

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you, and through you to all members of this House, a founding member of the Women's Alliance Party of Iceland, Magdalina Schlram. Ms. Schlram is a well-known journalist, Mr. Speaker, civic politician and feminist from Reykjavik, who has undertaken a number of speaking engagements in our province, and I'm very pleased to have the honour of introducing Ms. Schlram.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join with my colleague in welcoming our guest from Iceland. Mr. Speaker, Iceland has always been very dear to my heart as my father's mother and father both came from Iceland. My grandfather, Bjarni Tomasson, was born in Hunovatn, Iceland, and my grandmother, Steinum Jonson, was born in Akureyri, Iceland. As you can see, our name has been Anglicized, and I may change it again, change it back.

My father was always very proud of Iceland's accomplishments and of Icelandic people and their history, and up until his death in 1983 he was active in the Icelandic community and spoke the language fluently.

On behalf of myself and all the members, we welcome you to Saskatchewan and Canada, and we sincerely hope your visit will be rewarding and enjoyable.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — I, too, would like to introduce to hon. members this afternoon some guests from far-away places and not so far. Seated in the Speaker's gallery we have with us Dora and Ernie Rice from White Rock, B.C., Muriel Clay from Surrey, B.C., and, from down under, as it were, Donald and Margaret Sinclair from Bright, Australia. Also accompanying them today is Marilyn Rice.

They were in Regina this past week attending a wedding on the weekend, and now they are touring the city before returning home. I might add that I attended that wedding and it was a good wedding, indeed.

Please welcome the guests.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Employment of Former MLAs and Others

Mr. Anguish: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Acting Premier this afternoon. And people are becoming increasingly concerned about the government's record of

corruption and waste, mismanagement and patronage, and what's most bothersome is your policy of hire a hack a week so the employment rates won't peak. And could the Premier or the Acting Premier confirm that Myles Morin, an ex-PC MLA, is the new Superintendent of Pensions in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, if that is in fact the case, I'm not aware of it, Mr. Speaker. I will undertake to take notice of that and bring that answer back tomorrow.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, we would like also for the hon. member to bring back on notice, if he could tell us how much money Mr. Morin will receive from his new appointment, and will this amount be in addition to the amount he currently receives from Pemberton, Houston, Willoughby in the province of Saskatchewan. And finally, if he could tell us why this wasn't an open competition held for the Superintendent of Pensions, to at least give some sort of face of cleansing to this blatant legacy of patronage in the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I only respond the same way, by saying I'm not aware that this in fact has happened. I will undertake to take notice of this and I will bring it back.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that last week we took some questions from . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. Order.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, but in his absence, to the acting Premier — the acting deputy, I suppose. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can confirm for this House that one Larry Birkbeck — you will know him as the former PC MLA for Moosomin — is now employed with the provincial Emergency Measures Organization as a federal-provincial liaison officer. And can you tell this House just what open competition was used to fill this position, and also can you tell us how Mr. Birkbeck's extensive background as a dairy farmer qualifies him for this position?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order! Order, order. Please be seated. Order. I'm having great difficulty hearing the Minister of Justice, and I'm sure most members in the House are, so would you please allow the minister to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the question in the following way: the question was, does Mr. Larry Birkbeck work for the government of Saskatchewan? The answer is yes. And coming from the member from Regina Victoria, I would pose the question back to him. Did he work for the previous NDP government, and the answer's also yes, Mr. Speaker. I say that's hypocrisy in a question proposed

by the member from Regina Victoria.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary for the minister, and I wonder if he would tell this Assembly what level of salary and benefits the people of Saskatchewan are paying Mr. Birkbeck? And can you indicate why the taxpayers should be so gladdened to see him at the public trough and at this latest elevation from the private to the public sector? Can you tell us that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I can . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Question period cannot continue if members will be interrupted when they're asking the question, or when they're trying to answer it. Therefore I ask the hon. members for their co-operation.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the question, if this becomes the wish of everyone in the House, they can say that Mr. Birkbeck is working for the government. Mr. Birkbeck is working for the government. If we want to go through a list of people that worked for the previous administration, I can go through the list, Mr. Speaker, as I have it here. I don't think that serves any great purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Birkbeck works for the Government of Saskatchewan. He has worked for the Government of Saskatchewan for some time. He's in the emergency measures area, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Birkbeck is doing a very good job in that field.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Acting Premier, and it also deals with your government's hiring practices. Can you confirm that one Jack Cennon is now on staff in the Prince Albert Premier's office? Can you tell us: (a) what his duties are; (b) what his qualifications are; and what his salary and benefits are?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware . . . I am not aware that Mr. Jack Cennon is working for the Government of Saskatchewan. I will undertake to find out if that's true. I do not . . . I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you. Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. High paying patronage jobs go on and on, Mr. Speaker, at public expense. Mr. Cennon, a defeated Tory candidate in the 1988 federal election, joins Gord Dobrowolsky, another defeated Tory candidate in the 1984 election, as staff in the Premier's office. Do you have any more defeated candidates, Mr. Acting Premier, from that area you intend to move into that office? And will we be stuck with another renovation bill of \$86,000 to renovate the office and make more room for patronage hacks?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, Gord Dobrowolsky is in fact working. He worked in the Premier's office for some time; he now works in the Premier's office in Prince Albert. I wonder if the hon. member would suggest that instead of us hiring Gord Dobrowolsky to work in the Premier's office we should hire somebody like Don Cody.

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the acting Premier today, Mr. Speaker, and I draw his attention to return no. 2 which was filed in this House . . . tabled in this House on Friday. And yet another example, Mr. Acting Premier, of that phenomenon, down goes a Tory, up pops a job.

As I look at the return, Mr. Acting Premier, I see listed as a consultant for the Department of Trade and Investment for the period of September '87 to May '88, one Stanley Korchinski. Now Stanley received \$45,000 to act as federal-provincial liaison for eight months.

And my question to you, Mr. Acting Premier, is this: this Stanley Korchinski, is this the same Stanley Korchinski, former member of parliament for Mackenzie? And I ask you as well, Mr. Acting Premier, other than his political connections, what were his qualifications that merited this job, Mr. Acting Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, one Stanley Korchinski, former MP for some 27 years in the province of Saskatchewan, was in fact put on contract by the department of economic development and trade. I was then responsible for it. His job was basically to determine intelligence with regard to parliament and report back to us on that, Mr. Speaker.

And I would suggest to the members opposite, should the time ever come when they are government, and should the time ever come when someone like Les Benjamin retires from politics, I would suggest that the members opposite would probably hire Les Benjamin, just as we hired Stan Korchinski, experienced members of parliament, to give them information as to what's going on down there.

Mr. Hagel: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the time will come when the people of Saskatchewan will find out how this side will conduct itself as the Government of Saskatchewan and that time will come soon.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I'd simply like to ask the hon. member to indicate whether he's asking a supplementary or a new question.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I said before, supplementary, and I still say that, and I say to the minister as well, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan will discover soon enough how the people on this side will conduct themselves for the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — The same return, Mr. Minister, same return. One name, Ken Cheveldayoff, \$6,800 for industrial and economic policy consulting. Now this Mr. Ken Cheveldayoff, I ask you, Mr. Minister, is this the same Ken Cheveldayoff who was the head of the PC Party youth wing? And again I ask you: other than his political connections, what were his qualifications that qualified him for this job at the cost to the taxpayer of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Kenny Cheveldayoff, he is a very accomplished student at the University of Saskatchewan . . .

An Hon. Member: — And a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Well maybe he's Tory. Well what's wrong with that?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I said, Mr. Speaker, that I wasn't going to go through this . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I preferred not to go through the list, but I'm going to go through the list for a short period of time here, Mr. Speaker, to draw the analogy and show the hypocrisy. This is at the time of the NDP government between 1971 and 1982, and I'll just go through a list of some people that were . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Next question.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same minister and it also refers to the practising or hiring of the government opposite. Mr. Speaker, we note that there are no jobs for our young people who have to leave the province, but we have lots of jobs for retired Tory MPs. And I want to ask the minister: is it true, Mr. Minister, that you have found a job for John Gormley in the privatization department in your government?

Mr. Minister, isn't it true that one of the objectives of your privatization department is that the private sector is better than the public sector? Don't you think that it would have been better to allow Mr. Gormley to practise that philosophy in the private sector rather than hiring him in the privatization department of your government. Don't you think that you should at least do that much, is allow him to practise his philosophy rather than being at the public trough?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I think that in order to respond to that question, I'm going to try to . . . permit me to take a little time to respond to this particular question. John Gormley . . . of course we look at John Gormley in this government the same way that the previous government looked at Doug Archer, looked at Pattie Atkinson, looked at Chris Bannerman, looked at John

Burton, looked at Frank Fox, looked at Don Cody, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Once again we are unable to hear the minister at all. And I think that all members wish to hear his answer and I will give him a few seconds now to wrap it up.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I wonder if they didn't hear, Mr. Speaker, if I could be permitted to go back over that list. They also included Don Faris, Margaret . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I believe the minister has made his point.

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Mr. Minister, I didn't know that all of those people were defeated MPs as Mr. Gormley was. Mr. Gormley, who has been rejected by the people, and as somebody else indicated before, you people found a job for him.

Mr. Minister, would you mind telling this House, would you mind telling this House, what Mr. Gormley's qualifications were for the job, how much he is being paid for the job, and whether or not there was open competition for that job? Would you answer those three questions? How much is he being paid? What are his qualifications? And was there open competition?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, again permit me some time to respond to that because also we used the same rules that were used by the previous government to employ one Glenn Hagel . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order, order. I do believe that the minister has made his point, and I don't think it's a forum where we wish to read whatever number of names he has. However, if he has something to add to it, I'll allow him to add to that now.

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — I was going to get into the Koskie family. Would you consider adding that to it?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Premier, and it's related to yet more political appointments of defeated PC hacks. Mr. Minister, your government's job creation record is the worst in the country for ordinary people in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — But it is by far the best job creation program in the country for defeated and rejected blue Tories. Your economic program has become a career enhancement program for defeated Conservative candidates.

My question, Mr. Minister, pertains to one Myrna Petersen, yet another defeated candidate in the Regina Elphinstone by-election of May, 1988, who you appointed last year to the Rent Appeal Commission of

Saskatchewan. Could you tell the people of Saskatchewan what qualifications she brings to this very high paid job other than being a defeated PC candidate?

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I simply make the point the following way. I look across the floor and ask myself, how many of the members sitting in their seats today, many of them posing the questions, in their previous life before this one in fact were political appointees to a government 1971 to 1984. Now people that were in fact hired by a government in a political capacity, Mr. Speaker, I think they're hardly the people to call the kettle black.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Solomon: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, again to the minister. He's obviously very sensitive about this topic because of the number of people they've hired. Mr. Speaker, Myrna Petersen was totally rejected by the people of Elphinstone last May. She had the weakest performance of any PC candidate in Saskatchewan. In fact, she received a mere 12 per cent of the vote, and in fact 88 per cent of . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I believe the hon. member is now getting into debate more than getting to his question. However, I recognize the member Regina North West.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, after this performance, you reward her with taxpayers' money. Then you appoint the Saskatoon Eastview's PC campaign manager, Don Morgan, as director of legal aid. Why would you reward, Mr. Minister, these two political hacks after such poor performances, and more importantly, what did these two people do for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to make us want to pick up the expensive tabs for the rewards?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, I simply answer the question this way. You know, question period is the burning issue of the day, and here we have members across the House, and I would say almost half of them in their previous life — more than half of them in their previous life were doing a job that they now complain about that somebody from our party is doing when they were in government. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how credible is that?

