the members opposite that don't believe, that don't believe in some of the dogmatic rhetoric that their speech-writer gives them, one after one after the other. I

ask some of them to stand up, stand up on principles, Mr. Speaker, stand up towards the future, and stand up with this side of the House and feel good about it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goodale: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I see by the clock that there are very few minutes left in this debate this afternoon, but I would like to take one or two of those minutes to address some of the issues that have been raised both by the Speech from the Throne itself and by the discussion that has taken place in this House with respect to that speech.

If I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to draw some of the debate back to the world of reality. I would like to get away from any scurrilous personal attacks - of which I think we've heard plenty this afternoon - and instead, I would prefer to deal with substance, Mr. Speaker, rather than some of the other matters that have unfortunately, in my opinion, dominated some of the discussion, especially today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great joys of my job as an MLA and as leader of my party is the opportunity that I have to travel this province, to meet and to visit with the real people of Saskatchewan in every corner of Saskatchewan, and to listen very intently to what they have to say. And in that listening, Mr. Speaker, I hear of a Saskatchewan that is friendly and wholesome, where families and neighbours really count for something. I hear of a Saskatchewan of tolerance and compassion, where there is special attention for children and for the elderly and for the disadvantaged, and where vital human priorities like education and health care are cherished and defended.

I hear, Mr. Speaker, of a Saskatchewan where agriculture and the family farm are proudly depicted as our most central and enduring economic pillars, and they must be defended. I hear of a Saskatchewan that takes pride, Mr. Speaker, in business and in enterprise - a competitive Saskatchewan that values initiative and self-reliance; a Saskatchewan that is striving for secure and stable growth for the future and not flashy quick fixes; a Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that is yearning for a tax system that is fair, and equally important, Mr. Speaker, taxes that are not wasted.

From the real people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I hear of a Saskatchewan where government has a legitimate but a limited role to play in people's lives, where government is not Big Brother running everything all the time, everywhere, and where those, Mr. Speaker, who serve in government can be counted upon to be honest and competent and fair.

From the badlands in my own constituency south of Assiniboia, Mr. Speaker, to the pine forests north of Ile-a-la-Crosse, what I've just described in the last moment or two, is what I hear from the real people of Saskatchewan, what they tell me about their values and about their hopes and their dreams for this province.

And, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do not believe that either the present government nor the official

opposition is living up to the standards and the expectations of Saskatchewan people. What this province needs more than anything, Mr. Speaker, is that blueprint for the future that we hear a lot of talk about in this Chamber, but that blueprint which, in reality, does not exist today, a blueprint to build a better future for Saskatchewan more in tune with the values and the expectations of Saskatchewan people.

And having that overall blueprint, Mr. Speaker, is fundamentally important for the long term because it provides that necessary sense of direction. It provides that necessary sense of purpose, and it gives you a yardstick by which to measure your progress.

And for far too long, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has been drifting from day to day, lurching from one crisis to the next, with government policy - quite literally in some circumstances - government policy being scribbled down on the back of the envelope to try to meet the most recent emergency or somehow to manoeuvre past the next election campaign.

What we see is an exercise in crisis management or in damage control, and it does not appear to me, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that it does not appear to a very large number of Saskatchewan people, that anyone has been thinking or planning ahead in any serious way for the future of our province. The only obvious motivation in the ranks of the conservative government is a determination to bludgeon the NDP. But once that's been done, they don't seem to have any game plan or purpose or direction beyond that - certainly nothing that's particularly new or exciting for Saskatchewan's future.

The NDP are really the flip side of the same coin, totally preoccupied with the short-term gimmicks that are crafted to embarrass the government or to exploit every partisan opportunity no matter how superficial, no matter how short-sighted.

Mr. Speaker, that is no foundation upon which to tackle the challenges of today, let alone to build a future of stability and opportunity for tomorrow. Saskatchewan needs that thoughtful, long-term blueprint or game plan that so many members of this legislatures talk about, but, Mr. Speaker, which is certainly not yet evident in the public policy of this province.

I recognize that the clock is approaching 5:30, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I must inform the Assembly that under Rule 13(4) it is my duty at this time to interrupt debate and put all questions necessary to dispose of the main motion.

(1638)

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 32

| | |
|--------|-----------|
| Devine | Pickering |
| Muller | Martin |
| Duncan | Toth |
| Andrew | Sauder |

| | |
|----------|-----------|
| Berntson | Johnson |
| Lane | McLaren |
| Taylor | Hopfner |
| Swan | Petersen |
| Muirhead | Swenson |
| Maxwell | Baker |
| Schmidt | Gleim |
| Hodgins | Neudorf |
| Gerich | Gardner |
| Hepworth | Kopelchuk |
| Hardy | Saxinger |
| Klein | Britton |

Nays — 21

| | |
|-------------|--------------|
| Romanow | Simard |
| Prebble | Koenker |
| Rolfes | Atkinson |
| Brockelbank | Anguish |
| Shillington | Goulet |
| Tchorzewski | Lautermilch |
| Koskie | Trew |
| Thompson | Smart |
| Solomon | Van Mulligen |
| Mitchell | Goodale |
| Upshall | |

MOTIONS

House Adjournment

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice, be leave of the Assembly:

That when this Assembly adjourns on Thursday, March 31, 1988, it do stand adjourned until Monday, April 4, 1988.

Motion agreed to.

Address be Engrossed and Presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice:

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor by such members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

Ways and Means

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I move by leave of the Assembly, seconded by the Minister of Justice:

That this Assembly, pursuant to rule 84, hereby appoints the Committee of Finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her majesty and to consider the ways and means of raising the supply.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:43 p.m.