

EVENING SITTING

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There's been several rulings in the last couple of days that seem to be very inconsistent, and I want to refer you to page 56 of *Hansard*. Mr. Speaker, you and the Deputy Speaker have cautioned members on this side of the Assembly, and several times today when I mentioned the name of the Leader of the Government, the Premier of the province, I was sat down and other members similarly.

If you notice on page 56 of *Hansard*, the name of the Leader of the Opposition was used by the member for Rosthern, on that page and several other times. I haven't taken time to look them up, but no mention was made by the Deputy Speaker, I believe, who was in the chair at that time.

I'm wondering whether or not you couldn't, and your Deputy Speaker, be more consistent in your ruling. It seems to me that the members of the opposition are being treated in one manner and members of the government side, with their large majority, are being treated with more leniency. Now that's unfortunate because obviously the Speaker of the Assembly is from the government side. And I think if you're going to err it would be, I think, proper and probably in the best interest, if you were to err on the side of the opposition, who are the minority in the group.

I want to say, as well, that before we broke at supper time, the Deputy Speaker had ruled a couple of words unparliamentary in referring to the government. One was "deceit" and one was "dishonest." I want to quote *Beauchesne's*, page 110, where it lists out a number of words that, following 1958, were in fact ruled as being parliamentary. And the list includes deceive and dishonest.

The Speaker: — Order, order. According to *Beauchesne's* the hon. member cannot debate a previous ruling, only if he has a new point of order. It seems that this is the ruling of *Beauchesne's*, and I must bring it to your attention.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want a point of clarification. What I am saying here is the Deputy Speaker would not allow him to say those words. The member from Saskatoon Eastview used the words deceit and dishonest in talking about the government. That was ruled unparliamentary and I'm telling you that, by the rules of the Assembly, it is not.

The Speaker: — Order. If the hon. members would be just patient, I will recognize them.

I would like to draw the hon. members' attention to rule 324(1) from *Beauchesne's* which reads as follows, and I think in order for hon. members to understand it, I will take the liberty of reading the rule:

It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate

against particular Members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order; much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention, of the person speaking; sometimes upon the person to whom the words are addressed, as, whether he is a public officer, or a private Member not in office, or whether the words are meant to be applied to his public conduct, or to his private character; and sometimes upon the degree of provocation, which the Member speaking had received from the person he alludes to; and all these considerations must be attended to at the moment . . .

And I believe that is sufficient for that portion of the ruling. Going a little further:

An expression which is deemed to be unparliamentary today does not necessarily have to be deemed unparliamentary next week.

The long and short of the ruling is that a word which was deemed as unparliamentary perhaps yesterday or last week, because of these other factors which enter into it, it's not necessarily unparliamentary today. That's *Beauchesne's*, rule 324.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I had asked as well about the use of the individual member's name. You didn't rule on that. When you rise, I wish you would. But I want to question under rule 324, where it says:

Well there was no reference to particular members when the words were used. It was in reference . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. I don't believe we can get into a debate on the specific ruling here. You've raised a point of order on the word that was used earlier in the day — or yesterday, I'm not just exactly sure — but earlier in the day today or yesterday. And I have ruled that the word which was perhaps unparliamentary today and not necessarily yesterday, the same or vice versa. And I believe that covers the issue you have raised.

As far as the earlier issue is concerned, it is a point of order; it is certainly well taken. Members should not use members' names. However, the inference that the hon. member makes, that the government side is being treated with more leniency than the opposition side, is certainly not correct, not correct.

Both sides are being treated with equally . . . The chairman, the Speaker, and Deputy Speaker in being human, perhaps at one time the name might slip by on one side and not on the other and vice versa. But there's absolutely no intention, no intention whatever, of treating any side more equal than the other.

I think that should clearly cover your point of order.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I meant to comment on

the point of order initially raised by the member from Regina Elphinstone before you made a ruling on that. And I don't mean in any way to contradict any part of the ruling you made, but I was merely going to cite that the member for Wascana used my name in the legislature when he was speaking. And if you want to check the reference you can check it. He used it in reference to the mayor of Regina, Mr. Doug Archer, who was my executive assistant at one time. I do not wish to separate myself from the facts of the matter that he was my executive assistant; he was a good one.

With regard to the second point that was raised by the member from Elphinstone, I wonder on reflection and at a later time, Mr. Speaker, if you could review the citation that you made from *Beauchesne* in direct connection with the comments made by the member from Regina Eastview as to whether he referred specifically to an individual or to a general grouping. I think that you will find that the member from Eastview referred to the government, not to any particular member.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the original point of order both by the member from Saskatoon Westmount and the member from Regina Elphinstone, I would refer all members to page 24 of *Hansard* as well, where the member, being a member from the opposition, referred to the member from Maple Creek by name. I mean that goes on.

I make only this suggestion, and I think to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House. I think we have got into a habit, and I say we, both sides of the House, of referring to members by their names, and I think that is something that has perhaps drifted on and should be corrected if you're looking at the parliamentary system.

The second thing that I do think that I would suggest helpful is that we get the whole area of parliamentary and unparliamentary language. Perhaps it would be appropriate for the Speaker and the office to set out for us some of the areas, or the language, that is clearly unparliamentary. And if we could . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well you have it in *Beauchesne's* and I would simply suggest it as a guide-line to all members; I don't think that's an inappropriate request.

The Speaker: — Order. I have listened to the hon. member's point of order. And yes, you know, unfortunately we have kind of at times drifted into the use of names by hon. members. However, let me just say this, that this issue has been brought up many times. And I would just say this to the hon. members. They have been told over and over not to use the names of other members. And I would say this, that after having been told that many, many times, it is incumbent upon them not to use the names of hon. members. It's just that simple, and the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker shouldn't have to be listening to every single word that's always said, just in case some hon. member is using another member's name.

That is a long standing ruling of this house and it's a point well taken from both sides. But I also say this, hon. members from both sides, I think it's also your

responsibility not to use names of hon. members.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Martin: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the member from Morse continues with his Speech from the Throne, I'd like to introduce some young ladies, and their leaders, in your Speaker's gallery. Mr. Speaker, these are . . . I beg your pardon? Oh, I am sorry, I must ask for leave.

The Speaker: — Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Mr. Martin: — We have in the Speaker's gallery Girl Guides from the St. Joan of Arc Girl Guides in Regina. They reside in Normanview West, Mr. Speaker. And the age of these young ladies are ages nine to 12, and a fine looking bunch they are indeed, with all their badges from the various competitions and skills they get involved in in the Girl Guide program. They are with two of their teachers, Mr. Speaker, Shirley Dobie and Teresa Geni, I believe are the teachers. And we have the Commissioner, Dianne Penner, and Bonnie Rhyrochuk, who is a Guide leader. Welcome to the House.

What you have just heard here for the last few minutes is a discussion concerning the rules, parliamentary rules. And as you heard that Mr. Speaker had the final word, as indeed he should have, but there was a fair exchange of ideas back and forth across the floor, as would happen in this kind of a discussion. But he has the final word and that's what we were listening to.

We are involved now, at this point in the legislature, in the Speech from the Throne, debating the Speech from the Throne, and each of the sides takes turns speaking about the subjects in the Speech from the Throne. And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I would wish the members to welcome our Girl Guides and their leaders from the St. Joan of Arc Girl Guides.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1915)

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Martens: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first of all want to begin by congratulating Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, for her first throne speech in this Assembly. And I have noted, Mr. Speaker, that during the past four or five months that she's been with that responsibility, the role that she has played as a person who has come from Saskatchewan, she has a high degree of professionalism, and she has a high degree of acceptance in the province of Saskatchewan for who she is and in her own right for what she has done in the province. And I think that that's a special recognition that we have paid a lady who has indeed deserved it.

I want to also congratulate the new member seated right behind me from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg on winning the election down there. I spent some time working down there, and I got to appreciate his constituents equally as much as mine. Part of his constituency touches mine and I got to meet a lot of people there that I had met earlier and that I was acquainted with.

I know that it's going to be a privilege working together with him. We've already sat on some committees together with him, and he's got an interesting sense of humour and his candour is excellent. He's got a willingness to participate, and I think that that's a good thing to have, and I think we can appreciate that coming from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. The speech that he had was well delivered, and I think it was excellent, and he's going to serve this Assembly well in the future.

I want to also, Mr. Speaker, thank the people of the Morse constituency for their continued support. They have been very helpful to me in dealing with the various kinds of things that I've been involved with there. I have worked with the various government agencies, the municipalities, the hospital boards, and it's been a privilege for me to do that.

I also want to just point out a number of things that have happened there that I think are of significant value. I want to thank the Minister of Environment who's responsible for Sask Water for coming out to a small town called Vanguard, Saskatchewan, to take a look at some of the irrigation projects that they had been using there over the last 50 years.

Some new developments had taken place there and they had to have some reconstruction of some weirs, and in that they maintained a water supply for the village of Vanguard. And I received a very complimentary letter, as did the Minister of Environment, for the actions that were taken there. And I think that that spoke well of the decision that we had and that we'd made.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that the four-lane highway now proceeds all the way through my constituency. It has been finalized and it moves on to the member of Maple Creek to move it further to the west. And I believe that over the next period of time that that will happen.

That stretch of highway, Mr. Speaker, probably caused more accidents, took more lives than any stretch of highway on the Trans-Canada, and I'm certain that it's going to improve that record there. I don't know why that was happening but it definitely was a concern, and it was a concern to my constituents.

The Department of Education is presently building a school in a small town called Success, and they are probably going to have it ready by the beginning of the next school term. And it will be a school for K to 9, and that is an excellent opportunity for that community. I know that they have worked long and hard to put that into place and I want to compliment the school board for their vision and for their well deserved efforts in planning and initiating these schools.

In the past six or seven years we have had a real development in our nursing home structure in the province, and I want to acknowledge the fact that we're going to this summer be building an integrated facility in the town of Cabri. That facility, Mr. Speaker, has been planned and discussed since 1975. I really think that it's important to emphasize that because it's a focus that was put into place in the by-election at Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that we were going to dissolve all the hospitals, close them down and ignore rural Saskatchewan.

Well in the Speech from the Throne that the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg read about, the hospital in Lafleche I think is a good thing. The same thing is happening in the town of Cabri. This summer they're planning on putting together that facility. That facility, Mr. Speaker, is really needed. It's going to have a hospital and a level 4 care facility for the seniors. And that will, Mr. Speaker, provide 22 beds in all — 12 for level 4 care and 10 for acute care.

A former board member who is now on the health commission has worked a long time to put that facility together. Mr. Ernie Moen, I remember when I was on the R.M. council at Sask Landing, that he came over to our municipality to see whether there was any interest in our municipality providing some of the funding over there. When he had that put together, the package put together, he went to Kyle, he went to Stewart Valley, he went to Pennant and all the communities around to see whether there was an opportunity to put that together.

He was working at it, and right about that time, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health put a moratorium . . . or the Department of Social Services at that time put a moratorium on that portion of health care in the province of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Speaker, almost froze in total the development in that community for a level 4 facility. And I think that that's the kind of thing that is really appreciated in those small communities where they have an opportunity to maintain the community, the older people in the same community that they grew up in, that they lived their own whole lives in. They can retire knowing that there is a facility there that they can go to when their capacity, their physical capacity is somewhat impaired. And I think that that's the kind of thing that I am proud of in this government and I know that others are too.

The throne speech made mention of a number of things that dealt with . . . things like health care, adoptive services. It dealt with agriculture, and I'm going to talk a little bit about agriculture to begin with.

The commitment that the Premier and the government have to agriculture in this province, I think it goes without saying. We have earned that respect from the things that we have done over the last few years. I want to just outline a few of them.

If we take a look at some of the things that we have done and the impact on money spent, Mr. Speaker, we have probably spent more money in the last six years than any 15 years prior to that. I want to just mention that the 1982

Agriculture budget was something like \$72 million, and today it's 140 to 250, in that range. And we have a lot of other programs, rural development and those, that have been increased in their funding too.