Mr. Speaker, that is hypocrisy at its greatest. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite worked for a plan in a political capacity with the government. The reality is, people do work in a political capacity. They should recognize it. They blame us for it; they have done it themselves in spades, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — New question to the minister. Mr. Minister, by way of background, the difference is, is that these members went on to success politically; yours went on to success in the government, having been defeated. That's the difference.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order! I'd just like to once more remind the hon. member that we should allow the questioner the privilege of asking his question without hollering him down.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to address my question to the Minister of Justice. Today's list, that we have produced here, indicates that there are a large number of defeated MPs, MLAs, and candidates who are living high on the hog at public expense.

But that's not all. I want to go through the list that hasn't been asked today, Mr. Speaker. The list includes Paul Schoenhals, chairman of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan); Gordon Dirks, who consulted for the Department of Education; Tim Embury, who also held a consulting contract; Sid Dutchak was president of SHC (Saskatchewan Housing Corporation); good old Louis Domotor, who works for the property management; Paul Rousseau, who has a comfortable job as agent-general in London; Gord Currie . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Order. I realize that the member could probably read names . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — However, question period is not a forum where we simply read names, lists of names which may or may not be relevant, but an opportunity to ask your question. I would ask the member to do that now.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After that encouragement, I do want to ask the question. If you want to pursue your privatization mania that you people are bent on, why don't you try privatizing this group of defeated MLAs, Tory candidates, and turn that money over to the farmers of Saskatchewan for the drought payment?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated — and I don't know whether he meant to or not — but he indicated that one Gordon Currie, a defeated candidate. Gordon Currie was not a defeated candidate. My guess that he stood for election almost any place in the province he would not be defeated.

The hon. member also indicates that all of their people went on to greater things after politics. Well let's go through the list. We got this Bill Knight, William Knight, former NDP MP. He went on to become the principal secretary to the then premier Allan Blakeney. He went on then, Mr. Speaker, to spearhead the campaign in 1982. Tremendous success. He went from there, Mr. Speaker, to head up Mr. Broadbent's campaign in . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Order, order. Order. I realize that members on both sides can ask these types of questions and answer them all afternoon. I don't think it's really enhancing question period that much, and therefore I ask members on both sides to get to the questions and to the answers.

Suggested Taxes on Financial Institutions

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. I want to suggest to members opposite that you are sapping the strength of the Conservative Party. I have no idea why anyone would want to win an election on your behalf when you go on to a cushy \$100,000 a year job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — I've watched the Minister of Finance with mounting frustration watching these proceedings, and I'm going to give him an opportunity to enter the debate after a bit.

My question is to the Minister of Finance. It has to do with a question which appears to have gone over the head of the Premier last Friday. Now I want to say an idea doesn't have to gain altitude very fast to accomplish that feat.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Shillington: — What went over the head of the Premier was a question having to do with Michael Wilson's stated intention to impose a tax on financial institutions. As any number of studies have pointed out, that will be a direct addition to interest rates of about a quarter of a per cent. Indeed, the question is inspired by an article in the *Globe and Mail*, which suggests it will cost this country 45,000 jobs.

Mr. Minister, my question has to do with the fact that you were in Ottawa recently, meeting with the Minister of Finance. Did you point out to the Minister of Finance how ill-conceived such an idea was, how difficult it would be for farmers and business people in this province to absorb an even more punishing interest rate?

Hon. Mr. Lane: — I can't say I've ever had the hon. member's problem of mounting frustration, but I will endeavour to answer the hon. member who just asked the question, who, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member being one of the defeated NDP candidates who subsequently got a government job at very high cost to the taxpayer . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. The minister . . . Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the former defeated NDP and executive assistant, I would like to respond and advise, Mr. Speaker, that the discussions about the implications of a national sales tax have been ongoing for some time. We've discussed it in the last couple of sessions of the legislature.

What I've indicated in the past, that the government's position is that we want to see the proposals for a national sales tax before we take any position.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a speculative question as to the form of the national sales tax, and it has been made clear in public that we do not have nor does any province have the final definitive statement or the proposals from the national government.

Secondly, I will indicate when it comes to the value

added tax or a national sales tax being imposed on financial institutions, it is quite fair to say that in every country, I understand, that has imposed a value added tax, financial institutions have been exempt. I have no reason to believe that they wouldn't be exempt under this, but again until such time as we get the final proposals, I'm just unable to comment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Martin: — Yesterday I went over some of the accomplishments of this government in health care, and before continuing, I'd like to briefly review some of those accomplishments.

Since 1982, Mr. Speaker, this government has increased spending on health care by some 68 per cent. It has built new hospitals, new nursing homes, new alcohol and drug abuse treatment centres, more rehabilitation facilities — more, Mr. Speaker, of almost everything.

I'd like to comment for just a moment on the new alcohol and drug abuse treatment centre called Whitespruce, which is the first of its kind in Canada, and one of only two or three adolescent treatment centres for drug and alcohol abuse in North America.

Mr. Gordon Currie, who was the former member from Regina Wascana, is running that operation, and in the course of slightly over a year has turned it into a fast moving facility which is housing somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20, 25 young people from throughout Saskatchewan needing alcohol and drug treatment. So the Whitespruce alcohol and drug adolescent treatment centre is one of a kind in Canada. We can be very proud of that accomplishment.

We have added 2,000 new nursing home beds, which in context of the NDP moratorium, I guess, amounts to an infinite increase. It was a sad day in the late 1970s when the NDP decided to put a moratorium on nursing homes; when they decided that the elderly people of this province no longer needed to be in nursing homes; that beds weren't necessary for the elderly people of this province, and put a moratorium on them. But when this government came into power in 1982, they said, enough of that; we've got to get some beds for the elderly people of the province.

Is it enough? Probably not. We need more and we will have more, Mr. Speaker. But 2,000 new nursing home beds for the elderly people of this province, I think is a fine start, and there will be more.

We have obtained CAT scanners, expanded open heart surgery, put in place a province-wide chiropody program, and built new cancer clinics. This Progressive

Conservative government, Mr. Speaker; this government had the courage to end extra billing by doctors, of patients. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on the outrageous and frankly insulting remarks of the opposition.

They're trying to frighten people into believing that this government supports deterrent fees. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition informed this House that his whole campaign would be based on deterrent fees and the destruction of medicare. Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP, in legalizing extra billing, the NDP were the ones who brought in deterrent fees. They like to talk up a storm and shout from the roof-tops, but they allowed patients to be extra billed for necessary medical expenses. This government put a stop to that. This government said no to the NDP practice of extra billing. The NDP, they are the government of extra billing, they are the government of deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker. Where was the outrage of the Leader of the Opposition when he was allowing patients to be charged directly for their care?

The hypocrisy of it, Mr. Speaker, is simply unacceptable. And if you go down the record, you see it repeated over and over and over again — sheer, bold hypocrisy. On the treatment of farm families — hypocrisy; on public participation — hypocrisy; on uranium mining — hypocrisy; on public accounts — hypocrisy.

My friend from Rosthern said it very well when he said the NDP is a party of blackmail and fear. But I think it is also necessary to say that they are, the clearest terms possible, the party of hypocrisy, and did we ever need a more clear demonstration of that than we saw in question period this afternoon. This is the party who wrote the book on patronage to their people.

And you know we've had something like nine months now since the last session ended, and over this nine months we've had some serious issues have come forward to the people of this country, health care being one. Certainly free trade is one, public participation, day care. All of those are big and central issues of the day. Environment's a central issue. And what are those people from across the way after nine months . . . they should fire their researchers and start all over again because they haven't come up with one decent question in the days we've been sitting here.

Surely whether or not Paul Schoenhals or Larry Birkbeck or some of these other people who were defeated candidates in the last election are the pressing issue of the day is mind-boggling, Mr. Speaker, just mind-boggling. They are so bankrupt of ideas that they have to resort to that kind of feeble questioning during . . . taking up the time of the people of the House. And I know that people watching on television must have been just aghast. And if you go back through the book, you will see that there hasn't been one intelligent, one good question asked since this House sat last week.

Mr. Speaker, this government has an admirable record and an ambitious plan. It is a record that I have recounted to you in some detail in terms of health care. And, Mr. Speaker, I think a look at the plan shows you the strong

commitment of this government to continuing that strong record.

The community care program is another health care first for the people of Saskatchewan, a proven plan that brings people together in the kind of co-operation that my colleague from Wilkie spoke of so eloquently yesterday: communities co-operating and building their future in health care and across the board, Mr. Speaker. And that is a good thing, a thing this government can be proud of.

Let me give you another example of the co-operative principle at work in the health care field, Mr. Speaker. The new plastic health card is a good example. I know that you know who designed and implemented that card, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to inform the opposition. It was a co-operative — a co-operative that designed the new plastic health card. Mr. Speaker, Co-operators Data Services Limited did the work on the new plastic health card.

And I can tell you that there's some shock among members of the co-ops in this province that they would be accused by members of the NDP of trying to destroy medicare by working with the government to bring this world-class, first-of-its-kind technology to our province. It must be a shocking experience for the members of the co-ops in this province to feel that the people opposite are denigrating them for being involved in this kind of an operation.

This co-operative not only put the new system in place, Mr. Speaker, but they will be operating it on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan on a permanent basis. They will maintain the computer system and make the system work. They will market that system into other provinces and the United States.

And the NDP say that co-ops are destroying medicare because they're working with the government, when indeed, Mr. Speaker, because they are co-operating . . . Co-operation works, Mr. Speaker. It works in health care and in all areas of building our province.

The community care program announced in the throne speech is a major contribution to that great tradition. I watched last night on the news, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses making a presentation to the health care task force that parallels in a direct way the commitment of the throne speech to enhance the role of rural nurses in front line positions.

Give the nurses the power and the skills to do more, and they will take on that challenge in a positive and co-operative way. The nurses of Saskatchewan want that opportunity, they want that responsibility, they want that challenge, and this government will give them that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased that the government has announced its intention to do precisely that.

There are many other areas of excellence from the past seven years, and there's much more in the current throne speech on the subject of health care. But I'd like to talk for a few minutes about a subject that I spent 25 years of my life reporting, Mr. Speaker, and that is the area of

environment. The kinds of things the opposition would like to pretend are their concerns today, I was doing stories on with film and videotape some 25 years ago for the CBC. Sports may have been my beat, but the outdoors, recreation, wildlife habitat, the environment in general was my main interest and our family's interest.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I observed and reported on the record of the previous government, the NDP, on environmental issues. And without being too specific, I will say they could have done a great deal more concerning wildlife habitat, water drainage, protection of endangered species, wetlands, and critical habitat.

And of course any credibility that the NDP government had concerning environmental issues was quickly destroyed when, on orders from above — from orders from the top — they paved over a PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) spill. Now today everyone is well aware of the deadly effects of PCBs, but the NDP tried to cover it up in their late '70s PCB spill, to their everlasting shame, Mr. Speaker.

Whereas on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, the record of the current government is positive and forward thinking. The North American water-fowl program is a classical example, as is the critical Wildlife Habitat (Protection) Act, which protects millions of acres of habitat for wildlife throughout the province. This Act was long overdue. Now we have it, and I compliment the minister and the cabinet for this action.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal of misinformation from the NDP about the Shand power project. But the Shand is recognized around the world, not just at SaskPower, not just in our Environment department, but around the world, Mr. Speaker, as being at the forefront of environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, the Shand will implement an environmental process never before used, and that process is called zero discharge. Mr. Speaker, it's called zero discharge, and what it means is that not one drop of effluent, not one drop of waste water will be put back into the environment. Nothing will be discharged, and hence it is called zero discharge. That's never been done before, Mr. Speaker. Another Saskatchewan first that is leading the way for the world.

The throne speech, Mr. Speaker, indicates this government will continue to lead on concerns in the environment. And it is especially pleasing, Mr. Speaker, to see that environmentally unsafe products will be taxed to pay the cost of protecting the environment.

