

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Clerk: — I hereby report that I have examined the petition under rule 11(7) and I lay it on the Table for reading and receiving:

Of certain citizens of the province of Saskatchewan praying that the Legislative Assembly may be pleased to urge the Government of Saskatchewan to join the petitioners in their support for Wald Ambulance Ltd.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of 10 students from the Maple Creek Learning Centre. They are accompanied by their teacher and chaperon, Jackie Harapiak. I welcome them here, Mr. Speaker.

The centre is provided through the Cypress Hills community college, which is a very active college in the south-west. I hope you had an enjoyable trip up this morning, and I hope you will enjoy the proceedings this afternoon. I'll be meeting with you at approximately 3 o'clock for pictures, and I'm sure you'll have many questions. And we'll have refreshments in my office. I would ask members to please welcome them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Settlement Agreement by Farmers with ACS

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today has to be directed to the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier. And it relates to the agricultural credit corporation, ACS, and a settlement agreement between ACS and a farm family or, putting it more accurately, farm families.

Mr. Speaker, they ask me to start all over again because I see the Premier and Minister of Agriculture has shown up, so if that is permissible I'll start. My question therefore is to you, Mr. Premier, in your capacity as either Premier or Minister of Agriculture — take your choice.

Mr. Premier, my question relates to the agricultural credit corporation, your ACS (Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan), and a settlement agreement as ACS has been urging farm families to enter into — farm families in serious difficulty with respect to their financial operations. This settlement agreement between ACS as advanced by ACS allows the farm family to wipe the slate clean of the debt with ACS. It then goes on to say in the agreement as follows, in clause 3, quote:

The Borrowers (referring to the farmers), the Borrowers understand and agree that they will not in future be entitled to receive, and shall not apply for any grant, loan, cash advance, guaranteed loan, financial assistance or benefit whatsoever provided by ACS or its successor corporations under any act of the legislature of Saskatchewan or the regulations thereunder (end quote).

Now, Mr. Premier, my question to you is this: how, sir, can you and your government explain this extremely restrictive and limited clause which has been inserted in your corporation's ACS agreements with respect to quit-claim proposals or settlement agreements of the farmers of Saskatchewan who need a break? How is that explained?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I will review in some detail the clause the hon. member refers to. I would say at the outset, when you're in situations where farmers are in extreme difficulty and you're going to write off the debt and you're finished with your dealings with them, then I'm sure that some restrictions have to be put into place so that in fact they just don't go to another arm and another arm and another arm to get more money at the same time. Now it seems to me that there is some balance there where you're looking at providing some assistance on one hand, but in some cases where the farmer is obviously going to leave, that he doesn't have access to other forms of credit so that one side of government or one arm of government doesn't know what the other arm is doing. So I think, I'm sure, you'd have to be very careful.

I will go back and examine the paragraph in detail and be prepared to respond when I have a chance.

Mr. Romanow: — Thank you, Mr. Premier, and I thank the Minister of Agriculture for that answer which says that he'll go back to take a look at it, and I highly commend him for that, and I think he should do it. Because Mr. Speaker, new question this clause says that the borrowers understand and agree that they will not in future, with no limitations so that any farmer who might have been able to get out of the financial situation that he or she finds himself in, with no restriction in the future, is forbidden to receive any of the benefits of Saskatchewan law or any of the benefits of ACS with respect to farming programs advanced by your government, or even subsequent governments, in the future, whatsoever, for ever. Now I think that that surely is a very Draconian provision.

If my understanding is correct, I would urge the Premier to look at this clause very, very carefully, to undertake an examination, and, if my interpretation is correct, to indicate to the House whether or not he'll be making and directing an appropriate change to that form.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well I will get back to the hon. member. If this clause says that you can't get more money

until you pay back what you owe ACS, there's some validity to that. Because if you're going to say, well I'm not going to pay off ACS, but I'm going to go and I can get money from this department or this department or this department, the government is saying, now hold it, you can't have it both ways. If in fact you're not going to be making your payments, then you're not going to be getting other loans from people before you at least pay what you owe to the agriculture credit corporation, or else everybody would want you know, what I'm saying, everybody would want to say, well I won't pay my ACS, but I'll go to another department and get some cash here.

You have to have some guide-lines there, so that if the man or the woman or the family is saying all right, that's it, I'm done with you. you know, let's say okay, fair enough, if you're out of farming and you don't want to do anything else, then don't come to us for other loans when you still owe us money. That's what I suspect this clause is about. I'll go back and I'll review it, and I'll be glad to share that information with the hon. member.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the Premier. I have a copy of the agreement in front of me. The one that I have is dated the 23rd day of December, 1987, and at some appropriate time under the rules I'll be pleased to forward a copy to the Premier or his office so that he can be assisted in the review of the situation, but I want to assure you that what this agreement is between ACS is a straight exchange where the borrowers surrender a number of matters, ranging all the way from land to equipment, in exchange for an agreement that they now have the slate wiped clean with respect to their borrowings to ACS. I understand that, so this is not a question of shopping for credit. But what I don't understand is clause 3 which says, quote:

The Borrowers understand and agree (this is after the exchange has been made) that they will not in future be entitled

And I won't take up the time of the House to read this clause again, but in future they're not going to be entitled to get any of the benefits ranging from loans, cash advances, under any statute under ACS's administration or involvement whatsoever, full stop.

I say to you, Mr. Premier, that clause is an extremely Draconian provision, one which is bound to handicap farmers who may be struggling to work their way out of financial debt and still see the light at the end of the tunnel for some future farming. And now by this provision, if it remains in the agreement, they will be for ever stopped. Will you please direct your ACS to look at this and to undo this provision so that farmers can get back in where their circumstances warrant it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — So I understand the question clearly, are you saying that it would be all right in that clause 3 if there be no future borrowing by that individual until he paid back what he owed?

An Hon. Member: — No, no. That's not the issue, Grant.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, that's the whole issue. The whole issue is either you have to pay back or whether you don't. You're saying, all right, don't pay this back, but you can go borrow other money from ACS or from other departments.

Now look, what they're saying is that if you want to — and I'll go back and look at it — if you want to go borrow from some other department of government, then fine, but you're not going to get more funds from the government until you pay back what you owe. it seems to me that you've got to have some reasonable nature of fairness there or else everybody would go into ACS and say, I'm not paying back beaus I can borrow from every other department. Now you can't have that.

So we've got to have a mechanism if you want to settle this and your counselling assistance people want to have a farmer settled out from under an ACS situation, they have to have some guide-lines in terms of what he can go borrow from what other departments, or else he just goes from department to department to department.

Now, if you're saying that as long as he pays it back then he can go borrow, then that would clear up your question.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier, and I don't want to over politicize this, but I do think that the answers by the Premier are good examples of why the Premier should take a look at another cabinet shuffle and get a full-time minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Because, Mr. Premier, Mr. Speaker, the document says clearly under clause 2:

Upon full satisfaction by the Borrowers of the conditions set out in section 1 of this agreement

Section 1 sets out all the payments that the borrower has to have made to ACS:

Upon full satisfaction by the Borrowers of the conditions set out in section 1 of this agreement, within the time limited ACS shall forgive the Borrowers from the Loans (full stop).

Paragraph 3 is what I'm directing your attention to. It's after that exchange has taken place. And paragraph 3 says, after that time, the borrowers in the future are hereby denied the right of any cash, grants, loans or any other farm support that ACS might have in store under this legislation or future legislation, and binds the governments of the future.

I say to you, Mr. Premier, and I ask you to take a look at it from that point of view, this provision is a Draconian measure which would bar farmers from getting back on their farm lands if the circumstances warrant. Won't you agree that's unjustifiable and you should force your ACS to withdraw that clause?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — I mean, if you don't want this to get partisan, then don't get too excited, okay?

If ACS is going write off and forgive \$300,000 from a farmer, or 100,000, then what we have to do is be careful that the farmer doesn't come in the next day and borrow another 100 or another 50 or another \$300,000 from another department when he already owes the money.

Now we've got to be fair. We've got to be fair to all the farmers out there when we strike a forgiveness clause with somebody that is not going to pay and says, it's over, I can't make any payments. Now you have to be careful so that they can't come in and get more money from here and more money from there when they've already said, I'm finished with it, I can't make the payments.

Now if you're saying you can forgive them and then have them come into another department and borrow another 100,000 for this or another 50,000 for that, that gets a little bit difficult, and you know You know why a clause should be there to say, if you want more money, then you're going to have to pay back what you owe.

Now something reasonable in that term is only going to be fair or else everybody is going to say, I'm not paying it back because I know I can borrow from another department and I don't have to pay the money back. We've got to be fair to everybody out there, and if we're going to have some forgiveness, then we say, you can have access to other lines of government departments, but maybe you should pay back what you owe before you get another \$50,000 or another \$100,000.

Now I'll go back and review it, and I'll be glad to give you the specific details of all kinds of things that they could get access to, and I don't have all those with me here today, but all the things they could get access to if they're going to be forgiven the money they owe.

I'll say this in final point, Mr. Speaker. When we lend money to farmers, we expect them to pay it back, and I think that's the only fair way to treat the taxpayer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the same minister. A couple things become obvious in the exchange that's just taken place, and one is that the minister doesn't understand, as Minister of Agriculture, what's in the agreements that are being put in front of Saskatchewan farmers to sign — doesn't know what's in the agreement as the Minister of Agriculture.

The second point that comes very obvious, Mr. Speaker, is not only does this government want to remove farm families from the farm, they want to assure that they can never get back on the farm, and if they do it will certainly be without government assistance.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Anguish: — Obviously, the Minister of Agriculture has lost control of the situation with agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan. When will you honour the

request that many people are asking you to do, and that's resign as Minister of Agriculture and let someone handle it who can do it as a full-time job which it warrants in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that this government, and this Minister of Agriculture, have helped contribute about \$2 billion in deficiency payments to the farmers of Saskatchewan and western Canada, and they didn't have to pay back a dime of it. I'm talking over \$2 billion.

At the same time, over one-point-some billion dollars out to farmers at low, fixed, long-run interest rates. That was never done before, and he's standing up and saying, well, we need some more. So we went back and we said to farmers, if you need cash advances for the livestock industry, we'll provide that; if you want natural gas on your farms, we'll provide that; if you want individual line service in your communities and farms, we'll provide that; if you want money to move livestock into areas of drought, if you need help because of grasshoppers or flood, we will do that. The list goes on and on and on.

And when interest rates are high, Mr. Speaker, we were the first that went right in there and said, we will hold those interest rates down and protect farmers. Mr. Speaker, I will say, more money and more programs and more cash, Mr. Speaker, have gone into the hands of thousands and thousands, literally tens of thousands of farmers, across the province of Saskatchewan and western Canada as a result of this government, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, at least in part because of this Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

French Language Rights in Saskatchewan

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question on a new topic, but I will forward to the Premier a copy of the document and to the journalists who may be interested about is so that the interpretations of the questions and answers can be put in proper perspective today.

But my question to the Premier relates to another area; it relates particularly with your government's Bill No. 2, the government response to the Supreme Court ruling on French language rights in Saskatchewan. And my question to you, Mr. Premier, is this: have you consulted with the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mulroney, whether or not this legislation violates the spirit of Meech Lake accord, or in the alternative has Mr. Mulroney called you about the question of this Bill and Meech Lake accord, and if so, what was the Prime Minister's response?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I have not talked to the Prime Minister this morning or yesterday. We have been in touch with federal officials, with other provinces, the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General — I have been in contact with the attorneys general in New Brunswick, in Quebec, and federal officials with respect to getting their assistance in providing translation, learning and putting

together the mechanism whereby we can provide legislation and statutes in both official languages. So we've received very good co-operation from several governments, including the federal government.

