

EVENING SITTING

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, before dinner tonight I had just started my remarks on public participation in the province of Saskatchewan. And I'd indicated, and I wanted to start my remarks by indicating to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to all the people of the province, that when we talk about public participation we talk about a non-political public participation.

It gives the opportunity here to all Saskatchewan residents, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to, for the first time, become involved in all the major Crown corporations that we set forth for public participation. It gives everyone the opportunity to participate, and become an owner of success and of the success stories that we have created in this province of Saskatchewan.

And I want to name off a few to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I don't want to take a whole lot of time and name off all of them, but I want to name a few.

I think probably one of the first major successes in this province has been Saskoil. I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that under the NDP administration, and when the Leader of the Opposition was the deputy premier of the province of Saskatchewan — the member from Riversdale — I want to indicate to you that Saskoil had never turned a profit, and always had to come back to the trough for more and more investment dollars to go out there and try and compete as an oil company in the world.

And I want to indicate to you now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Saskoil was one of the greatest success stories in this province. It has now become one of the most nationally known oil companies across this nation, in the beginning of public participation, and henceforth it has been profiting. And those particular profits are definitely coming back to all the people for benefits to all the people in the province through royalties and through shares.

I want to indicate to you also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in your own particular riding up in . . . or around your particular riding of Prince Albert there, in the Shellbrook-Torch River area, that the Weyerhaeuser story in the province here has been nothing but a success again. And I want to just read you a recent announcement that has just come forth.

But before I do that I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when we inherited and up until the time we had sold Weyerhaeuser into the private sector, that that had put a debt burden on the public of Saskatchewan at

approximately \$90,000 per day cost to the taxpayer.

An Hon. Member: — 91,000.

Mr. Hopfner: — My colleague from Rosthern had remind me that it was 91,000. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was a per day cost on the debt of that pulp mill sitting up in Prince Albert region. And who argued that sale? Who argued here for days about give-aways, and about giving it to the private people so that they could operate it and profit and expand and create a whole bunch of jobs, and secure jobs, lifetime jobs, Mr. Deputy Speaker? It was the members of the NDP opposition that kept us in the legislature to debate it for day in and day out, and to try to convince the public that this was a wrong thing for this government to do.

And I want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you spoke earlier towards the throne speech, you had indicated the numbers that . . . in the millions of dollars of return, profit, return to the taxpayers that Weyerhaeuser has already given to us. And I want to indicate also that of their recent announcement because of this success story, a \$20.8 million expansion was announced for the Weyerhaeuser pulp mill in Prince Albert.

The company is going to build a plant to turn its roll of paper into sheets of paper before export (before export, Mr. Deputy Speaker.) It is expected to create 34 permanent jobs and about 100 man-years of construction employment.

Weyerhaeuser said the expansion is in direct response to the free trade deal with the United States where most of the mill's fine paper has been exported. The company has waited until now because duties on exporting sheeted paper to the United States were higher than the duties of shipping the rolls of paper. Weyerhaeuser expects construction to begin this spring with completion in the summer of 1990. Overall, Weyerhaeuser employs now about 1,000 people in Saskatchewan, including about 100 in a saw mill in Big River; another 100 at a chemical plant in Saskatoon; and the rest working out of its pulp and paper mills in Prince Albert.

Now I want to indicate to the members opposite, those individuals, those 1,000 plus people, are going to have an opportunity to have secure life. Oh, I touched a nerve, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The member from Quill Lakes, he's still upset about the fact of the Weyerhaeuser deal. And he's also still upset about the free trade deal, and this here is documented proof that we can now export a finished product instead of our raw materials to have them processed in another country. But he's still hollering and complaining about it.

But I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when we're talking about public participation, we're talking about jobs. Jobs — jobs for our young, and secure jobs for the people that are already in the working place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, the member from Quill Lakes is upset. He's hollering; he's trying to holler me down. But

I want to indicate to you that what we are doing here is showing the people that there is so much more we can be. We had said this in 1982, that we believed in this province, that we had a vision of that, and that vision was that we knew we could be so much more. And I want to indicate that there are major investments going to be coming in here that will rattle the minds of the opposition within the next year and two, and so on and so on.

I know the members don't like to hear it across the way, because they were not able to attract business into this province. They, in fact, you know, the members opposite are arguing about the fact that there has been an exodus of people out of the province. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to indicate to you that we have an upgrader in Regina that they were against, that created jobs and brought people in.

We have an upgrader announcement in my own riding of Cut Knife-Lloydminster, that's in . . . last fall. We have already done some groundwork, and this spring, once the frost is gone, we'll be doing more and will be . . . And there has been tender let for engineering on various different types of equipment, etc., millions of dollars worth of tenders. And they are against that.

It was odd, while I'm on that topic, it was odd because here during the federal election, Mr. Broadbent, the leader of the federal NDP Party, comes out in the paper and says, oh no, we're in favour of that upgrader in Lloydminster; that's the greatest thing since sliced bread. But still in this legislature, they talk about us giving away millions of dollars to oil companies and everything else and saying, we'll shut them down, we'll shut them down.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Well I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they shut down the oil industry in this province, if they get to be government and shut the oil industry down in this province, as they say they will, as the member from Riversdale says they will, then I'll tell you what's going to happen in my area. It's going to become depressed.

It will become a depressed area. And you want to talk about small businesses, they pretend to believe, make people believe that they're trying to be on the small business side. I tend to challenge them if they depress the oil industry any more than what it had been from world prices, through their royalty tax structures as they indicate that they're going to slap on to the oil companies in this province.

Then I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there'll be major bankruptcy up in my particular area. People have invested dollars into small business ventures in my area, in the expectation of a secure oil industry in this province. And I'll tell you, I want to warn them right now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that from the words that have been coming out from the member of Riversdale, the Leader of the Opposition's mouth, in this legislature, if he ever becomes leader I ask them to begin to worry, because he's coming after them; he's going to tax the oil companies into oblivion and chase them out of the province of the Saskatchewan once again.

I want to indicate, and I have back-up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they were in government, when they were in government, there was about 100 gas wells drilled over their whole period of government — about 100. And I want to indicate to you that since we've invited the gas companies to Saskatchewan and have allowed them to . . . and opened the door for them and allowed them to explore and develop gas in this province . . . The natural gas wells that we have drilled in 1988 was in the eight hundreds of gas wells in Saskatchewan. And I want to indicate to you that that gas is now feeding our domestic lines as well as exporting to the eastern markets. And I will indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that those jobs . . . Those wells that were drilled have created many, many hundreds of jobs for the men and women in this province. And they want to do away with it, they want to keep it in the ground. They don't want to develop anything, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they want to keep the people in this province under fist.

They want to keep the people of this province down to such a low that they don't believe in themselves. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe in the people of this province. We believe that they have the brilliance, they have the attitude to go out and develop and grow. We have the attitude to expand, to become world-wide known. They have the . . . We have the abilities, the technology and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is what it's all about. It's about families, it's about giving them some secure feeling about a province.

I have sat here and listened about the fact of . . . and the condemnation on our administration, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on health care. I could not believe that they're still trying to carry that argument. I want to say to you that their medicare to the people of this province is played out. They haven't grasped the fact that people don't believe them any more. People do not believe the NDP with their scare tactics on the medicare programs.

I will give you the background of this. When they were in administration there was approximately \$760 million spent in health care under their administration in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we as a PC government and under the leadership of Premier Devine . . . I know you're going to correct me again. I spoke . . .

(1915)

The Deputy Speaker: — Members are not allowed to use other members' names.

Mr. Hopfner: — Under our great Premier and our leader, I want to indicate to you that our government is budgeted at a third or better now of the total budget in health care alone. We're sitting into the billion of dollars — I believe it's about 1.2, 1.3 billion now. And I want to indicate to you that I give you some examples. I'll just go back to my home riding because I'm sure other members want to brag about the various different facilities in health care things that have taken place in their particular areas. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government, and through me, have been able to go ahead and put a hospital in Lloydminster, new facility; a hospital in Maidstone, new

facility; a hospital in Cut Knife, new facility.