What is so impressive about this is that the business community has come out in full support of the measure. The business community that the opposition would have us believe is out not only to destroy the government, that community has said, we want to co-operate to protect the environment. And I say, good for them, Mr. Speaker; bravo to the business community and to this government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that others want to participate in this debate, and I can see the NDP are eager to get up and tell us if they have agreed on any policy positions on

any subject at all, and I wish to hear from the next speaker just what it is that that speaker propose the government should do. But please don't tell me you believe in low unemployment, a clean environment, and a perfect health care system, because we all believe in those things. You tell the people of Saskatchewan how you plan to accomplish those goals, and maybe your speech will be worth listening to.

With that advice to the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I fully support the Speech from the Throne and the best leader in Canada, and I'll be voting yes to the motion of my friend from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. And thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1445)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to enter in the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I want to say as well that in listening to the Speech from the Throne I thought it was well delivered by Her Honour.

It was truly lacking in substance — rehashed material, ideas — but, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we can expect from a government that has been and continues to be bankrupt of ideas. I say to you that it was bankrupt of ideas because what it dealt with almost in every case were bills that were left on the order paper at the time of the prorogation at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Oh, there was some other things. There was farm equity, which has been rejected soundly by credit unions in the province, by farm groups, by the Sask. Wheat Pool. That is going to be forced down the throats of the farmers. But other than that, there was very, very, little.

There was talk of taxing hazardous material — not banning it as the Government of Ontario proposes to do, but putting a tax on it — so that it is legal and profitable to produce hazardous wastes in this province, as long as you pay the taxes.

I want to say to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, congratulations on your victory. We look forward to working with you in the Assembly between now and the next election. I think the expectations that you created during the by-election are very, very high. I've been in Gravelbourg a couple of times since the by-election, and they're wondering when the new hospital will be built, and I'm sure that it will be built before the next election as you promised to do during the campaign. And not so much yourself personally, but the Premier of the province, the member for Estevan who was in Gravelbourg a great deal, met with the hospital board, and promised them that if a Conservative member were elected, that in fact a new hospital would be constructed in the very near future.

I say, as well, you raised expectations in terms of the drought payment. You went along with the promise made at the federal election that \$45 per acre would be paid to the farmers in your area when the drought payment would come forward, and at that time you said, early in

1989. Well it is now the middle of March of 1989, no payment has been made yet, but a promise made to pay between \$12 and zero. Now that is hardly a fulfilment of the promise that you made during the by-election along with your federal counterparts.

I noticed with interest last night a report from a small town in south-east Saskatchewan where the member for that area, federal PC member, was taken to task by farmers in that particular area about the lack of a drought payment. And to that end I have called on the member for Shaunavon, the PC member from Shaunavon and the MP for that area to hold a public meeting in Shaunavon to explain to the farmers how it is that during an election campaign there's a promise made of \$45 an acre. And the member for Shaunavon will know that the majority of his constituency, even though he promised \$45, is not going to get one cent in the initial stages of this program. So I think it's appropriate that all members would be going to their constituency as soon as possible, renting town halls and holding meetings where you explain and account for your actions at the time of the federal election and the by-election, and the result that we see at the present time.

I want to say a few words about the constituency I represent, Elphinstone, and I want to say that it is indeed a pleasure to represent the constituency of Elphinstone. It's quite different than a rural constituency. Obviously I enjoyed very much my two terms I spent as the member for Shaunavon, but there are certain advantages to living in the city where the legislature sits. You can be home at supper time, and there are some great advantages.

I would like to say though that there are many, many problems in the constituency of Elphinstone, only a few blocks away from this building. My colleague from Moose Jaw South yesterday outlined the fact that not very far from here many people go to bed hungry, and how hard that is for some of us to understand and believe.

Now the people who are going to bed hungry are mostly children. Statistics show that we have the second highest rate of poverty in Canada, here in the province of Saskatchewan. And I suppose in my constituency you would have the highest rate of hunger and poverty of any constituency in Saskatchewan.

That's not to say that many people don't have good jobs and live a fulfilling life, but there is a large number of people, a large number of people who simply don't have work. The unemployment rate of people below the age of 25 across the province is 17 per cent, and I'd be willing to wager a bet that in my constituency the percentage of unemployment of young people would be closer to 25 or 30 per cent.

And what happens to those people? Well, inevitably, sociologists and psychologists will tell you that people who are unemployed — particularly young people — for long periods of time have difficulty staying out of conflict with the law and may from time to time turn to the use of unlegalized or illegal drugs.

Now I want to say to you that what your solution is is not to find jobs for the people but to find jobs for Tory hacks and to build new drug treatment centres. That's a good

idea, to build them, but why don't you deal with the fundamental problem that you people have created, which is record high unemployment among young people right across this province.

I say to you that in my constituency, if you want to know about hunger, all you have to do is come with me any time and we'll knock on doors in my constituency and you'll see the havoc that your policies and what they have done to the people of this province. Basically what's happening is the middle class is being decimated, and we're ending up with a small group of wealthy, elite, rich folk, most of them friends of the Conservative Party and a very large, much larger group of poor people who are unable to pay taxes, unable to take part in the things that are good about our society, and which they were able to do only a few short years ago.

All you have to do is come with me on most weekdays when Theresa Stevenson offers food to hungry children when they come to the centre in the constituency, North Central Community Centre (Society), on a number of weekdays each week. They come from the school because there's no food at home and they come there to have a hot lunch.

Now that's a new proposal from the Conservative government to deal with the problem of hunger. Rather than give jobs and provide jobs for families in my constituency, we now have food banks set up only a few blocks away and a lunch program being served by Theresa Stevenson, offered to hungry children, because the biggest issue in the classroom in my constituency is not the lack of school books, which is important, because they do lack books; it's not the teacher-pupil ratio, which members from Saskatoon will talk about, and that is a legitimate concern — the biggest issue in my constituency is children coming to school in the morning not having been fed. That's the biggest single issue, and teachers in that area will tell you that.

Now this is Tory economic development in action in the Elphinstone riding. And at a meeting the other night we held there, a number of people came forward to a forum we held on hunger — 12 or 13 groups, the member from Regina Centre was there — and they provided some ideas that we will be bringing forward as positive alternatives and positive solutions to the situation that exists there.

I want to now turn for a few moments to the rural part of the province and the issue of agriculture. Being a farmer, still maintaining a farming operation in the Shaunavon district, I have opportunity on many occasions to go down to the farm and meet with the business people in Shaunavon, out of necessity and also because it's an enjoyable thing to do, go back and renew acquaintances and buy fertilizer and parts for the cultivator and all those kinds of things that farmers have to do, but I'll tell you that the problem with small town Saskatchewan can't be exaggerated too much. There are literally hundreds of small businesses going broke, many of them machinery manufacturers. If you go to Shaunavon, you'll find that almost 100 homes are for sale in that small town. It's not a very big town — about 2,200 people — but there are approximately 100 houses for sale in that town at the present time.

And Shaunavon has advantages. It's not without somewhat of a diversified economy. It has oil in the area. It has great reserves of coal in the area, but I haven't heard one word from the government or the member for that area, the PC member, about industrial development that would bring that coal onstream in terms of a power project, or use it in terms of developing jobs; has not argued once about the boondoggle down in Estevan and the power plant being built over there; not one word defending the constituency of Shaunavon in terms of job development.

But I want to say to you that the bigger disaster that I see in rural Saskatchewan comes from the older people who talk about what things used to be like, and they can hardly believe how things have changed in rural Saskatchewan. They can hardly believe it.

My dad, who's 72 years old and had no involvement in politics before I joined the party — in fact, I think my family may have even been from a different background from time to time, but they were not political people. But my dad, who's 72 years old, remembers the last Conservative government only vaguely. He was about 18 years old when the last Conservative government was turfed out back in 1934 or '35, and he tells about how the communities built this province and how he can't understand how this government has set about ripping it apart; how they've attacked SaskPower, the power corporation that the people of this province built.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that SaskPower wasn't a power corporation that was shoved down the throats of the farm people. It worked the other way around. Farmers got together and lobbied the government to set up a Crown corporation that would deliver power on a broad base to the people of this province — and the same is true of SaskTel — and they did, and many of them volunteered in setting up the power poles and getting the power corporation running. They can't believe that you people are ripping it down and selling it off to your friends.

Medicare is another example. He says what's happening to the medicare system? Medicare wasn't designed by one government and shoved onto the people of this province in 1962. It started far, far back before that, in 1946, in Health Region No. 1 in Swift Current.

And it was started there by people in municipalities who got together to hire a doctor because they couldn't afford to pay one, and they shared the expense, back in 1946. It was people working together to develop a province the way they wanted it. It was different than other parts of Canada, that's true. But I'll tell you, it was much better than what existed in other parts of Canada or, for that matter, anywhere else in North America. And the people in that area developed the health care system and then asked that the government implement it across the province in 1962. And then the people in other parts of Canada demanded that the federal government — Liberal government, I believe it was — implement across Canada.

Now the line that the Conservatives, or John Diefenbaker,

put medicare in place is just so much malarkey, Mr. Speaker. It simply isn't true — another line that is used by the Conservatives to try to cover up their footsteps and their record. But I say to you, when you go to places like Shaunavon, they are amazed at the population drain and the number of farmers who are being forced off the land.

Now when did this theory of getting rid of farmers start in this political party's mind — the Conservative Party? Is it recent? Is it the drought? Is that where the concept, the seed began, that the Premier of the province would believe that we should get rid of farmers? Well I want to quote to you from 1977, when the Premier, Dr. Devine, was then at the University of Saskatchewan, and I want to say to you . . .

The Speaker: — I'd just like to remind the hon. member that we don't use members' names in this Assembly.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I want to quote from a time before the member for Estevan was Premier of this province; in fact he was a professor at the university in Saskatoon. And the *Business Review* of the winter of 1977 lays out, in short terms, what was going on in that member's head about farming in Saskatchewan. And in the *Business Review* under marketing boards, economic, or social policy, and I want to quote from that article that he wrote. In that article he said:

Realizing that most of our food is produced by less than 20 per cent of the farmers who tend to be good business men as well as producers, society may not wish to support higher food prices or producer security so that the non-productive 80 per cent of the farm population can live in the country at a profit.

That's what he said in 1977. That's when the farm economy was booming. That wasn't when there was a drought or a depression that has been caused and created at least in part by you people on that side of the House. This was a belief he had when the farm economy was booming in 1977. There weren't any better years in the history of this province than 1977. I was there; I remember it.

And they continued to get better up until 1981. Even with high interest rates, in 1981, our last full year of government, that was the year of the highest net income on the farm in the history of Saskatchewan, even with high interest. Check the statistics.

(1500)

An Hon. Member: — 1984.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — No, that's not accurate. If you check the record, the statistics will show that 1981 was the highest net income in the history of this province. That was even after taking into consideration the high interest rates. And there's a reason for that.

But I want to get back to this philosophy of the now Premier. This is a plan that he's had in the back of his head for a long, long time to get rid of farmers, to get rid of them. What's written here, he wrote it. I didn't write this.

I'll table it and you can have a look at it and ask him whether he still agrees with it.

But to look at the thousands of farmers who are leaving the farm at the present time, I believe that was one of his intents of getting involved in politics — to rearrange the structure of this province. And that's why the population is draining out of the province at a record number. That's why the population isn't growing like it was back in 1976 when we had record growth in terms of population increase in this province, record growth in terms of population growth in 1976.

But I want to say to you that the philosophy of getting rid of farmers is not one that has just been dropped into the Conservative caucus. It was being thought out by the now Premier while he was a member of the staff at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, and this confirms it. There's no doubt about it. So I say to you, when we talk about the numbers of farmers leaving the land, this is not only as a result of drought, but as a master plan that Grant Devine has been thinking about for a long time.