There is one area that I believe needs to be looked at, and I want to do this, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's necessary. This past year I spent a few days at a conference — it was called Agriculture in the Class Room — sponsored by the Department of Education. And it dealt with, Mr. Speaker, some really, really fundamental issues in teaching children and young people in schools about what agriculture can do and ought to do in the development of our economy.

We have in the province of Saskatchewan initiated a program called the agriculture development fund. This provides \$200 million over five years and it is a research component dealing basically with a number of things. And I want to point them out today for you and for members of this Assembly, so that they can understand a little bit about what the opportunities in agriculture are.

So many times we conclude that agriculture is putting the seed in the ground and putting the combine out and harvesting. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not what agriculture is about today. Agriculture is about marketing; agriculture is about diversifying into commodities that weren't grown five years ago, 10 years ago. It's diversifying . . .

An Hon. Member: — Name them.

Mr. Martens: — Name them. Lentils, and you have a whole host of those kinds of things. That's the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker. Fava beans, all of those. They're crops that have not traditionally been grown in Saskatchewan. In dealing with the . . .

An Hon. Member: — Kochia weed, foxtails.

Mr. Martens: — And as a matter of fact, kochia weed is a fundamental crop that is being used this year for feeding cattle in south-west Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And if you want to go to the silage pits in south-west Saskatchewan today, you'll find that 50 per cent of that stuff is kochia weed; it has higher protein content than any of the others.

Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, exactly, what we're finding out in this kind of a discussion, and these kind of research projects that are being dealt with in a very concise, precise way by the agriculture development fund. We have to, Mr. Speaker, stay in tune in our research with the kinds of things that develop in soils. We have today probably the highest involvement of salts in soils and a decrease in the productivity of our soils. We have to research that, Mr. Speaker. It's an important part of the development of the science of technology . . . in technology and development of our crops.

We need to find out, for example, Mr. Speaker . . . I just was at a spring ratepayers' meeting about two weeks ago, dealing with . . . The agrologist there presented a paper on the Russian wheat aphid, and there are some very interesting things about that little creature, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to point that out because it's significant. That little aphid is reproducing in North America without fertilization. It immediately, as it's being born, already has young that it can give birth to within four to seven days. That is going to cause a serious problem, Mr. Speaker, in the volume of pesticides and the chemicals that are going to have to be used to kill that aphid.

And if we in the agriculture sector aren't aware of the problem, if we aren't researching the kind of things that are going to be there to destroy that aphid, we are going to have a problem that is far surpassed by anything that grasshoppers have ever done in this province.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a reason why we need specialization in crops. We need specialization in soils. We need diversification in our attitude towards that so that our young people will go out and become research scientists in these fields. And I believe that is very important, and that's why I wanted to bring it up here today.

We need research, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the livestock industry. We have more and more people believing that livestock and confinement are . . . that is something wrong. We have to have an education process in place, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the kinds of things that agriculture food production are required to have to provide the food for people in Canada, for people in India, for Africa and all those places. That's going to be done by the kinds of research we can do.

To use an example, Mr. Speaker, the impact that research in various sectors has is calculated on the basis of a component of a percentage benefit it is to the industry. For example, livestock, research in livestock could have a 15 per cent increase in the impact that it has and the benefits it has to the society here in Saskatchewan.

Canola, for example, had over 100 per cent improvement impact in the kinds of things it can do for the economy of the province of Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, let's take that into the marketing component and deal with how we sell it to the United States. And that's a very important feature in dealing with the kinds of things that we need to research in this province.

And our agriculture development fund is providing those kinds of opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan to say yes, there's an important component in research, but there also has to be an important component in dealing with how these people translate that into the on-farm practice. And that's the kind of thing I believe that we need to have in dealing with a transfer of information that has a positive impact in the part of agriculture that we need.

(1930)

I'm just going to deal with a number of the kinds of projects that we have in place, and I want to do that for a specific reason. We are dealing with a lot of different items in this \$200 million that we're talking about; we're dealing with a lot of different organizations. And I want to point them out because it's all of agriculture participating together in the various areas that we're dealing with.

In crops, for example, the agriculture development fund in one of its areas has a project with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that deals with the selection and valuation of improved high yielding spring wheat and soft wheat, and triple M qualities. And that, Mr. Speaker, Sask Wheat Pool is dealing with that, and they have some funding through ADF (agriculture development fund) and I think that that's a really important feature.

Another group that are working together with agriculture development fund are the University of Saskatchewan, which is fairly obvious, and they have a whole lot of projects in this agriculture development fund research component. They're dealing with winter wheat production technology in south-west Saskatchewan; that's an extremely important feature.

If you follow the flow of the Russian wheat aphid in rye and in winter wheat, it's going to be almost devastating. We're going to need to have some real serious looks at some of those things that deal with insecticides in relation to those two crops.

Now there's other areas. There's one, for example, Agriculture Canada are looking at semi-dwarf wheats which would produce higher yields, less straw. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a very important feature in some of the northern areas where volume of straw is a problem.

I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan Seed Growers Association are also involved in the agriculture development fund project. They deal with the vigour and performance of testing lots, on how they would respond in various kinds of small plot uses, and they're working with different kinds of crops in those areas. The Saskatchewan Canola Growers Association are also involved in a project that deals with the canola potential in the province, and I think it's an important feature.

I was watching *Country Canada* the other day, and on that they were talking about those kinds of agencies and natural control factors that we can use in controlling the plants that we don't want to have grow and controlling the pests that we use and are controlling with pesticides. We are asking the Saskatchewan Research Council to deal with that.

Then there is also the component in that area dealing with the involvement of sweet clover as a nitrogen fixation plant. All of these, Mr. Speaker, are providing an in-depth rationale first on the research side and then, Mr. Speaker, on the development side, so that we can have a translation of the technology in developing these on the farm. And I think that that's extremely important.

We have — and I took a note of it — we have at least 46 different agencies that are dealing with precisely these kinds of things. And I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are crop things, there are livestock items, but as we go through them, there are things which I think ought to be mentioned.

First of all, I would like to mention the wild rice research in Saskatchewan that's being conducted by the

University of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Wild Rice Council — a direct asset to the people of northern Saskatchewan in dealing with the component of rice and the marketing and how they grow it and how they harvest it.

We also have for the production and viability of market gardening in the province of Saskatchewan . . . We import a lot of our market gardening from California. A lot of it could come from the province of Saskatchewan, and I believe that we could do a lot of work in that area.

There is a noxious weed that is dominant in the southern part of Saskatchewan. It's a weed that is growing further and further along the South Saskatchewan River. It's called leafy spurge. It is a noxious weed that is all over through the United States and into Canada. And the Premier has worked out an agreement with states in the United States, Alberta and Saskatchewan to deal with that.

What I'm trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, is that the need for young people in agriculture is more evident today than it has ever been before. We need young people. We need bright young people in agriculture to provide that kind of depth in research, development, marketing, in all of those areas, in order to have a well placed economy in the agriculture sector.

I'm going to just pass on to some of these other things here. There's a couple of other things that I want to mention. One is that the Farming to Win is also sponsored by a number of these agriculture development funds and I think that that's important.

I also want to point out the Saskatchewan Indian agriculture program is also using the agriculture development fund to fund some projects in various parts of the province, and I think that that's really important.

We have other agencies, like the Economic Council of Canada; we have Saskatchewan 4-H Council is also doing some; we have a group of people that I think are important, is the Saskatchewan Safety Council who are working together in an agriculture development fund project; Saskatchewan Abilities Council, the Saskatchewan division of the Canadian Paraplegic Association.

We have in this province something like 2,000 farmers who are disabled, who have in some way had a farm accident and are no longer able to function in the same fashion that they did before. The agriculture development fund is looking at some of these projects in dealing with how they should handle some of the things that they have to do, and the accommodation that they have to make for some of their lack of . . . a capacity to do things.

But what I want to say, as I spoke to a group of these farmers a while back, and I encouraged them to look for new and innovative ways of enhancing their opportunity to develop the kinds of things that they have done. Attachments on steering wheels for people that don't have hands; attachments on lift carriages into tractors, and things like that. Those are the kinds of things that these people are inventing on their own, and I think that's

really an important part in dealing with the kinds of things we ought to in agriculture. The agriculture development fund is helping those people develop those kinds of skills in coping with their inability to do certain functions.

I know that there was some reference made, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, to dealing with some of these things in the university, and I know that there's also that going to be happening.

The production loan program, we had in our public accounts this morning quite a bit of discussion on that. We have put out to the province of Saskatchewan about \$1.2 billion, and it is slowly coming back. The first year only interest had to be paid, and then in the second year the unpaid for portion of that loan, which was over and above the extension, was placed at nine and three-quarters for 10 years, and the original was still at 6 per cent. That's a part that this provincial government played in providing some up-front money in dealing with the problems that agriculture faced at the time.

The irrigation assistance program set up in 1984 provided, Mr. Speaker, a large sum of money for grants to people of Saskatchewan for developing irrigation. This, in my opinion, is money well worth spending.

The average grant was \$8,000, which isn't a whole lot of money when you consider the cost of the expenditures in irrigation. And that, Mr. Speaker, irrigated more than 23,000 acres. I believe that that is an important feature as we take a look at what has happened out of the last five years. We've have drought in the south-west three of the last five years, and in those cases that irrigation has paid off more dividends more than anything else.

Irrigation funding program set up in '86 with the federal government gave a development feature to the province of Saskatchewan over a long period of time, five years to be exact, for \$100 million. The Saskatchewan Water Corporation and the federal government are working on that.

I want to point out that last summer there was an extensive activity in well drilling and in dug-outs and things like that, supplying permanent water supplies for the people in Saskatchewan. And I've had people thank me over and over again for that kind of a program.

The '85 to '88, over 3,000 test wells have been drilled. And in '88, 1.3 million was spent in that one area alone. In '85 to '88, in deep wells, 3,000 were drilled and 3.7 million in 1988 alone.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we decided as a government and as Sask Water to do was to fix the water supply in a permanent position for the people of Saskatchewan, and that, Mr. Speaker, was extended.

The member from Elphinstone, who used to be from Shaunavon, is saying that we cancelled it. Well, Mr. Speaker, those people that make application till March 31 still have all summer to be able to develop those kinds of facilities. And that, Mr. Speaker, is extending to the people of Saskatchewan an excellent opportunity in developing a permanent water supply. Over 5,000

dug-outs and small storage reservoirs were built in 1988 for a development of \$3.2 million at a cost that was partly shared by the federal government; almost 4,000 farm dug-out pumping projects, for a cost of a million dollars in 1988.

On individual irrigation systems, Mr. Speaker, we have since '85 looked at 504 individual irrigation projects. And I think that that's a very significant figure. There is probably 504 more producers in Saskatchewan who are able to carry their own feed supply from year to year without having to purchase it from other people. And I think that that's an excellent way of placing the economic focus on the people in the various areas where they reside.

I want to also say that in group irrigations there has been 124 of them and we spent 3.5 million in 1988. The group irrigation special projects, I want to point that out because I think it's an excellent approach, have put into place about \$30.4 million in Luck Lake and they're looking at development in Riverhurst. And I've talked to producers there, and that's right along the edge of my constituency, and they believe that it's an important and very . . . a good feature that they have.

Mr. Speaker, what they did with those irrigation projects . . . And I think here is what the member from Regina Wascana was talking about earlier; here is what should have been done in Outlook in days gone by. The farmers and Saskatchewan Water Corporation in Lucky Lake are working together with Ducks Unlimited and special soils management to control the salinization of soils.

Mr. Speaker, the farm input price survey established in September of '85 has been conducting surveys on products, agriculture products, that the province's farmers have been using. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a very important part of providing a sense of the prices that farmers are paying for the products that they use.

(1945)

I want to deal, Mr. Speaker, with an item that has occupied my attention over the past year, and that's agriculture extension services in the province of Saskatchewan.