And I want to talk to you about nursing homes. Nursing homes were . . . The members opposite . . . And I can't use names and I respect that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it's too bad, because there are individuals across the way there, the NDP opposition, that were ministers of Health, that are sitting in this legislature right now condemning us for not doing enough in health care. And the member from Saskatoon, I can't remember, Nutana or somewhere, south, Saskatoon South, he was one of the fellows that was the minister of Health at that particular time and they had a moratorium, a moratorium on the nursing homes — and the people of Saskatchewan, in particular in my riding, will never forget them.

I want to indicate, I want to indicate that the health system has improved tenfold in my riding — the facilities where people now can go into these facilities and not worry about the staff having to take pails around to collect the rain that was running from the roof and things like this. This is the kinds of things that they had to put up with out of my riding — literally pails and mopping floors because of raining through the . . . water running through the ceilings from rains and stuff. And they just turned their back on the people — poor facilities, and the equipment in them was poor, was outdated. They were so . . . The equipment was as outdated as the NDP opposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

But you know, like, when it comes to the health care, the scare tactics they use on seniors, etc., Mr. Deputy Speaker, my minister have developed programs for seniors in this province that are second to none across the whole nation, and our seniors are finally realizing the fact that it was not the NDP that believed in them. It's our administration that are trying to work with them. We've been condemned about having task forces: health task force, seniors task force, and everything else. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're talking with the people in Saskatchewan; we're talking to seniors; we're talking to young people; we're talking to the sick; we're talking to the entrepreneurs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're not concerned about trying to scare people. We're trying to warn the people in this province of Saskatchewan that if they ever bring back an administration under the leadership of the member from Riversdale and all his caucus, for what they are, I want to warn them that if they want to go back into those days of moratoriums, and high taxes, and saying . . . listening to all the lame-brain excuses of why they have to do this and that, I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're in for a real ride.

Socialism is becoming a party of outdate. There is no ideas, there are no ideas of how they can compete into the real world. They've lost it.

I want to tell you, I want to tell . . .

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about the real world.

Mr. Hopfner: — Well, that's . . . And the member from Quill Lakes wants me to tell him about the real world. Well I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the member from Quill

Lakes has never been in a real world; he's never been in a real world.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that they also condemn us about education. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you a little bit about education and the facilities that we have up in my region. Since our government has taken power there has been continuous, continuous expansion and population in my area, continuous expansion of young families in my area, continuous expansion of education facilities in my area — not only in the city of Lloydminster, Mr. Speaker.

We're diversifying. Our smaller communities up in my constituency are expanding and we have to upgrade our facilities in education. Our education facilities are definitely expanding, and we're . . . New jobs, new jobs for teachers, new jobs for young people, young men and women, young married families, young people.

Our sporting facilities are expanding; our community businesses are expanding, Mr. Speaker; and this is what it's all about. It was through support programs from agriculture, support programs to oil-related business, and mortgage protection programs that are bringing . . . In fact, I want to tell you this story, Mr. Speaker.

The other day I had a young couple that lived in Lloydminster, Alberta, and they were down here for the throne speech. They came down for the throne speech, and they came to me and indicated to me that they are afraid of the interest rates taking their mortgage payments a little away on what their budget is going to be. And they know there's a security in Saskatchewan on home mortgage payments. And they had indicated to me that they had just sold their home, I believe, and they're going to now move back to the Saskatchewan side of Lloydminster, and they're going to settle in Saskatchewan.

And it just made me happy to know that there's a program that our government has developed that are bringing young people back to Saskatchewan — to feel more secure, to be able to budget, to be able to know that they're not going to be paying more than nine and three-quarter per cent interest on their home mortgages. Now isn't that a nice secure feeling.

I want to indicate to you also, Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about the fact of environment and various different environmental aspects and expansion and everything else, when we're talking to these companies, we're taking into consideration all environmental impacts. We're taking into consideration the security of clean fresh air and good forestry programs and all around a clean province and a province that people can be proud to live in, to work in, to play in. It's just one of those things.

But I want to indicate to you that today I heard them slandering us about some emissions from the upgrader here in Regina which evidently they're trying to run the upgrader down. They're trying to say it's no good. They're trying to say it shouldn't have been built. They didn't believe in it in the first place, and the whole bloody gamut.

But I want to tell you that when they were in government . . . And it's been mentioned here by a colleague that the NDP says, PCBs no danger. This was a headline: "NDP says PCBs no danger."

The NDP long for the old days. They also like to portray a strong sense of concern for the environment. In 1978, it was discovered that the NDP government of the day had kept secret a massive spill of PCBs in the city of Regina. More than 1,500 gallons of the PCBs was spilled onto the earth on the 1600 block of 1st Avenue. When the cover-up was discovered, the NDP Deputy Minister of Environment had this to say: "While it is normally department policy to make the public aware of a potential problem when we are first aware of it, in this case we felt there was no danger to the public."

Can you imagine? And now they're the righteous ones here; they're trying to condemn this administration for poor environmental policies. But there was no danger to the public.

Late notification was not used as an explanation, as the (D.M.) deputy minister said the agency was notified immediately after the spill took place. The solution employed by the NDP was sealing the spill with asphalt.

Now if you can imagine leaching problems and the whole thing that could have taken place, and gotten into the water systems, and could have travelled for miles underneath into the various water veins . . .

In other words:

The NDP were informed of the highly dangerous spill, which they then claimed posed not even a potential danger . . .

And solved the problem, like I said, by paving over top of it.

We may never know, we may never know how many cancer cases might have been caused by this spill or whatever, but I'll tell you, I'll tell you: did they care? Did they care? I ask you, I ask you if they cared.

We have that same thing with the NDP government when they were in power, when they had said that waiting lists at cancer clinics for very important surgery to take place of all kinds and natures . . . Well they said that is the kind of system we have if we have a good health care system. It's a sign of efficiency in our health care system. And now they stand across the way and the member from Riversdale, he indicates that these line-ups are just horrendous and he's blowing us, trying to embarrass the government for this kind of thing.

But I want to tell you something: these people had nowhere to go. They didn't expand in the cancer facilities; they didn't expand in the hospitals; they didn't expand in health care costs. People had to go out of province. People had to leave this province for operations and treatments and CAT scans and the whole thing, Mr.

Speaker. And these are the simple, fundamental, basic things that should have been given to the people, but they refused.

And now yes, we as a Progressive Conservative government are in a catch-up mode. So they ask us over there, righteously, that we should be pouring more money into health care. Well we all agree with that. We should be pouring more money into health care. We should be pouring more money into education. We all agree we should be pouring more money into education. We should be pouring more money into agriculture. Well we all agree that we should be. We should be pouring money into almost literally every program that government has. But there's only so much.

And then on the other side of the . . . They turn around and they say, high taxes, too much high taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the members opposite and the people in the province here that . . . I don't have to tell the people of the province. I want to remind members opposite that government doesn't have a machine that I can go in a back room and crank out a million dollars or two. The money comes from the people. There isn't such a thing as free this, free that, free this and free that, free health care, free education, free agricultural programs, free this or that. People pay for it. They pay for it — hard, cold cash — they pay for it.

They pay for it through resource revenues. They pay through it through income tax. They pay through it through various other taxes. Government has to get resources from somewhere. People aren't that naive. The NDP opposition must be. It doesn't take people to figure these kinds of things out.

(1930)

They want good quality education. They want good quality health care. They want good quality agricultural programs. They want all this quality service. They know the NDP squandered the money that they entrusted; they squandered it on the purchases of potash mines.

What did they do with the potash mines? Did they create any more jobs? No. Did they create less jobs? Yes. Did they profit? No. Did they run a heavy deficit? I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, they ran millions and millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars deficit in the potash alone, by the purchase. And they don't like to hear that.