The Speaker: — Order, order. I remind the hon. member once more to refrain from using the name of other members in this Assembly.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that getting around to the issue of forcing farmers off the land — and I've got a great deal to say about privatization and other issues — but I want to spend the balance of the time I have here talking about an issue that I would rather not talk about. But I tell you, yesterday, in listening to the member from Rosthern — I can't help but get into this debate on an issue, I say again I would rather not talk about, and I find it regrettable that I have to speak to.

But today I want to deal with the spectacle to which this Assembly had to look at yesterday, the member from Rosthern and the speech that he gave. I have to say as much in sadness as in anger that I have to go through the next 15, 20 minutes of what I'm going to say.

I say here we are elected members. We're sent here to represent the people who elect us, and I want to say that what I saw and heard yesterday from the member from Rosthern was far beneath what I have ever seen in this Assembly in the years I've been here, and that's ten years. And I've seen many speeches; I've seen nights that were raucous; I've seen question periods where members have got kicked out, but I have never seen or witnessed the personal attack that I saw yesterday by the member from Rosthern.

I say the attack was bad enough, but the more important thing is, Mr. Speaker, that there were no facts involved in what the member was saying. It was gutter politics, Mr. Speaker, and gutter politics should have no place in this legislature or in politics in this province.

Unfortunately, the member from Rosthern is not alone in using this tactic. Gutter politics has become the *modus operandi* of the entire PC government. I say they're a desperate government. They are afraid of the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague, because they can see

power slipping away. They can see how popular and respected a leader the member from Riversdale is, and they are panicking.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — So I say, Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have seen members opposite stoop to new lows in their personal attack. But yesterday set an all-time new low.

In this Assembly the member for Rosthern referred to a family in the public gallery and said:

I would like to introduce to you a family . . . that the Leader of the Opposition foreclosed on . . . Mr. Gaudet was forced off his farm . . . by the member for Riversdale.

That is a direct quote from *Hansard*. And that, Mr. Speaker, is an absolute falsehood. Not one ounce of truth to it. The only reason I don't put it in stronger language here, Mr. Speaker, is because it's not allowed. Anywhere else I would and will put it in stronger language.

Just how false was shown only a few minutes later when the member from Rosthern was finished speaking in this House, when the Gaudet family spoke to journalists. The Gaudets confirmed that the member from Riversdale had never been involved in their legal dispute with their bank. The Gaudets confirmed that they had in fact not lost their farm but had given some of the land up to the bank and reached an out-of-court settlement.

I knew that would be the case because the facts are these: the Leader of the Opposition practised law from 1985 to '87 as part of a 16-member law firm in Saskatoon. The Leader of the Opposition never at any time acted on behalf of any financial institution or against any farmer.

In fact, the Leader of the Opposition provided legal advice to the Crown Land Tenants Association, a group of farmers who the PC government was trying to drive off their land.

Regardless of, the Leader of the Opposition has not been involved in the law firm since 1987, nearly two years ago. Those are the facts.

So, Mr. Speaker, the allegations are the worst kind of gutter politics and are simply not true. But that hasn't stopped the Premier and his members from continuing to repeat these falsehoods. The Premier especially seems to take great pleasure in repeating these false statements.

Today I intend to call him and his government on these tactics. I'm sure that the people of Saskatchewan would assume that if the Premier really believes what he has said about this issue, he would have checked with his own house before launching this personal attack, that he would have looked around his own caucus. He would have sat down and asked every lawyer in his caucus if he had ever acted on behalf of a financial institution in a foreclosure action against the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, the documents that I am about to table in this

Assembly give the Premier two choices for a defence: either he is in incredibly incompetent and has failed to check his own lawyer MLAs about their activities in this field, or he is the biggest hypocrite in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Because if the Premier had asked his MLAs about their activities, Mr. Speaker, the member from Melville would have told him, yes, even during the time I was a member of the legislature for the PC Party, I acted directly on behalf of a financial institution against a farm family or farm families. I not only knew my firm was doing this, but I was personally involved; in fact, my firm handled more foreclosures than any other law firm in Melville put together.

Mr. Speaker, I lay on the Table a copy of an affidavit filed at the Melville Judicial Centre on August 8, 1983. It is an affidavit filed with respect to the Queen's Bench case No. 108 of 1983.

In this affidavit, the member for Melville, on behalf of a vacationing law partner and a financial institution they represent, makes application for a hearing to apply for a leave to commence foreclosure against a Melville district farmer. According to the court records, the foreclosure action was only discontinued in 1984 after the farmer had agreed to settle with the financial institution. That's one example.

Here's another — and again I lay the documents on the Table, Mr. Speaker, for the province to see — this document deals with Queen's Bench court case No. 58 of 1982. It shows where the member from Melville, acting on behalf of the Bank of Montreal, has applied to force a foreclosure sale of a farm in the Melville area. Another bank, the Royal, had actually launched foreclosure action. The member from Melville, representing the Bank of Montreal as one of the farm's creditors, applied to force a judicial sale in order to get his bank's share of the money.

Here we have a farmer about to lose his operation and the banks are picking at the bones. I lay these documents on the table, Mr. Speaker, to prove the clear hypocrisy of the members opposite. Here we have a sitting member of the government party whose firm was not only foreclosing on farmers on behalf of banks, but who handled the files personally.

I ask the member from Melville, did you not tell the Premier this before he launched his province-wide attack on this issue? Did you hide it from the Premier hoping he and the people of Saskatchewan wouldn't find out, or did the Premier know all along and still decide to master-mind these personal attacks? Which is it, Mr. Member?

And I put the same question to the Premier. His credibility is on the line on this one. I ask the Premier, do you plan to deal with the minister, and what kind of activity do you allow in your government? The point is this. If you really believe half of what you have said in your personal attack, then you have no choice but to deal with it.

I want to say, and I want to move on to what we see as the real issue in this debate about farm foreclosures, the true public policy debate as it should be, and that is the issue of who is really driving farm families off the land.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Last year the Farm Land Security Board received 1,245 notices of foreclosures from all creditors combined. Some are from banks, some are from credit unions, but many are from the Government of Saskatchewan, specifically from lawyers acting on behalf of the Premier of the province.

This means the Premier of the province has a stable of lawyers he has hired to deal with farmers in the legal sense. Not one farmer . . . or like the two the member from Melville has dealt with, but literally hundreds and thousands of farmers that the Premier is acting on directly. Oh yes, he's removed himself one step. He doesn't sign the papers because he can't — he's not a lawyer — but he hires lawyers to do it for him, then roams around the province accusing everyone else of being responsible for driving people off the farm.

Well the Premier is guilty in this case of being directly involved, because he could stop them at any time as it applies to his role as the Premier of Saskatchewan and with loans outstanding to the Government of Saskatchewan. He is in total control of the situation. All he he'd have to do is phone his lawyers and have them stop proceedings. But he is having them act against farmers, not in small numbers, but to the tune of thousands, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the government is trying to hide these figures and it refuses to release them to the public. I asked the Minister of Agriculture, how many farmers have your lawyers started actions against in the last year? How many farmers have your lawyers launched other legal proceedings against in the last year? I ask the Premier to come clean.

Perhaps we can get some sense of how many farmers the Premier is trying to drive off the land by looking at the actions of his federal counterparts at the Farm Credit Corporation. The FCC (Farm Credit Corporation) is currently processing foreclosure actions against 286 farm families.

You've heard the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture talk about how Brian Mulroney and his FCC are driving . . . or have you heard how they're driving farmers off the land? Not at all. Not one word of defence for farm families being driven off the land by the federal government. Not one word. Have you heard the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture talk about how his lawyers at the Agricultural Credit Corporation of Saskatchewan are driving Saskatchewan farmers and families off the land? Of course not.

That's the real public policy issue at the core of this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the sleazy, false attacks we saw in this Assembly yesterday are part of an elaborate smoke-screen by the Premier to try to take the public

attention away from the fact that he, as the Minister of Agriculture, is the number one farm forecloser in Saskatchewan today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I hope that my intervention today . . . and I said at the outset we would have preferred not to go through this act today. This has been well-known knowledge for a long time. This is a defence mechanism against the sleaze that is going on by the Premier of this province against an individual. But I say to you, like many times in politics, when you stoop, it comes back to haunt you. And I say today that farm foreclosures, I guarantee you, will become an issue in this province as a result of . . . (inaudible) . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1515)

Mr. Muller: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour for me to rise before the Assembly and speak in response to Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor's first Speech from the Throne. I found a sense of vision in Her Honour's speech, and I'm proud that I will be active in fulfilling that vision for the people of Saskatchewan.

I also want to compliment our new member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg on the winning of the by-election in December. I certainly spent a lot of time down there working on his behalf. I talked to a lot of people and from all political affiliations, and certainly it was enlightening for me to go down into a different part of Saskatchewan to what I'm used to, to work in a by-election where it's ranching and grain farming, which is a little bit of different agriculture than I'm used to.

I talked to many Liberals and NDP and Conservatives, and I found a lot of support for what we are doing in agriculture. There was only one real definite dissenting voice that I ran into down in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and the gentleman said to me, I don't want to vote for this member that could represent us very well, but he's the best horse veterinarian we've ever had here and I don't want to lose him. So this was his reasoning for not voting for the member that now sits here in the legislature. I'm sure that that member will represent that man very well as he does . . . as he worked very hard for him in his trade as a veterinarian. And it's really too bad that you can't have both, you know, good veterinary medicine and good members of the legislature, but I'm sure that this member will do the best he can to fulfil both of those roles. I know that some members that sit across here try and fill two roles as members of the legislature and take teaching positions, so I'm sure that members on this side of the House can handle their jobs as veterinarians and members of the legislature.

It's a great honour for me, Mr. Speaker, to represent the people of Shellbrook-Torch River in this Assembly. It is because of the people of that constituency and their confidence in me that I'm here today. The people of Shellbrook-Torch River elected me, and I'm looking out for their best interests. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the people of that constituency are seeing progress, progress

that can be attributed directly to our government's commitment to them.

For example, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at health care. That was always a big issue in my seat prior to the '82 election where Mr. Bowerman, who was one of the heavyweights, I guess you could say, in the NDP cabinet, he chose to build grandiose liquor stores in the town of Shellbrook rather than nursing homes. That was one of the issues that was certainly brought to me in the 1982 campaign, and it was certainly an issue that I had to deal with in my first term of office.

You'll find in your first term of office that it takes some time to find your way around this institution, to understand how each department works. And I finally, being a slow learner maybe a bit, but I finally did understand how the system did work a bit.

Anyway, I got a commitment from our Minister of Health in my first term of office that certainly we were going to build a nursing home in the town of Canwood, which certainly had no consideration from the former government and their moratorium.

So everybody says that after a member gets re-elected for the second term he probably forgets some of the commitments he made. That wasn't the case in my position, or in my spot because right after the 1986 election we went to work again in getting this nursing home built, and it's there today.

And everybody in this legislature certainly knows Mr. John Gormley, who was at that time the federal member for The Battlefords. He was at the opening of the nursing home, or the ribbon cutting of the nursing home. And I always try and be innovative and think of new things that a member can do for his constituency.

So six weeks before the ribbon cutting, I phoned John Gormley and invited him to come. So John Gormley was a very hard-working member federally, and I had a lot of faith in him and I still do. So I phoned a couple of young fellows in Canwood and I said, why don't you put together a presentation to make to this federal member when he is here at the ribbon cutting for this . . . or sod turning for this nursing home. I said, we all know how badly we need heavy steel from Shellbrook to Debden to make the connection with Meadow Lake. And we had the whole new community hall that was built since 1982 in Canwood, full of people that day. And these two young people, both farmers — one had a university education — got up and made a tremendous presentation to the crowd and to Mr. Gormley and myself. They had copies of it that were all sent to the federal Minister of Transport, and copies that were sent to our provincial Minister of Transport and the provincial members from Meadow Lake and Turtleford who were certainly involved.