I want to review just briefly some of the things that we have done. In 1987, in December of '87, Mr. Speaker, the agriculture caucus was asked to review the role of extension services in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the recommendation that we made to the Department of Agriculture was put into place in the SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) convention in 1988 by the Premier. And his comments at that time were that the government would have an enhanced rural service network and that it would service at least at 52 locations; there would be no job loss by employees; and that we would deal with a very strong consultative process with the employees, with the people of the SARM, and all of the people of Saskatchewan.

Well that's what we began to do. In the beginning of '88, and moving on to May and June of '88, the minister's advisory committee which I was the chairman of —

which I still am the chairman of — we invited the people from SARM to come and visit with us to put in a strategy that would deal with how extension services would be delivered in the various areas of the province.

We dealt with, first of all, Mr. Speaker, an initial phase and that would put together an opportunity for the minister and myself to speak to all of the employees throughout the province who were looking at joining forces to provide a better service to the farmers in rural Saskatchewan. Those four areas, Mr. Speaker, were together with community planning, lands, extension, crop insurance.

Now we met with the members of the SARM executive on a regular basis. We met with people from the rural municipal councils. We dealt with them. We had meetings with the rural municipalities' reeves and councillors for their six district meetings, and in those six district meetings we talked about the kinds of things that we would be interested in doing.

In order to establish exactly what we needed, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural Development asked the six regional councils to place their representatives before him and we asked them to serve on the committee. They are representatives who we did not appoint. They were chosen by farmers in Saskatchewan to represent them in agriculture districts and regional councils.

In the six regional councils, we had one member from North Battleford, we have a member from Carrot River, we have a member from Laporte, we have a member from Melville, we have a member from Gull Lake. We have also asked SARM to submit two names to us to provide their representation, and one of them is from Rouleau and the other one is from Biggar.

We also asked them to put on a member, because we were dealing with the kinds of things that required some administration focus, we asked that there be a member placed on there from the rural municipal association, secretary treasurers. And we have a gentleman there who serves on that from Bengough.

I think one of the things that is really important — there were three members at large that were appointed. One is Mrs. Margaret Cline, who is from Zelma, she is the head of the women's institute; Murray Westby, who is the Saskatchewan president of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers Association; and then we have the former president of Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, Mr. Don Abel from Melville. I think that this committee has worked well over the past year in providing the minister with some real pointed and direct input.

Our management team, made up of the deputy minister and people from the minister's office, worked during the summer of '88 to talk with the employees of those four areas: the crop insurance, lands branch, community planning, and extension services. We asked the employees a number of questions: how they featured the service network should work; how the four government divisions should be co-ordinated; how the offices should look; how the offices should be equipped; how the staff

should work together with district boards; how the staff help rural Saskatchewan develop and diversify.

That, Mr. Speaker, became the focus of our attention as we addressed the various areas of our organization. Through the summer, we got a lot of information from these employees to deal directly with the component of that rural service network.

The structure that we used in determining how the rural service network will work is taking . . . And I've used this illustration before. We built on the foundation that was established by extension in previous years. The rural municipalities have an opportunity to set up a committee of agriculture councillors that deals with agriculture in the municipality. They then appoint an individual to serve on the agriculture district, and there are 43 of them in the province, Mr. Speaker. Those 43 districts then appoint six regional councils, and those regional council members in turn are the ones that are going to be on the minister's advisory committee — totally selected by people from the rural municipalities who have a vision, who have direction in the way that agriculture should go.

The commitment was made, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this focus in a four-step method, to have the rural municipality, the ag district boards, the regional councils, deal directly with the minister's advisory committee to provide input into programs for the minister. And that, Mr. Speaker, probably took four steps out of the program as it was in the past. In that way, Mr. Speaker, these ideas came from employees, they came from rural municipal people, they came from people who understood what the whole thing was about.

We have opened three offices of this nature already, Mr. Speaker, and of the 52 those three have been open — Leader, Wolseley, and Watrous. And I believe that the people are going to be very well served out of those offices, and the 49 we're going to be opening in this next year.

Now in order to put this into perspective I just want you, and the members of this Assembly, to understand that these 52 locations are locations where offices today are located. Now in those offices we have 98 different focuses that are in different locations in these various communities, in these 52.

There are some communities that have one component of those four that I mentioned; there are some communities that have two; there are some that have three; and there are some that have four. There are 24 that only have one, and I'll just use as an example the Minister of Environment's constituency, the town of Kyle. There is no agriculture service opportunity for an agrologist to serve the people of that area from Eston through to Outlook. And I really believe, and it's the belief of the department, that there needs to be an agriculture emphasis.

If you take the area from south of Weyburn all the way to the Alberta border and 50 miles to 100 miles north, you have no agriculture services in that area at all. And I think that that's the kind of thing that we need to take a serious look at as how to provide an agronomic service within that framework in those areas.

Now I believe that this structure will provide that to the people of rural Saskatchewan. This will enhance the opportunity of delivery, and I want to talk about that a bit because I think it's really important. We are placing into those service centres a computerization component which will be able to be accessed for crop insurance; it will be able to be . . . Individuals will be able to go in there and check out their own crop insurance policy. The service is connected with the university to the research council. It's connected to the Canadian component of research in all of Canada to develop the kind of thing that can be accessed in those 52 locations by rural people just getting on line and knowing who to contact and who to get hold of.

That, Mr. Speaker, in this year, will likely provide a component that is very, very important in what we would call distance education. Distance education for rural Saskatchewan with a two-way audio and a one-way visual will provide into these service centres some dimension and some dynamic for giving them an opportunity to develop and to know what their markets are. I believe that that's a step forward, and that it's a part of an overall strategy to have rural Saskatchewan improve itself and want to be in a better position to compete with other people in other countries.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that there were a number of references made to the ag credit corporation setting up a new dynamic for initiatives in financing. And I'm going to be watching with some interest that development, because I believe in rural Saskatchewan that is a dynamic that is going to be really important over the next three years.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, in reflecting a little bit about earlier comments about the fact that the 1970s were just the best years in agriculture in Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, the grain sector did have some very, very good years in the '70s. But if members and individuals who are acquainted with the livestock industry would have been involved in the industry in '75, '74, '76, '77, in those years, I believe they would have a significant different opinion.

There were many, many people in that period of time, Mr. Speaker, who went out of agriculture. In fact, from 1971 till 1981 there were 1,000 farmers a year that left agriculture.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is a reflection on what people would consider the good times in agriculture. And what we have today is probably a reaction and what you would call a ballooning effect on what happened in the last part of the '70s and the beginning of the '80s, and that was the high interest rate that was never really addressed by any government at that time. And I believe that that is very, very important in dealing with how we handle future financing in the province of Saskatchewan.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when feeding livestock in the province of Saskatchewan was considered a high-risk form of making a living. And I don't think it's really changed much over the years; however, there have been certain features that we as a province have put into focus.

It's a window that people have to deal with these concerns.

We have just moved from an example of that in the beef stabilization program into signing an agreement with the federal government on tripartite stabilization which is going to help our cow-calf people, which is going to help our backgrounder industry in the province. And I was just talking to one of my constituents yesterday who is going to use tripartite stabilization as a backgrounder focus for putting into place some quality cattle into the feeder-finish opportunity.

Another window that we've put in, Mr. Speaker, that is really, I think, going to just slowly grow and grow, and that's the feeder association loan guarantee program. We have at this time over 45 associations, both as limited companies, as co-ops, that are using that, and they will be able to take that program and develop it into an opportunity for them to get financing that is going to be almost at a minimal over prime. And that is an extremely important feature.

(2000)

I just want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that our family is in the process of setting one of these up. And we had . . . Without any initiative of ours, I had a call from a number of financing institutions asking whether they would be able to service our family with an opportunity to provide loans to us, and that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what this does. It's enough of a guarantee to provide an impact into the lender's hands that he will then make sure that the financing is available for investment in what people would consider a high-risk area in agriculture.

The area that I want to touch on just briefly here is we have had a considerable attack here in the last few days about the drought payments and reasonably saying that there was some concern about how the program was being delivered. However, standing and criticizing isn't going to help the situation in any way, Mr. Speaker, and I think that what we need to do is consider some form of assistance in delivery in showing people how to deliver it better.

In 1986 we had a special grains program that delivered 1.1 billion into western Canada in a deficiency payment and that, Mr. Speaker, provided almost half a billion dollars into the province of Saskatchewan. And that, if you take it in perspective, is 50 per cent of the seeding costs involved in putting the seed into the ground in one spring in Saskatchewan.

Last year the federal drought assistance, together with Saskatchewan, provided a lot of opportunities, and I mentioned them earlier.

I want to deal now a little bit with what I consider one of the best programs around, and that's the natural gas distribution program that SaskPower and SaskEnergy are putting together.

We have in this province, Mr. Speaker, now in rural Saskatchewan, an equal opportunity to reduce costs that are . . . or have our costs in our homes and in our shops, in

our hog barns, our chicken barns, at a fair market value. That reduces the cost: it improves the net profit in these projects that we have. And I believe that we need to deal with this more and more as we go along. How do we lower the costs to our producers? And this definitely is a method to do that.

I just want to use an example of one community, and it's in that community that is served by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and it's the town of Bateman. I went there to cut the ribbon on the gas program that was being put in there a number of years ago, and a comment was made to me by a gentleman by the name of Jim Bateman, who the town was named after. He told me this, he said, the benefit to the community is extensive but nowhere is the impact felt more than in those agencies that we have to go from person to person to collect money for, like our rinks and our schools and our community involved . . . community centres. Those are the things that really feel the impact of that natural gas the most, and I'll tell you why. It's because we don't have to go pay . . . collect all that money to pay for the fuel to be burned to heat those facilities during the winter.

And that, Mr. Speaker, in some cases reduced the volume of contributions required by 50 per cent. And that is a really extremely important feature to many of these people in small rural Saskatchewan. And I think that is an example of what has happened to all those communities that when we delivered the gas into those communities, they had an opportunity to have a better community life-style.

In the natural gas program, it has enhanced the opportunity for 29,000 more people in rural Saskatchewan to have natural gas to heat their homes. And I think that that's an important feature in dealing with how the people of Saskatchewan can relate in a competitive basis to people around the world.

I want to talk a little bit about health care because we have, I think, been unjustly criticized about the way we've handled health care. The opposition have said we haven't done anything, we're going to probably be shutting down hospitals, and I think they're totally wrong — I know they're totally wrong. The task force on health care has gone through the province and are meeting for the last few weeks in Regina and Saskatoon and in that we're probably going to come down . . . They're probably going to come down with some very important recommendations that I think are going to be necessary. They're going to provide a background for the kinds of things that we need to do in health care.

I want to indicate that we have had a high increase in spending in hospitals in the province. We've had almost 1,500 new hospital beds in Saskatchewan and when you take into consideration that there are 7,000 hospital beds in Saskatchewan already, Mr. Speaker, and 5,000 of them are occupied, it's a matter of where they're located that we had to put these extra 1,500 new ones in. And these 1,500 new ones are located in places like Saskatoon and Regina where we have needed a whole lot more selective and elective kinds of operating procedures being followed.

Now those areas have generated about 700 new nursing positions in the province. We have put in six new CAT scans in the base hospitals, expanded open heart surgery in Regina, day surgery in Saskatoon. The cancer priority . . . And I want to point this out, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing that makes a person recognize the benefits that have come to us over an extensive period of time on people who are willing and prepared to go into the research side on cancer.

A year ago, or almost a year ago, my nephew was diagnosed as having leukemia and when that was told us, Mr. Speaker, it was like someone pulled the rug out from under us — and that in itself was an extremely negative thing in our home. The diagnosis was completed; the treatments are ongoing; and what I found is that the people who work in the cancer clinics in Saskatoon and Regina have a lot of empathy to these people who are in these positions.

And I talked to my brother about this extensively because he was almost living there for the first month, or during the month of April last year, and what he said to me was that these people who work in these cancer clinics are extremely dedicated to the kinds of things that they have chosen for a profession. And what I want to say, too, is that the opportunity in Saskatchewan for people to go into there is excellent. This is one area across Canada and across the globe where people are needed and when we talk about educational opportunities, that is an extremely important area.