And with respect to Meech Lake, what Meech Lake wants, and what Meech Lake says, and in the spirit of Meech Lake, is to design a system across this country that allows us to have both languages used and both languages implemented in a fashion that we can manage and that we can handle and that we can administer, for a long, long time. And that's what you see in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and that's why it's the appropriate kind of legislation for this time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier. I hear the Premier telling the House and the people of Saskatchewan, for that matter perhaps the people of Canada, that his department and his government has consulted with a variety of governments with respect to the French language Bill 2, but that does not answer the question, which I again redirect to you, sir, for what I think can be a very simple answer and a straightforward answer. And my question to you is this: have you or your ministers discussed, directly, Bill 02 and the national implications of that legislation with the Prime Minister of Canada or the Minister of Justice of Canada, and if so, will you please tell the House what their response is?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Assembly that I've spoken both to the Minister of Justice, as well to Senator Lowell Murray, who is responsible for this particular issue at the national level.

With regard to Meech Lake, it is the view of this government, Mr. Speaker, that under Meech Lake all provinces agreed to view the rights of French minorities outside of Quebec. And this legislation, for the first time in our province's history, allows legislation, allows statutes and Acts to be introduced in this House in both official languages. That's never been done before. Clearly that means an advantage to the francophone community of this province.

This particular Bill allows, contrary to some of the opinions advanced by the media, allows an individual charged with a criminal offence in this province — can conduct and have his trial conducted totally in French, including a jury trial conducted totally in French, including a jury trial conducted totally in French, involving francophone members of the jury, a francophone prosecutor, a francophone judge. It also allows the rights, as found by the Supreme Court of Canada, for our individuals to have those particular rights in a civil case.

We allow in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker — which is not the case in many assemblies across this country — we allow people to speak in English or in French in this particular Assembly.

So yes, this is in fact consistent with Meech Lake, and yes, this does in fact give to the francophone people of Saskatchewan more rights than they had in the past. And

this government with this Bill for the first time is in fact allowing — and you will see — statutes introduced in this House in both official languages.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I must direct this question to the Premier because while the Minister of Justice refers to the word "allow," the reality is that, in the Mercure decision out of the Supreme Court, this was a recognition of existing rights, not an allowance of anything by the members opposite or by any government previous.

But my question to you, sir, Mr. Premier, is as follows. At the time that Meech Lake was introduced for ratification to this Legislative Assembly, on the issue of language rights and the accord you said the following:

It has the very important consequence of not making the province of Quebec the sole protector of the French language in Canada. This was introduced into the amendment in order to protect the interests of French language minorities living outside of Quebec.

Those are your words, Mr. Premier. In the light of the response taken by all of the responsible leadership of the French Canadian community and what appears to be the response by the national community, how in the world do you square those words on Meech Lake and the spirit of Meech Lake with the particular legislation, so narrow and restrictive, that you introduced yesterday?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the legislation does precisely what we wanted it to do as a result of the Meech Lake accord. With the Mercure decision you had three alternatives. You could say no to everything; or you could say yes, it's all going to be bilingual all at the same time, all today, and rewrite the past; or you can do something in the middle that will give us time to get it done.

And that's exactly what we've done. We've taken a reasoned approach that said that we can walk into the future with both official languages; we can have statutes and legislation in both official languages; we can speak in this legislature in both official languages; you can go to court in both official languages, and we can do so at the speed that will accommodate Saskatchewan.

Now you can't have it all French, all at once, right now, because it's virtually and physically impossible. We cannot do that. And we didn't say we're going to cut it off so it can never happen. so we said we are going to design it so that we can manage it and make sure that it happens in a fair and reasonable fashion. That's precisely what we have, so that we can introduce legislation, as this Bill is introduced, in both official languages, and more Bills. And we can pass Bills that are in the past, and we can walk into that as we have the translation units, as we have the staff, as we have the money, as we have the co-operation, and as we have the expertise.

It's not cut off, but it's managed in a fashion that is very responsible, and I believe it's the only way we could do it

in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, thank you. A question to the Premier, my final question in this area. I do not quarrel with the necessity, on this very sensitive and important issue for national unity, to make sure that it is, in the Premier's words, managed in the best interests of the province and the country.

But that's a different issue. The issue that I wish to make to the Premier is this. You have here a situation in Bill 2 where French and English language rights can be designated at your whim by your cabinet. That's what the legislation says. you have rights granted and rights taken away, notwithstanding the Supreme Court of Canada's decision as to the historical status of those rights.

My question to you is this, sir. Your minister of multiculturalism said just a few days ago in this debate in the Speech from the Throne:

(Saskatchewan) did in fact ratify the Meech Lake accord
And we should not lose sight of that, because right in the
Meech Lake accord it says Canada's a bilingual country.
And sir, (the minister from multiculturalism says) that
includes us.

Your minister.

Now how in the world does those words — how do you straddle the fence and justify those words that this is a bilingual country and that includes us, that your minister says, with the legislation introduced yesterday that the francophone community rejects and many national organizations reject? We'll see what the Prime Minister has to say about it. How in the world are those two positions reconciled? Surely somebody's resignation is in order, either yours, sir, or the minister of multiculturalism, because the Bill falls short.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, just let me very briefly reiterate. This reaction and the Bill 2 that has been put forward by the Minister of Justice does exactly what is necessary to allow us to move towards both official languages being used in this legislature and in the statutes and in new legislation as we pass it here in this House. We can't do it all at once; it takes time.

Now who's going to manage that? If it isn't the government of the day that manages it in co-operation with the French-speaking community and this Legislative Assembly, I don't know who it is. It's Executive Council, and it's this Assembly that will allow us to do that. Some day we'll be able to speak in both languages and have automatic media translation in this Assembly as they do at the national level.

This is a bilingual country. We accept that. But in Saskatchewan we have to walk into that. My children are bilingual. Many, many young people who are going to school are perfectly bilingual. We understand that, but

we have to walk into the future one step at a time, Mr. Speaker. We can't hit the floor running because we don't have the physical capacity, let alone the financial capacity, to do all of that.

Who else can manage except government? We have the responsibility now, and this legislation will allow us to manage. You will see laws introduced in this legislature that are in both languages and passed in both languages, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF FINANCE (BUDGET DEBATE)

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Lane that the Assembly resolve itself into the Committee of Finance.

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I will continue. The Deputy Premier wants me to thought that I was finished last night. I'm happy to say that I'm back here again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short overview in regards to the general impact of the budget again. I'd also then shift into the implications it has for northern Saskatchewan, but also in relation to Indian and Metis people.

Yesterday I talked about the aspect of the budget and the fact that it really puts a strain on a lot of Saskatchewan families. It makes it tough, extremely tough for people to spend money on clothing, the basic necessities of life, basically because there's such a high cost in relation to the question of paying higher taxes and having to pay for higher costs in terms of services.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I talked about the aspect of the budget and the fact that it really puts a strain on a lot of Saskatchewan families. It makes it tough, extremely tough for people to spend money on clothing, the basic necessities of life, basically because there's such a high cost in relation to the question of paying higher taxes and having to pay for higher costs in terms of services. And, Mr. Speaker, as I start today, that's an important point to remember. We know that these increased costs come because we give away to large-scale corporations. And that is the message of this government. They give away to large-scale corporations and we have to pay for them.

When I look at the question of taxation, there is an inequality, as I mentioned. There is an inequality in a sense that while the families of big-scale corporations get away with a lower tax, ordinary people have to pay up to 2 per cent now on the flat tax, and this is \$500 for a person making around 25,000. Now that's a lot of money for people to be putting out, especially when the drug bills

are higher now, especially when the drug costs are way high from what it used to be.

So the real question is this: that because we have to pay more, a lot of people thought we will be getting better services, but we are not. We are getting less services in health, less services in education, and many other fields as well.

Now I'll get into the question of the situation of northern Saskatchewan. One of the first things that hit me last year after the budget, that people hoped would be in this year's budget, was the question of the drug prescription plan. As I said last night, a lot of people don't have the up-front money, basically because this government doesn't want to hire any more people in the mines. They don't want to follow the laws to make sure that we are living up to our legal agreements there. They don't want to make sure that Weyerhaeuser hires a lot of people in the North. They have a faulty clause in that sense, so a lot of people are not partaking in the development that takes place in the North the way they used to when the NDP government was around.

So when you look at the issues of the North, the first thing therefore that people said, we've been promised this hospital in La Ronge since 1982. We knew that the NDP government had a plan of action all ready to put money into planning in 1982, and the plan had already started. Ever since that time since 1982 this PC government, Mr. Speaker, has put this on hold.

When the election came around they said, oh, we're going to have it for you. It's going to be there — 1986 they were campaigning. And as I listened, a lot of people thought, my goodness, this time possibly we will have a hospital in La Ronge which services a high area for the betterment of health in northern Saskatchewan. But, lo and behold, 1987 came around. Nothing, no hospital. We wait in 1988, no hospital.

The people of northern Saskatchewan and their children and the seniors are still waiting. Because in connection to the hospital we would not only perform basic services and right there in northern Saskatchewan we wouldn't have to go to P.A. (Prince Albert) or Saskatoon on basic services. We would be able to do them right there in La Ronge.

And the other aspect to that is this, that not only could we include a new hospital, but a more comprehensive plan to take care of the seniors. Our seniors have to come out to a new environment in the South, and it's very difficult when you're in a second language situation. And I know that when a lot of the older people talk to me they say, Keith

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

And what the people are saying was — I talked to the seniors — is this: they said, we want something right in the North. We want something where our people can come and visit us. They can talk to us in our own language and be able to deal with these issues of concern, and we can keep track of how our little grandchildren, what they're talking about, what they're saying at the schools;

we can see them grow up. But this way we can't do that, they said, we have to be shipped to the South. They say, we need something in northern Saskatchewan for the seniors, in not only the basic services of the seniors, but in the level 3 and 4 care, right there in the North.

And as I look at the other aspects, we know that this year people were looking for the connection to the community. Health, in and of itself, is very important, but it needs to have a connecting mechanism at the community level. The community health workers that perform that function, last year of course they were cut back. This year we were looking at the fact that maybe this government will change its attitude, maybe this government will listen to the people, but again the record shows very clearly that this government will simply not listen.

As I look to other issues, I mentioned yesterday the situation of the North. And just to put it into a proper perspective, a lot of the major development, the so-called uranium development that the Premier talks about, the forestry development, a lot of the roads up there are very important as a network that connects the different communities with each other and provides for intercommunity exchange and so on.

But these roads have also been downgraded in the past six years. They've become unsafe; they've become dangerous. Not only has there been more an increasing number of people who die on our roads in northern Saskatchewan, but the fact remains that there is an increasing amount of dangerous chemicals that are being transported on these roads. And it's very important (inaudible interjection) one of the members from across laughs and makes a joke out of it, but I don't think at all it is a joke.

I think it is very important to recognize that the proper roads that we fought for in Saskatchewan, all over the place, are an important part of our communities. The people in the South say that, and the people in the North say that, and I wish that member from across would know that that is the basis and the reason why I'm saying that.