And I'm proud to say that prior to the 1988 election, that that heavy steel was laid from Shellbrook to Debden, and that's the kind of communication we need with our federal members. It's going to be a little more difficult working with someone in there now, but this . . . Mr. Gormley was very good at returning my phone calls, always back to me from Ottawa, keeping me up to date

on what was happening, and as was mentioned today in question period, I'm very proud that he's working on our team, and I'll hang my head nowhere for that.

I just have to say one or two more things about health. I'm not really following the text that was given to me here, I kind of wander a bit once in a while, but I remember prior to the 1982 election when the NDP kind of forgot about the seniors of this province. They certainly forgot about their needs in nursing homes, their moratorium . . .

An Hon. Member: — That's why we put in home care.

Mr. Muller: — I'm not quite sure, but the member from Saskatoon South who's now speaking from his seat, may have been the minister of Health at that time when they put the moratorium on nursing homes. And I know that the people of Canwood probably remember him and their representative they had at that time, that wouldn't take a look even at what they wanted to do in Canwood. I know that the people of Shellbrook-Torch River and Canwood don't forget the moratorium that was on the building of nursing homes.

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order.

Mr. Muller: — Anyway, I'm going to move off of health care now, Mr. Speaker. I know that there's many more positive things that we on this side of the House have done, but I'm sure there's other members here who can relate to that probably better than myself. I just tried to relate to what happened to me specifically.

The other important thing that we have done . . . I have to mention one more thing that we've done in health care, and I'm speaking specifically about the Everyone Wins promotional program. The member from Moose Jaw doesn't like my speech because it hits a little too close to the heart of what they're trying to promote now.

This is an important program, Mr. Speaker, its main purpose being to motivate individuals and communities in Saskatchewan towards healthier life-styles, and to improve overall health of our citizens in the province. Our government is promoting preventative health care through this program — preventative health care for all of Saskatchewan. But . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. We can't have two hon. members giving a speech at the same time. Right now we have the hon. member from Shellbrook-Torch River, so I ask you to allow him to continue his speech.

Mr. Muller: — Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not just here today to talk about health care. I'm very excited about what's happening in my constituency and the constituency of Shellbrook-Torch River. I shouldn't say my constituency; it may be someone else's next time, someone may beat me, but . . . somebody may beat me for the nomination. Somebody may beat me for the nomination.

But I think some of the members from Prince Albert certainly need an education on what's happening up in Prince Albert and north of Prince Albert, and even a bit

west. Hopefully, by the time my colleagues are done, they will have received a well-rounded education on a variety of subjects.

But I'm here today to educate them on a very important subject. That subject, Mr. Speaker, is public participation. I want the member from Prince Albert to pay particular attention to this lesson specifically in light of his recent article in the *Prince Albert Herald*.

Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to an article that appeared January 16, 1989, in the *Prince Albert Herald*. In that article, the member from Prince Albert condemned, and I quote, "large, out-of-province corporations." He condemned by reference, Weyerhaeuser, and by condemning Weyerhaeuser he condemned our public participation initiatives. Well I say, how dare he, Mr. Speaker. How dare the member from Prince Albert condemn a corporation that has done so much for his constituency and mine.

(1530)

Mr. Speaker, Weyerhaeuser has not only created jobs for the people in Saskatchewan, it's also implemented training programs for existing employees of that industry. Weyerhaeuser has put money into Prince Albert and area in the form of donations. They've donated money to the city. They donated money to the preschool program, to the nursing home in Big River . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's another nursing home.

And, Mr. Speaker, they've donated money to the Prince Albert Raiders in the form of a scholarship fund. Also some of the things that aren't mentioned in my text here, I'd like to go over. There's a little beach up at Emma Lake, Niece's Beach. Weyerhaeuser's gone in there, improved that beach, donated the money.

And in 1987 we had a fire, a fire of a boy's school up along the Molanosa road — I don't imagine any members over there, even the ones from P.A., know where that is — but this boy's school was burnt. Right as soon as they could possibly get the trailers up there, Weyerhaeuser was interested enough in getting accommodations for those boys so that they could continue on with what they were doing. Now I think those kind of corporations care; they get right involved with the community. Weyerhaeuser is really caring.

The other thing — and I'll never forget this because I was kind of involved in it; I was the legislative secretary to the Minister of Saskatchewan Forest Products at the time in the transition from PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company) to Weyerhaeuser, and there was some concerns by local communities about cutting rights and how Weyerhaeuser was going to manage the forest. And I remember very well going with a couple of the officials from Weyerhaeuser and meeting with the Lakeland rural municipality which is in the Weyerhaeuser cutting area.

And they had a legitimate concern because there's a lot of lakes there — there's Emma and Christopher and McPhee and Anglin Lake — and it's a very beautiful spot in the world, because I even have a cabin there, so I know quite well that it's a very beautiful spot in the world. And the

Lakeland R.M. council was kind of worried about how close they were going to cut to the lakes and the rivers, and it was a legitimate concern by the local council and the people from Regina and Prince Albert and Saskatoon and Regina that have cabins there.

They didn't really know to deal with this new corporation. They'd always had a very good relationship with Parsons & Whittemore and sometimes rocky with PAPCO, but not all that bad. But anyhow we went and met with them.

After the meeting — Weyerhaeuser had never really made any commitment at the meeting other than to go back to Prince Albert and take a hard look at what these people's concerns meant to the company and to the area. And this was still in the transition period when Weyerhaeuser was trying to get a feel for the whole community and how they were going to deal with it if they took it over, when and if they took it over. As soon as they took over the Prince Albert pulp mill, when the keys were turned over to them, they issued a news release dedicating another 5,000 acres of timber in the Lakeland R.M. surrounding the lakes, extending the borders that would not be touched.

So Weyerhaeuser showed to that local community that they were willing to sit down and work with them and show them that they were willing to dedicate that timber to the beauty of the area. And it certainly would have been more economical for them to cut that timber because it's very close to Prince Albert, but they decided that they would designate that timber to the resort area so people could enjoy the forest.

And the people were very happy because the cutting zones that PAPCO had, ran a lot closer to the lakes and the rivers and the roads. So Weyerhaeuser extended that by 5,000 acres. And if anyone here knows the make-up of the Lakeland R.M., it isn't a large R.M.; it isn't an agricultural R.M., it's a resort R.M. It runs along the west . . . or the east side of the Prince Albert National Park from Emma and Christopher Lake up to McPhee Lake, with Anglin Lake about in the middle.

So it's not a large rural municipality but a very resort-oriented one, and the trees to them meant a lot. And I thought that that was certainly one of the things that Weyerhaeuser showed, that they have good faith in the community in which they want to live and work.

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I shouldn't be so hard on the member from Prince Albert. Perhaps I should direct some of my statements to another one of the members of the opposition, for example, the member from Riversdale who stated in *Hansard* of 1986, and I quote, "Saskatchewan doesn't need Weyerhaeuser." Well, unquote.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Riversdale who, in the *Leader-Post* on February 29, 1968, stated that the reason the government should own pulp mills is that they are in fact risky and so the taxpayer should shoulder the difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, don't the people of the province shoulder

enough without the member from Riversdale loading them down with a government-owned pulp mill?

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order.

Mr. Muller: — If anybody really wants me to get into the detail of how the government of the day loaded them with the debt of PAPCO, I mean, they at that time didn't have the money to go out and buy out Parsons & Whittemore, or the shares that Parsons & Whittemore had — I think the government had about 30 per cent. They didn't have the money to go out and buy it so they went to the Bank of Montreal and the Imperial Bank of Commerce and they borrowed the money, and they borrowed it at 17 per cent interest. They borrowed the money at 17 per cent interest.

The thing that we found when we came into power was that they never made a payment on the principal or the interest, so the debt was getting larger and larger. The reason the pulp mill was losing money wasn't because the people at the mill weren't doing a good job, wasn't because the mill wasn't a good mill; they overloaded it with debt. What they tried to say . . . and I wish I could get my banker to understand this, but he won't. He won't do it with my farm anyway. He won't let me finance my farm the same way as the NDP government financed the pulp mill.

You see, they said in 1981 there was a \$24 million profit in the pulp mill. But there was a 35-point-some million dollar interest debt that they never paid. So there's almost a \$12 million loss — not quite, 11-point-some — and my banker won't allow me to finance my farm that way. But the government of the day, which is the NDP, tried to say there's a \$24 million profit where there was actually a 35-point-something million dollar interest rate. So that's almost a \$12 million loss. I could farm very comfortably if I could bank that way.

Well anyway, just to clarify why the mill was losing money when it was government-owned, I think we've done that. But now let's look at the Weyerhaeuser record. Since the sale of the company, it's had sales of 298 million to the end of 1987, and earned for Weyerhaeuser Canada 15 million. And, Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the agreement the mill also earned for the people of Saskatchewan about 65 million. Sixty-five million dollars, Mr. Speaker.

As part of the deal, Weyerhaeuser invested \$248 million in the new paper mill, making it the second largest in Canada. Mr. Speaker, during that construction a total of 700 new jobs were created — 700 new jobs.

An Hon. Member: — For Prince Albert and district.

Mr. Muller: — More for Shellbrook-Torch River, I believe. But yes, for the Prince Albert and area. Prince Albert certainly got some of the spin-off from that.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, 175 permanent positions were added. How dare the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Prince Albert say that Saskatchewan doesn't need Weyerhaeuser. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what they don't need. We don't need people like the member from Riversdale and the member from Prince

Albert. We don't need their negative attitudes present in our legislature.

They would rather see no new jobs, no new investment in Prince Albert. The member from Prince Albert, the whole crew over there with their tax on the pulp and paper mill are in effect slapping the working people of Prince Albert and area in the face.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that Weyerhaeuser is creating new economic growth in the Prince Albert area. Mr. Speaker, the sale of PAPCO to Weyerhaeuser is an excellent example of this PC government's plan to diversify the economy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muller: — Since the sale of PAPCO, the people of Saskatchewan earned over \$63 million — \$63 million. Earned 63 million compared to a loss of 26 million in the 20 months preceding the sale.

And I ask the member from Prince Albert and his leader, the member from Riversdale, how can you condemn what Weyerhaeuser has done for this province's economy? Our government isn't here to be in the pulp business. And because we no longer are, the people of this province have gained by it — gained by \$63 million, Mr. Speaker. Public participation means diversification.

Another example comes to mind. The new paper sheeter in Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker, the new paper sheeter sells into the U.S. market a product never before produced in this province.

I want to stop there and elaborate a little bit on what this paper sheeter means to Prince Albert. When Weyerhaeuser was producing rolls of paper, which the paper mill started to produce last summer, the new paper mill — they had to ship this paper down into the United States, have it cut into sheets, and then they paid duty on it coming back into Canada. Now they're going to make the sheets, finish the product. There will be Xerox-quality paper produced right in the constituency of Shellbrook-Torch River, just north of Prince Albert.

And this is very, very important. The new building that is going to house this sheeter is . . .

An Hon. Member: — A what?

(1545)

Mr. Muller: — The members can laugh. If they don't know what a paper sheeter is, they can laugh. That's fine.

The new building is the length of two football fields. That is a big sheeter. This is going to create 34 permanent jobs, 34 additional permanent jobs after the construction of the building. The construction of the building and the investment is \$20.8 million, and it's going to start in the spring of 1989 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Saskatoon Westmount knows how easily I am to upset, so he's speaking from his seat. I'm sure that he'll have an opportunity in this legislature to rise and speak in favour of Weyerhaeuser now that he knows the details.