I want to just mention that nursing home beds have been up . . . or we have over 2,000 more nursing home beds. I think that's an extremely important feature. I've had an opportunity to have a few of them in my seat and the people in the various communities appreciate that.

I want to talk a little bit about rehabilitation as it relates to various areas . . . the rehabilitation in a couple of areas that deal, first of all, with drug and alcohol abuse. I think that that's an extremely important feature in dealing with the kinds of things that are happening in society today. I think it's a step forward. We have a children's rehabilitation centre in Saskatoon, the Wascana institute here, rehabilitation centre in Regina — excellent places for extensive rehabilitation opportunities for people who really need it.

I want to just dwell a little bit about one important feature that I think is important. The Everyone Wins promotes eating right, keeping fit, reducing stress, quitting smoking, combating drug and alcohol abuse, avoiding accidents. I think that one of the things that we need to have in rural Saskatchewan is a clear emphasis that this is an important feature. And I will note that there are many, many people in agriculture who have put themselves in awkward positions, and only to regret it later on when they have had to go to get rehabilitated in various areas like Wascana institute here, a rehabilitation centre.

I want to say that many people have expressed a real optimism on the fact that the health care card has been established in Saskatchewan. I think that it's really, really a benefit to people of Saskatchewan. In dealing with the card and what it can do, I think we're only touching the

beginning of an opportunity, and I am looking forward to the kinds of things that we can do in the future with that card to provide the benefit to people in health care and in other areas.

Last summer we had introduced a private adoption Act or an adoption Act that deals, in some ways, with private adoption and various areas. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in that Act there are some very important features and I became involved with it because I was interested in it.

There are certain things that are very pronounced there. One is that the interests of the children are looked after. There offers more protection, more choices in adoption planning for birth and adoptive parents. There's opportunity for parents to select the parents that they want to have for their children. There's more protection for the father in the instances of the child being allowed for adoption in other areas.

The requirement for independent advice for parents signing adoption consent is also enhanced — and I think that that's important — and requires independent advice for those people who have children who want to be adopted, who are over 12, and they have to have consent of the child. And I think that that's important.

The other area that I want to touch on briefly is the area of public participation. We have in this province, Mr. Speaker, probably, access to the Government of Saskatchewan and for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan approximately a billion dollars in the kinds of bond issues that are really important.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's important from the aspect of the fact that what is happening in the bonds, is that money that would normally not be invested in Saskatchewan would flow to Ontario. We would have to, then, if we wanted to, make loans for that money to invest in Saskatchewan. We'd have to take that all back here and we would have to do it, and our people here would not receive the pointed benefits that accrue to that. And really what it would generally do then is overheat the economy in Ontario, which is overheated already, and we don't need any more of that. And I think that those are the things that those bond issues do for us.

(2015)

I want to just touch a little bit on public participation as it relates to prior to this government being involved in governing. I want to touch on a little project that was developed in the back rooms by some of the people who sit opposite. There was a gentleman, who was a minister by the name of Cowley; there was a premier by the name of Blakeney; there was a minister by the name of Smishek; there was a minister by the name of Bowerman; there was a minister by the name of Cody; there was a minister by the name of Kramer; and then there was one member who formerly represented the constituency of Humboldt and now is in Regina North East. These people did a couple of things, they did a couple of things. They first of all were, Mr. Speaker, on the board of directors on the Crown investments corporation, and I think that that has to be put into people's minds. These people were

prepared to do a number of things, and I just want to outline a few of them.

The board of directors and the people that I just mentioned were members of a board of directors of Crown investments corporation which in January of '82 met to show . . . to begin to work on providing an investment opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan.

An Hon. Member: — To discuss, Harold, that's right.

Mr. Martens: — Right, and it was an agenda item on the board, and the decision was reached, and the decision was this. The Saskatchewan share proposal is an attempt to accomplish two major objectives — two of them: to encourage Saskatchewan residents to invest in provincial industrial developments; to generate a new pool of capital to make strategic investments, thereby allowing Saskatchewan to take advantage of opportunities for large industrial projects in an era in which capital rationing for Crown investments has become a reality. Right!

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that this has aroused some curiosity on the other side. Some of the guiding principles were to provide a mechanism for all residents of Saskatchewan to invest in the province. That was one of the guiding principles. To provide an alternative source for major new investments in resource enterprises and industrial projects. Okay.

An Hon. Member: — New. New projects.

Mr. Martens: — Right. To reinforce the identification of a partnership between the government and the people of the province in the developing of our economy. Those are very, very good guiding principles. Mr. Speaker, I think those are the kinds of things that I would vote for, too.

Anyway, they continued on. What are the political consequences? This is the paper that was presented. What are the political consequences? The political consequences, Mr. Speaker, are, other Saskatchewan political parties will undoubtedly make similar proposals in the future. That, Mr. Speaker, is a very, very important feature. Other Saskatchewan political parties will undoubtedly make similar proposals in the future.

An Hon. Member: — They knew they were going to lose.

Mr. Martens: — There! There you have it. Another political consequence. If a substantial sum of investment capital could be raised through a share program, the government would be able to take advantage of large industrial projects, opportunities, without requiring a reduction in the investment by the utility or commercial Crown corporation. Now there you go. That's the kind of thing that those people were talking about in the back room and never had the courage to initiate, Mr. Speaker.

And today, what we see today far more than any other time in the period of time that I've been here, they have been saying to us that we are wrong in public participation in the province of Saskatchewan, and they have continually said it.

Now some of the projects that they would consider as

new projects, aspen newsprint — interesting one; aspen market pulp; heavy oil upgrader — now there is a good one. They never, ever talked about joining forces with the Federated Co-op to put in a heavy oil upgrader. And then they wanted to maybe put in an ammonia plant, and then direct iron ore reduction out at Ipsco here probably. And then they have one potash mine that they'd be interested in investing in. What about the uranium mine and natural gas exploration? Very, very good opportunities for diversification in Saskatchewan.

The other thing that I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, the potential investments that could be transferred. Now I just talked about new ones in the component of this thing that we were discussing with public participation. There was a well-known iron smelting factory in the province of Saskatchewan — well known in Western Canada — it's called Ipsco. Those people, Mr. Speaker, those people were prepared to sell Ipsco to the people of Saskatchewan in a bond or that kind of an issue, or maybe even shares. They weren't quite sure on how they were going to do it, but they were going to participate with the public of Saskatchewan, which is today, Mr. Speaker, exactly what we're doing.

Now I just want to point out another one, Prairie Malt, and if it's the same Prairie Malt that I know about, it's in Biggar, and that Prairie Malt is probably going to be criticized all over the place for public participation and involvement by the public of Saskatchewan.

Now let's take a look at another one. We've had a lot of criticisms about SED . . . S-E-D components. And you know, they had an interesting comment beside SED Systems: the precarious financial position of the company would have to be disclosed. Now that's an interesting observation by Crown investments corporation. The precarious financial position of the company would have to be disclosed. Now that is an interesting one.

In 1982 these people opposite were talking about how they could involve the public and how they would have to disclose some of the focus that they were placing on these Crown corporations that they were trying to run. And were they so pious in their discussing all of the components of this share capital program? Another one. I want to go through the list here because it gets better.

Cablecom, current losses and value of predecessor would become public. Now there is a real one. Now that public information — and we were in public accounts today and the NDP piously were dealing with the kinds of things that say, oh, you can't do this and you can't do that and you can't do the other thing. Now they weren't willing to disclose those features. They figured it was a threat. And maybe that threat kept them from disclosing those opportunities for the people of Saskatchewan to invest Saskatchewan dollars, home-grown dollars in good companies in Saskatchewan.

Another one, the Cornwall Centre, the Cornwall Centre. And this is what they said about that: the early years of this project will have very low returns — well it's no wonder, they gave such a good deal to the people of Toronto. But it will have a source, but it will be a source of regular

income. Now there's a real good investment, and I think it probably would have been.

Now here we go to what the member from Shellbrook-Torch River was talking about earlier about Weyerhaeuser and PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company). Now there is a good one. Now here, I want you to hear this because it's an important component of what we found out later on. This is what their forecast was for PAPCO. Listen: a good possibility with a dividend flow, but in an industry expecting difficulties for the next few years. I wonder whether we should sell it. Now that's Weyerhaeuser. PAPCO moved from where they were in 1982, it hit a tremendous slump in the pulp business, and it drove this government to pay \$90,000 a day in paying the interest costs in the delivery of a pulp mill to the province of Saskatchewan. And what have we got today? We sell it to Weyerhaeuser. And these people stand up and yip and yap about what we should have done and should have done it different. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is fundamental to this government that public participation is the road to go.

I noted with some interest, Mr. Speaker, that a news release just recently indicated that the people in Chaplin and Fox Valley — and this is a special interest to the member from Thunder Creek — that the employees of the sodium sulphate plant in Chaplin and in Fox Valley got a 700 to \$1,000 profit-sharing benefit, and that management earned between 1,000 and \$2,000 as a profit-sharing component of the deal that was worked out for those people.

Now did they ever get that when they worked for the government? I would doubt it. I would doubt it very much. That, Mr. Speaker, is why we on this side of the House say, when they're in power they do things strictly on their own. They don't ask anyone. They don't allow people in this province to participate. They think they can run it better.

And we on this side, Mr. Speaker, believe that people in rural Saskatchewan and urban Saskatchewan can run it better than government can. And I honestly believe that, and I want it to go on record that we support the areas of public participation that we have done.

I want to point out a couple of things, Mr. Speaker, that they even had the mechanism set up on how to do this. They had a mechanism set up on how to do it. They talked about the financial implications. They did all of those kinds of things. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why on this side of the House we sometimes call those people over there hypocritical. And I believe that the evidence is being brought forward more and more all the time. And I wonder how they can stand here and in their piety tell us we're doing wrong when we are almost implementing what they said we should do in the first place. I think that that, Mr. Speaker, is totally, totally misrepresenting an opportunity for truth.

I want to deal with two other areas before I close. One has to do with the home program. The Minister of Urban Affairs, who is responsible for Sask Housing, has probably created more jobs through the home program than any minister has ever done in any kind of a program in the

history of Saskatchewan — winter works, or whatever. And I want to point out something.

Now in the home program there were almost 300,000 applications for matching grants, and I wonder if any of those people on the other side decided to take advantage of this opportunity. I'll bet you that they are some of those people, too. There were almost 60,000 who had a 6 per cent loan program provided to them in a mortgage reducing interest rate. Now what did that do for jobs? Mr. Speaker, 20,000 jobs have been established over the period of time from 1986, '87, '88 and I think that that . . .

An Hon. Member: — And that's why we have the highest unemployment — higher than the national average.

Mr. Martens: — Mr. Speaker, the member from Quill Lakes is talking about high unemployment. Mr. Speaker, if we hadn't have done it, just think of what the unemployment would have been if that would have happened. And I think that that's the kind of thing that we need to do and we need to continue to do. That, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, and probably in his too, because he has a rural constituency, he probably had just about the same amount of opportunity for development.

In my constituency that value . . . that value in my constituency was over \$2 million that was paid to people to improve their housing. And I believe that was really, really important — yes, yes, Mr. Speaker, \$2 million in my seat and almost \$2 million in the loan program. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is truly a good make-work kind of program where people of Saskatchewan benefit, and people of Saskatchewan have gone to work, and I think it's an excellent opportunity.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, on an issue that was raised through the last few days on electoral boundary changes. And I know it was in the throne speech, and I wanted to address it.

(2030)

People have said: why should one area of the province have a representation that deals with 12,000 constituents, another with 9,000, and another with 7,000, and another one with 8,000. And I believe that there are a number of things that we have to do and we have to think about when we represent people. There are things that we have to consider when we have rural constituencies.

And I just want to point out a couple of things, Mr. Speaker. One is, I have run in the Morse constituency for four times, and, Mr. Speaker, for me it has been an exciting experience. My political involvement began in 1973 . . . in 1972 in the R.M. of Sask Landing, that's when my political involvements began. I have lived in that constituency all my life. I was born in that constituency. I know the people. I understand the people, and I want to continue serving the people there.