I think it's very important to recognize that in the case of the roads, the road directly north of La Ronge where we're looking at the connection to tourism, the connection to the communities, the connection to the fact of working at the mines, that these roads need to be improved, and nothing is being done. The maintenance levels have gone down.

The connecting roads from Cumberland to the mine — only 25 miles of road — should be built so that people can work there. They want to work there. A lot of people don't want to get into the welfare syndrome that this government promotes. I think it's very important that people are require these roads so that they can go and find those jobs that are readily available for other people.

I think that it's very important that this whole issue of roads has to be clearly re-examined by the Minister of Highways so that in the future that something indeed can be done. The roads are not only decrepit, they are dangerous, and they have to be improved. But nothing,

Mr. Speaker, on this budget in relation to that.

I looked at the other aspect of the question of power rates in northern Saskatchewan. I received a complaint from the Deschambault Lake area in relation to the tourist and cottages where they used to have their own power diesel units. Then there was a deal made with Saskatchewan Power to put in services there, but what they found out is that it was an exorbitant rate.

But the thing is that there was an unequal treatment on the other side of the province. In northern Saskatchewan there was a friend of a Tory on Armyot Lake who built, who got connected to the electrical supply system, at a cost of approximately \$20,000, and the information that I've got is that they only paid \$5,000. But the same type of opportunity wasn't provided for the people from the other side. Only the friends of the Tories are provided this opportunity.

As I look at the question of the power rates, one has to look and make a jump in regards to the overall strategy of Saskatchewan Power Corporation in regards to the North. And one of course has to make that connection in regards to what is happening to the province as a whole, because this budget affects not only the North but into the South.

Well what do we have in this budget? We have \$1.2 billion Rafferty-Alameda project for the Premier's own riding, and we look at that, and we look at northern Saskatchewan. This "shafferty" project, as a lot of people have referred to it, is providing a lot of political benefits for the Premier, but he does not care about what the people's concerns are in relation to the effects of SaskPower projects in relation to northern Saskatchewan.

There is an issue of Cumberland House, and I've raised it time and again in this legislature last year. There is nothing in this budget, Mr. Speaker, that in fact there is absolutely nothing in relation to the compensation issue of the dam 60 miles upstream from Cumberland; that in fact Cumberland has been trying to resolve this compensation question, but the government doesn't want to move. They said they were going to move last fall. People are still waiting. People are also waiting on the compensation issue right at Sandy Bay in regards to the Island Falls dam. People are waiting at Southend in regards to the dam that was built there. People are knowing that compensation already occurred to the people just north of Carrot River area in regards to the Squaw Rapids dam; that people were compensated in regards to the Nipawin dam; people were compensated in regards to Diefenbaker dam, but no compensation for people in northern Saskatchewan.

(1445)

And I think it's very important in regards to the fact that northern people are cut back in their municipal budgets, in the fact that they try and meet with this government to resolve the issue of the compensation question, that there is still no movement on it — or very little movement.

I think it's extremely important that when land is destroyed that the means of existence for a people becomes extremely tough. We know that. Everybody

knows that. But when things are done there should be proper compensation, and people are still waiting. I'll have to report back to them that there was nothing in this budget of special interest to them in relation to this question.

As I look at the last issue that I want to deal with, it's the issue of the Indian and Metis question in the province of Saskatchewan. Before I start, I would therefore like to say a few words with due respect to all the languages of this province, Mr. Speaker. I pay due respects to the English language, the French language, the Ukrainian language, the German language, and all the languages that are vitally a part of Saskatchewan history. And when I reply back and state certain things in my own language, Mr. Speaker, that's in the context of the respect for the other languages in this province, and I want to make that clear.

I also want to make it clear that it is with due respect that I received from the House in being able to speak my own language in the House. you know, as a Speaker, you will well recognize the importance, and as a former educator, in relation to the importance of language and what it plays in the role and everyday aspects of people's lives. So I would like therefore to say a couple of words in my own language of Cree.

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

I guess, Mr. Speaker, I was relating back on an extremely important aspect of language in people's lives, that when you look at language, a person learns the basis of understanding, of knowledge, and the feelings that he has for their own people, and she also.

It's very important to remember that as one speaks their own language, that it's a confirmation of that deep respect that a person has had about their cultural heritage. And it's this cultural heritage that is very important, not only for us but for all peoples, that as we express ourselves in our own language, it shows that we respect ourselves. It's only by respecting ourselves can you really truly lean to respect others. And it is in this context that I utilize and use my language with great respect.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — As I look at the question of the issues that are related to this budget, there is no mention, Mr. Speaker, in either the budget or the throne speech, as I talked about last week, there is no mention of treaty rights. There is no mention of Metis rights. There is no mention of any issue whatsoever in regards to Indian and Metis people in this province.

And when you look at the historic tradition of Saskatchewan and the importance of Indian and Metis people in being part of the building process in Saskatchewan's heritage, that as I stand here in the legislature, it strikes me as completely odd. It seems that this government wants to make the question, the whole question of Indian-Metis people, disappear. They want to wish it away.

And in this regard, I looked at the question of the Indian and treaty rights. And as I looked at the new issue that has

come up which was an integral aspect of cultural development in Canada, cultural and linguistic development in Canada, we had the question, Mr. Speaker, of Meech Lake last year, and also the French language question that was talked about this past week. And a lot of people were wondering at that time when Devine voted for Meech Lake

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Goulet: — I know why you're standing up, Mr. Speaker. I'm not supposed to use the Premier's name at all, so I apologize.

In regards to the question of the Premier, the Premier dealt with this question and made eloquent speeches on the maturity of Canada and the maturity of the province of Saskatchewan and how he was so open to the question. But we know very quickly that vanished this week when a lot of the French community responded to the new Bill that was presented this week. It was not a very favourable response.

All of a sudden the openness disappeared. One then has to look at it in historical context: why did that happen? We look back at the Meech Lake thing, the question last year, and also in conjunction right prior to that in April and right into March 26 and 27, we have to look at the aboriginal constitution. And at that time, in the aboriginal constitution, probably the thing that impressed people the most on the constitution was the strong stand that James Sinclair presented in regards to aboriginal people. A lot of people were deeply impressed right across Saskatchewan and right across Canada in relation to the powerful message that was given by the leader of the Association of Metis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan in fighting for Metis issues, Metis rights at the national level.

I remember when Mr. Sinclair put the Premier in an extremely tough position, because the Premier's position was really a watered down approach to the question. None of the organizations wanted any part of it, it was too watered down. And when Mr. Sinclair put the Premier down, a lot of the people looked at the Premier, and all you could see was the Premier looking down — like that — feeling I don't know whether it was guilt or whether it was shame at not doing anything, or I don't know what it was for.

But a lot of people said: oh, oh, the Premier is going to get back at them, at the people. We have to know in this budget whether or not that is true. And as I look at the record for Indian and Metis people in the past two years of budgets, the record shows very clearly that the people's fears were true. And when we connected it back to the Meech Lake question, I will read to you what Jim Mr. Sinclair said about Meech Lake because the Meech Lake question was going to be opened up. I will quote on the 1987 constitution. Mr. Sinclair said this in relation to Quebec when he was addressing the Quebec delegates. He said:

We wish you the best of luck that you will acquire your rights and your place in the constitution of Canada. And I am sure you will, because this

government and the provinces around here will accommodate you, because they cannot leave out their own.

Mr. Sinclair sensed something in relation to that. He sensed that while they were being left out of the constitution, and no further development of self-government would take place, that the Meech Lake accord — and he understood the politics of Canada and the importance of the Quebec question to the Mulroney government — he understood that and he knew that indeed something would come out.

He knew that the Prime Minister would have the determination to push through Meech Lake. He had picked that up. But he knew at the same time that the Prime Minister didn't have the same determination in relation to the Saskatchewan accord at that time to really make a strong commitment because this province, themselves, were not strongly committed.

And so we waited for these past two years to see if there was anything in relation to Indian and Metis rights — treaty rights and Metis rights. And what we see is what Devine actually said on pardon me, the Premier said, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier said on March 27, 1987. This is what he said in relation to the aboriginal constitutional conference, when he said he would come back to Saskatchewan. The Premier said:

We will go home, roll up our sleeves and sit down with the aboriginal people of our province and the federal government and communities, and solve real problems of aboriginal people.

And this is what the Premier said. A lot of people who were leaving that conference said, we are afraid that the Premier really means he is going to roll up his sleeves and beat up on Indian and Metis people.

And when you look at it in historical context, and one sensed the friction that was coming from that debate, and you made a connection then to Meech Lake, and all of a sudden the Premier expressed openness. And again the leader, Sinclair, made a straightforward statement that was historically accurate. The only reason, he said, why the Premier agreed to Meech Lake is because of the Prime Minister. He had to pay back a political debt. He had to pay back a political commitment. He had to pay back the Prime Minister because the Prime Minister had given him \$1 billion to win an election in the fall of '86. And that was very clear.

(1500)

So when I looked at the old question of the budget, I looked at it in historical context as to why Indian-Metis people are kept down in this province. Although the Premier, every time I raise a question that's a little bit embarrassing for him, he will go back in his old statements and say: oh, economic diversification; oh, the uranium mines; oh, diversify this, diversify that. But nothing every really happens. What we know, what we know that's very clear in relation to the budget, is that the budget is the same.

But what was it before in relation to the Indian economic development program? We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian economic development program had \$3 million in it two years ago. Last year I complained that it had dropped \$1 million. When I raised the question in estimates last year, I found out that not only was there the big cut-back from 3 million to 1 million, there was also a lack of proper expenditures on the 3 million. I found out that there was only \$1.7 million that was actually spent out of the 3 million.

In other words, Indian economic development had paid \$1.3 million to pay for the deficit that this government had put us in. And that was last year; this year, they give Indian economic development \$1 million again. Who knows, it may only be half a million dollars by the time the year rolls around.

I look at the issue also on the question of land. Every time the issue of land is raised in this province, the right wing of the Tories just makes just shake their head and don't want to deal with the issue, because land claims, Indian land claims, is something they don't want to deal with, so you don't see anything in relation to the budget speech or the throne speech. They're scared to tackle the issue because, Mr. Speaker, they feel it's bad politics.

But I think it's important to recognize that when you're dealing with important issues, such as land for people, land that is very important for the survival of a people, that the land issue in relation to Indian and Metis people is treated very differently from the land issue in relation to the powerful corporations, and also in relation to the development of saving our wildlife.

When the report was done last year, which it included Tory members in this report — it was a federal report in relation to self-government in 1984 — one looks back at that land thing, and the point that was made that is not reflected on this budget is this: that while the question of parks, most Indian and Metis people agree with the issue of parks and the saving of our wildlife and the saving of our raspberries and strawberries out in the forests.

These are important issues that we need to look at for future development, but I think one has to look at it in proper context. While we will save land for our wildlife, we will not look at land for people — for Indian people. I think that tells a lot about the type of system that we live in and the type of government that doesn't want to deal with that issue.

I think the importance of land in relation to parks is this, and the facts have come out clear; there are, in the past few years, in the more recent history since parks have been formed, there's been five times more parks land given out than five times more parks land were given out than all the amount of land that was given to Indian people across Canada since the signing of the treaties.

That makes an important statement. It says that land for wildlife is more important than land for people. But Indian people recognize that land and the wildlife is also important for them too. And while they see the promotion of wildlife lands, they also want to see the promotion of land for their own people as well. And it's not a difficult

problem to deal with. All it needs is a bit of determination, a bit of taking a tough stand. The Premier comes up here and he says, I'll take a tough stand, all the time. But he will not make a strong stand when it comes down to Indian people and land question in Saskatchewan. He whimpers away and you will never hear from him because he will not make a strong stand in relation to the land question.