They're selling this paper now beyond our borders — selling beyond our borders a product never before produced in Saskatchewan. And this is important. This is what we have to do in Saskatchewan, is diversify our economy so that we finish our products here.

I know you people over there wouldn't understand that. You've never wanted to see anything bloom and grow. You've always wanted to suppress. And this is where we differ. You people wanted to buy out industries that the jobs were already here. You've never wanted to create an industry that would produce more jobs. All you ever did was buy out industries that were here — nationalize them. You didn't create any more jobs by doing that. All you did was create a debt on the people of Saskatchewan.

I have to go back before PAPCO was sold to Weyerhaeuser or before the pulp mill was sold to PAPCO. I have to go back when Parsons & Whittemore owned the pulp mill, or 70 per cent of it. The people of Prince Albert were really excited about the way that company treated them in Prince Albert and area.

At that time, I was quite involved with 4-H and a leader of a 4-H club for 12 years, so I know very well the history of what happened with the involvement of Parsons & Whittemore in community projects, and how they supported things like 4-H, and supported those kinds of things that we all believe in. I remember being at many fat stock shows and sales, when Parsons & Whittemore had someone there buying calves out of that sale. Children were so proud that the pulp mill was there purchasing their calves.

But a funny thing happened after the transfer of the pulp mill to PAPCO, and I was still a 4-H club leader at that time, and still very heavily involved, and before I was elected to this place. After the government owned the pulp mill they diminished their involvement in the community, especially the surrounding communities. There was no buyer there buying our 4-H calves. There was not near as much involvement in the community, of course. I guess there couldn't be because they were losing money; the government couldn't support the communities surrounding the surrounding areas, and the functions and clubs within the city. But anyway, I noticed that.

And now that Weyerhaeuser has taken over from PAPCO, they're getting involved in all communities surrounding Prince Albert, and certainly involved in the city of P.A.

I have to go back to what the member from Saskatoon Sutherland said last night, was that when and if — and Heaven forbid — that they ever form government, that they would tear up the deal with Weyerhaeuser. Well let me say this, that the people in Prince Albert won't be too excited about anybody tearing up the deal with Weyerhaeuser.

An Hon. Member: — That's a pipe dream.

Mr. Muller: — The member from Athabasca says it's a pipe dream, so I guess he agrees with me that no, it is a pipe dream that they'd tear up the agreement.

But it's really an exciting constituency to represent. The Shellbrook-Torch River constituency is probably one of the most exciting places to be in this time. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Albert area is indeed attracting many companies from beyond our borders, in fact, from different countries all over the world.

I'm referring to what I like to call the great diamond hunt. Companies from different countries are seriously looking to Saskatchewan as a prime site to produce diamonds. Mr. Speaker, nearly a million acres of land surrounding Prince Albert has been staked by companies and individuals hunting for diamonds. And there are other applications pending.

Our PC government is encouraging these types of industries that are bringing money into the Prince Albert and Shellbrook areas. My constituency reaps the benefits of projects such as this . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Cumberland says, a South African company. I wonder if he would have the expertise to search for diamonds. I wonder if he'd even know what they look like.

But it isn't only companies from Africa that are searching for these diamonds. There's Claude Resources. There's many private individuals, many private individuals that have property staked.

It's really exciting, especially to me. I have land within 10 miles of where they're drilling for diamonds. In fact, I have a half section you could probably say you could hard-rock mine on it. The minerals are in the Crown. The minerals are in the Crown. I don't have any stakes on that property as far as any of the minerals are concerned. The Crown has always refused, the Crown has always refused to come and pick up their minerals, and I've got some laying loose on top. But these aren't diamonds. I don't think they recognize these as diamonds.

Anyway, like I said, it is probably one of the most interesting areas in the province to be right now, except maybe some of the northern areas where there's gold mining. But my constituency of Shellbrook-Torch River is benefitting from the great diamond hunt, but is also benefitting from another government project, and that's the new Prince Albert interchange. I mean, there's lots of activity north of the creek.

The Prince Albert interchange was officially opened in October of 1988, Mr. Speaker. The interchange at the intersection of Highway 2 and 3 in Prince Albert provides a more efficient flow of traffic for those travelling along these two routes. And the one thing that is really great about this, the flow of traffic north to all our tourist-related areas is certainly better with this new interchange.

Mr. Speaker, the approximate cost of the interchange was \$5 million. This represents the PC government's commitment to riding an improved highway system for Saskatchewan. The east and west traffic also. I'll just stop there. The east and west traffic is a tremendous, it's a tremendous change. Instead of having to go through part of the city and travel north to go to Nipawin, or coming from Nipawin you'd have to travel north and back

through, now it's a straight run right over the top of the interchange, east and west . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hear the member from Prince Albert chirping from his seat, and he has never really had a positive thought; he never wants to see any improvement in the highway system or in the pulp mill or paper mill; he's against Weyerhaeuser — always has been.

And I was so happy, I was so happy today that I would be able to speak in prime time on television so the people in Prince Albert would be able to see and get some of the facts on what's happening with the pulp and paper project, the new sheeter, and also the new chemical plant in Prince Albert.

And the members opposite laugh. Mr. Speaker, these kinds of projects benefit all of Saskatchewan and people beyond Saskatchewan. It benefits tourists, tourists coming into Saskatchewan to enjoy our beautiful lakes and lush scenery.

I would like to say today, Mr. Speaker, that I will continue to work hard to obtain more for them, for the people of Shellbrook-Torch River in the future. The throne speech is accommodating the people of Saskatchewan and will allow me to work towards the future. Mr. Speaker, the throne speech works for the people of Saskatchewan, and I will be supporting the Speech from the Throne. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this was my very first throne speech as a new MLA, and given the major challenges facing the province of Saskatchewan today — issues in health care; issues in agriculture, education, youth unemployment, out-migration in this province; issues of hungry children and hungry families and seniors — I was expecting this throne speech with some real substance, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I was kind of excited about the day.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I must have been to a different play than the member from Shellbrook-Torch River. Certainly his speech was obviously written before the throne speech. It's the same old Tory line, and I hope the member does not have any intention of sending his speech to his constituents. I think it would be a disaster for him politically.

Before I proceed with the throne speech, I have to make a couple of comments about a statement that the member made, and that statement relates to the fact that the previous government left a big debt to this province. Well, this is really quite humorous, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't so sad. And this must be challenged.

The previous administration had balanced budgets every year that it was in power; left this government \$139 million as a slush fund. Now we have a \$12 billion accumulated deficit, and I would suggest that the rest of his speech has no more credibility, based on that kind of misleading statement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Speaker, what a disappointment for thousands of Saskatchewan families that Speech from the

Throne was the same nonsense that we heard in 1982 — boy, are we going to do wonderful things for you. To you would have been a more apt description, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to be taking part in this throne speech today, and I might add, as my colleagues have done, it's long overdue.

Just about 12 months ago the people of Saskatoon Eastview honoured me by electing me to represent their interests, needs and dreams in this Assembly. It goes without saying that I was overjoyed with the overwhelming vote of confidence the people of Eastview placed in myself and in my party on that day.

Over the past year I have worked hard to fulfil the trust that has been placed in me, and I will continue to do that to the best of my ability. Mr. Speaker, the only other member . . . only one other member has served in this House a shorter period of time than I, and I refer of course, as my colleagues have, to the new member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Well I'm sorry to see him here, and not his opponent from the New Democratic Party. I do offer him my congratulations on his victory and wish him luck. He's certainly going to need it. I think he's just beginning to realize what he's gotten himself into.

(1600)

Mr. Speaker, the past 12 months have been both busy and exciting. They have been months of satisfaction, of hope, and I might add, Mr. Speaker, of some tremendous disappointments. In my capacity as a member of this House I know that I share with each of my colleagues a tremendous satisfaction in serving the needs and concerns of my constituents. At the same time, this role fills me with tremendous despair and disappointment, as the dreams and concerns of the people of Saskatchewan are shattered by the callous and unfeeling actions of the Devine government.

What are some of these actions, Mr. Speaker? Well, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, the cancellation of the prescription drug program. Leaders in health care; health care being a priority. Doesn't sound like it, Mr. Speaker.

The cancellation of the school-based children's dental program; sell-out and give-aways of our natural resources, and the future of our children; excessively high taxes and more tax increases this year to cover up the waste, the mismanagement, and the ineptitude of this Devine government; failure to provide drought assistance to our farmers; going back on promises. Another string of broken promises by this government; the willingness of the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier to stand by and watch the Canadian Wheat Board be dismantled. Who is standing up for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker . . .

An Hon. Member: — Oh, come on, you don't even know what you're talking about.

Mr. Pringle: — Oh, touched a nerve did we? Who's standing up for Saskatchewan? It certainly isn't the Premier. He sings the Hallelujah Chorus to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year, I have talked to and visited with and met with hundreds of people from one end of Saskatchewan to the other — yes, in rural Saskatchewan — and the litany is the same, Mr. Speaker. Young people, older people, low-income and high-income farmers or workers, small businesses, retailers, clerks — they all say the same thing, that this government has got to go, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Without exception almost, they are embarrassed and upset with the waste and patronage of this government. As someone said, my colleague from Moose Jaw, yesterday, down goes a Tory candidate and up pops a high paying job. In question period today we focused on the string of high paying jobs for defeated Tory candidates while our young people are forced to leave the province.

Mr. Speaker, people are upset with a deficit that's totally out of control. They are indignant with the indifference shown towards the education and employment needs of our young people. They are disturbed over the blatant disregard for the needs of small-business people. They are disillusioned with the failure of the Devine government to come to the defence of the Canadian Wheat Board. They are furious with the cut-backs in our health care system. And the list goes on and on.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I derive hope from the situation because it tells me that not long from now the people of Saskatchewan will say, through the ballot box, enough is enough. They will say through the ballot box, Mr. Speaker, that it is time to take control of this shameless situation and vote the rascals out. And rightly so. They will say, Mr. Speaker, through the ballot box on the new gerrymandered constituency boundaries, that it is time to give the future back to the people of Saskatchewan. And rightly so.

Mr. Speaker, it is a day that I, my colleagues, and the people of this province look forward to.

Before proceeding to a little more of the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Regina Elphinstone and express my sadness and disappointment yesterday with the member from Rosthern, a member that I had some respect for, for the vicious and false attack on the Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition. It's a sad day indeed, Mr. Speaker, when we abuse the privilege and immunity we have in this Assembly.

And I hope the member from Rosthern will do the honourable thing and apologize to the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, a member who has served here with integrity, with conviction, and with competence over so many years. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people simply will not accept such dishonest goon tactics, and I'm very surprised and disappointed in the member from

Rosthern.

As I said earlier, that the past 12 months have been a time of some disappointments for me as a new MLA, a time of disappointment to me, to the people of Saskatoon Eastview, and certainly to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it has been nine months since the legislature met last to deal with the important and pressing needs of the province — nine months in hiding by the Devine Tories.

The members opposite, Mr. Speaker, have shown both in words and deeds that they consider this body and the democratic process to be both irrelevant and an obstacle to cast aside at whim. Look at the record, Mr. Speaker — failure to respond to any written question on the order paper since 1986, the year of the election . . .

An Hon. Member: — We got them yesterday.

Mr. Pringle: — Got them yesterday. Unwarranted delay into the introduction of the budget in the 1987 session, a budget introduced only after the threat of court action by members from this side of the House forced the Minister of Finance to fulfil his obligations and responsibilities to the people of Saskatchewan — that same Minister of Finance who was out by \$800 million in his financial forecast; that same minister who will say in two weeks, Mr. Speaker, trust me. Well the people of the province do not trust the Minister of Finance, and they do not trust the Premier.