But I just want to tell you something about . . . and you know, Mr. Speaker, the member from Elphinstone, who used to be the member from Shaunavon, indicated this earlier in his speech today, and I want to compliment him for his broadmindedness in this issue. He said it's different

serving an urban seat than it is a rural seat. And it's different because he just has to drive four or five blocks to provide the same service that I drive two and a half hours to get to my constituency, first of all, and then it takes me another two hours to drive either way — I live right about in the middle — to drive either way to serve the people of my constituency.

I just want to point out one other thing . . . I want to point out something else. Mr. Speaker, in my constituency I have 12 municipalities — 12 municipalities — I have seven hospital boards, I have one park, two resort villages, and six regional parks. I have 18 towns and villages, Mr. Speaker. And it seems to be bothering them over on the other side. And I want to just point this out: those are the people that I serve, and those are the people that I have to become involved with; those are the people that I want to become involved with, and I have. And that's, Mr. Speaker, what it takes to be a good MLA, because the focus is different today than it was 10 years ago; the focus is different today than it was five years ago. The focus, Mr. Speaker, has to do with a number of things, and I want to point them out.

They come to the MLA office . . . And I have three offices in my constituency. I have one in Swift Current, one in Cabri, and one in Morse. I have three offices, and in those three offices I'll tell you what I do. I become a counsellor, I become an adviser, I become an ombudsman, an administrator, a business man, and whole lot of other things to these people who come to see me. And I do it consistently through the year, all the time.

Now if I have to drive . . . For example, the member from Elphinstone, he can go to the place that he represents in the city of Regina; he can drive there and in an afternoon; he can meet four or five people, even coming from the legislature. He can go there and sit with those people, having coffee with them. I can't do that, Mr. Speaker. I have to drive 150 miles to get there, and then I have to drive another 75 miles just to get to the constituency's boundaries. And I have to do that, and I'm pleased to do that. But you have to recognize one thing that's very important, Mr. Speaker, and that it takes me five and a half hours to drive from here to Swift Current and back. It takes another three hours just to go have coffee with the people in some corners of my constituency. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the report of the task force on the boundaries of constituencies and how they place mine.

Now they have criticized or compared Morse constituency with urban constituencies, and I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to have been mentioned, but I just want to point out one thing to the people of Saskatchewan, that it takes a lot of time to serve a large constituency.

One other item, Mr. Speaker. The members from Athabasca and Cumberland probably have some same and similar circumstances to the kinds of conditions that I have, and that, Mr. Speaker, is why they have less voters in their seats, is because they have the long distances. That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of thing that I'm referring to, and why I believe that the Electoral Boundaries Commission did the right thing in recommending the kinds of things they did in the rural constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I will be informing the House that I will be supporting the Speech from the Throne and I will be proud to do that. I want to compliment the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg on his delivery, the member from Yorkton on how he conducted himself in seconding the address from the Speech from the Throne, and I will be supporting the motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Okay, thank you. Mr. Speaker, with due respect to the language of the House and also the languages of the province of Saskatchewan, I will say a few words in Cree, and I will also translate the introductory remarks following.

(The hon. member spoke for a time in Cree. See end of *Hansard*.) [See page 140.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will present the document that I just spoke in Cree. With due respect to the historical writing system in Cree, the syllabic system was created in the 1840s, and it was used by the Wesleyan Methodist missionaries, along with help from the Cree speakers from northern Manitoba. And as we went further West, there was the development of the syllabics and it was utilized by the Anglican church. And the document that I present is therefore the syllabic system as is used by the Anglicans throughout western Canada. I will then give that to the page to deliver it to *Hansard*, you know, as an official record.

In regards to the throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look at it in three aspects. One is in regards to the question of who is included in the throne speech. But more importantly, who does it exclude? What happens to be the sin of omission by the PC government for 1989? What's their position on the neglect of people in this province?

A quick look will show you that there is no mention at all about our transportation system which they had privatized previously. We now have one of the worst roads in any province in Canada. And there is no mention of improvements on our roads, and especially on our dangerous northern roads.

I also look at the area where there is no mention of jobs. Many working people in Saskatchewan and small businesses were looking forward to a year where there would be an emphasis on jobs and job creation. Again, no actual mention.

There is also only a cursory mention of Indian and Metis people, and I'll read that into the record later on.

The Progressive Conservative government states very clearly that it wants to be positive. And I would like to put it on the record that they are indeed very, very positive. They are very, very positive in regards to the big corporations, whether the big corporations are from the United States or Japan or South Africa. They're extremely positive when it comes down to them.

They are also very positive to Crown corporations; not the Crown corporations from Saskatchewan, but the Crown corporations from China.

The latter part is, what about the neglect and the negativism of this throne speech. I would say that it has a straightforward attack on the Crown corporations that Saskatchewan people built as a protection for themselves. Because basically they had looked at the history which I will mention later on.

There is also really, as we look, a continuation of the strategy wherein they did away with the department of co-ops, and there is no strong mention of co-operatives except as a cursory mention.

The other thing is in regards to Saskatchewan children when we recognize that one out of every four is in a poverty situation. One out of every four of our children in Saskatchewan is hungry. No mention of our children.

When we look at the overall aspect of who builds Saskatchewan, therefore there is no real strong, solid support for the workers, the business people, and the farmers of this province.

The first major area I would like to discuss is that whole area of economic development and jobs. And as I look into the throne speech on the job record of this province, I look at it as one of the most dismal in Saskatchewan's history. I look at the 50 to 80 per cent unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan. I look at the fact that 43,000 people are out of work, and we know that's a formal record; there is probably more like 80,000 people out of work in this province.

As I look at the fact of our youth and I look at the fact that 1,600 people have just recently left our province in only one month, could you imagine our people, our youth are leaving this province because they know that there is no future except empty promises?

The only place where I saw jobs as advertised this year, and very recently in regards to this Tory government, is to the Tory MLAs — the defeated Tory MLAs, those people that wreaked havoc on northern Saskatchewan before, people like Sid Dutchak, who did absolutely nothing in regards to northern development. He got a job.

When we looked at the other people who ran, for example, in northern Saskatchewan, we saw Jack Cennon, recently defeated MP who ran in P.A.-Churchill in northern areas and was completely wiped out in the North — by over 10,000 votes he was beaten. He gets a job. When we look at John Gormley, when we look at Gordon Dirks, Paul Schoenhals, making over \$100,000 a year when people are trying hard to get jobs. There is absolutely no caring and concern by this PC government in regards to working people in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2045)

Mr. Goulet: — When we look at the area of mismanagement, there is absolutely no province in the history of Canada that has come from a balanced budget in 1982 to a \$4 billion mismanaged economy. It's a deficit that's beyond any reason at all. It costs us \$3

million a day. There is no wonder that there are long waiting lists at our hospitals, because the staffing is not there. There is no wonder that our education . . . our youth cannot go to university because there is no money for our universities so that they can go to school, so that they could have a future for themselves. The mismanagement of this province is . . . the PC government is beyond precedent in Saskatchewan history.

On the other hand, they will turn around and have birthday parties — \$9 million — \$9 million for birthdays. When I look back, even the defeated MLAs and MPs of this province, people also look forward to the future. This PC government only looks forward in regards to their own particular re-elections.

And I have to look at the Premier's own riding wherein he has a \$1 billion boondoggle, the shafferty project. And when we look at that, people are crying out for health services; seniors are asking for continuing care in this province.

There's a whole host of developments that are required by a lot of small-business people in this province. And yet we have to continue paying for the re-election of the Premier in his own riding.

We talk a lot about the experiences of acid rain, of ozone layer. But he will have this coal-fired plant in his home riding. It will not only burn holes in our pockets but it will burn holes in our atmosphere at the same time.

When I look at the overall general aspect, the economic disaster of this PC government, I look at the 1,500 bankruptcies of small business and farmers in this province; I look at the fact that there was over 1,200 foreclosures this past year for farmers in this province, and when I look at the fact that in all of this the same income tax and business tax increases have hurt a lot of the businesses.

I see the higher costs in utilities that are raised because of the serious mismanagement of our resources and our finances. This has got to be the most incompetent and corrupt government in the whole history of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — This PC government talks about the future. It talks about global views of economics. But the only solution it offers is the 200-year-old dream of Adam Smith, where supposedly the invisible hand of private ownership would trickle down wealth to everybody. But that hasn't happened in 200 years. We well recognize that in Canada, at the height of development in the '20s, that the big corporations went at great lengths to control everybody's lives, and we ended up in the '30s Depression — when it was uncontrolled and unplanned. We also see that even in 1988 with the crash. The fact is that this is an old-fashioned theory wherein putting dollars on resources solely and only in the hands of big business will there be success for the people. And when you look at history, that's not the way it is.

We look at Saskatchewan history: we look at the

legislature today, we look at our highways, we look at our buildings, we look at our schools, our hospitals, we look at our farms. Right from the early days people have to work together; people had to work together in order to build the farms; people had to work together in order to make a base of living.

Indigenous people prior to that worked together in collectives, working together side by side to make sure that proper living was made. And this type of idea of working together is no longer the basis of Saskatchewan history. All it is private gain and private greed. And I think it is very important to recognize that the working together of economic development, wherein you have private enterprise, where you have co-ops, where you have the Crown corporations working side by side and co-operating together in a joint venture in this province in a mixed economy approach — that has been the success that we've had in this province. That is what brought us into a situation where we had balanced budgets and a lot more jobs than in today's PC era.

When we look at the aspect of the mixed economy, this idea was transferred also in the area of health care. We saw Saskatchewan people having to challenge the privatized medicine of the past. We saw the old ideas had to be challenged where people would have to be working together for the public good. We saw that they had to co-operate, that indeed, leaving it solely in the competitive sphere was not good enough; that they needed a system where there was competition and co-operation at the same time. There had to be balances in the system.

And when we saw the medicare being attacked by the Tories in this province, we saw that they were only interested in themselves. They only wanted the rich to be able to afford medical help. This was the same thing a hundred years ago in regards to education when we had only private education and privatized education. Only the rich were able to get an education; only the rich were able to get medical help. And this is the type of society that you are promoting again through this throne speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — One of the biggest things that I saw is the tremendous hypocrisy in this throne speech. I see the fact of the big corporations wanting to take complete control, not only in Saskatchewan but throughout the world. I see the fact of South African corporations trying to dig up our diamonds in northern Saskatchewan. I see the U.S. corporations moving in through the free trade agreement, and also Japanese.

But the most hypocritical thing that I see here is the fact that at the same time they are doing it, this PC government attacks the Saskatchewan corporations that the people of Saskatchewan built. The hypocrisy here is that they will support the Chinese public corporations and they will not support the corporations that the people of Saskatchewan built.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — That is the tremendous hypocrisy of this

government.

When I look at the record of the mixed economy approach, when I look at the record of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation, when I look at the diversified investment system that was utilized in regards to base metal production and uranium production in the North, I saw Saskatchewan mining corporation take a global and world leadership in business management.

Now when we look at the Tories, all they want to do is provide the \$60 million that was made clear-cut profit by SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) and transfer it to private people. Just transfer it over to, possibly, the free trade giants from the United States or to the Japanese large scale capital.

An Hon. Member: — Tory friends.

Mr. Goulet: — The Tory friends, as the member from Saskatoon also states.

So what we are looking at is the dismantling of corporations that have been effective, that have worked for us in the province, corporations such as SGI. When I used to live in Ontario for a while, when I was teaching there on a five-year period, I remember when I came back to Saskatchewan and I said, my goodness! am I lucky to be back home. Look at the insurance rates. I had to pay close to 800 bucks in Ontario.

And when I look at youth, what it tells me is only that the rich youth will be able to buy privatized-type insurance — tremendously high rates. Either that, or you will get second class insurance where the costs aren't as big, but you will not be covered fully. And that's the type of system that you're trying to implement in our province which has shown a leadership not only in Canada, but in the world. It was world class that you're trying to take apart.