The land question is looked at more recently as you look at the Lucky Man Reserve and you look at the issue of La Ronge band. You look at the issue of Peter Ballantyne band. you look at Treaty 4 and Qu'Appelle and many other outstanding land entitlement and claims issues in Saskatchewan that have not been dealt with.

And it just needs determination. And I hope that budgets can be shifted around after they're brought in, that money can be put into the Indian claims department so that it is fitted in to deal with the question of the land claims with the fact of the federal claims commissioner question. I don't want to deal with that question because it's a federal issue, but I think that it's important that because of the 1930 land transfers agreement that the question of land still remains in the province and the province has to be part and parcel of the agreement in regards to land claims and land entitlement issues.

So that's a question that has not been dealt with at all in this budget. It stays the same, and when it stays the same it means little or nothing gets done.

When we look at the question of justice, Indian-Metis people and justice, I was hoping, and many people were hoping that there would be some sort of reinstatement, even in a modified form, of the native court workers program but we see nothing, Mr. Speaker, on this budget.

The native court workers program was very important in this sense: it helped people out, deal with law when they got into situations. We know that high unemployment rates, we know the social problems that that causes. and a lot of people were going into jail at a higher rate per capita of Indian-Metis population than the rest of the province simply because they did not know how to deal effectively with the legal processes and procedures that were taking place. And many times it was because of a second language situation and many times, I think it's important to know, that the regular citizen sometimes does not understand the legal process because it does not affect them on a daily basis.

And this native court workers program provided not only a translation service for people in relation to understanding more about our legal system, it also had a it was also providing a situation where it was a support service to the people so that they are not so overwhelmed by the legal system. And that was a good program. Many people hoped that something would be done in that regard.

And when I hear the Premier talk about families, the importance to the people of families, I think to myself, well he must not mean Indian families or he must not mean Metis families; he must mean only the families of the big corporations and the friends of the Tories. Maybe that's what he means by "families."

When I examine the record, the amount of damage that it has done to people, for not having the jobs that they got through that native court workers program, and the number of little children that were affected by that decision, shows a complete disregard for those families. But the Premier and many members across will talk about the importance of families. But we know one thing about this government, Mr. Speaker, that they put a lot of hardships, not only on Indian and Metis families, but they put a lot of hardships on ordinary people, a lot of workers, a lot of small-business families. These families suffer in the hands of this government. It makes it more difficult for them to fight and prepare themselves alongside the system and to be able to co-operate with the system for a better life like everybody else.

Instead, people see that we see instead of direct support to families we see more moneys, last year, put in for jails, more moneys for the justice system, but no real money improvement on economic development; no increase on education in this budget; no increase on those things that are important for the well-being of the family.

And as I make my final statement, I will deal with this important issue of why it is that there is less money for Indian families on economic development, and Metis families for economic development. And the formula is not hard to figure out. We look at the budget, 2 per cent you know that \$500 figure is tabbed on to us to pay for the expenditures of the system.

But the corporations, well, it's 2 per cent less. We know that for every \$1 that is raised from our own pockets, only 16 cents is raised by the corporations. That's a big difference.

(1515)

We know that we pay for the give-aways to Weyerhaeuser. That's why we have less for Indian economic development and Metis economic development. We know that when we need roads in northern Saskatchewan to be built, Weyerhaeuser can build into the bush 32 kilometres of road every year, but also the fact that they got \$8 million last year. I mean, if Indian bands got that money it would be an important part of their economic development and economic development system. But we don't, we don't get that money.

As I look at the rhetoric of this government, they will say, well, we're promoting private enterprise with Indian people; we're promoting private enterprise this and diversify that. Well, what does that mean in practice? People have to judge by what has taken place.

Well the only private entrepreneur that I know that got any amount of money in Saskatchewan this past year was Peter Pocklington. What does Peter Pocklington get? Well, he gets over \$20 million from the Saskatchewan government and Peter Pocklington gets over \$60 million from the Alberta government. So he gets about over \$80 million to one corporate citizen and his family. But if people got just one-tenth of that that was given to this one

person, they would be happy.

So the Indian economic development question and the Metis economic development question is something that has to be re-examined by this government. It's not only the rich, the big corporations, that should get free money from our system. These corporations will turn around when we want to raise money to educate our children, to improve our health, to improve all these things; they will say, oh, you can't do that, that's a form of welfare. When they take the money and run with \$80 million they call it economic incentive. And to me, that's a system of inequality that this government promotes.

I would like to also say that it's not that we don't have enough money in the province, and I will give one good little example that came out this past week. I raised the issue last week of the ad with Sitting Bull, the ad where he was represented alongside crooks and criminals. I raised the point and I said, well my goodness, if Diefenbaker, a famous leader in Saskatchewan, was put in the same boat with an advertisement in Saskatchewan with criminals like Al Capone you'd have a public outcry.

People would not say that's acceptable to have a famous figure like Diefenbaker in with common everyday crooks like Al Capone. It just wouldn't be accepted; it wouldn't be bought. You wouldn't be able to put it through. It would just not be acceptable. But when it comes to the question of Indian-Metis people it can pass.

Sitting Bull was a famous fighter for his people, but not only that, he was a respected spiritual leader at the same time. A lot of his descendants live in this province, and they want to have a fair share like everybody else. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not see the fairness there.

I checked out how much it costs to put the ad — and it was quoted in the paper — and the amount it cost was \$400,000 to put that ad on. I find that absolutely astounding, that we can use taxpayers' money in advertising at that level of \$400,000, and yet at the same time you can cut back Indian economic development by \$2 million, and leave only \$1 million.

As a matter of fact the record very clearly states, Mr. Speaker, that if the Indian economic development budget is \$1 million, and if the record of the PC government holds true, then only approximately \$600,000 will be spent. And yet, at the same time, when I raise that question to the Premier, he will go on and on about uranium development and this and that.

But the Premier has to recognize that he's spending \$400,000 on what I call a racist ad. And that's my position still remains, Mr. Speaker, because to me racism is something that is wrong. It is wrong whether you do it in a light fashion or in a blatant fashion. Racism is something that has to be fought against.

We knew that very clearly from the records of Fascism in the Second World War. People didn't start by exterminating the Jews or exterminating a lot of other people. That racism didn't start there. It started by subtle racism, subtle little racist jokes, subtle statements here and there. When that became allowed, then the tougher

more blatant forms of racisms became acceptable. It became acceptable to a level that even lives were taken away.

When I read a record of a report that was done by the federal level, called *Equality Now*, that's what it says. I read on page 65:

I think you get the idea of what it was like day in and day out. If it wasn't so hurtful and dangerous, you'd have to feel sorry for the weak minds that come up with thoughts and words like these, but you can't let them get away with it, because that's exactly how it got started in Germany. The Nazis didn't start extermination of the Jews with gas chambers; they started with name-calling and hate letters. Once they got away with that, they felt bold enough to try nastier methods.

Mr. Speaker, nobody likes to deal with the issue of racism. Nobody wants to be put in the light of racism. There are subtle forms of racism and there are blatant forms of racism, but in the end result you can't allow even a little bit. You have to tackle it when it's there. You can't allow it to grow. You have to stop it when you see it.

That's what is learned from the history of the world. That is what we already know, that you cannot allow intolerance to develop. You have to fight against intolerance. You can't even look and join in on the jokes that make a mockery out of people, because you are treating it as an acceptable form. And once you allow yourself to do a little, then you can do a little more and a little more. I do not agree with that type of strategy.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that in most cases, as a student of the history of racism, I know that the majority of people who are indeed sometimes caught in a subtly racist position do not do it on purpose. I know that. I know that they don't intend to do it on purpose. That is very clear. But the important thing to remember is that the result is one of promotion of intolerance.

And that's the problem that I have — is the effect of it. Because not only do you have to change the practice, you have to change the thinking.

People a few years ago did not understand a lot of things about sexism and racism and handicap-ism and discrimination against the elderly. We know that; we understand that. We, now, in this day and age should learn to fight against it. When we see it and we make a mistake, it is better to acknowledge a mistake and to do away with that mistake than to continue to try and hide around it.

I was utterly astounded, Mr. Speaker, I was utterly astounded when the minister came back on the next day and stated, well, they made lots of money out of it. And I said to myself, money is extremely important, money is extremely important to raise. And I think she threw around a figure of about 200,000. And I looked at it and I thought to myself, well, that can't be true. If indeed you are doing something wrong and you make money out of it, then you should stop. I think it's important to recognize that even in the advertisement.

Nobody would agree, absolutely nobody would agree that you could spend money in the way Al Capone spent money. He spent money selling. He made lots of money selling booze. He made lots of money in regards to prostitution. Butch Cassidy made a lot of money robbing banks. But the making money — although they made lots of money — doesn't make it right. Just because you make a lot of money out of a faulty ad does not make it right.

I think the Premier and the minister should re-examine that ad and take it out of the market-place. I think that's the only thing to do about that ad. You cannot allow something like that at this day and age.

It is very clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I never said that it was blatant to a lot of people. I know clearly that it was a more subtle form for some people, but to me it was a little bit more blatant because I have had a chance to look at this history of racism and examine it a little bit more carefully.

And that's why when I speak here in relation to the budget and I see expenditures like that in the budget, I certainly hope that the 1988 budget will not be used in the promotion of this type of advertisement. I certainly hope that when you have \$400,000 to spend, that you will spend it on Indian economic development; that you will spend it in the areas of helping out in Indian alcohol and social work programs; that you will spend it on Indian science and technology; that you will spend it in many of the places right across Saskatchewan for Indian families and children. That's the point that I would like to make today.

This 1988 budget to me, when I look at it in history, is again a shameful budget. It's a budget that does the same thing that it did last year with little or no improvements; in some cases it is worse.

(1530)

I certainly hope that — when I looked at the history of Saskatchewan I saw a sign of the people getting together again. I saw signs last year where there was 100,000 names in petitions. I saw 2,000 teachers just this year demonstrating to force the issue of a settlement of the teachers' agreement. I saw positive signs, even across Canada. I saw the Lubicon demonstration which was here. Now they've got a land claim today, a positive development.

I see people putting pressure on this government, and to me, I stand here in solid support of people who will be moving towards that direction. And it gives me, as an MLA in the province of Saskatchewan and in northern Saskatchewan, it gives me again a faith in the system, and it's the people that I have faith in. I mean I have faith.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And I would like to make that clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's the people, the Saskatchewan people, that I have faith in and not the government, the PC government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to have the opportunity today to get into this budget debate. This is the first opportunity that I've had during this current session to speak, and there are a number of things that I would like to get into. I'm very proud to participate in the budget debate and support the Minister of Finance and our Premier in the budget that was brought forward.

I believe that this budget is a very important piece of legislation and information that's brought forward in this legislature, and it has a big impact on the future of our province. The budget has clearly followed the trend that the Minister of Finance had laid down last year, and though we still have a deficit, it's a much smaller deficit than we had before, and it's tracking in the direction of a balanced budget in the near future. I'm pleased with that direction.

Now I think we all realize that we've been through very tight economical times in the province of Saskatchewan. If a person wanted to zero in on a balanced budget as the most important thing that we had to do, then you could cut programs and cut opportunities for people and raise taxes and do all of those things. But I believe the direction that this government has gone is the direction that was needed at this time in history.