A few more examples: persistent attempts by this government to gag the Public Accounts Committee, and the failure to produce *Public Accounts* in accordance with past procedures and practices in this House, and perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the gerrymandering of electoral boundaries in such a blatant way. This government will do anything for partisan politics. And of course, the unwarranted attacks, the ruthless attacks on the integrity and the ability of long-serving servants of this House. This government kills the messenger, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Estevan, the Premier, may be proud of his dreams to follow the lead of Mikhail Gorbachev, but I say, and members on this side of the House say, that we would prefer the leadership of the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — We on this side of the House prefer leadership that will return to the people of this province control over their democratic institutions. We on this side of the House prefer leadership that will show respect for the democratic rights of the people of Saskatchewan. We on this side prefer leadership that will fulfil the trust of the people of this province and ensure that the well being of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan will be the first priority of government.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the member for Saskatoon Riversdale asked me to undertake special critic duties in the area of democratic reforms. It is an area of reform that is long overdue. Our democratic institutions were

designed to serve the people, and serve the people they must. In recent years, however, these very institutions have been badly misused by this Devine government.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I'd ask the members not to use other members' names in the legislature.

Mr. Pringle: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm a little bit uncertain about the rules because that comment was used all day yesterday and I've been using it three or four times in my speech so far, so if you could clarify the rules for me please.

The Deputy Speaker: — I have clarified this rule many times and I will do it again: that no member on either side of the House during their speeches are allowed to use other members' names.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in recent years these democratic institutions have been badly abused by this PC government, Mr. Deputy Speaker; consequently, the public is not only poorly served, but has become increasingly cynical about this process. No longer are governments of the day, this government of this day, and legislative bodies, looked upon to provide leadership. No longer do people place their trust in these institutions with confidence that the needs and the dreams of the people will be properly dealt with. Instead, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our democratic institutions are viewed as adversaries of the people. How ironic — adversaries of the people they are designed to serve.

This PC government has breached every time-honoured tradition and convention in this legislature, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Over the months ahead I will be making a number of proposals designed to strengthen the purpose and the role of our democratic institutions, and I look forward to receiving the co-operation of government members in the House to ensure that the people of Saskatchewan will once again be well served.

Well let's look at taxation and the deficit for a moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, tongue in cheek, someone once said: a fine is a tax for doing wrong, and a tax is a fine for doing all right. I wonder, however, what that person would have said if they lived in Saskatchewan today. Perhaps it would go something like this: a fine is a tax for doing wrong, and a tax is a fine for government ineptitude.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — Clearly, in this province you don't have to be doing all right to be crippled by taxes; all you have to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is live here.

What happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the promise of the PC government to eliminate the provincial sales tax? What happened to the promise of the PC government to reduce the provincial income tax by 10 per cent? What happened to the promise of the PC government to eliminate the provincial gas tax? What happened to the statement by the Premier that this province was so rich in natural resources that any government could mismanage the economy and still balance the budget?

An Hon. Member: — Kept half that promise.

Mr. Pringle: — Kept half the promise. That's right. This is clearly a government of broken promises, and you can't trust them, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the past seven years — just think about it — in the past seven years this PC government, the business people, the managers, have taken our trust, our taxes, and our natural resources, and built up a deficit of \$4 billion and accumulated overall provincial debt of \$12 billion overall.

In Saskatoon Eastview, Mr. Deputy Speaker, people can hardly believe this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with this government there is ineptitude and there is mismanagement. The record of the PC government is simple ineptitude. Personal income tax is the highest anywhere in Canada. Property taxes have increased up to 44 per cent for farmers — these are the supporters of small family farms — 44 per cent tax increases, and up to 50 per cent for home owners. Renters are paying 40, 50 per cent of their income on shelter in Saskatchewan today. Small businesses are in near revolt over the tax burden that they must carry, thanks to this government. The flat tax, which seems to go up every time there's a new budget, has placed an intolerable burden on all taxpayers. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Finance tells us that the nightmare is not yet over, with more tax increases on the way.

(1615)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all taxpayers of Saskatchewan understand the need for a tax system. They understand that from time to time some tax increases may be necessary to deliver new services, or anticipated tax reductions may be delayed because of short-term recessionary cycles in the economy. From 1982 to 1984 though, the PC government told us, told the people of Saskatchewan, that we were opting out of the recession. Well the people of Saskatchewan knew otherwise. They were out of touch then, and they're out of touch now, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What people in Saskatchewan cannot accept are tax increases and an unfair, inequitable tax system that is used solely to cover up ineptness, or to use the words of the media: "The unmitigated disaster of fiscal mismanagement practices by this Devine government." It's a direct quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I've asked members not to use other members' names. Order.

An Hon. Member: — I don't think it's a divine government either.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I would ask the member from Regina Centre to please not comment when the Speaker is on his feet.

I have asked the member for Saskatoon Eastview not to use other members' names in his speech.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I respect your ruling to me. I'm quite upset though that yesterday the Leader of

the Opposition's first name and last name was used and was allowed. So I'm disappointed with the inconsistency of the rules, with respect, sir.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during this debate and the upcoming budget debate, my colleague the member for Regina Centre, and others from this side of the House, will have more to say about the very serious budgetary situation faced by this province; consequently, I will not dwell on it here. Nevertheless, the situation this province has been placed in by the actions of this PC government has far-reaching implications.

Mr. Speaker, over the past seven years this government has failed to govern wisely, they've failed to govern responsibly, and they've failed to govern prudently. It boggles the mind to think that in this short period of time this Tory government could increase personal income taxes, could increase overall government revenues from personal income taxes, and at the same time cut services to people under the guise of government restraint, and in doing so incur a huge deficit of \$4 billion. This debt load, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is now so burdensome that the government is frantically searching for a way to sell off the assets of the people of Saskatchewan. It is no different, Mr. Speaker, than selling off your house to pay the family grocery bill.

Isn't it a shame, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that future generations cannot be here to see all the wonderful things that this government is doing with their money . . . is doing to their future. Or more appropriately again, to their future.

This government is committing each one of our children and our grandchildren and your grandchildren to a debt load and a future that will severely restrict the ability of each one of them to grow, to mature, and to develop their own creative individualities.

The actions of this government are preventing ourselves and our children from living in a province, from living in a society where the people can use the economic and political levers necessary to ensure that all people will receive equal treatment and benefit from all that our province has to offer them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as this government attempts to proceed down the road of so-called privatization, I want to remind them that the process is like a tube of toothpaste — easy to take out, but hard to put back. Privatization of the utility Crowns and Sask potash corporation must, and will, be stopped, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Over the past few years this government and others have stated that privatization and cut-backs in services to people are a good thing — a good thing because everyone else does it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is no different than trying to keep up with the Joneses. If the Joneses sell their new Buick for a 10-year-old Pontiac with a rusted-out body, then we should too. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the policy of this government.

Consequently, in this province we witness lotteries to buy hospital equipment because everybody else does it. They say there is no money for our universities because no one

else has any. They say that there is no money to provide services for hungry children because no one else does it. Starving children, Mr. Speaker, starving families in Saskatchewan will be one of the legacies of this PC government. This government refuses to provide drought relief assistance for farmers because no one else has. They have lots of money for corporate give-aways to help others to buy up our future, because that's what others do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the people of Saskatchewan had followed that logic in the past, medicare would have remained a pipe-dream, and so would have public automobile insurance. The people of this province would never have formed credit unions and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. The people of this province know that this logic and the policies of this Tory government is not good enough — they never were and they never will be.

The people of Saskatchewan know that it is incumbent upon each man, woman and child in this province to work together, to work co-operatively to plan for the future and to implement the dreams that we have for our families and for our society. They know that what others do is not necessarily good and proper for the society they cherish and wish to live in, and it is painfully obvious to them that this PC government is unable to provide the leadership, the confidence and the trust that is necessary to accomplish this goal.

We don't want to model Saskatchewan after Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are record levels of hunger and poverty in those countries as well. Let's take a more positive future, not go back in time, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to turn to an issue of major concern to all people of this province, and that is an issue of the quality of family life, another favourite catch-phrase of this government, certainly reflected in the throne speech.

In the past we have heard a great deal about the rhetoric from members opposite about families and family life. And I am sure that all of us are not only familiar with this rhetoric but recognize how empty the rhetoric has been — rhetoric about families, yet economic and social policies which place more stress on them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that families have two levels of importance to all of us. First is the importance of our families to each of us as individuals. Our families provide support when needed; they nurture us physically and spiritually. Our families provide both a source of love and affection as well as an outlet for our needs to express the same. For most, our families provide a focal point for everything that we do. Unfortunately for many, they are not so fortunate, and that is regrettable.

On the second level is the role that our families play as the primary unit of structure and interaction in our society. It is at this level, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that government has an important role to play if it's serious and sincere and honest. It is at this level that government can function to enhance or to contribute to the deterioration of family life, as this PC government has done.

What are the important functions that government nurtures and supports, Mr. Deputy Speaker? The list, in my view, is simple and it's short. They function as supporting health care services, economic security, educational services, community services, employment opportunities, justice, fairness and equality and equity for all people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, together the maximization of the potential of each of these areas of family life adds up to the quality of life enjoyed by our families and by our entire society. Just as our families are based upon the concepts of co-operation and equality, so too is our society, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Unfortunately, this doesn't describe the actions or the agenda of this government. There is no question, in my view, in the view of the colleagues on this side of the House, that this PC government has betrayed the families of this province by attacking them and those areas that are vital to the maintenance and encouragement of the family unit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Saskatchewan is far more than a geographical area bounded by invisible lines to the east, the west, the north, and the south. Saskatchewan is more than that. Saskatchewan is a community of people who understand that the future is dependent upon their ability as a community to work together. I don't know why Tories can't understand that — as a community of people dependent on their ability to use all the tools and resources available to them to accomplish their commonly held dreams and aspirations, for this generation and for those that follow.

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this means that there must be a strong, well-balanced approach to the future, not a hollow throne speech of fluff and feathers, not a \$9 million self-indulging birthday party, as mentioned in the throne speech. In Saskatchewan, this means capturing the potential of the future provided to all of us — to the private sector, the co-operative sector, and yes, the public sector. In Saskatchewan, this means allowing the mixed economy to mature, to grow, and to flourish. You don't phase out the department of co-ops; you don't kill the small-business sector. All sectors have to flourish in a mixed economy approach. That's the Saskatchewan way.

Mr. Speaker, from our history in this province we know full well that this formula works for us, because it enables the people of Saskatchewan to build a society that provides a high quality of life, to build a society that provides opportunities, security, equality and hope for people today and people tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the importance of history is not to enable us to relive the past, as members opposite are trying to do as they attempt to bring back 18th and 19th century economic and social policies. On the contrary, the importance of history is that it provides us with the pride and the heritage necessary to plan for the future, and this means in part, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it is not sufficient to believe that the economic and social agenda of the United States is good enough for us. It means that the future is dependent upon the ability of the people of

Saskatchewan to direct and manage their economy and their lives. That we cannot do this is an insult to seniors who live in Saskatoon Eastview who helped to build this great province. This is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so discouraging to read, month after month, the net outflow of residents from this province, many of them under the age of 34.

(1630)

Let's look at the net outflow over the last couple of years: 1987 — 10,200 people, net outflow from this province; 1988, we lost 13,300 people from this province. In January of 1989, 1,600 people left this province — net outflow. Again, many of those young people, 70-some per cent of them were under the age of 34; the town of Rosthern, the town of Wilkie, wiped off the map just like that. In another few days the stats will be out for February, and there's no question the results are going to be the same — 14 to 1,600 people will have left again.