When I look at the fact of . . . I gave an example of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation), the fact the potash corporation was in the hands of only private, large-scale owners. We need to balance them off and compete alongside them. We provided them the opportunity to operate in the mines in this province, but we set up our own Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan because we wanted a fair return. We wanted to have not only a window, we wanted to have the fair return that gives us the advantages at the world scale that we were already competing in.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — When we looked at the Crowns, the balances were in favour. The reasons why they were brought in was in regards to the fact of greater concern, not only of the economic consequences of corporations. One of the basics and an historical fact of Crowns is because it would have to take into consideration the social development, that the profits that come from the corporations would have to be rechannelled into health and education and so on.

And that was the reason why the Crowns were

established so that they wouldn't only go to Japan, they wouldn't only go to the United States, in San Francisco, and in many other places in the world — the profit would disappear from Saskatchewan. In this way, when the Saskatchewan Crowns, when we built them, in the same way that people challenge the big corporations in regards to the retail centre through their co-ops, people have to challenge them in the co-operative fashion, in much the same way that we did co-operative investment into our Crown corporations. Because there was no way that the concern, the social concerns, the environmental concerns, the job concerns were adequately met by the privateers.

I think it was very important that when the Crowns came in, it balanced it off. It forced a lot of the private entrepreneurs then to start dealing effectively, not only economic concerns but social concerns and also the concerns of the environment. A moral, well-rounded economic development strategy was developed through that approach. And it is through that approach that we have developed Saskatchewan.

And I will remind that we have not tried to completely displace the private ownership. We work side by side with private ownership in joint ventures as in SMDC. We work side by side with the co-ops, and we work to develop our own Crown corporations.

So when I look at the historical record, one recognizes that we had indeed achieved global status. When we looked at the international investment community, they looked at Saskatchewan to invest. When we looked in the area of mining, that's the historic record. When we looked at the whole record of forestry, that was the case also. When we looked at the aspect, we had to be able to deal and balance it off from sector to sector.

When we weren't getting the returns, we were able to establish our own competitive network in our own very Saskatchewan way, because it was Saskatchewan people who built it. It was Saskatchewan people who did all of these things.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — The basic point behind all of that is that as an NDP government in the past, and when we look forward to the future, let it be said that we trust our Saskatchewan people, that we trust them that we can work and stand up beside any global corporation in the whole world, and that we can be the best in the world also.

(2100)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — One other . . . On a personal level in regards to this whole privatization, I had a chance to be able to see it firsthand when I visited Chile last fall. I looked at Chile, and I arrived there and saw 15 years of privatization and 15 years of deregulation and 15 years of free-trade-type systems.

And what did I see when I got to Chile? Well the first thing

I was confronted with was that the large-scale corporations had an army to protect them. The army was there to meet the people on the streets; that the privatized realms of big business and the rich in Chile were safely protected by the army, by the military dictatorship.

When I went to the rich areas I definitely saw positive development. I definitely saw positive statements by the Chilean government in regards to the big corporations and also to the rich in Chile. I also saw that they were fenced off from the people. They had high fences with people walking around and guns protecting them. This was the only place where I saw development; there were brand-new plush housing. That was where the development . . .

I went downtown; it was a wreck. I went downtown to the poor areas; it was a disaster. When I saw the straightforward privatization policies, and I saw everywhere I went, children begging on the street. When I see signs and records today that one out of every four children is now going hungry in Saskatchewan, and that Saskatchewan is the second of the last in Canada in regards to poverty and in regards to child hunger, and when I saw the Chilean children, I knew what privatization and what deregulation had accomplished over there.

I see many times a lot of the government trying to get the middle class to support them. But I saw the middle class over there in the initial stages, what I read and then talked to them. They said, we sort of supported; we didn't know. But they said, we don't support the Pinochet government any more. We don't support their privatization strategy because it has hurt us.

I talked to many teachers over there, as an educator from there. They were being paid \$100 a month, \$200 a month. They had to find second jobs in order to subsist. And when we look at the record, and I looked at the cost and prices — they were pretty much the same as in Canada — I said, how could they survive?

In regards to some of the meals, I notice that one of the persons said that just one afternoon meal by the big shots in one of their homes is how much an ordinary worker gets paid for the whole month in Chile. And that was the impact of 15 years of privatization and 15 years of deregulation in the Chilean economy.

When I looked around and I visited the indigenous people in Chile, I also recognized that not only did the land of the indigenous people, which was under collective ownership before, not only was that not ignored, it was privatized. It was cut up so that it would be given back to the rich landowners over there. It's a lot like a lot of the land went back to the rich banks, not very dissimilar to the fact that we see a lot of our farmers' land disappearing to the rich bankers in Saskatchewan.

So when I see the policies of privatization by this government, one has to look at facts throughout the world. One has to recognize exactly where a privatized strategy has been utilized with no concern for a mixed economy approach. The mixed economy approach is the basis of what is happening in the global world.

As I also look at the issue of the North in regards to the throne speech, I would have to introduce my remarks by saying that in 1982 this PC government produced a document, a Department of Highways document that went to tourists from the United States, tourists from across the world, and a lot of people who visited Saskatchewan, and everybody who gets a map.

And in that official document in regards to northern Saskatchewan, it said: northern Saskatchewan is populated with beautiful lakes and rivers, but no people. I remember looking at that, absolutely astounded. And it's only after being in session for the first time in 1986 did I realize that the PC government meant what it had said back in '82, because the policies were one that showed a complete neglect in northern Saskatchewan.

This past year I have to congratulate the minister in charge of the North for visiting northern Saskatchewan. But she has indeed been uplifted by the North, because I saw a document recently that stated that the North is alive. And it was indeed a revelation for the minister to find that people are indeed alive in northern Saskatchewan. It took them seven years to figure out that people from the North were alive. We have been alive all this time. It's now the first time that this PC government recognizes that we're alive in the North.

When I looked at the throne speech, I saw a presentation there in regards to Cumberland House. And it said that this agreement in Cumberland House was a model of co-operation. And I looked at it and I thought, a model of co-operation — my goodness! And I started looking at the record. The first thing I noticed was since 1982 the people of Cumberland House have been making a strong stand for the settlement of their claim.

In 1983 they had put on a legal case to take this government to court in order to fulfil the compensation of the vast areas of destruction on Cumberland area on trapping lands, fishing lands, not to mention the problems of transportation, etc. We used to kill about 1,000 muskrats a year for a lot of the trappers there. Now you can hardly get 50 if you're lucky.

There was tremendous damage to the people of Cumberland House. It took them six years in this model of co-operation to finally get a settlement from this government. It also cost them \$1.5 million in legal fees. It means that the people of Saskatchewan, whether we look at it, are going to have to start spending \$1.5 million in legal fees in order to get this outstanding case and model of co-operation, because it was \$1.5 million.

Somebody mentioned the name of Bill Carriere from across over there. Bill Carriere happens to be my uncle. I just had a conversation with Bill Carriere on Sunday night and he wanted me to leave you a message. And the message was this. He says, we thought we were very pleased with the agreement that something was finally being done. But he said, on the one hand I'm a fisherman; I do a lot of fishing in my area. All of sudden I'm cut back with species limit because some rich doctor tries to come and do some fishing in my area where I built camps for many years. So he says, I'm being squeezed out of a

livelihood there.

On the one hand the Premier, he said, promised us that the trappers and the fishermen would have a specific clause in that agreement to provide them with bucks. And he said, no there wasn't; there's only a generalized agreement. That indeed he said that the Premier appears to be backing up on his word in that regard.

Since I know that the process of negotiation is taking place, a lot of other people say that the aboriginal rights clause in there has to be taken out because it is a straightforward compensation agreement.

The other aspect that I saw in this model of co-operation is that Cumberland people took a strong stand. I was proud of my own community taking such a strong stand.

We had asked the Minister of Environment to get off his high horse and away from the ivory tower approach he was doing, to go and work with the people of Cumberland. And I remember it was only after that that there was some action that took place. But the changes that took place only appeared after the people took a strong stand. They decided they would bring some media attention, and they built a weir.

Now this model of co-operation seems to suggest that people in northern Saskatchewan, if they want to get action, have to build weirs or threaten blockades before they will get any work done. And that's the type of thing that had to be done in Cumberland House. And here you give it as a shining example of co-operation.

I think that as we look back on the Cumberland House case, on the other side of Cumberland you built a brand-new highway for Simpson Timber, according to your plans last year. You did an environmental work that you did in one week and you gave the okay to Simpson Timber to build this road. A lot of people raised the concern about most populations on the other side. You went ahead and built it.

And what the people said is that they did not listen — the PC government did not listen. What we wanted was a road from Cumberland to the mine, so they could get jobs at the mine only 25 miles away. Instead they built something for Simpson Timber. Now we find out that Simpson Timber is going to be closed down. Some planning!

When we look at the whole area of the Cumberland agreement, and as I watched through all the communities, I must say that the people, the trappers, the people who do fishing, all the traditional resource users are saying, while the big businesses get deregulated, we get more regulations. We get more species limits. We get more control so that we can't move. We aren't able to do our living. Subsidies on transportation were taken away from us. In the area of pickerel, where a little bit of money could be made, where the big corporations make big money, you give them big dollars. When we try hard to make a living on pickerel, you take the transportation subsidy away from us. And they also relay a message; they said, how come you still subsidize bulls and you can't subsidize the trappers and the fishermen in northern

Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2115)

Mr. Goulet: — As I looked at the throne speech, there was only a mention of Indian and Metis people in a way that was more or less . . . no, I think it was in the last paragraph . . . it said that they would be visited by the Duke and the Duchess, and it said that they would visit our children, and it said they would visit our native people in the North. And I thought to myself, well, a lot of the treaty Indians in this province have made strong cases before that they want to be recognized as Indians, that the PC government should not be afraid to say that treaty Indians are Indians, not native people.

The fact that Metis people are also recognized in the Canadian Constitution, in section 35, they want to be recognized as Metis, and the only mention is the visit in this whole throne speech. And it's a real shameful aspect of our Saskatchewan history when that's the only mention that Indian and Metis people can have in this province.

I look at last year, Indian economic development was cut back by \$2 million, from 3 million to \$1 million. And when I looked at they spent money on advertising — when I presented the case of Al Capone and Sitting Bull last year — there was about \$400,000 spent on that. And I presented that thing last year, and I said, why not put that money into economic development where it could be fairly utilized under the control of Indian and Metis people. But no, what this government did was to take away that important source of livelihood for many families and children in this province.

When I look at the question of land entitlement, this PC government is back in the dark ages. Over 100 years ago the treaties — Treaty 6 in 1876, Treaty 4 in 1874 — established the basis of land claims, as I said, through the settling of treaties, at that point.

The PC government of the day had these policies, and I will put them on the historic record. For the big corporations, the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway), the PC government of the day gave 25 million acres of land, 25 million acres of land went to the big corporation. Hudson Bay Company received 7 million acres of land in that PC government over 100 years ago. How much did the treaty making process establish in terms of land? It was 1.5 million acres, just over 1 million acres for Indian people and 25 million acres for the CPR.

When we look at it 100 years later, we see the same type of outdated policy by this PC government. Now we see both the federal and the provincial level trying to utilize the same type of argumentation. Weyerhaeuser gets 12 million acres.

The fight for land entitlement by Indian people according to the '76 formula that the NDP agreed to, and also in regards to the federal government of the day, would have provided another 1.4 million acres to treaty Indians in this province. But this government simply will not settle those claims.

They say they should use the standard of date of first survey. That means they will go back to the original dates when they were surveyed. That means they'll go back 100 years. When we do grants, when we do systems of fairness today, we take the population of Saskatoon in 1989 when we want to provide a grant for the city of Saskatoon. We take the 1989 population of Saskatchewan when we want to deal with people of Saskatchewan. This PC government will not do that. They will take the population 100 years ago. What would it be like if people in Saskatchewan said, we will look only at the population of 1905 to come out with a grant system, to come out with some source of fairness. People would be absolutely outraged. But this is exactly what you are doing in regards to Indian land entitlement in this province. While tremendous amounts of land goes to the big corporations in form of the CPR a hundred years ago, 25 million acres, Weyerhaeuser today at 12 million acres — and all Indian people are asking for is just over 1 million acres. It's a travesty of justice.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Overall I would say, as I listened to this throne speech, the conclusions that I can come from it is that the government is very positive for the big corporations, whether they are from South Africa or whether they're from Japan or whether they're from the United States.