Mr. Speaker, this covers a lot of the areas that I feel you and I and our families will benefit from. There's a strong commitment to health care and an increase in expenditure in that area, a strong commitment to education, and again, a major increase in expenditure. It looks at the items that would cover the needs of Saskatchewan families, and fiscal responsibility for us as a government, debt reduction and yet some economic development. All of these at a time when the province is experiencing economic difficulty, I think speaks well for the budget and for our Minister of Finance, and indeed for our Premier.

The area of agriculture was mentioned today in question period, and the call came that the Premier would dismiss himself as Minister of Agriculture and put someone else in. I believe that that kind of call to this Minister of Agriculture is not a call that should be heard at any time. There's been no minister of Agriculture in the history of our province who has done as much for the industry as this Minister of Agriculture, our Premier.

This year the farmers will participate in a \$1.1 billion deficiency payment. It's true that comes from the federal government, but I don't believe for a minute that it would have come had it not been for the Premier of this province and him, as Minister of Agriculture, laying his case before the federal government and getting that case accepted.

As well, we see that the Farm Credit Corporation was convinced to move to put \$330 million in to write down farm debt so that many of our young farmers would be able to stay on the farm. Now 330 million isn't going to solve all the debt problems that farmers have in Saskatchewan, but for those who are in dire need at this

time, it is a significant number of dollars and, if used wisely, will protect many who are in the agriculture community and keep them on the farm.

The new initiative that was in this year's budget was soil conservation. Our government is putting in a \$15 million sum, the federal government 70 million. A combination of the two brings \$90 million. This will give an opportunity for a considerable amount of research into the soil conservation area. Many people around the farming community will get a chance to be involved in doing a variety of studies to see what can be done to prevent further soil erosion.

Another area that I believe has been extremely beneficial to our farmers is the livestock cash advance, the livestock tax credit, and the assistance through agriculture credit corporation for additional funding to build livestock facilities in rural Saskatchewan.

Each of these have a role to play. No one will solve all the problem, but as I go around an agricultural constituency like the one that I represent, and I talk to farmers, and I talk to many of them, the indications that I hear are that they are extremely pleased with the way this government has responded to the needs of that agricultural community.

The health care budget this year has seen an increase up to \$1.2 billion, almost a third of the total provincial budget. This government is committed to a high quality of health care, and the proposal for a task force to review the whole health care position in this province, I think, is extremely important at this time.

Health care has been in place since the early 1960s, and during that course of time there have been many changes in the way that health care is delivered and can be delivered. The costs of health care have risen astronomically over that period of time, and we are now able to do things in health care that were not even dreamed of at the time that the program came in in 1962.

It was interesting to me last year to be around the Plains Hospital here for a number of days when my wife was not well, and to see the major operations that are being performed on a routine basis in Saskatchewan hospitals. When they told me first that they were able to do up to six heart bypass operations in a day at the Plains Hospital, I thought it was almost an impossibility. One doctor does the majority of that work.

But what a tremendous cost to the health care system. Very important if you need it, and I'm thankful that we're able to do it; but still, a tremendous cost to our health care system, and one that I'm not sure we can continue to absorb 100 per cent. But at this point, we're able to. We have committed the money and I'm glad of that, and I look forward to what the task force review will bring forward that will give us guidance for the future.

We are committed to quality hospitals and major renovations to many of the hospital facilities in our major centres. I think of Regina and the Pasqua Hospital and the major commitment of dollars that have gone into that hospital and have added to it and upgraded it until it's

going to be a first-class facility.

The Wascana Rehabilitation Centre in Regina, a major undertaking of something over \$50 million that will make this rehabilitation centre a centre of excellence, one that we can be proud of and one that will I'm sure assist many people to restore them to complete health.

The Regina General, again, has had a considerable amount of upgrading, additions and upgrading, until it is now a very fine hospital, one that is serving our people well.

In Saskatoon, on the 15th of this month, we will see the opening of the new wing of the University Hospital. Very soon the opening of the new wing of St. Paul's Hospital will also come, and the sod-turning for a brand-new City Hospital in Saskatoon will also occur in April, I think showing a major indication of the commitment that this government has for health care and for the future of health care in our province.

I'm very pleased with the number of things that have been done in my own constituency for health care, and I'd just like to mention a few of them.

This year there's been an approval for a major upgrading of the Mildred Union Hospital. It will be a project of something like \$640 million.

In the village of Elrose, an approval for a 30-bed special care home. They've had a special care home but it's outdated, can't meet the needs of the people in that community, so this year they'll be getting a replacement of those 30 beds and two additional. This will give Elrose the capability of dealing with the heavy level 3 and 4 care that is needed in our nursing homes.

In Kyle we have a fine new hospital that was started last year. It's not completed at this time, but it's well under way in the construction process. That hospital is anticipated to be ready by next spring, and it will bring a combined facility, a new hospital with 12 nursing home beds attached, that will meet the needs of that community for a number of years into the future.

There are a number of other things in health care that are happening, but I won't touch on them all today. It's important to see them happen, and I'm very pleased with the direction that is happening within our province for each of the constituencies that we represent.

I was pleased this year to see a move to upgrade the Saskatchewan Landing Park. It will be a provincial park. It has been there now for a number of years but has seen little development up to this point in time.

But the study that was done a number of years ago indicated that Elbow should be the first park to go forward, and then Saskatchewan Landing would be the second. We're now at that stage where Saskatchewan Landing will be concentrated upon, and many of the needs of that area are going to begin to take place.

There's a commitment for a new marina. It's a considerable cost but very much a part of a good park

set-up. Also a commitment for a sewage lagoon and tennis courts, staff housing, irrigation for the trees and the grass.

(1545)

This park will serve the Swift Current, Kyle, Rosetown and area west. There are many visitors that come to that park, even though it was not developed very far, because it has a beautiful lake — tremendous opportunity for sailing and fishing and many of the recreational activities that we all look for when we go to a park.

I'm pleased that we're going to start to utilize that body of water to the benefit to the people of our province, but also to the benefit of those who are tourists and will travel through and take advantage of the parks as they go.

I was also pleased, when the Minister of Highways tabled his project array last night, to see a considerable amount of highway work in my own constituency. I'm not going to list the different highways, but there's something over \$6.5 million of highway work that's to be done in the Rosetown-Elrose riding. And as I look across the province at many of the constituencies, I see similar figures showing for almost every constituency in the province.

The \$100 million capital program that's there for this year's highway budget should put in place many of the needs that our highway system has today, and beyond that there's a \$30 million enhancement program that will take place over the next three years, and again, this 30 million will assist to bring many of the highways into first-class condition.

I'm confident that in our communities we can go ahead and develop businesses and be assured that the communities will have good highways and good roads to service them. The business can develop with confidence and know that the government is there with them, and the Highways department is looking after them to see that each community has the kind of roads and services that are so essential in today's method of travel.

I'd like now to touch on the Department of Environment and Public Safety and some of the areas that we will be working in in this year. I'd just like to mention a few of the highlights from our budget.

Our government remains firmly committed to the protection of the environment and firmly committed to the protection of the people of our province and to the protection of wildlife.

This year we have a new program to deal with a number of the abandoned mines that have been of concern to people, particularly in the coal mining area near Estevan and other centres in that area of the province. But we also have a number of mines in the northern part of the province that are of concern and will be looked at. We will be putting a staff member in place to begin this program in the very near future.

This year we would like to address some of the mines close to the populated centres in the south-east corner of our province. This was brought on, I guess to some extent,

by the tragic death last year of a youth in the Estevan area, and we have filled a couple of mines in that area now, but we'll be continuing to work to make the communities safe for the residents over the next short while.

A major study this year is going to begin in Regina studying the ground water quality for the city of Regina and area. This is a three-year comprehensive monitoring and study program that will go forward at a cost of something like \$50,000, and it will involve people from other agencies, but the Department of Environment will be the lead agency.

Beginning this year, we will obtain and compile and interpret the information on ground water, and I trust that in the near future we will be able to deal with any contamination that is occurring in the area to protect the residents of Regina from a lack of good water in the future.

I wanted to also mention the planning that has been put in place in the department, looking ahead into the future, for a number of different areas. We are looking very seriously at the hazardous waste area. It's a time of restraint and difficult to put a lot of money into hazardous waste, and yet I believe it's something that we must address as a department. The staff in the department are recognizing the need, and even with limited dollars are willing to work hard to see that that need is addressed.

Our government is also looking at the public safety side, and this year, in June, we will see the coming into force of the regulations that will give the building accessibility standards that have been so necessary for our handicapped people. It's an area that had been worked on for a number of years and had been looked at by many groups in society, but each time it would get close to the finalization of the regulations, there would be someone concerned that they couldn't afford to meet the requirements under those regulations. I'm glad that we have finally been able to resolve that.

The regulations were passed back in the fall and gazetted, and they are to take effect on June 1.

Last year the National Task Force on the Environment and the Economy completed a major study and issued its report, and this report deals with a wide variety of subject areas of environmental concern to the people across Canada. This year we would like to begin round-table discussions with groups in society on the details of that report. The report has now been widely circulated, and people are beginning to respond to the various areas that are in the report. I was extremely pleased that when this national task force's report went forward to the first ministers' conference last November, that it was unanimously agreed to by the first ministers of Canada. So that gives an indication of the work that went into that report and the high regard that is held for the quality work that was done.

I trust that many of the members here will read the report and, as the round-table discussions begin, that they will take part and have input into the future of that, as major decisions will come forward from it.

The government as well, through environmental impact

studies has reviewed many major projects in the past year — I think 24 major projects. We have done a detailed study in all cases, and I believe that, as the approvals have been given for various projects, that the projects go forward in a manner that is going to protect our environment and yet accomplish economic development. It's a very tight rope to walk sometimes to accomplish both ends, but I believe that we've been able to do that.

I congratulate the staff in the Department of Environment, as they have reviewed these environmental impact studies. I think we can be proud of the quality of people that we have, and of the work that they have done.

I want to just report that last fall we did a major clean-up of an arsenic trioxide storage site near Douglas Lake in the area near the town of Creighton. We cleaned up about 20 tons of arsenic trioxide that had been stored in a vault, a concrete vault, just a few yards from the edge of Douglas Lake. This had been talked about for something like about 30 years and nothing had been done.

But when I went out to have a look at the storage vault with the department staff and we took ground samples, looked at the vault itself and then took water samples, you certainly could realize that this was a hazard to the people in the area, and it couldn't be left any longer.

So our government expended something like \$175,000 to make this major clean-up and to move that product through. So our government expended something like \$175,000 to make this major clean-up and to move that product through to Yellowknife where it was processed through with the gold mining process there, and the arsenic trioxide purified to the point where it is usable and sold to the companies who use that kind of product.

I'm very pleased that the community of Creighton can now use the water from Douglas Lake for its drinking and home use and be confident that they have a safe and clean supply of water for their community.

This last year we passed The Clean Air Act, which is a major change and an improvement in the direction that our department will use to be sure that industries in our province will not be polluting the air, but rather will be operating in a safe manner. We are working carefully to monitor the emissions from a variety of different businesses around the country. We've had good co-operation from many that we have been in touch with up to this point, and I'm confident that as we continue to work, that people in our province will have cleaner air, safer air over a long period of time.