There's only one reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why 1,600 people per month are walking away from Saskatchewan: there are simply no jobs here. This is particularly true of the hundreds of young people, our future, who are leaving each month.

This throne speech is full of hypocrisy. It talks about youth and their future, but talk doesn't mean anything, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Young people can't work because there are no jobs. They can't go to universities because there are no spaces. Voting with their feet, these people are passing on to the PC government the greatest condemnation a government can ever receive from the people it serves. They are passing judgement on a government whose policies have allowed unemployed to increase and the labour force to decrease — a government whose record includes record numbers of farm and business failures across the province; a government that refuses to increase the minimum wage to enable people to live adequately and decently; a government that has placed the future of our farm families in jeopardy; a government unwilling to adequately fund our educational institutions; a government unwilling to develop a child care system for single parents in Saskatchewan; a government that believes that funding for health care and education can be increased by promoting gambling.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are these the actions of a government that is concerned about the people, about the youth, and about the families of this province? This throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was a bunch of nonsense. Is it any wonder that people are voting with their feet and simply leaving?

Mr. Speaker, not long ago I conducted a survey of small-business people in Saskatoon Eastview. These are businesses averaging three or four full-time employees, two or three temporary employees, and two or three part-time employees. And small business represent, as we know, a major source of employment growth in our province, or did in the past. They still do but they're hurting.

I want to share with you just a few of the results of that

survey. Eighty-five per cent said that business was fair to poor — these are their words, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Overall gross sales decreased on an average of 9 per cent between 1987 and 1988. Sixty per cent said that the minimum wage was too low. I want to stress that because even though 85 per cent said their business was from fair to poor, they recognize that the minimum wage in this province is too low. Eighty per cent said their taxes were too high. These businesses, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are hurting, and to compound their difficulties they believe that this government has abrogated its responsibility on the question of store hours, giving in to the demands of large businesses, sacrificing the needs and wishes of the small-business owner and employee.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I consult with other people in my constituency and elsewhere across the province, I hear similar things. When I talk to educators, I hear of the lack of funds for post secondary institutions; I hear of insufficient resources for students with special needs; I hear of pupil-teacher ratios that are too high; I hear of confrontation by an arrogant Minister of Education, as we heard today from the member from Regina Elphinstone; we hear of hungry children going to school.

When I talk to workers, I hear their concerns and needs for job security and the lack of future employment opportunities, the lack of predictability. I hear of the reductions to services in many of our communities. I hear the worry over the introduction of a two-tiered minimum wage and the proposed regressive labour legislation.

An Hon. Member: — That'll be dandy for the young people.

Mr. Pringle: — Yes, that'll be great for young people, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hear the anger over taxes and cut-backs that affect the welfare and the health of their families.

When I talk to farmers — yes it may surprise you I talk to farmers; I have farm roots. I recently had a meeting with a number of farmers, active farmers, who live in the riding of Saskatoon Eastview. I hear their concerns as they relate to the lack of services to our rural communities. I hear of their anger and frustrations over this government's unwillingness to defend the Canadian Wheat Board and the orderly marketing system.

This government is a friend of the small farmer. Who's standing up for the small farmer? It certainly isn't the Premier of this province.

I hear of their very real concerns over the debt load they must carry and their opposition to the proposed equity financing program of this government. I hear of their concerns and fears as it relates to the preservation of the family farm, and their families are real and vital units of our provincial society.

When I talk to parents, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hear of their concerns and anger over the emasculation of health care services, the effects on their children, their parents and themselves. I hear the concerns for their educational system. I hear their needs and dreams for an adequate child care system. I hear their anger over the taxes and the plans of this government to sell off our future heritage —

to give away our future heritage.

When I talk to young students, they want to know why they must leave their families in this province to go to school and find employment elsewhere. They want to know why this government has so severely cut back on student summer employment programs — programs which for thousands of Saskatchewan students provide the only means they have of being able to complete their education, not even mentioned in the throne speech. Can you believe that? A summer program which provided 9,700 jobs in 1986 and 10,000 in 1987, 4,000 in 1988, and less than that in 1989. This is a government concerned about youth, families, and education? Who are you trying to kid?

When I talk to single parents, unemployed and individuals who are required to receive social assistance, largely due to the failed economic policies of this government, they want to know why they must be relegated to second-class citizenship. They want to know why they must suffer the attacks on their personal integrity and dignity and the dignity of their children by this PC government. They want to know why they must suffer ridicule and cut-backs in services. They want to know why this government has failed to ensure that employment and economic opportunities available in our society are not accessible to them and their children.

Seniors have concerns as well. There are a large, large number of seniors in my riding. They are concerned about home care cuts. They are concerned about the prescription drug cuts. They're concerned about the cuts to all the programs that affect them and their children and grandchildren. And I wanted to read a very brief letter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of a constituent who — and I have several of these — but one I picked out that was written on March 6 from a senior citizen in Saskatoon Eastview, or from a couple actually, and I quote:

If we we're going to detail our present day worries, it would fill a book, or volumes. Our main concern is the despair and the plunge toward privatization by this government. Free trade is a give-away.

What concerns us deeply is the destruction of our social framework built up over many years by people like us. Money and greed are the mainstay of our present-day governing bodies which is an insult to the past and present generation of Canadians, leaving the future generations little to look forward to unless they belong to the minority rich.

We hope you can help to do something to change the direction and bring hope to the average person in despair. We wish you all the best in the future.

Well, Mr. Premier, your policies are hurtful, and you're out of touch with the people of Saskatchewan.

In the throne speech, what did we hear about indigenous peoples? Eighty-five and ninety per cent unemployment in northern Saskatchewan. How is this government supporting indigenous families by cutting programs and services, by making racist comments that are all too

familiar to this Premier and cabinet ministers? The same is true the way they will offend minority groups.

Mr. Speaker, the sad part is that I could go on and on and on. When you add it all up, there is only one conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this PC government has taken every step possible — despite its rhetoric — has taken every step possible to attack Saskatchewan families in this province. Make no mistake about that, this PC government is incompetent, it's deceitful, and it is corrupt.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — In this session, this PC government will be exposed for what it really is. It's dishonest, it's destructive, it's anti-youth, it's anti-family, and it's undemocratic. And we will be exposing that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if there's one way to measure the insensitivity of a government to the needs of the people, it is clearly in the way in which people are treated, particularly the health and welfare of our children. We know that over 25 per cent, as was pointed out earlier today, that over 25 per cent of the children in Saskatchewan are living in poverty today, and nothing this government has done has alleviated this problem. They won't even acknowledge that it's a problem.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the record for a minute. In health, they eliminated the school children's based dental program, they made it more difficult for parents to provide required medication to their children, and they have underfunded our hospitals. Plastic cards do little to help a sick child when prescriptions are required, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Income support — what has this government done? They have placed a freeze on the family income plan. They have refused to increase the minimum wage. Families are cracking under the stress. All you have to do is talk to any counselling agencies — there's a two- or three- or four-month waiting list because there's been cut-backs to those agencies.

How about food and nutrition? This government has encouraged the reliance on food banks, the fastest growing industry in this province. This government has refused to provide even short-term, interim assistance by way of school-based meal programs.

The only conclusion one can draw is that this government is obviously content to see children starve. I can't believe that. I can't believe that the member from Rosthern would accept that. I just can't believe it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's an old cliché to say that our children are our greatest and most precious resource, and yet the truth of that statement is very profound. The situation faced by our young people today represents the greatest challenge facing our government and our families. And if we are truly concerned, if this government is truly concerned with families and children and family life, this must be regarded as a top priority of this government. Was it mentioned in the throne speech? No, it wasn't.

(1645)

Unfortunately this PC government is more interested in cutting quick deals to sell off the future and heritage of our children. And again, nowhere is this more clear than in the throne speech.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we hear a great deal from this PC government about an agenda for change — a change that reconstructs a society and an economy that was rejected by the people of this province decades ago; a style of change, Mr. Deputy Speaker that is simply not acceptable. It is not acceptable to the people and the families of Saskatchewan. It is not good enough to, as this government attempts to do, to go back in time.

Change? And we agree that change is required on this side of the House, but it must always move to the future. Change must move forward. It must meet the needs of today and capture the potential of tomorrow. To meet the needs, to approach the future, it is necessary to harness all the social and economic forces at our disposal. That is the approach that members on this side of the House believe in, because we believe in the future.

We don't need a cheer-leader for Brian Mulroney. We believe in a Premier that stands up for Saskatchewan's interests. We believe in a future that provides justice, fairness and equality. We believe in a future that provides all of us with the opportunity to make a living — surely that's not asking too much — and the opportunity to raise our children in dignity.

We believe in a future that provides for the security of families. We believe in a future built upon a strong, well-functioning, mixed economy. That's what we believe on this side of the House, where decisions are based on sound environmental policies . . .

An Hon. Member: — On human need.

Mr. Pringle: — . . . and on human need. We believe in a future that is built upon the people of this province having a large measure of control over their economy and the ability to provide effective direction in a society.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we believe in a future that all the people of Saskatchewan can look forward to — that all of the people can look forward to — not just defeated Tory MLAs and MPs; that all of the people of Saskatchewan can look forward to with hope and confidence. That kind of future was not described in the throne speech.

While we look forward to the future, Mr. Speaker, today I share with the people of Saskatchewan, my colleagues and I share with the people of Saskatchewan, a profound lack of confidence in the ability of this PC government to provide for our commonly held needs and concerns of today and tomorrow.

Therefore, I simply cannot support a throne speech which is living in the past and I again condemn this PC government for its deceit, for its dishonesty, and for . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. I find that

comment, in the context it was used, unparliamentary. I would ask the member to retract . . . Order. Order. I would ask the member to retract the statement and apologize to the House.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect, sir, I am unable to do that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. Order. Order. I would ask the member again to apologize to the House for unparliamentary language.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, with respect, I simply cannot withdraw that statement . I just so fundamentally believe that, I cannot . . . (inaudible) . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. For the third time, for the third time . . .

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. There's no point of order to a Speaker's ruling.

I have ruled that the language that was used was unparliamentary. I've asked the member to apologize to the House. He has refused to do that. I'm giving him one more chance to apologize to the House for the use of unparliamentary language.

There is no point of order. I would ask the member for Saskatoon Eastview once more, the last time, to apologize to the House for the use of unparliamentary language.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am unaware of what the point of order is before the House, whether . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — There is no point of order before the House. There is no point of order to a ruling from the Chair. I've asked the member for the last time to apologize for unparliamentary language. The member . . . I will recognize the member for Saskatoon Eastview to apologize to the House.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was in the process of asking you what you're asking the member to withdraw. I didn't hear the member's comment. I was listening to his speech. I didn't hear that point. I'm asking you: what is the unparliamentary term you're asking the member to withdraw?

The Deputy Speaker: — There's no point of order to a ruling from Chair. I have ruled that the language was unparliamentary. I would ask the member to retract his last statement.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you be clear with me please on what you would like me to retract?

The Deputy Speaker: — I asked the member to retract his last statement and apologize to the House.

Order. I can read the infraction. Page 104, paragraph 319(3):

- (3) In the House of Commons a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case; or to use any profane or indecent language; or to question the acknowledged and undoubted powers of the House . . .

I would ask the member again, for the last time, to retract his statement and apologize to the House.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I have been unparliamentary in my comments, I apologize. Nevertheless, it certainly doesn't . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — It cannot be a qualified apology. It has to be an unequivocal apology to the House. The debate continues.

Mr. Pringle: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw my . . . I apologize to the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in conclusion I will simply say — I was on my last sentence — I will simply say that the Premier of this province, that the government of this province will be held accountable by the people of Saskatchewan for the most disastrous and callous betrayal of any government in the history of the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Being near 5 o'clock, this House is recessed until 7 p.m.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.