But I want to guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, they're going to be the first people, the NDP opposition are going to be the first people to stand up on this floor of the legislature when we put the potash mines up for public participation. Watch them!

I'll guarantee you, that although in 1976 and again in 1979, when they were thinking about it, when they were dwelling on it, they were saying in '76 and '79, yes, we're going to put up these Crown corporations, potash mine, we're going to allow the public to participate, they didn't have the guts to do it. They didn't have the guts to do it and I'll tell you why. Because, as the member from Riversdale always states: the people that make the

decision is the party, is the convention; they make the decisions. And they know; they know that the people involved and their delegates involved at their conventions wouldn't let them do it. They wouldn't let them do it.

Listen. They wouldn't let the people . . . The delegates at your convention would not let you people allow to put the potash or any Crown corporation up for public participation. Now we did it and we're going to continue to do it. And it's popular out there. And members of the opposition better take some polls, because they're going to find out it's popular out there, because we already know it.

And I want to indicate to you that when it came to the question, when it came to the question that I said earlier, there was a question to the member from Riversdale, the Leader of the NDP Opposition, where it says, "Will you legislate to recover lost Crown corporations?" Well his answer was, "That decision's going to have to be made if and when we assume office." Well . . . And I wanted to remind you because you weren't listening.

But I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I've enjoyed being able to have a couple of cents' worth in this throne debate, and I'm certainly pleased about the vision that our Premier and our government is taking this province.

And I want to indicate you that it's a pleasure to be back in this Assembly, being able to speak, through your Chair, to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. And I just want them to get ready because we're going to have a great time in this province for years to come. And I just can't wait to be able to get some of these industries and some of these announcements that are just in the back room right now, get them going, getting the jobs created; because, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there's so much more we can be in this province, and I know we're going to be it.

And I want to say to you and to all the members of this legislature that I am proud to be able to support the main motion, and I am very disappointed that the NDP opposition even put in an amendment to that motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I've listened carefully to the member's remarks who has just resumed his seat. There was some of his remarks which was intelligible which occurred before supper and it had to do with the little game that's going on about who is taking land away from farmers.

A few days ago the member for Rosthern staged an event here in the Chamber where he had some people in the gallery claiming that the member from Riversdale had taken their land away from them in a court action. Mr. Speaker, I've been around this Chamber for quite a few years, and I've seen a lot of little games like this played, and the interesting thing about this particular game was that it was so transparent that everyone could see through it. No sooner had the member for Rosthern finished his speech and the people that he had set up in the gallery

went out, the media confronted the people that had been in the gallery, had been the star witnesses for the member for Rosthern in this particular case.

And when the media questioned these people, the person who was in the gallery, a Mr. Gaudet said he hadn't actually met the Leader of the Opposition, the member from Riversdale — although the member from Rosthern said that the member for Riversdale showed no mercy in persecuting this person — said he'd never met the member for Riversdale, never had any personal dealings with the member from Riversdale; and he was not forced to give up his land as the member for Rosthern had said, he settled out of court — settled his case out of the court.

The transparency of this particular case which was started by none other than the Premier of the province a couple of years back, the transparency is this: that when it comes time to put the evidence on the table, to fess up and show the facts with regard to the case, the Premier is unable to do it.

As a consequence of the member for Rosthern's little charade in the Chamber a couple of days ago, the member for Regina Elphinstone in fact brought forward documents and put them on the table of the legislature, which proved conclusively that a member of the cabinet of this government was personally involved in taking land away from people through court actions. A member of this government's cabinet was personally involved in that — not the member for Riversdale, for where there is no evidence whatsoever, not one shred. And I invite the Premier, if he has evidence, to lay it on the table, so that everybody can judge the truth of the evidence — no evidence whatsoever.

Today the member from Riversdale, the Leader of the Opposition, laid on the table — laid the documents on the table — that showed the biggest forecloser of farmers in Saskatchewan is the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Minister of Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The people of Saskatchewan should expect more of the Government of Saskatchewan than what's been happening here with regard to this smear campaign. I hope, I hope that the members will cease and desist. If they put the evidence on the table, we're quite prepared to look at it. But there is no evidence; there is no evidence. It's a fiction, and it's transparent.

I sat waiting now, Mr. Speaker, for about two days to get into this particular debate, and it gave me some time to contemplate the Chamber, the legislature, the government, the opposition, and what's going on. And as I sat here listening and thinking and looking, I thought about the years that I've spent in this Chamber. I've been in all of the legislative chambers in Canada, except the Northwest Territories, and in their own way they all have something attractive about them. But I suppose you would say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm biased. I appreciate this Chamber more than any of the others; more than any of the others.

It has beautiful red rugs; it has lovely columns; it has

beautiful oak woodwork; it has galleries for the public to look in. It's a place that should inspire people to give good, thoughtful speeches about Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan's problems, Saskatchewan's victories; speeches which we can all be proud of.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of speeches here that I'm not too proud of. One is the prorogation speech and the other is the throne speech. These particular speeches were delivered in this Chamber by Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Saskatchewan. They were delivered last week on March 8 and there is an irony here; there's an irony here that really bears some explanation because I'm sure the government members haven't understood the irony of the situation.

Here we have the situation where the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan, the first woman Lieutenant Governor of the province of Saskatchewan, delivering her first speech in the House, which is the prorogation speech, and her second speech in the House, which was the throne speech, on March 8, International Women's Day — the first Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan that is a woman — on International Women's Day. And that never got mentioned in either of the speeches; never got mentioned, no acknowledgement.

But yet this government says that it is doing something for the women of Saskatchewan. The women of Saskatchewan have made some progress in accomplishing equality and I am proud to say they made some of that progress under our government when we were the government of Saskatchewan.

That's not to suggest for a moment that more progress shouldn't be made, but the government failed to recognize the opportunity. They were insensitive. And this is not the Lieutenant Governor's speech; this is the Premier's speech. The people of Saskatchewan should understand that the purpose or the duty of the Lieutenant Governor is to give the speech that is handed to her, in this case by the Premier of Saskatchewan. So the insensitivity of this government and the Premier, the leader of this government, shows quite clearly that he wasn't able to grasp the situation on opening day.

The contents, the words, the ideas for the prorogation speech and the throne speech came directly from the Premier of Saskatchewan. They're not the words of the Lieutenant Governor. She did her duty. She delivered the two speeches to which I refer, but I'm sure that she must have been embarrassed having been handed these two speeches, her first two opportunities to speak to the people of Saskatchewan directly. No acknowledgement made of the fact that she's the first woman Lieutenant Governor; no acknowledgement made of the fact that it was International Women's Day on which she was delivering the speech, these two messages of mediocrity which she was forced to deliver to this House.

Let's examine them a bit, Mr. Speaker. What did the throne speech say? The throne speech said, we in Saskatchewan have a new plastic health card with new and increased fees for prescriptions to be paid by the sick. That's if you interpret and analyse the throne speech. That's what it said. Let me repeat it. We in Saskatchewan

have a new plastic health card with new and increased fees for prescriptions to be paid by the sick.

Three things about the plastic health card, Mr. Speaker. The plastic health card incurred expenses of . . . increase in expenses of several hundred per cent, and this increased cost was due to bureaucratic administrative structure which was necessary for the health card. Now that's not the most serious fault with the health card. Most of that is a one-time expenditure although the cost of keeping the plastic card operational will be several times the cost annually of the previous card system which was in place.

The serious part of the new plastic card is that every family in Saskatchewan will have a new \$125-a-year deductible. Let me stress that, a new \$125-a-year family deductible. Everyone who uses the health card, the sick that use a health card because they're the only ones who use it, Mr. Speaker — let's make no mistake about that — will have a new 20 per cent sick tax.