The pesticide container collection program which began five years ago has resulted in the collection of 3.2 million chemical containers, and over 420 barrels of residue have been recovered as these containers have been crushed and taken out of our society. I'm pleased that this program is going forward. It's been a program highly valued by the farming community and, I believe, beneficial to every resident in our province.

I listened last night to the member from Cumberland as he was speaking, and he made some statements and some accusations that I take exception to.

First, he says that there was a chemical cyanide spill in northern Saskatchewan. There's no recorded spill of any cyanide spill ever happening in northern Saskatchewan, so the member's facts are wrong. And he goes on to say that a record number of accidents have occurred because of the highways and the spillage of chemicals. These statements are not true statements. And as I listened to the member I wondered whether I had missed something, so I went back to the department to check very carefully. I find that the member is off base in what he is saying. He's trying to confuse and scare the public, and I believe that the member should withdraw those statements because they are not factual.

Today, again, he made a statement about the Rafferty-Alameda project and he said that the government is spending \$1.2 billion on Rafferty-Alameda. That's absolute hog-wash. Rafferty-Alameda is budgeted at \$126 million. That's a long ways from 1.2 billion. And there's to be \$51 million of that, approximately, coming from the United States, so when you get it backed off to what it's costing Saskatchewan, it's a long, long ways from 1.2 billion. Even if you add the Shand project, it's a long ways from 1.2 billion.

So I think the member throws out figures and statistics without any background — a very dangerous practice at any time, and in this legislature, I think, extremely dangerous and one that's almost unforgiveable because the facts and the figures are available to the member. He simply didn't use his research, and he throws out whatever he feels comfortable to do.

(1600)

I'd like to touch briefly on the Sask Water Corporation that was established in 1984 and has an impact on the lives of almost every person in our province as they deal with water issues. They've had a major commitment to irrigation over the past few years under the Canada-Saskatchewan subsidiary agreement dealing with irrigation-based economic development. That \$100 million sounded like a very large figure when it came forward about two years ago, but as the people in the province who were interested in irrigation came forward and identified the projects that they would like to proceed with, that \$100 million was used up very quickly. I'm not saying that it's all spent yet, but it's all committed. One of the major projects is in the area just south of Riverhurst. It's called the Luck Lake project. It was designed to go forward in three stages, and the first stage was under construction last year and this year, and it's intended that this project will be on stream for the spring of 1989.

It was interesting to me to notice the response of the farming community there, even in these difficult financial times. At first it looked like the only acreage that would be irrigated from the beginning stages would be something between 4 and 5,000 acres. Then as the project began to be developed and people could see the type of project and the type of delivery that would occur, immediately we have a demand that the second phase of that project go simultaneous with the first phase so that both will open in the spring of 1989. That will bring on stream something in the neighbourhood of 18,000 acres. It shows the

demand that that community has.

Along with that project, Ducks Unlimited came last year and, in negotiation with the Sask Water Corporation and the farming community near Luck Lake, have agreed to a major Ducks Unlimited project that will provide a wet marsh area for wild fowl. This project is going to cost about \$5 million, the largest single project ever undertaken in Canada by Ducks Unlimited. And it will take place at Luck Lake itself. It's an alkaline lake, but with the volume of water that they would put in it now, it would be very suitable for wild fowl. So I'm glad to see that happening.

Last year we also had a request from the community near Riverhurst to begin another major irrigation project. The design work is pretty much completed now. The road into the pump station is about all of the groundwork that has been done. But this project will begin construction this year and will be timed to come on stream for 1990.

When you get those two projects complete, along with some of the individual irrigation that's taking place, it will bring about 50,000 acres of land under irrigation from these projects since this \$100 million Canada-Saskatchewan subsidiary agreement was first signed, a major accomplishment by the corporation and by the farm communities as it goes forward.

The water corporation also was asked to take over the irrigation development centre at Outlook effective July 1 of 1987. That has been accomplished. The irrigation development centre is working very closely with the Sask Water Corporation and have been a real asset as we work with irrigation across the province. They bring much expertise to the water corporation. I believe that it was a wise decision for the two to be put together so that they could more effectively deal with the major projects.

Sask Water has four programs for farmers in small rural communities, and they make a lot of effort to assist these small communities to locate and develop ground water supplies and to construct surface storage. This year we have been called many times by small towns in the south and south-west, advising us that indeed the ground water is going lower and lower all the time so that many of the wells are indeed drying up, and it puts a number of communities in very difficult circumstance.

The staff from the water corporation have worked very carefully with many of those communities to develop alternate supplies, and to assist them with the technical expertise, but also with the financial need to make those supplies available to the citizens in their communities.

Some time ago I asked the Saskatchewan Water Corporation staff to spend extra time reviewing all of the E-logs from wells that have been dug over the past number of years, whether by water well drillers or oil well drills or whoever has done the E-log work, to identify as many of the ground aquifers as possible on their maps, so that when there is a need we don't have to spend weeks looking for the source but rather we have the source at our fingertips.

It's been an interesting time for the water corporation

staff. It's demanded a lot of work. They've done it willingly, and I believe that it will be a real advantage to the communities as they come forward and look for help.

Over the last two years that I've had the opportunity to address the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, one of the areas that they've asked about in each of those two years was about fish mitigation in the Qu'Appelle area. A number of years ago as the Qu'Appelle conveyance channel work began, there was an agreement that the government would put in a fish mitigation process at a cost of something like \$384,000. Now as the channel work proceeded, it seemed each year the demand for fish mitigation rose, and this year we have approval to go ahead with that fish mitigation at a cost of some \$700,000. That is a major expenditure.

I hope that the fish mitigation will be successful so that people who have cabins and who holiday in the Qu'Appelle area will have an opportunity indeed to go in their boats and catch a few fish and enjoy fishing.

Altogether that Qu'Appelle river channelization has seen something like three and one-half million dollars expended, and with this \$700,000 it gets to be in excess of \$4 million.

The member from Cumberland indicated that nobody was doing anything for the people of the North. I believe that either he doesn't go to the North very often, or when he does, he doesn't listen to the people, or he has his eyes shut. I'm not just sure what's happening exactly, but I want to give an example of a few things that the member might take notice of, and maybe indeed he should be saying thanks once in a while.

Last year the water corporation put in a brand-new water treatment plant at Cumberland, the member's home town, at something in the neighbourhood of a million dollars of cost. Very valuable to the community, it guarantees them good water for their community for a long time into the future.

Last year also, we went into Jans Bay and put in a sewer and water system at a cost of about \$1 million. We have seven projects for sewer and water that have gone in in the North in the last very few years at a cost of something over 3.2 million.

So people are doing things in northern Saskatchewan, doing a number of them. There are many other things that should be done, but I think for the member to stand and say we are doing nothing for the North is not quite fair. We are doing a lot, and I believe the developments that we have put forward in the North are better than what has happened under previous governments for the people of that region.

In the budget there were many references to our government's commitment to Saskatchewan families, and I commend the Premier of our province for his strong moral stand regarding families and family life. You know, I have a great deal of concern about families, and have a family of my own. I have four children, all married; 10 grandchildren. I do have a major concern for the future of families and what's right for families.

And I believe the stand that the Premier has taken on moral issues is very much a traditional Judeo-Christian stand that has been the basis for the development of Canada. I'm proud of that stand, and I hope that our Premier and others continue to take that kind of stand, a very firm stand, so that there is a right and a wrong, so that young people and some not so young can make choices and know that they're on the right track.

The basis of our laws have been the Christian belief and the absolutes, and I believe that's important and that we should maintain some of that. More and more we're seeing a greying of some of these issues, and as that greying occurs it leaves a confusion among the young people and the teenagers of our society. They lose direction, and I believe that loss of direction is very, very serious for the future of Canada as a nation and for the future of our province.

I'm very pleased that through our concern for families we've been able to continue the mortgage protection plan that has meant so much to many of our home owners, in the cities in particular. People who carry a heavy mortgage can carry it and feel safe that yes, we can afford it, our interest rate is not going to go beyond a fixed level. With that kind of security they feel comfortable to buy a home and to be sure that they're going to have a roof over their head for them and their families into the future.

I'm pleased that we were able to exempt the sales tax from clothing and footwear for articles under \$300. That covers most of the clothing that's needed by the average individual and especially for children. People in our type of work may go and spend more than \$300 when we buy a suit or a coat, but for the most part it covers the clothing of most people.

And I'm very pleased with the support that we have given to the families as we deal with the growing problem of drugs and alcohol abuse. The assistance that's been put in place for young people to get treatment when they do have a problem with drugs is very beneficial, and it will bring people back into our society cleansed of a serious problem that could have ruined their life for ever.

(1615)

I'm also pleased to see an enhancement of day care being provided for in this budget, and a new, safe shelter in Swift Current for victims of family violence. We hope that people don't need that kind of facility, but when they do, I'm certainly pleased that it's there and that people have someone to turn to.

The enhanced support for the foster parents, again a very strong move in family support. I'm pleased that we have people around our province who are willing to be foster parents and take children in and make a good home for them. This additional support will make it possible for them to continue to care for young people and to promote positive parenting through a new program that we have called "Families Matter." This program, I think, is going to be very beneficial and should give many people an opportunity to learn from one another and from a very

good and family-stressing program.

On the issue of abortion, this has dropped on our lap this winter, and it has been a very major issue for governments across the nation. It's an issue that I think you and I need to take seriously because it impacts on the future generations in our country. The stand that our Premier has taken, I think, is a strong stand and one that is supported by many, many people around our province. When we met with the major church groups as a cabinet recently, as the groups got up to speak, one after the other, we were hearing them say, thank you, to the Premier; we agree with you; we support you on the stand that you've taken. There was only one dissenting voice in the whole group. I'm not going to identify that voice, but there was only one dissenting voice in the whole group.

And when that meeting was over and the press reports that came out after it, I couldn't believe that that could be the result of the meeting that I'd been at. The press reports must have come from only the one person because they were not saying what all of those church leaders had been saying in the meeting when they met with cabinet.

I had a letter from a doctor in my constituency, one who has been a medical doctor in practice for something over 20 years. And he spoke in that letter, or he wrote in that letter, of the abortion issue and how he saw it as a doctor. And what he said was that after 20 years as a medical professional dealing with people, he had not seen one medical indication for need of an abortion — not one in 20 years.

Yet in our province in 1982 we were seeing that there were about 1,800 abortions being performed in a year. We made some changes, and that figure has dropped. But I'm still not very pleased with the figure; it's still something in the neighbourhood of 900. It's cut in half, but still not nearly cut far enough.

I believe that as a nation, as a province, we need to ensure that there is something put in legislation that's going to provide the rights for the unborn. If we don't do that, I believe it's the first step towards more serious issues in the future when we will see not only the very young being aborted, but we may also see euthanasia practised for seniors and perhaps for the handicapped or other undesirables in our society.

As we open the door, we leave that danger there for other segments of society. I hope that as this issue comes forward many of you will take a strong stand to support the federal government in putting forward legislation that will be very specific and will take the stand to support the unborn.

I'd like to speak briefly on the education issue, and as a parent and a former school trustee I have a real concern for the education system in our province. I'm pleased this year to see a major change in the course offerings that will be provided in our schools, so that we're going to have a core curriculum that's going to put quality back into many of the schools. And I think we lost some of that during the period when we looked at the idea of every child doing his own thing. Indeed, they did do their own thing, but their own thing was not necessarily great and

the quality of education suffered. I'm glad to see a change coming in that area.

Since 1982, spending on education in our province has increased by almost 50 per cent, and we see this year 5.2 per cent additional being put in the budget for education. It shows a very major commitment that our government has for the education and the future of our children.