And also they will be helping their defeated MLA friends and MPs and provide jobs for them when many children of this province and many workers are out of jobs in this province.

We see therefore from this throne speech there is absolutely no way I can support this throne speech. I can't support it because it has no respect for Saskatchewan history. I cannot support this throne speech because there is absolutely no respect for what the people built up in this province. I cannot support this throne speech because there is absolutely no respect for the original Indian people in this province.

There is absolutely no respect in this throne speech for people in the North, except on a confrontational nature. That indeed as we look forward in the future, we will have to say, why doesn't the government smarten up and start listening to the people of Saskatchewan? Why doesn't the government start paying respects to the people? Why don't they start respecting the institutions that the people of Saskatchewan have built on a co-operative basis, on a private basis, and on a Crown corporate basis?

And with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to state strongly that I'm highly disappointed with the throne speech of 1989.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Petersen: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I can only say that the last speaker probably made more sense, and spoke with more feeling and conviction and with more sincerity than any of the previous speakers I've heard from the opposition benches. At least there is a

person who understands the problems of his people and speaks them from his heart, and does not do it from the standpoint of partisan politics. His standpoint has been one that he's probably kept throughout the years and he has not wavered. He has not wavered in his beliefs, nor do I believe him to be hypocritical. Unfortunately that can't be said of other members of the opposition. We saw that earlier today — question period, Mr. Deputy Speaker, question period.

We have issues today that are serious. We have a number of people who have brought up the situation of Indian people, the problems in the North, the problems in the rest of Saskatchewan. We have questions brought up about unemployment. We have questions brought up about agriculture, farmers, the drought. And the burning questions today in question period, Mr. Speaker, took us to a new low in this Assembly — a new low. Hypocritical questions from members of the opposition, saying that there were a number of people who were appointed to positions and condemning them because they had Conservative backgrounds, while at the same time, when they were in power, hundreds upon hundreds of people were appointed — were appointed.

And they weren't all . . . they weren't all simply people who had served in public office. Oh no, they weren't, they weren't. The NDP have made a practice of looking at individuals who work for the government, and they've implied that it's improper for these people to work for the government because they may be Conservative supporters.

Well I'd like to review some of the past hiring practices in this province. And I'd like you to be patient, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the practices and the lists I have are fairly long.

We'll start out with, oh, let's see . . . the name of James Eaton, the director of the EMO (Emergency Measures Organization). He gave a contribution; as you know, lists of people who give contributions to political parties in excess of \$100 are available, they're public information. This gentleman gave \$100 to the NDP. Presto, he is now a director of the EMO.

The public record shows that one Doug Archer gave a significant financial contribution to the NDP and was appointed as an EA (executive assistant) to the member for Saskatoon Westmount at that time; later, given a position that paid \$4,000 a month. In 1981, Mr. Speaker, \$4,000 a month was a lot of money.

Ah, Dr. Boulton, president of the Saskatoon NDP constituency association; he gave a contribution; he was given a big job as a director under the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Regina North West may find this one interesting. One June Butz was given a job, public service 6, Mr. Speaker, not through the Public Service Commission but through an order in council.

Let's take a look at the Highway Traffic Board, Mr. Speaker. Ron Bohner gave money to the NDP, was given a job with that board. Amazing. Amazing. Dennis Renaud gave money to the NDP, given a job with the

Department of Highways; Valerie Gorchuk gave money to the NDP, given a job on the Highway Traffic Board. And on we go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not bring up the names of these people in this Assembly lightly. We have a rare privilege in this Assembly, as you know. We can speak what we feel and what we believe to be the truth, and I am speaking what is the truth.

I bring up the names of these people not to demean those people, not to put them down. They were probably very capable people, Mr. Speaker, probably good people; probably have wonderful relatives in this province. They voted NDP. It's a free country. They're allowed to do that. Why I bring the names and the list into this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is to show the members of the opposition that they are not without blemish when it comes to positions that are appointed, jobs that are available to people in the province for persons who may have a political opinion different to theirs. They did it when they were in office, and they condemn the present government for doing it now.

Well there're some interesting people. Past president of the NDP constituency association, one Pat Lorje, I believe, gave money to the NDP. Who was that? Oh, what was the name . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh see, they know the name, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I mean Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker. They know it, and they know it well. And that person was given \$3,000 a month. Three thousand in 1981 was a lot of money, Mr. Speaker — \$3,000 a month.

A consultant, Mr. Speaker, to the Department of Health, a consultant who gave money to the NDP was paid almost 8,000 a month in 1981 — 8,000. That was a really, really good position at \$8,000 a month. Now that was a heck of a position, Mr. Speaker, for one Mr. Colin Smith. Jack McPhee gave money to the NDP, and in return the NDP gave him a job in Energy and Mines worth \$5,500 each month, Mr. Speaker — \$5,500 a month, each and every month.

(2130)

Oh, here's an interesting one, Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker, one Bev Dejong. Does that name ring a bell? Did I say that one right? I see members of the opposition don't want to hear this, Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker. Oh, she got 3,500 a month. You know, you folks across the way made a sad mistake when you ran for public office again and got elected. You had to take a cut in wages. Some of you should have stayed where you were at.

Kevin Hayes made a large donation to the NDP in '81, and he received a large job as executive director of municipal management, all by order in council. You see the pattern, Mr. Deputy Deputy Speaker. Give money to the NDP and they'll give you a job. They condemn this government for employing experienced people, but at least this government does employ experienced people — people who can do a good job for the province. The NDP auctions off jobs. The more you give, the bigger job you're going to get.

Let's go back to the list for a while, Mr. Speaker. One Dale Weisbrot gave money to the NDP, and in turn he was placed with the Department of Agriculture. Michael Kraft, who didn't give money to the NDP, but who had one Bill Knight write a letter for him to the government. And Mr. Knight in his letter, and I quote, "Kraft is a good New Democrat." Now he was given a job because he was a New Democrat; it was in the letter. And congratulations to him for having a friend like Mr. Bill Knight who could bargain for him — get his friends jobs. That's great.

Brian Kramer sold memberships for Gordon MacMurchy, former minister of agriculture. And behold, Mr. Kramer was given a job in the Department of Agriculture. Now isn't that a surprise, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, the list goes on and on and on and on and on. It's amazing, Mr. Speaker, it's amazing.

There was a lot of different people who picked up good jobs. Myrn Twigg was one of the big spenders, Mr. Speaker. Yes sir, she was given a position as the director of women in Labour at the price to the taxpayer of 4,500 each and every month. Give money; get a job. To the highest bidder go the spoils. That's amazing. That's just amazing.

And the NDP opposition stand in their places today and sanctimoniously criticize this government, stand there and in all arrogance say, bad, bad, bad. You shouldn't do that; it's not proper.

Well I could get into the lists of former NDP MPs and MLAs who were hired as well because . . . the opposition chuckled when I said, you know, we look for people of experience. Obviously they looked for people of experience too, because if they weren't experienced people, why did they hire them? Why did they? And I would think that the name of Don Cody would be an experienced person. He was defeated in 1971, pardon me, Watrous; defeated in '75, Qu'Appelle. But he was given a job in SGI, a senior position until June of 1978 when he was re-elected as an MLA in Kinistino. And he probably did a reasonable job as an MLA, Mr. Speaker. He resigned from SGI, you know, in 1978. That was good of him. There are other members of the opposition who retain full-time teaching positions and things like that while they are sitting members. It's interesting.

Cooper — one Marjorie Cooper — one-time CCF (Co-operative Commonwealth Federation) MLA. Let's go back awhile here. Regina West in the mid-60s, she was elected in 1952, Regina city constituency; '56 and 1960, elected 1964, Regina West. W. Cameron Cooper is her son — October 1975, special assistant to the Minister of Transportation; EA (executive assistant) to the Minister of Education, August 1971, \$840 a month — \$840 a month, 1971 — could we have someone compute that into 1989 dollars. That must have been a fair good salary back then, and he was an EA to the Minister of Education, and later received government contracts.

George Burton, transportation agency, director of public communications, brother to John Burton, former NDP MP, \$2,882. Zennie Burton, appointed to the Highway Traffic Board, paid \$10,710 as an honorarium in '81-82.

Obviously, Zennie is the wife of John Burton, the former NDP MP. But there's no political patronage, or is there, Mr. Deputy, Deputy Speaker?

Eric Cline appointed Crown solicitor, Law Reform Commission, Attorney General's Department, June '81. He was a defeated NDP candidate in the 1978 provincial election. And again, Mr. Speaker, I say these are good Saskatchewan people, and I bring their names up not to demean them but to show the public of Saskatchewan that members of the opposition are not without sin.

Hagel, Glenn; Hagel, Glenn. I apologize, Mr. Deputy, Deputy Speaker, the name that I referred to is now the sitting member for Moose Jaw. It's interesting; I apologize for that. NDP candidate Moose Jaw, April '82 election, received an honorarium of \$5,700 from the Department of Education, 1981-82. I wonder what he was doing before that?

Terry Hanson, former NDP MLA elected 1971 Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, defeated 1975 Indian Head-Wolseley, given an honorarium for special services from the Department of Agriculture — \$1,910, '81-82, as a member of the farm ownership board.

Frank A. Hart sought the NDP nomination in Swift Current in 1978. He didn't even win the nomination, he just sought it; order in council appointment as associate director of one of the departments for \$3,895, 13th of December, 1979, OC 2135/79. It's amazing isn't it. Amazing. It's a lot of money every month.

And I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, but I think what I will do, I think what I will do is I'll just save a little bit of this for later on in my presentation because I plan to have a fairly lengthy presentation.

Now that we've touched on the differences of opinions that we had in this House earlier today, to which many members have alluded to in their reply to the throne speech, on the basis of whom should be hired by whom, perhaps we should get back to the throne speech, in proper, and the Government of Saskatchewan and its record in Saskatchewan.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a number of firsts in this province that I'd like to tell you about and I'd like to tell the people of Saskatchewan about. I'm very proud of the job that our government has done; I'm very proud of the people of Saskatchewan; I'm very proud of the businesses in Saskatchewan; I'm very proud of the investors; I'm very proud of the working people in Saskatchewan, and there are a number of firsts that they have accomplished.

At the top of my list is that in Saskatchewan we have the first leader of a political party to foreclose on farmers — a first, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a first. The Leader of the Opposition is the first leader of a political party to be part and parcel of a firm that is foreclosing on farmers — the first political leader of a political party. I'm really, really impressed with that. And that person aspires to be not only, not only the Premier but, God help us, the leader of the NDP federally, and possibly the prime minister. And that person turns the, oh, the power, if you would, the power of the law against farmers who have had some

difficult times.

And then we see another first. We see the member for Regina Elphinstone stand up and defend that Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly, and then tells everyone what a good man he is and he really didn't do it. It wasn't really him that done it. And that same member from Regina Elphinstone, only a short week or so ago, was one of the members who was trying to stab the leader in the back — *et tu Brute!* Amazing the way that politics works and what it does to people and their minds. I think we must have struck a nerve, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Well let's see about some other firsts that we have here that are a little more positive. We have the largest primary steel producer in western Canada, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have the largest fine paper mill in western Canada, rock pickers, rod weeders, chisel ploughs were invented here. We have the first protein oil starch pilot plant in Canada, the POS (protein, oil and starch) plant. We have the first fibre optics system in North America. We have the largest deposits and the largest uranium mine and highest grade uranium in the world. We're the biggest exporter of potash and uranium in the world.

Well I think the members opposite are saying from their seats, it's not because of us guys, not because of this government. And I want it to go on record that members of the opposition were in favour of being the largest uranium mine and having the highest grade uranium in the world and being in favour of being the biggest exporter of uranium in the world, because their party can't decide what side of the fence they're on in the uranium issue. And I really appreciate the fact that members opposite have clarified that for the people of Saskatchewan. I'm really, really pleased to see that.