(1945)

I wonder why this happens, Mr. Speaker. Because we were given a guarantee; the people of Saskatchewan were given a guarantee. And I have that guarantee right here. It says on the guarantee, a written guarantee:

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan rejects any form of deterrent fees or health insurance premiums.

It continues on in the guarantee, Mr. Speaker, the written guarantee:

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan will abolish the unfair deterrent fees for prescription drugs.

And it's signed by the leader of the Conservative Party, and co-signed by the seat mate of the minister in charge of privatization in the province of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Finance is the co-signer of this guarantee on health care. Can we trust them, Mr. Speaker? I doubt it, I doubt it.

It's an interesting side note which I just noticed on the guarantee. Who printed the guarantee? Well, Mr. Speaker, it was printed by Brigdens, Brigdens. And the minister of privatization will be listening, I'm sure. He knows who Brigdens is; that's the printer of record for the Tory party in Saskatchewan. That is the company that has just got the telephone book privatized to them. A profitable section of SaskTel, the telephone book, has been privatized to Brigdens, who write the guarantee on health care by this minister across the way.

That is another ironic situation. A guarantee signed by the member for Qu'Appelle-Lumsden on health care in the province of Saskatchewan.

The throne speech, in another section, Mr. Speaker, announced again the expenditure of \$9 million of taxpayers' hard earned dollars on an 85th birthday extravaganza. The hidden purpose of the PC Party is to get

the electors in the mood to re-elect this government again. That's the hidden purpose of the \$9 million birthday party.

This government is a great patron of the advertising arts in Saskatchewan. My, do they do advertising. I've been watching some of the advertising, and this 85th birthday party is going to be an advertising extravaganza, I assure you, Mr. Speaker. A good chunk of that \$9 million will go to the friends of the Conservative Party, the government of this province.

Just looking around at some of the advertising . . . Well I've got some here. I've got the chamber of commerce magazine. It's called *Business Review*. Going through the chamber of commerce *Business Review*, I was struck by the amount of government advertising in it.

This is published quarterly, quarterly, this *Business Review*, Mr. Speaker. It has only 10,000 circulation in the province of Saskatchewan, no more than 10,000 circulation. This copy has only 36 pages, only 36 pages, but five full, complete pages are government advertising. Five full, complete pages of this quarterly publication are government advertising. I'll let you guess at the price, Mr. Speaker, of advertising. And I want to say something about the price of advertising, just very shortly.

I want to say, before I depart too far from the birthday extravaganza, what the Premier of this province is throwing for the 85th birthday of the province, I want to read to you what the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* says about the birthday extravaganza. When it was announced on October 14, or thereabouts, the *Star-Phoenix* issued an editorial. And I compliment them for the editorial, because the people of Saskatchewan were being told by this Premier and his government that tough times are ahead, we've all got to pull in our belts; we've all got to sacrifice; we've got to sacrifice if we're going to save Saskatchewan. The *Star-Phoenix* had this to say in the editorial: "Expenditure repugnant." The first paragraph:

When necessary social agencies and health programs in this province are suffering from inadequate funding, the government's plan to spend \$9 million in preparation for Saskatchewan's 85th birthday celebration is repugnant.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — That's what the *Star-Phoenix* said. Further on, another paragraph, the *Star Phoenix* has this to say:

There is something flagrantly political about this, given that Saskatchewan's 85th birthday in 1990 coincides with the expiration of the Premier's current mandate, and his dismissal of any possible connection does nothing to diminish speculation on this score.

The Premier is trying to be . . . has been trying, ever since he announced this extravagant birthday party, to explain it. He's been shifting around and trying to get away from the attack that was mounted here and by other people

who are concerned about this flagrant expenditure of money, taxpayers' dollar, on a birthday party, an 85th birthday party. As the *Star-Phoenix* said, whoever heard of celebrating an 85th birthday, anyway? Well the *Star-Phoenix* goes on:

The name, the Future Corporation, and the theme which is supposed to emphasize Saskatchewan's place in the world, do not suggest a traditional birthday celebration. In fact, they provide a ready vehicle for political propaganda.

Political propaganda. This example of government waste in advertising pales to an insignificance when compared to the advertising overkill practised by this government in the TeleBond sales effort. That program cost the taxpayers well over \$2 million of radio, TV, newspaper, magazine, billboards, and other promotional items; waste of taxpayers' dollar; advertising overkill, Mr. Chairman.

Now lest the members lack some examples of government extravagance in advertising, I have a recent one for them. I just received, a day or two ago, return no. 204 and it states as follows. The body of the request, the return, is as follows:

For the period March 1, 1984 (keep those dates in mind, beginning March 1, '84) to the date (of) this return (when it) was ordered: (which was September '87, so from '84 to '87) (1) the amounts paid to the firms of Dome Advertising Limited and Dome Media Buying Services Limited by each department . . . Crown corporation and agency of the Government of Saskatchewan . . .

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was a Herculean task, but I went through the return no. 204 and sorted out the expenditures, and you know what the Government of Saskatchewan paid to Dome Advertising in the period from September '84 . . . March '84 to September '87? By the way, who is in Dome Advertising? Somebody with a very close connection to this government.

An Hon. Member: — Spence Bozak.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Spence Bozak, Spence Bozak. He came right out of the heart of this government into Dome Advertising. Now some of my compatriots here, some of my compatriots here obviously haven't read the return because they were guessing 100 or \$1,000 — or 10,000?

An Hon. Member: — 10,000, 30,000.

Mr. Brockelbank: — 30,000.

An Hon. Member: — 80,000.

Mr. Brockelbank: — No, no, you're way light. The Minister of Urban Affairs has his hand up. Do you have a guess? Does the Minister of Urban Affairs have a guess? He'd probably guess \$10 million. Well, Mr. Minister of Urban Affairs, big spender that you are, you're a piker compared to what has been spent on Dome Advertising by this government. From March '84 to September '87, that short period of time, the total is \$32.575 million. Let me repeat that to the member from Regina South, the

member from Regina South because, by golly, he spent a lot of that advertising money in his own department, just tonnes of it. Well let me give you some examples; let me give you some examples that make up this figure of \$32,575,099 — \$32 million.

Well who are the big spenders? Well the Minister of Agriculture is obviously a fairly big spender. He spent over \$1 million in that period of time — just that little Minister of Agriculture spent over a million dollars. SaskPower spent 2.2 million — SaskPower. That's so they can split her in two and have two companies and you pay two power bills — a power and a gas bill — instead of one and twice as much advertising too, because that way you get more money into Dome Advertising for advertising because you're two companies advertising then.

And I can recall, I can recall those members, Mr. Speaker, when they sat on this side of the House. They said, oh well you don't need to advertise utilities because there's no competition. Utilities don't have competition so they don't need advertising. But you know, I have . . . racking my mind to say now who else, other than the power corporation section of the gas utility, the gas utility section, is delivering natural gas in Saskatchewan. I can't think who they're in competition with but, by golly, the SaskPower spent \$2.2 million of this 32 million.

Economic Trade and Development, 2.6 million; Finance, 1.3. Well I can understand that. The Minister of Finance takes a lot of advertising to cover up the boobos he has made since he has been Minister of Finance. Revenue — over a million dollars by the department of revenue. Here's a favourite of mine. The Minister of Finance got his hand back in here again through SaskTel — spent another 2 million in SaskTel, of hard earned taxpayers' dollars. There's hardly going to be anything left for the birthday party — nothing left for the birthday party.

Tourism and small business: now here's an area, here's an area that the government's really gone overboard. Tourism and small business: \$4.5 million — 4.5. They must have just given it over to the advertising company and said, you come in and set up the advertising program, because they really went wild.

SGI: this is another Crown corporation this government's divided in half so they can spend twice as much on advertising because they've got two companies now — two companies, \$4.5 million, 4.5. Health: a piddling \$1.3 million. Well, the Minister of Health was keeping a low profile, not too many ads.