I'm pleased that there is 7 million increased in the school operating grants and 2.8 million increase in university operating assistance. Add to that the 14 and a half million for the educational development fund, and 31 million in capital assistance for renovation and construction of new schools, and you see the major commitment that this government has for education.

I'm pleased, as well, to see a note in our papers that indicate that likely we have a settlement in the teachers' salary contract. Now there's no assurance that we have a settlement until it is ratified and the contract is signed, but the comments that I'm hearing are good. And the articles that are coming forward from people like Fred Herron, the general secretary of the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, and he said, we're pleased that there has been an increase; we would certainly like more, but consideration, the type that we have this year, he says: but considering the other elements of the budget, it shows priority for education. So the general secretary of the teachers' federation is pleased with what we're doing for education.

Ray Matheson, chairman of the Regina Board of Education, was also pleased and he said: considering the economic times we're in, education has fared well. Of course you'd like more, but with the resource base the way it is you have to be grateful for what you're getting — I think a comment that is probably speaking it as it is. Everybody would like more, but indeed pleased with the fact that there was more money put into education.

Reid Robinson, at the University of Regina, academic vice-president was encouraged, and he said: we're certainly encouraged that there are some indications that we're going to have some increased capital funding. Through this and previous budgets, our government has taken important steps to ensure that the people in our province have access to high quality education, and I trust that we will continue to have that concern and that our people will, over the long haul, have a very strong education system that will put our people through the education system and stand them well as they go forward to become the leaders in our society.

In a time of restraint, I think it's a credit that our government has been able to increase spending this year by 127 million, 82 per cent of which goes directly to health and education, and also that we've been able to cut back on the amount of deficit that we will experience. I was pleased when the Minister of Finance was able to come in below the predicted deficit that he had last year by some \$9 million. I believe that to cut back on the deficit by 42 per cent from what it was in 1986 is a step in the right direction. I hope that very soon we can cut that — remaining amount — so that we are at balanced budget position.

We're committed to economic development diversification, and I'm very pleased to see the upgrader that's under construction here in Regina. That upgrader should come on stream this fall, and as it begins to process our heavy oil at the rate of something like 50,000 barrels per day, that's going to be a major economic benefit to our province and provide a number of jobs here in the city of Regina.

We have 50 million seedlings in the reforestation program proposed, to be made available to replant our forests. That's a major project. Something like 9,000 jobs should be created as we move forward with the economic development programs in the next short while. And as we've encouraged our businesses and our industries to "hire Saskatchewan," I'm pleased to see that many of the businesses here have taken that seriously, and have been able to hire many more Saskatchewan people than had normally been the case.

Some areas we don't have the expertise, but as we begin to recognize the need, and the need to develop that broader expertise, our universities and technical training schools are broadening their base and providing additional training, so that in the very near future I believe that when we have a major development, Saskatchewan will have the expertise, and that will stand our people in good stead.

I'm pleased to see the unemployment rates continue to drop and to see that this province is the second lowest in Canada. That's something that we've worked toward. I'd like to see a zero unemployment rate, as all people would. We haven't arrived; we haven't quit working. We're going to continue to strive for that, but at least we're moving in the right direction and the unemployment rate is dropping steadily. I'm encouraged by that and look forward to the day when anyone who wants a job will be able to get it.

We have many other areas that I could speak to. I don't want to monopolize the whole time of the House, but I would just close by saying that I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support the budget as it has been presented. I'm encouraged that over the next year we will likely see our economy continue to strengthen. The government will be providing the services that I believe Saskatchewan people need, and I'm looking forward to our province taking strides forward in the coming year as the economy turns.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and as others have said before me, I too am pleased to enter this budget debate. I'm not pleased to enter it because of what is contained in this document, but pleased to stand and speak in this House, because I consider it an honour and a privilege, and indeed a responsibility, to have this opportunity.

And I think all members present would be well advised to remember what a privilege and an honour it is every time that we have opportunity to speak in here, and to take that

seriously. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I remain very grateful to the people of Moose Jaw South who have given me this privilege and this honour and this responsibility.

But may I also say, Mr. Speaker, before I begin remarks on this budget, that I think all we who are elected would be well advised to remember that it is perhaps not the most important thing we do when we give speeches in this House.

(1630)

Mr. Speaker, some of the most important things we do are when we're in our own constituencies and when we are with the people who have given us the privilege to sit in this place; when we're helping that senior citizen with a grant application form; or when we're steering someone through that maze of social services; or indeed when we're bringing greetings to an anniversary; when we're on the street talking to people and listening to people; when we're with the people who gave us the honour and the privilege to sit in this House, that's where some of our most important work is to be done. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, it would be my judgement and my opinion that when we speak in this House, if we are not reflecting the wishes and the desires and the concerns of the people of our home, then we are not doing our job, and the only way that we can speak effectively in this place is to be with those people.

Mr. Speaker, so what I hope to do in this budget debate is to reflect not only my own concerns, not just the concerns of my caucus, not just the concerns of my party, but to reflect the concerns of the people I represent and, hopefully, the concerns of the people of Saskatchewan whom we were all elected to serve.

I want to do that, Mr. Speaker, by picking up on a little bit of poetry that entered this debate from that gentle, poetic member from Quill Lakes, the opposition Finance critic, in his introductory remarks in response to his budget, the member from Quill Lakes, the opposition Finance critic, quoted a line from that beautiful little poem by William Butler Yeats. He quoted this line, Mr. Speaker:

(But), being poor, have only my dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pick up on that short quote and, if I may, quote a little bit more of William Butler Yeats and his poem, "The Heaven's Embroidered Cloths." He wrote this:

Had I the heavens' embroidered cloths,/ enwrought with
golden and silver light,/ . . . I would spread those cloths
(underneath) your feet:/
. . . But, I being poor have only my dreams;/ . . .
Tread softly, because you tread (upon) my dreams.

Mr. Speaker, when the people of Saskatchewan gave this Progressive Conservative Party the mandate to govern, in many ways the people of Saskatchewan laid their dreams at the feet of this government, entrusted their hopes and their dreams to this group of men and women. And what's happened, Mr. Speaker? The people of Saskatchewan have seen their dreams trampled on, they have seen their dreams trampled on by this government.

And this budget which, by it's own admission, stays the course — stays the course — continues to trample on those dreams. The dreams of Saskatchewan people have been stepped on, they've been hurt. Saskatchewan people have seen their neighbours hurt and their families hurt. They've seen their hopes and their expectations and their optimism and their confidence in this great province trampled on. They were promised: there's so much more that we can be. They've discovered how much less we can become in seven budgets — seven years of famine, Mr. Speaker. Seven long, lean years.

Having laid their dreams at the feet of this government, Saskatchewan people and Moose Jaw people have seen many of those dreams betrayed.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that a few moments ago the Premier of this province finally announced the dates of a by-election for Saskatoon Eastview and Regina Elphinstone. I understand that he's finally, after 10 long months for the people of Saskatoon Eastview, finally found the courage to seek the opinion of Saskatchewan people on his government and on this budget. And, Mr. Speaker, if I may say, when that opinion is given, I would say to the Sergeant-at-Arms, he had better be sure there are two more desks on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatoon Eastview, the people of Regina Elphinstone will indicate their judgement, and in many ways they will express the opinion of all of Saskatchewan on Wednesday, May 4.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn to some of the specifics of this budget, I would like to address another issue that has been brought into this budget debate, an issue that does arise from this budget and the direction set out by this budget and has been introduced into this debate by the minister of privatization. And I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the sell-off of Saskatchewan Minerals, the sell-off of Saskatchewan Minerals.

And I want to report to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members of this House what is being said in the communities of Chaplin, Fox Valley, and Carrot River, and what's being said far beyond those communities. The people of Saskatchewan are saying that this is privatization of the worst possible kind. The sell-off of Sask Minerals is privatization of the worst possible kind.

Mr. Speaker, here we had a Saskatchewan firm for over 40 years which had regularly and dependably, year after year after year, returned a profit to the people of Saskatchewan; a Saskatchewan firm that has been the life-blood of several rural Saskatchewan communities; a Saskatchewan firm that competed effectively in the market place; a Saskatchewan firm that developed a Saskatchewan resource for the benefit of Saskatchewan people; a Saskatchewan firm that was in the leading edge, the state of the art technology, Mr. Speaker; a Saskatchewan firm that has paid millions in grants in lieu of taxes to the communities where it was located; a Saskatchewan firm that has paid its full share of royalties to the provincial government; and a Saskatchewan firm

that has returned over \$40 million — \$40 million, Mr. Speaker — to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about those dividends, the dividends that came, that I received, that my family enjoyed, dividends of Saskatchewan Minerals. I had, we had, the best prescription drug plan in the world. We had the best children's dental plan, school-based dental plan, in the world. That's a dividend, Mr. Speaker. We had roads that we could drive on. That was a dividend, Mr. Speaker. There were tuition fees that I could afford to get a post-secondary education. That was a dividend that I enjoyed.

Where are the dividends going now? Where are the dividends going now? Into the hands of the corporate friends of this government. What has this government done with Sask Minerals? In a secret deal negotiated behind closed doors, Mr. Speaker, in a secret deal where no tenders, no tenders were offered; this government chooses its own corporate friends and sells off Sask Minerals to central friends from central Canada.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that in this House I inquired of the Premier his reasoning for selling Sask Minerals. I asked him in this House to justify the sale of this Saskatchewan asset. And he responded in this fashion, Mr. Speaker, and I quote from page 26 of *Hansard*, March 23. In response to my question to the Premier, why did he sell off the Saskatchewan asset, he said the following:

The public (he said) wants to participate. They want to see it grow, and they want to see profitable operations, and they want to see us in a prosperous situation. Now we inherited many, many, many public corporations that were not doing well, or that could do much better.

The clear implication, Mr. Speaker, in the Premier's response to my question, is that somehow or other Sask Minerals was not profitable, not prosperous, that it could somehow do so much better. Mr. Speaker, when the Premier stood in the House and said that, it was nothing but a direct slur on the workers and the management of Sask Minerals over all these years, those who have served on those boards. When he came into this House and said that this Sask Minerals wasn't profitable, wasn't prosperous

An Hon. Member: — Calculated deceit.

Mr. Calvert: — Calculated deceit, my colleague says, Mr. Speaker, when the member from where's she from?

An Hon. Member: — Maple Creek.

Mr. Calvert: — Maple Creek. On the rare occasion when that member from Maple Creek makes a speech in this House, I sit here quietly, I sit here quietly and listen, even endure, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to ask her to extend the same courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, the record, the corporate record of Sask Minerals, the successful record of that corporation was due to the dedication of its workers and its management and its board members, and somehow for the Premier to

imply that they were not doing their job was a slur on those people, and he ought to stand in this House and apologize to them. I thought his job was to protect Saskatchewan people. Rather, he attacks.

Mr. Speaker, the sale of Sask Minerals is privatization of the worst possible kind, and it was done, Mr. Speaker, it was done without consultation. Indeed, if anything it made a mockery of the process of consultation.

Mr. Speaker, on March 19, Saturday, March 19, we read in the *Leader-Post* a headline that said, "Public to get a say ahead of privatization." The minister of privatization that day announced that the sale of Sask Minerals was being considered, and then in the article it reads, "But before any privatization is carried out," Taylor said, "there must be clear benefits to the public."