We have the purest reserves of potash in the world and the largest reserves in the free world. Of course that may not be an issue that excites members of the opposition. We have the most heavy oil reserves in Canada, and we're the site of the only heavy oil upgrader in Canada. Aha! They didn't say, not because of us, that time. It is because of us that we have the first heavy oil upgrader in Canada, and it's because of our willingness to work with private sector people like the co-ops in putting up the largest heavy oil upgrader that anyone has seen here. And there is a second one to come on stream — a second one, a second one.

An Hon. Member: — Maybe.

Mr. Petersen: — The opposition says, maybe. And they said previous to the building of the plant in Regina with the co-ops, the new co-op upgrader, they said, you'll never do it. As a matter of fact, they were hoping we wouldn't do it. They don't like to see people have jobs, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They like to see people on unemployment so they can say, we'll save you, we'll save you. That's us, we'll save you. And that's what they say to people. They want them to be poor, they want them to be without jobs, they want them to be downtrodden. They don't want them to think for themselves. They don't want upgraders and potash mines and uranium mines and upgraders. I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's disgusting.

Agriculture, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have the site of the largest agriculture livestock show in North America, the Western Canadian Agribition. It's one of the biggest in the world. We've also got the site of the biggest dry land farming equipment show, the Western Canadian Farm Progress Show, in the world.

Now I don't know if members opposite have ever bothered to wander over there and take a look at what's here, but for members of Regina, members of the opposition for the city of Regina, those types of things provide a number of jobs here, a good number of jobs here. And when was the last time you stood up and said, that's good we're doing that; that's good we're promoting that? I haven't heard that from the opposition. All we ever hear is doom and gloom.

This is quite possible. A member just said that when someone from the opposition was an alderperson, they never went there either. Maybe they've been there since. I presume the members opposite have been there and have taken a look at the show.

But the important thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the important thing is the jobs for the people in the city; and secondly, is to show what we can do to the world. It's to show what people in Saskatchewan can accomplish.

That particular show is a show-place; it's an exposition of what Saskatchewan can produce so that our people can continue to build and continue to expand and continue to have jobs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, more and more jobs.

And how do you get jobs, Mr. Speaker? Well by building and expanding and research and development, and once you've built this product, Mr. Speaker, you have to sell it, and you have to trade with people. And these people come in from all over the world.

(2145)

We had 21 countries represented at Agribition last year. All over the world came to Saskatchewan to see what Saskatchewan had to sell, to see what trading opportunities they could work out with us. Members opposite say, oh, that's bad; free trade's bad. The Premier going to the Pacific Rim is bad. We shouldn't do that; that's terrible. My God! They might find out about us and they might want to trade with us and, good heavens! they may want to invest here and we wouldn't want that. And that's what members of the opposition say.

They don't understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that's what makes the world go round. That's what provides the jobs. That's the economic engine that fuels the social programs that everyone in Saskatchewan has come to expect. That is what has to be done, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Money does not grow on trees. You cannot simply expect the government to dig deeper into their pockets or in the people's pockets more and more and more, or go into deeper and deeper deficits, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What you need is an engine of economic growth, jobs, trade, so that these industries can provide the tax dollars and the royalty dollars to provide the services that we need, that our seniors need — nursing homes, nursing homes,

hospitals.

When the NDP were in power, they put a moratorium on nursing homes. And I'm sure they're getting tired of hearing me say this, and I'm glad they're tired of hearing me say this, because they put a moratorium on in what they call the good times. When they claimed there was money around, when they claimed they had a balanced budget, they put a moratorium on nursing homes. Can you imagine that, Mr. Deputy Speaker? In good times they cut back the funding for the defenceless, the most defenceless people in our society, our seniors who could not look after themselves. And they stood up and said, aren't we wonderful? We're the saviours of medicare. We're the saviours of the people of Saskatchewan. We stand for the poor and the downtrodden.

Well yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they certainly do stand for them. They stood around and they watched them try to find a nursing home and they didn't have any to go to. It was sad. It was sad.

My grandmother, who passed away November of '88, came into a serious problem. My grandfather could no longer look after himself. She, being a frail lady, could not look after him either. The family tried, worked very hard. Finally a nursing home bed was found 85 miles away — 85 miles away. And every day for five years that grandmother of mine thought about my grandfather being 85 miles away. She'd lived with the man for 65 years. Can you imagine that? What a shame. What a shame! What a travesty. What a travesty!

Those people were the pioneers of this country that made it possible for members of the opposition to enjoy the type of life-style that they have, for members of the government to enjoy the life-style that they have, for members of Saskatchewan's population to enjoy the life-style they have. And that little old lady had to have someone drive her 85 miles to visit the man she'd lived with for 65 years if she wanted to see him.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was building in the province during the NDP regime. Yes sir, I've got three liquor board stores in my constituency, brand spanking new liquor board stores, 350 grand apiece, but no nursing homes. That was okay. The old people could go down and buy a crock and drown their sorrows. I guess that was the NDP's philosophy. Because that's what they did. That's what they did. And it's there; it's a matter of record — liquor board store. Right there — big sign, big letters. The fanciest building in town until 1982, when we came along, until we came along, the PC government.

Well, for the first time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's a nursing home in my home town. It's attached to the hospital and called an integrated facility, a 12-bed unit attached to a 10-bed hospital. It's not fancy, it's not big, but it serves the needs of the public, and I'm proud to say that the people working in that facility are proud of the job they do. My grandmother spent her last two months of her life in that facility, and I'm proud to say that it was our government that put it there, so that that lady who had helped build this province could enjoy her remaining days in at least, at least the best that we could provide.

We didn't build a liquor board store for her to go and buy a crock in — we built a nursing home. And in Wadena — Wadena, the town of Wadena — it's been in the news a lot. We were there the other day, as a matter of fact Monday, yesterday, and there were 350 farmers who came out to a meeting. And they came out to a meeting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not to preach doom and gloom, not to condemn the government, not to demand another hand-out. No they didn't; they came, Mr. Speaker, to discuss improving their own lot in life with their own initiative. They came to discuss the possibilities of building an inland terminal, just like the inland terminal at Weyburn, so that we could have more jobs in our constituency, so that the grain that we grow can be cleaned there, so that we could have other industries start up, like feed mills, feed mills.

Members of the opposite benches, the NDP chuckle about that. They chuckle about that. They sit there and they smile and they've asked, you know, there's things that need to be done for farmers. Well yes, we've tried. We've done quite a lot, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I'll go into those things in a little while.

But I just wanted to bring to their attention that in the town of Wadena there were 354 forward-thinking farm people, good hard-working people in Saskatchewan who weren't sitting there going, what can the government do for me? They were saying, how can I better my own lot? How can I improve my own lot in life?

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is certainly a first in the thoughts of the members opposite because they'd never think of something like that. They believe big brother government should look after you for ever and ever and ever, from cradle to grave, from womb to tomb. And I could go on, but I won't.

They believe that the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan need somebody looking over their shoulder to look after them. It's okay though for old people to not have a nursing home, but everybody else has got to be regulated, and we got to look after how they think and what they do, never mind where they live, or what have you.

And the member for Regina Elphinstone, and I've got to go back to this because it slipped my mind momentarily when I was talking about it earlier, talked today about his constituency in his riding, just as I am talking about mine. And he talked about the suffering that's in his constituency, and he talked about how tough things were in his constituency and how sad things were in his constituency, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that constituency was represented by the former premier of the province, Allan Blakeney, for I don't know how many years. Do you mean to tell me he did nothing to improve the lot of the people in his own constituency? It's ludicrous, but the member opposite said that today.

Think about it. Think about what he said. He said, the people are suffering in my constituency, and he went on to list the woes and the ills and all the rest of it. And I'm quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that, given the talents of the former premier of this province, Allan Blakeney, I'm sure if he had wanted to, he would have done something in

that constituency to improve the lot of the life of the people there. But obviously he didn't — he didn't — which lends a lot of credence to my argument about the NDP wanting people to live in misery and to be poor. When you represent the poor, or claim to represent the poor and the downtrodden, and they are apparently your voting base, why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it makes a lot of sense to keep the people poor and downtrodden, because if they rise up in the world and learn and improve their lot in life, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why then, you won't be representing them any more, and they won't vote for you.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can only say that it was a shock to me to learn today that the former premier of this province, who represented the Elphinstone constituency for I don't know how many years, did nothing for the people in that constituency. And I suppose that's only fitting since he was the premier of the province when they were building liquor board stores instead of nursing homes. He didn't do anything for my people either — not a thing.

We got a fancy liquor board store in Wadena and a fancy liquor board store in Foam Lake and a fancy liquor board store in Kelvington, and that's nice. I suppose they pay taxes and they improve the scenery a bit, but outside of that, it's kind of a travesty.

An Hon. Member: — Do you think we could sell?

Mr. Petersen: — And I just heard a member say, do you think we could sell? That's an interesting thought. That's an interesting thought. There's one thing I know for sure, there's one thing I know for sure. We'll be building nursing homes and hospital beds.

And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, speaking of nursing home, there is another nursing home being built in the town of Wadena, in the town of Wadena.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Petersen: — A brand-new level 4 to replace the old level 3 attached to the hospital. And there are nursing homes being built in a number of other locations in the province too. And I'm only speaking of my constituency, because that's what I know.

Thousands of people in the province of Saskatchewan can go to sleep tonight knowing that, should one of their loved ones have need of a nursing home, there will be a better opportunity for that person than there was under the NDP. But they're the people who claim they're the defenders of the poor, the downtrodden, and so on and so forth. Well I think not, Mr. Speaker. We have another first in hypocrisy here.

Let's talk about agriculture for a while, Mr. Speaker. My learned friend from the constituency of Morse spoke about a number of things that have been done in the province of Saskatchewan. And they were done to enhance the role of agriculture. And when he was speaking, members of the opposition were catcalling and chuckling and laughing, saying, sit down, sit down, sit down. Well, it's not important to them you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so I can understand why they'd say that.

They don't care. They don't care and they don't understand. They don't understand that agriculture's one of the engines of economic growth in this province.

Sure, we've had a couple of tough years. But look at the course of history, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Look at the numbers of jobs that are created in agriculture. Look at what happens to jobs in Saskatchewan when agriculture is in dire straits, in tough times. Yes, we have unemployment in the province. Take a look at the elevators that have had to close because there is no grain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in many parts of the province. There's no trucking, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Maintenance crews that work for those grain companies have been laid off.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's no wonder there is unemployment. Agriculture is a major employer. Members of the opposition don't seem to understand that. They think of a job as some place where you go and you punch in and walk away or what have you and get a government cheque, work for the government. Many of them have done nothing else all their life.

But I'm here to tell them about the real world. The member for Morse was here to tell them about the real world, where people don't just, you know, go from college into a government job. They have to go out into the world on their own, and it's their choice. There are many people who work for the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Canada and municipal governments, who are fine, hard-working people and earn every cent that they are paid, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The people that work for this province in those government jobs, Mr. Speaker, are fortunate to enjoy many benefits that they have negotiated for over the years, and that's fine. I commend them for that. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't need the members of the opposition laughing and chuckling when the member from Morse is talking about people in other sectors in the province of Saskatchewan who don't have those benefits and those safety nets.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's talk about agriculture. When you look at the world and how it's changing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will see that in the province of Saskatchewan we have typically been one of the largest producers of export wheat in the world. That production, Mr. Speaker, is something that has given our people a number of jobs and have given our farmers a reasonable way of life and a good standard of living.

But, Mr. Speaker, just as my friend from Morse pointed out, the world is changing. We are no longer hewers of wood and drawers of water. It's not good enough simply to grow wheat and export it. We have to have diversification. We have to have value added, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have to go out and take a look at where we can achieve the greatest amount of profitability for our efforts, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have to look at new markets . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Being 10 o'clock the legislature stands adjourned until 2 p.m. tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.

The following is a reproduction of Mr. Goulet's words spoken in Cree as tabled by the member.

[illegible]