Public Service Commission, over a million; and advanced education, a million. Highways, oh Highways, I'm going to get you, I'm going to get you later, because I want to talk to you about that advertising, Mr. Minister of Highways. Nothing personal, Mr. Speaker, my comments are going through you to the Minister of Highways. The Minister of Highways spent \$1.8 million.

An Hon. Member: — How much?

Mr. Brockelbank: — 1.8.

An Hon. Member: — What is the advertising?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well, I don't what he spent it for.

An Hon. Member: — Didn't build any highways.

Mr. Brockelbank: — No, but it's advertising, advertising. Yes, yes. Sask Housing Corporation: I knew I'd get to the Minister of Urban Affairs, who's in charge of Sask Housing Corporation. He spent a tidy 1.5 million, contributing towards the \$32.5 million expenditure to Dome Advertising, a very good friend of the government. This is the same Dome Advertising where it was shown in court that SGI was being billed for services by Dome Advertising for which no services were done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(2000)

Mr. Brockelbank: — The same company, Dome Advertising. Now if it follows — it takes me awhile to catch on, Mr. Speaker, but it follows — that if somebody is submitting bills to you for a service they didn't provide, there's some kind of a deal on there. There's some kind of a deal on there.

And as a matter of fact, and I haven't had a chance to read it, but I would suggest it as required reading for all voters in Saskatchewan that they check what the judge said, check what the judge said in this particular case. Dome . . .

An Hon. Member: — What did the judge say?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh I haven't read it. If I had it here, I'd quote it, I'd quote it. But I don't have it here.

Now the people of Saskatchewan, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan who are asked to suck in their gut because times are tough in Saskatchewan, are going to be upset by this \$32.5 million figure. But we haven't got to the other advertising companies the government employs; they have other friends. And I'm sure that some members, some hon. members will want to bring that information forward in due course.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This has got me concerned because it's infectious. I think these guys across the way are infecting the government in Ottawa with their extravagance.

And I've seen an example of it recently, Mr. Speaker; they got the stamp on the thing upside down — the ad. Now I suppose the post office, Canada Post, is trying to make a point here. They're telling us in this ad that they haven't done such a good job.

Now I remember getting a lecture from my father — it wasn't a lecture, it was good advice — years ago. He says, never get up and tell people this is going to be a terrible speech I'm going to make, because they're going to find out soon enough whether it's a good speech or not.

But Canada Post has broken that rule that my father told to

me when I was a young fellow — don't tell them that you've done a terrible job, they know you've done a terrible job.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This corporation, run by their kissing cousins at Ottawa, who is trying to take the post office away from rural Saskatchewan, spent \$3,718 on this *Leader-Post* ad. And at the same time, the same day, they spent \$3,607 in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*. And at the same time, they had to get to their friends in Toronto, some money to their friends in Toronto, in Toronto *Globe and Mail*, \$7,558, plus an extra charge because there's colour.

The advertising campaign, just in the print media for this one ad which has turned the world upside-down, at least the beaver upside-down, would exceed \$60,000 — just in one day 60,000 bucks of taxpayers' money. I think these people should quit going to Ottawa, because those guys at Ottawa got a lot more money to spend, taxpayers' money, and if they get the habits that this government has of spending taxpayers' money, there ain't going to be none left for the birthday party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This throne speech is a grab bag of odds and ends from the past, a grab bag of odds and ends from the past.

I want to refer to the prorogation speech. Even though the Premier has shut off the previous session with his prorogation speech which he gave to the Lieutenant Governor to read, even though he's shut off that session, he is not going to shut me off because I've got a few things that I want to settle from that previous session. And I want to talk about it in this prorogation speech, because that's part of the thing that started — end of the day we started this throne speech on March 8.

In the prorogation speech it mentions mad dogs — this is a favourite of the Minister of Urban Affairs over there, mad dogs. But it failed to make any mention whatsoever to the ward system — never mentioned the ward system in the prorogation speech. But he mentioned the mad dogs, mad dogs. The ward system, which this insensitive, unfeeling government yanked away from the people of Saskatchewan in the last session of the legislature.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, I've concentrated on the Minister of Urban Affairs, but I've changed my mind because what I'm dealing with there is a puppet — I'm dealing with a puppet. And I'm going to go where the final responsibility lies, that's with the puppeteer, the Premier. The Premier is the man that pulls his string, and the Premier of this province is the insensitive one who took the ward system away from the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, what do the people of Saskatchewan think of the ward system? What did they think of it before? In 1977 Reginans voted overwhelmingly by 9,000 votes in favour of keeping the ward system. I'm going back a little in history, in 1977. In 1979, two years later the city of Saskatoon followed with a similarly overwhelming vote

in support of the ward system; 7,642 people more in favour than opposed to it. In 1988, the minister who is the puppet of the Premier and does what the Premier says he should do, and doesn't do anything without the express permission of the Premier, got representations from cities around Saskatchewan saying, "leave the ward system alone, we want the ward system" — the city of Regina, the city of Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Melville, Weyburn, Moose Jaw.

Saskatoon in this particular item in the *Star-Phoenix* on May 25, '88:

Saskatoon council is also opposed to abolition of the ward system, and passed a resolution that its position be forwarded to Regina aldermen.

Now let's just look at the size of the problem that we have before us here. The city of Melville has 5,123 people. The member from Melville sits in this Chamber, occasionally — has 5123 people. The Premier of this province said to those people and their representatives who opposed taking more, just don't worry, he says, I know what's best for the people in Melville. So he told those 5,123 people, just you mind your business there and I'll take care of how you're elected. That's what he said, this Premier who has said he believed in local autonomy. I think that's just a phrase he picked up prior to 1982, and he's just never dug it out of his vocabulary because it doesn't mean anything any more. He should get rid of it because he doesn't believe in local autonomy.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — He told the city of Weyburn, which has 10,153 people, he told them and their representatives, you just mind your own business. We're going to have my version of elections in your city. I'm in favour of local autonomy and I'll tell you how it's done. That's what the Premier said to the people of Weyburn.

To the people of Prince Albert, 33,686 of them, the Premier says, I know what's best for you, Prince Albert. And Prince Albert — get this, Mr. Speaker — Prince Albert was one of the cities that voluntarily accepted the ward system on their own. The legislation, prior to the Premier fiddling with it, said that only cities of 100,000 or more were obligated to have the ward system. Prince Albert has 33,686 and they voted in favour of the ward system; they put it in themselves. But the Premier says, even if you wanted that yourself, you can't have it any more; I'm getting the Minister of Urban Affairs to take it away from you.

Moose Jaw, 35,073 citizens there have had their representative told by the Premier of this province, through his puppet, the Minister of Urban Affairs, you have no right to the ward system; I'm taking it away on you. And he did.

To our capital city, Regina, 175,000 people, the Premier of this province had the gall to say to them and their representatives, you have no right to the ward system, when they have pleaded on bended knee with this Premier to keep the ward system.

To the biggest city in Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 177,641, the Premier said, you're not big enough to run your own affairs; I have to run them for you. And he took away the ward system.

Total it all up, Mr. Speaker. It totals up to 436,740 people. The Premier of this province said, "I'll run your cities the way I want to run them, through my puppet."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Some surprising events occurred in the lead-up to taking away this legislation, which the Minister of Urban Affairs did. And one of them occurred in Saskatoon. It appeared in the *Star-Phoenix*, April 23, '88.

And the editorial says, "Saskatoon businesses will send Urban Affairs Minister, Jack . . ." And I can't say his name. I'll just say blank. "Jack (blank), the same . . ." No it's a four-letter . . . oh pardon me, it's a five-letter word; it's a five-letter word.

. . . the same message as city council, leave the ward system alone.

That's what the board of trade said in Saskatoon.

In what Saskatoon Board of Trade president Dick Strayer called a surprising outcome, the business community voted in favour of the ward system on a mail-in survey.

And the amount of returns were very good in relation to mail-ins.