Mr. Speaker: — I know the hon. member had a slip of the tongue, but I must remind him that members' names are not to be used.

Mr. Calvert: — I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House.

The minister of privatization is quoted in this article as saying:

We want to see an adequate opportunity for consultation and discussion with those people affected. We don't want there to be any surprises. As such (the minister of privatization said that, quote) no firm decisions have been made.

And get this, Mr. Speaker: "The government might abandon plans if there is significant opposition to any particular privatization effort."

He said that on Saturday, March 19. On Thursday, March 24, the same minister of privatization flies out to Chaplin for a public meeting — a meeting with the workers, a meeting with the townspeople, and then a quick flight up to Carrot River for a meeting over there. I note that he did not have the courtesy to visit the community of Fox Valley.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about that meeting because yes, I was there. Yes, I was there and, contrary to the minister, I was invited to come. I was invited to be there. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the process of consultation that went on that day. The minister flies in at 11 o'clock, he meets with the workers for about three-quarters of an hour — three-quarters of an hour. Some of these men and women have given the best part of their lives to Sask Minerals. He extends them 45 minutes of his time. That's consultation.

With the townspeople he spends about — not quite — about an hour, an hour, and then, with his aides rushing him out the door, he's off to Carrot River, and that's consultation. And when he was there, Mr. Speaker, did this minister say to the community of Chaplin and to the workers, do you think that the sell-off of Sask Minerals is a good idea? Did he ask their opinion? No, no. He came and said, look out, we've just about signed the deal. We've just about signed the deal.

Did he say to the workers at Sask Minerals, did he say to the people who've given so much of their lives to this corporation, did he say to them, would you like an opportunity to participate? Would you like to share in the ownership? No. When that question was put to him, he turned the request down flat. That's consultation, Mr. Speaker. Could he provide to the people of Chaplin any firm commitment on the future of their jobs? No, he couldn't. Could he provide to the people of Chaplin any firm commitment that the head office would remain in their community? No, he couldn't.

Mr. Speaker, I have never, in one meeting, heard the words, "I hope," "maybe," "perhaps," as I did that day from the lips of the minister of privatization. All that he could really assure the workers in the community of Chaplin, all that he could assure them was that they were about to be sold out to some friends of this government from eastern Canada.

(1645)

So let's go through it again, Mr. Speaker. Saturday, March 19, the minister announced the sale of Sask Minerals as being considered. Thursday, March 24, he calls a public meeting that lasts about an hour and one-half, an hour and three-quarters, in the community of Chaplin. Monday, March 28, the sale is announced. Is that consultation, Mr. Speaker? All the while the minister's promising consultation, the ink on the deal is drying. That's a mockery of the process, Mr. Speaker. The minister has betrayed his own word. He's betrayed his word to the people of Saskatchewan, and, Mr. Speaker, that's privatization of the worst possible kind.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — And, Mr. Speaker, what did we get? What did we get for Sask Minerals? What did we get for this company that's on the leading edge in its field? What did we get for this company that has contributed over \$61 million in wages to its workers, that has contributed over \$2 million in grants in lieu of taxes to the communities where it's located? What did we get for this company that's contributed over \$12 million in royalties to the province? What did we get for this Saskatchewan asset that has contributed over \$40 million in dividends?

Well many are saying we didn't even get half of what it's worth. But I'll tell you what we did get, Mr. Speaker. We got enough money — enough money to pay the interest on the public debt for two and a half weeks — for two and a half weeks. We got enough money to pay the debt charges on this government's debt for two and a half weeks. If we started applying that money that we got for Sask Minerals to the debt interest payments today, it would be gone by April 23. Forty years of building — 40 years of building — we've sold it off for two and a half weeks' interest payments on this government's debt.

That's PC privatization, Mr. Speaker. It's privatization of the worst possible kind. And, Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder that across this province people are saying, will there be anything left, will there be anything left when this government is gone?

Mr. Speaker, the sell-off of Sask Minerals is a clear illustration of PC privatization, and I define it this way: the rich get richer; the poor get poorer; the friends of the PCs prosper, and the people are asked to pay — and that's PC privatization.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, let me return now to the quote from William Butler Yeats, and my observation: then, when given the mandate to govern, the people of Saskatchewan laid many of their hopes and dreams at the feet of this government, and they've seen so many of those hopes and dreams trampled.

Mr. Speaker, when the people of Saskatchewan gave the PC Party a mandate to govern their lives, I think they trusted that this government would govern with a certain level of common sense and a certain level of competence that they had come to expect over the years before. Mr. Speaker, that trust has been so completely betrayed.

Perhaps one of the best illustrations, Mr. Speaker, is in this government's gas tax rebate scheme. I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, about a drive that I had up into the Rosetown constituency not too long ago and, running short of gas, I stopped at a small service station, filled the tank, and then said to the owner of that small station just what he and his clientele thought of the government's gas tax rebate scheme.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I need to remove some of the language that he used, because you wouldn't allow it in this forum, and I wouldn't use it in any event. But if I can summarize what that gentleman said to me, he said: if certain members of this cabinet were to come into his service station, he would take them and hang them on the wall somewhere near his fan belts. That's what he said. That's what he thinks of this government's gas tax rebate scheme, this common sense, competent government.

Mr. Speaker, you remember, we remember, the province remembers, in 1982 it was this government that promised there would never again be a gas tax in Saskatchewan. You know, I think of that promise every time I fill the tank, every time I pay the bill, every time I tuck the receipt in the glove box I think of that promise.

But even, Mr. Speaker, if they were going to go back on their promise, the people of Saskatchewan can't believe, just can't believe that any government would be so incompetent, so lacking in common sense as to institute the kind of rebate scheme that has been thrust upon the people of Saskatchewan. They simply can't believe that a government would say it wants to tax out-of-province motorists by taxing all of us. They can't believe a government would create this kind of bureaucratic, red tape nightmare that is today seeing literally millions of slips of paper coming into Regina.

They can't believe that a government that once they trusted would be taking their money, hold it for some and many months, interest free, and then count on the fact — count on the fact that some of us will not claim what is rightfully ours. The people of this province simply can't

believe that this government would do that to them.

And then when this government says, well, the one good thing about this gas tax rebate scheme is that you see it's a student employment opportunity. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that any government, when there are senior citizens who need to be cared for when there are young people who need to be nurtured at summer camps and so on, when there are parks that need to be built, I can't believe any government who would take the talents and the enthusiasm and the energy of Saskatchewan young people and lock them up in cubicles going through slips of paper for the summer-time. Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan people are disillusioned and disgusted when they see the kind of mismanagement and incompetence and waste that has become the rule with this government, rather than the exception.

Mr. Speaker, this is the government that spends over \$8 million a year on empty office space while 15,000 people wait for hospital beds. Mr. Speaker, this is the government that spends well over \$20 million in self-serving government advertising and propaganda, and yet it tells us there are people in the North who can't afford to install that drinking water and that running water that the Minister of the Environment just talked about — communities in the North that can't afford to install it to their homes. What's the use of water treatment plant if you can't afford to have it installed into your home. Meanwhile this government spends over \$20 million on self-serving ads.

Mr. Speaker, this is the government that this year will spend \$330 million on the interest payments on the debt that it created. Over \$330 million of our money to pay for the interest on the debt that it created. That's almost a million dollars a day of our money — a million bucks a day — while forcing senior citizens in this province to choose between prescription drugs and their food. Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are disgusted and disillusioned. They trusted this group of men and women to be competent, to govern with some common sense, and they have been betrayed. Mr. Speaker, they have had that little dream trampled on.

Mr. Speaker, a group of people in our province who very particularly have laid their dreams at the feet of this government are the young people of Saskatchewan and the young families of this province, and I can only describe it as a tragedy what is happening to young people and young families in Saskatchewan.

And I had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago to meet with a group of high school students. Mr. Speaker, as I met with them, I found among them the same that I have found among young people wherever I've met them. The young people of Saskatchewan are questioning their future; they're questioning their future in this province; they're questioning whether they will ever be able to receive a higher education in Saskatchewan.

I mean, we continue to tell them that education is the key to the future. We continue to tell them that, and yet they see their provincial government cutting back in education, limiting access to university for the first time in the history of this province. They see what's going on

today at the campus in Saskatoon and they know whose fault it is. They know it's the fault of the people opposite. They see the massive cut-backs to the training spaces that occurred in our technical institute. They see their own teachers, this past spring, having been treated like second-class citizens by this government. They see cuts to the bursary programs, and they just wonder, Mr. Speaker, they just wonder if there's going to be any opportunity in this province for them, and I think that's a disgrace.

It won't be long, Mr. Speaker, it won't be long until it's only the rich who can afford a higher education in this province, Mr. Speaker, I see that members opposite are quite uncomfortable with the things I'm saying

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Calvert: — and I intend, Mr. Speaker, to continue that discomfort after supper, so it being near 5 o'clock I would beg leave to adjourn.

Leave granted.

An Hon. Member: — He adjourned debate.

An Hon. Member: — He asked for leave to adjourn debate and we agreed.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Order. Order, please. The hon. member did in fact beg leave to adjourn debate. I'm not sure if that was his true intention, and I'll give him an opportunity to clarify his remarks.

Mr. Calvert: — Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the slip of the tongue. My intention is to return tonight and cause further discomfort for this government. Therefore I would call it, Mr. Speaker, 5 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — On a point of order. I have a sense of what the rules are and have been for a long time and, as I understand it, a member having once asked for leave to adjourn debate, and that adjournment has been granted and he has taken his place, he is not allowed to get back in, and that order of business is finished for the day, except by leave of the House, of course. And of course since he has adjourned debate and it was granted, that ends the debate on this budget for this day.

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The point of order, I have considered carefully, and in fact the member did ask for leave to adjourn debate, and in fact leave was granted. Therefore the debate is adjourned, and this House now stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

I'm sorry. Excuse me. Would everybody please sit down for a moment. I just got a little ahead of myself. The House isn't adjourned, the debate is adjourned.

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker

Mr. Speaker: — I'm afraid the member for P.A. was on his feet first, so I'll have to recognize him.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask Mr. Speaker, you asked whether leave would be granted.

Now I would believe, Mr. Speaker, that you need unanimous consent for leave to be granted at this stage.

An Hon. Member: — We had it. We gave it.

Mr. Kowalsky: — No, we did not have unanimous consent. And I believe that you would have to ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is on the right track. However, when I asked for leave, I did not hear any dissenting voices, and therefore I did not hear any dissenting voices. Therefore, I had to assume that leave was granted unanimously.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, since leave has been granted to adjourn debate on special order, and since we have some difficulty in proceeding with in the normal course, with all of the necessary notice requirements, etc., I would ask for leave to move to second readings on Bill No. 2, Mr. Speaker.

Leave not granted.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in that event, since we don't have work before us to deal with this evening, I move this House do now adjourn.

The division bells having rung from 5:07 p.m. until 7:15 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 28

Devine	Pickering
Muller	Martin
Duncan	Toth
Andrew	Johnson
Berntson	McLaren
Taylor	Hopfner
Swan	Petersen
Muirhead	Swenson
Maxwell	Martens
Hodgins	Baker
Gerich	Gleim
Hepworth	Gardner
Hardy	Kopelchuk
Klein	Saxinger

Nays — 11

Brockelbank	Koenker
Tchorzewski	Atkinson
Solomon	Hagel
Mitchell	Calvert
Simard	Trew
Kowalsky	

The Assembly adjourned at 7:17 p.m.