Another comment from the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, which I know the Minister of Urban Affairs will be making notes on there:

If (blank) wants to take the pulse of the voters on this issue, he should push for municipal plebiscites or offer municipal governments financial support and legislative authority to hold more referendums. And even that sort of action would be questionable since there is no public pressure for the province to wipe out wards.

And that's the *Star-Phoenix* on March 24, '88.

The city of Saskatoon passed a resolution in council on March 28, '88. The wording of the . . . Don't go away Mr. Urban Minister, you've got a lot to account for to the people of Saskatchewan.

That this city council indicate to the Minister of Urban Affairs and to the Premier . . .

You see, they caught on before I did, that the Premier was pulling the string on the Minister of Urban Affairs, so they sent a copy to the Premier. Let me continue with a quote:

Its support of the ward system and its disapproval of any change to the present system of voting . . .

Carried — carried by Saskatoon city council. The city of

Saskatoon appreciated the ward system. It was necessary because the 1982 ward boundaries had become outdated due to growth of the city — the largest, most beautiful city in the province of Saskatchewan — so that on February 15 '88, the city of Saskatoon came down with new ward boundaries, at great expense to themselves, the taxpayers of the city of Saskatoon.

But the Premier of Saskatchewan ignored them. He was insensitive to the people of Saskatoon and the government of the city of Saskatoon. So the city of Saskatoon appealed to the Premier again, and they put a rush, urgent on it, Mr. Speaker, you see, in glowing day glow — rush, urgent. This is a letter to the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. blank over there, and the leader of the Liberal Party, who I believe has disappeared. And it says:

(2015)

Gentlemen: 1988 Municipal Election — Ward System/At Large

The Council of the City of Saskatoon at its meeting held on June 20, 1988, resolved that an urgent letter be sent to the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Minister of Urban Affairs, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party, and all M.L.A.'s representing the City of Saskatoon concerning the proposed amendments to the legislation dealing with the above matter.

City Council wishes to reconfirm its support of the present ward system. In addition, the Council of The City of Saskatoon is of the opinion that the people should at least have a local option for the ward system as it presently exists. In the event that the currently proposed legislation proceeds, this Council recommends that it not come into force for the 1988 municipal election year.

It is respectfully requested that the views of the City of Saskatoon be considered when the proposed legislation is reviewed.

Well, the city of Saskatoon might have saved their breath, because the sole Tory member from Saskatoon was unable to carry that message to Regina, to the Premier who was insensitive to the issue. The sole Tory in the city of Saskatoon couldn't carry that one simple, explicit message to the Premier of this province. Leave the ward system alone. He was unable to do that. He failed, he failed again.

This was just before the final debate, Mr. Speaker, on the ward system in this Chamber which occurred in the wee hours of the morning. And it's reported in the *Star-Phoenix*, June 30, 1988, and it refers to the debate at 1 a.m. in the morning when one of the members who had the forethought to ask for public participation in whether the public wanted to have the ward system kept in place or would rather go to some other system. And the calls flowed into this Chamber from people all over Saskatchewan at 1:30 in the morning, saying to the Premier, please leave the ward system in place. And they had some unpleasant things to say about the Minister of Urban Affairs which I can't repeat in the House, Mr.

Speaker, because of the rules about unparliamentary comments prevent me from doing that.

Let's take another poll with regard to this, Mr. Speaker. This poll occurred in October 1988. You will recall that STV in Saskatoon runs a television poll. They put a question on the television screen and everyone who phones in to answer yes or no to the question pays 50 cents to SaskTel — which is an interesting money-making scheme, and I compliment SaskTel for coming up with it. The question was this: "Are there too many aldermanic candidates for voters to make an informed decision?" The yeses, Mr. Minister, are 91 per cent; the noes, 9 per cent. I guess that was the Tories — 9 per cent. Ninety-one per cent said that the ballot had too many aldermanic candidates for the voters to make an informed choice.

Well I know the minister wouldn't believe that this was a long ballot, so I obtained a copy of the ballot. This ballot, Mr. Minister, goes from A to Z. Mr. Minister, are you with me? From A to Z.

An Hon. Member: — Point of order.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. What's the hon. member's point of order?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I will have something to say in this debate at an appropriate time, but I would like to point out that I understand the rules of this . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. The hon. member has the right to make his point of order.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, I understand that the rules of the Assembly are such that producing items of exhibition are not allowable during a debate.

The Speaker: — Point of order. The point of order is . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Point of order. I would like to speak on the point of order before he rules. What I have before me, Mr. Speaker, I'm dealing strictly with the point of order, is an official document of the city of Saskatoon, which I intend to quote from extensively. I cannot quote from this.

An Hon. Member: — Well table it.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, you bet I'm going to table this because I want it on the record of province of Saskatchewan.

I am going to quote from this document extensively. I cannot quote from this document unless I have it before me, Mr. Speaker. I am aware of the rules about quotations, and I am aware of the rules about exhibits — I have them before me; rule 328 and rule 333.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I've listened to the point of order and I've listened to the hon. member from Saskatoon Westmount and heard his views. It's true, they're both, both the hon. members are, in fact, correct. I don't dispute either one; however, the ruling is that you can't use anything as an

exhibit — it might be a poster or anything else that you might have to quote from — but you can't use it in such a way that it can be construed as an exhibit, and I think everybody understands that.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I shall conform with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I shall not use this as an exhibit. I shall refer to it extensively because I intend to.

Now this ballot, this ballot, Mr. Speaker, as I say, goes from A to Z. It covers a multitude of sins of this government; this government who said to the people of Saskatchewan, you can't have the ward system; we'll tell you what kind of a system you can have to elect your alderpeople in the city of Saskatoon. They told every city that.

This ballot is twenty-six and a quarter inches long. The first comment on the ballot which I . . . The first comment that I want to make . . . It says on the top of this, Mr. Speaker, "For the office of alderman place an X in the circle to the right of the name. You're entitled to vote for 10 candidates for this office." And it starts . . . I said it goes from A to Z. The first name is Aalbers, and the last name is Zunti, Z-u-n-t-i.

And there's some interesting names in between those two, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker. There's one Gay Caswell in here. Now this would . . . She's widely known in this province. As a matter of fact, I understand she's in the city of Regina right now with a big convention following.

There's a number of other ones here which . . . Let's see. Where, where is it? Oh yes, here's Mr. Penner, an appointment of the Premier of this province, running for political office here in a non-political council, mind you.

An Hon. Member: — Did he win?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh yes, he won. Yes, I have no objections to that, mind you. Everybody has a right to run, as does Mr. Mostoway.

An Hon. Member: — How do you find them on the ballot?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well he's there somewhere. But the interesting thing about this ballot, Mr. Speaker, is this. Before this government, this insensitive Premier, took away the ward system, the city of Saskatoon ballot was one column wide. This ballot is two columns wide. It's twenty-six and a quarter inches long. If it was one column long it would be fifty-two and a half inches long, which is precisely two and half inches taller than the minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — And I want to table this document so the entire province . . . this is the official ballot, I want the entire legislature to have a look at that ballot, put it on the clerk's table.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — On a point of order.

An Hon. Member: — Stand up, Jack.

The Speaker: — Order.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, they can't see me perhaps because of my physical stature, but if they want to try to out-yell me, I'm ready to do that any day in the week. My point of order is this . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Klein: — My point of order is this, Mr. Speaker. The member says that that is an official document from the city of Saskatoon. I don't know if it's an official document or a copy thereof, and if it's a copy thereof, I don't believe it's an official document. I'd like you to check it.

The Speaker: — If the member for Saskatoon Westmount is speaking to the point of order then he is recognized, otherwise . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, absolutely. There is no point of order so I have nothing to speak to. Do I continue, Mr. Speaker? Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, the way that the Minister of Urban Affairs, this puppet of the Premier, stood up and started to speak, I thought he was objecting to the comment I made about the ballot being two and a half inches taller than he was. I take that back; it's a personal remark and I don't want to make that kind of remark about the minister. It's about . . . I really should have said that it's two and a half inches taller than the minister's ego. That's what I should have said.

Now, has this government, has this insensitive Premier cost the city of Saskatoon extra money, and every other city that is involved, because of their shenanigans with the ward system? You bet they have; you bet they have, Mr. Speaker. It wouldn't be . . . it's bad enough that this government spends \$32 million on advertising to Dome, the company Dome, a good friend of this government, but they insist on wasting the city of Saskatoon's money too, in the ward system — taking away the ward system and giving us that long ballot. Because here's what it says, "Election cost hike due to new format." This is an article that appeared the *Star-Phoenix* on October 18, '88.

The cost of the 1988 municipal election will be almost \$470,000. At least \$50,000 of that total is a direct result of having gone to the at-large system of electing city council. The city council should send the bill to the Premier of Saskatchewan because he is the one that forced them to increase the cost.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The day after the election, Mr. Speaker, the people were still alive and kicking in Saskatoon, and an editorial appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* — I know the minister appreciates these editorials from the *Star-Phoenix* because I give him the date and he goes

back and reads them and then they send the heavies up to the *Star-Phoenix* and they try to bludgeon them into writing more favourable editorials. The member for Regina South doesn't know that I know that. But I got a report from the *Star-Phoenix* that a couple of years ago some heavies came up from the government and went into the *Star-Phoenix* and laid the law down about being a little more fair, get my message, nudge, nudge, wink, wink.

An Hon. Member: — No more advertising.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes. That didn't work with the *Star-Phoenix*, and I thank the *Star-Phoenix* for that.

So last year they sent their heavyweights directly to Toronto to see the Siftons — they sent their heavyweights right to Toronto to see the Siftons, who own the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post*. Now I thank God, and whoever else may be responsible for this, that the *Star-Phoenix* and the *Leader-Post* don't always buckle under to this type of government, this type of government.

An editorial in the *Star-Phoenix* reads as follows, October 27, '88:

Wednesday's civic election was a shameful example of how muddle-headed politicking can interfere with the democratic process. (That's you they're talking about, Mr. Premier, that's you — muddle-headed politics.) In the wake of the frustrating experience by voters and the unfairness imposed upon public-spirited candidates, Urban Affairs minister, Jack (blank), the cabinet minister most responsible for abolishing the ward system should offer his heartfelt apologies and his resignation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Resign, resign, resign.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Don't you pay a bit of attention to them, Jack. You just stay right in; you hang right in there, because you're one of the best things I've got going for me in Saskatoon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — You just stay right there. Keep making those speeches like you made last night to the Regina Home Builders'. What a show. That's another story, Mr. Speaker. I won't get into that because I've got more to say about the ward system and this puppet who has his string pulled by the Premier of this province and says to the people of Saskatoon, you have no business deciding how you're going to elect your aldermen.

(2030)

The city of Regina is a bit concerned about this. Now these people across the way are now attempting to categorize the city of Regina as an NDP government in Regina city. It's a campaign which will have innuendo, but it'll be interesting to watch how they divide the opinion that exists in Saskatoon about the ward system

and in Regina about the ward system. Because Saskatoon is totally opposed to you taking it away; so is Regina. As a matter of fact, in conjunction with the ballot in Regina in October for the civic elections, they ran a ballot on the ward system. I know the Minister of Urban Affairs didn't like them running it, because he knew in advance what the results . . . his polling had told him what the results would be; so would the Premier, but they're ramrodding this through; they didn't care about that.

The results of that poll are as follows: the question being, are you in favour of the city of Regina being divided into 10 wards? Yes, 47,657; no, 16,677 — 75 per cent said yes and 25 per cent, approximately, said no — overwhelmingly in favour of the ward system.

An Hon. Member: — But Jack knows best.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, that's right. Now the cities of Regina and Saskatoon are not about to be one-upped by the Premier if they can avoid it. Now they'll have their ways of dealing with you in due course. But both those cities now have adopted an informal ward system, and I have the informal ward boundaries right before me here in a newspaper article, Mr. Speaker. And I see in the *Star-Phoenix* on November 29, '88, and it sets aside which alderman will represent what ward.

The *Star-Phoenix* had another interesting editorial, Mr. Minister, and the date of this editorial is November 15, '88. And it says, "Good decision", that's the heading. And one of the paragraphs, the mid paragraph says,

Regrettably council can't on its own restore wards in the electoral sense, but at least the partial system it is planning will better accommodate residents between elections, and it will be out of the reach of municipal affairs Minister Jack (blank).

So they . . .

The Speaker: — Excuse me. I'll have to ask the member speaking, I had a little difficulty in hearing. Was he using the Urban Affairs Minister's name or somebody else's?

An Hon. Member: — No, Jack blank.

The Speaker: — Okay, okay. Fine. Okay, fine.

Mr. Brockelbank: — A fictitious name, Mr. Speaker, fictitious.

The . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh I've heard from the old Liberal member from Swift Current who's now a Tory. I imagine she'll be swinging back when the Liberals get a new leader. She'll be swinging with the Liberals again. Okay.

Now what does the city of Saskatoon do? We have the city of Saskatoon, a new council, brand-new council elected. Are they with the Premier and the minister on the ward system?

Well they sent another letter to the Minister of Urban Affairs, the fellow whose string is pulled by the Premier of

this province, and it was from the city council. It reported to the minister a motion that the city of council had passed, and they had passed this motion, resolution of council, November 14, '88 asking this — this is after the election, Mr. Minister, new council, brand-new council, masters in their own house, at least up to the informal boundaries that they've established, up to that extent anyway — November 14, '88 asking the government to amend legislation to permit cities over 30,000 in population to utilize either a full ward or at-large system of election.

Get the letter that the minister sent back. On December 9, the Minister of Urban Affairs sent this letter back to them, and I'll read you two of the paragraphs. If anybody wants to see it, the minister, I'm sure, will give them a copy. He's probably got it in his office. I'd be glad to let them see mine. One of the paragraphs said:

Prior to the October 1988 civic election, Saskatoon city council chose to utilize an at-large system rather than a mixed ward, at-large option.

Now that's like the fellow that was on the pirate ship and he had to walk the plank. And the guy was pushing him out on the plank with the end of his sword. And he had a choice: he could jump in with the sharks, or he could take the steel. What kind of sarcasm is this from the Minister of Urban Affairs? He said, you had a choice; you had a choice. It was either cold steel or the sharks. That's the choice the Premier of the province had given them. And then the ultimate sarcasm is in the final paragraph, when the Minister of Urban Affairs signs off. He signs off:

I appreciate your raising your council's view on this matter with me. Sincerely . . .

I appreciate. Like heck he appreciated it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — He didn't give a damn about the view of Saskatoon city council on this issue — never has and never will. You stay right in there, Jack. You're right where I want you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, this is not an exhibit. This is the resolutions of the 84th annual convention of SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association).

I see the Minister of Health is here, Mr. Speaker. He's a bit frustrated. He's a bit frustrated because he couldn't get up in the question period today and get the Premier off the hook when the Leader of the Opposition had him reeling on the ropes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — He's a bit frustrated, but you just sit there, Minister of Health. I'm sorry you missed the part I said about your department, but somebody else will get to you later on.

We have the SUMA convention which occurred January 29, '89 to February 1, '89, after all the urban municipalities in Saskatchewan had selected their new councils — their new councils. This is the new voice of urban municipalities in Saskatchewan, and this is the resolution:

Therefore be it resolved: that SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) requests the provincial government to enact legislation granting the respective city council the discretion to establish an election process based upon an at-large representation or a single member ward representation.

Carried. Carried without any opposition, Mr. Minister.

And I know you were there at the SUMA convention. Yes, you were there spreading the message about diversification and privatization. And Jack Sandberg was there. Jack Sandberg was there at the SPC booth, lurking about at the SPC booth.

An Hon. Member: — Paul Schoenhals.

Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I didn't see Paul; I didn't see Paul, but I saw Ralph Katzman lurking around the Highways booth there at the SUMA convention.

An Hon. Member: — George Hill.

Mr. Brockelbank: — No, I didn't see George Hill; no, didn't see him.

And I saw the booth of the minister of privatization there. Yes, he had a list, would you believe it? The minister of privatization had a list there of all the things he'd privatize in Saskatchewan. But you know the one he forgot to put in the list? Sask Minerals. He forgot to put Sask Minerals in the privatization list. I wonder why? I thought and thought about this and I said, there's got to be a reason; maybe I can figure it out. And I did a little research, and you know what happened? This minister of privatization couldn't put Sask Minerals in the list of . . . well he doesn't call them privatized, he calls them . . . what's that other . . . public participation. He couldn't put it in the public participation list because it wasn't.

What he did is he divided Sask Minerals up into two parts. He sold one part, the peat moss operation, to an entrepreneur in Quebec; he sold the sodium sulphate part to another entrepreneur in Ontario. So it becomes very difficult to see how Saskatchewan people were involved. How were they involved? It was sold, and control has gone to outside the province of Saskatchewan. It's almost as bad as selling out to the Chinese, you know, and I understand some people are trying to do that.

An Hon. Member: — Did they have WESTBRIDGE there, John? Did they have WESTBRIDGE or not?

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh, I don't know. I'll have to get my list out and do more research on that.

An Hon. Member: — SUMA allowed all of this.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Well I am sure that there were arrangements made. The ward system is still hot in Saskatoon; the *Star-Phoenix* says so. It says on February 4 — this is right after the SUMA convention was over, right after, and it says:

Few issues have so united urban dwellers as their condemnation of last year's wrong-headed government decision to abolish the ward system.

And it's no wonder; it's no wonder. Saskatoon voters, for example, won't soon forget the ridiculous civic election ballot they were forced to deal with, with about 70 candidates for the 10 councillor jobs up for grabs.

An Hon. Member: — With a ballot taller than the minister.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Yes, the ballot two and a half inches taller than the minister. Nor will they forget the arrogance. Maybe that ballot is a measure of the arrogance of the minister — that's what it is. That takes it out of the . . .

Nor will they forget (the editorial goes on, Mr. Speaker, in a serious vein) the arrogance of the municipal affairs minister (well they mean Urban Affairs minister), Jack (blank), in insisting that he knew better than they what they wanted in a system of electing councils and being represented for the next three years.

Listen to this paragraph — and I should acquaint the Premier and the Minister of Urban Affairs with some of their philosophy which they had when they were in opposition, but which now they have discarded. It's in this paragraph here, Mr. Minister:

This provincial government move was diametrically opposed to the (blank) government's strong election campaign commitment to local autonomy and respect for local preference.

Well it certainly was in spades, in spades, Mr. Speaker.

I am concerned about the priorities of this government which, in part, demonstrate themselves — or their lack of demonstration in part, too — in this throne speech which we have before us.

What is this government saying? It's sending mixed messages to the people of Saskatchewan. An article appeared in the *Star-Phoenix* on March 11, and the headline is: "Saskatchewan owes welfare recipients millions," and it goes on to say:

. . . the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal in June, the Department of Social Services discriminated . . . (and it goes on and) . . . estimated there are 9000 to 1200 people who were discriminated against by this government. (This is the court saying it — the court saying it.) . . . A board of inquiry is now trying to decide if the ruling applies to the individuals . . . (On the same day — the same day — in the *Star-Phoenix*, March 11, '89) . . . government

funds keep horse-racing on track. The provincial government will subsidize horse-racing in Saskatchewan to the tune of a half a million dollars a year.

Now that sends mixed messages; that sends confusing messages to the public of Saskatchewan, when the government on the one hand is spending pails full of money on advertising, won't pay its just bills that are before it, and is handing out money to other organizations. We wonder where their priorities are. Where are their priorities? This government is insensitive, arrogant, and contemptuous of the people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The statistics that I have to look at before I vote for this particular throne speech are dramatic and troublesome — dramatic and troublesome. I look at the labour statistics. The labour force in February has dropped 6,000 compared to February '88. From one year, February '88 to February '89, the labour force size has dropped 6,000. The number of persons employed . . . These are people that you call taxpayers; that's where you get the money from to waste, which you've been wasting. The number of persons employed in 1988 compared to 1989 has dropped 12,000 — the number of persons employed has dropped 12,000. The population, as we all know yesterday, has dropped 6,260 in the month of February alone, with an aggregate total to date in this year of 8,000.

(2045)

That's where the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster thought there was a population influx in his constituency. They were on their way to Edmonton; they were just passing through. He's going to get a light switch on the border there so that somebody can turn that out when they go.

Bankruptcies, bankruptcies in Saskatchewan — just go back to '85. In '85 there were 762; in '86 there were 915; in '87 there were 914; in '88 there are 1,236. Housing starts — the Minister of Urban Affairs, I'm certain, will be interested in this. Housing starts, 1986 there were 5,510; 1987, 4,895; 1988 . . .

An Hon. Member: — What year was that?

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . 3,902, 3,902. We've got a hearing aid program for you, sir.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The deficit. When I am considering . . . When I and my constituents are considering whether they should continue to support this government, they have to take into consideration how have they managed the financial affairs of this province. Well I ask the people of Saskatchewan: would you trust a government who immediately before the election tells you that it's going to have a deficit of \$389 million, and immediately after the election you find out that it's not \$389 million but \$1.2 billion? Would you vote for that government? Not a chance.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order! Order. Order! I'd ask the member from the Battlefords to be quiet while the Speaker is on his feet, and I'd also ask . . . Order! I'd ask the member for Regina North East to apologize to the House for unparliamentary language from his seat.

An Hon. Member: — What did he say?

The Deputy Speaker: — He said, that's a lie. I'd ask . . . We have ruled on this before. Order, order, order, order. Order. The member from Regina North East . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It doesn't matter whether it's on the record or not. I'm not arguing with the member from Regina North West. It's unparliamentary language, whether you're speaking from your feet or sitting in your seat. I would ask the member from Regina North East to apologize.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I respect the rules of this House. I will apologize for saying that the Minister of Finance lied in 1986.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order. I just made a ruling. The member from Quill Lakes seems to want to challenge it, so I'd ask him to apologize.

Mr. Koskie: — I have no problem in apologizing for calling the Minister of Finance a liar.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order, order, order. The member from Regina North East has just got up and apologized to the House and sits down and says the same thing over again. I think . . . Order. I just ask the member for Regina North East to apologize again to the House.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologize for saying that the Minister of Finance lied. I will also apologize for saying very clearly that the Premier lied.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — The point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker of the House ruled this afternoon that when there was an apology that they could not rephrase exactly what the thing was that they said, but they had to withdraw the remark without any further innuendos. And I would ask you to rule according to the way the Speaker ruled this afternoon.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. The member's point of order is well taken. The debate continues.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Order. I can't hear the member from Westmount.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was on my feet calling point of order. You didn't recognize me. You were — and I want to say that you're admonishing the ministers here — the Deputy Premier was standing there

yelling at me. You did nothing; you did nothing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — As to the question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to the question of whether a fact is a fact or a lie, just examine the facts. And I say to the people of Saskatchewan, a Premier and a Finance minister who say to you before the election, immediately before the election — you get out of that seat because that's a hot seat right there, it's going to be this session, a very hot seat — who say to the people of Saskatchewan before the '86 election, the deficit's going to be \$389 million.

An Hon. Member: — How much?

Mr. Brockelbank: — \$389 million. Immediately after the election, the audited statement with the Minister of Finance's signature on it comes out and says it's not \$389 million, it's \$1.2 billion deficit. Now I leave that, Mr. Speaker, to the good people of Saskatchewan to decide whether that's a truth or a mistruth.

If that's a stranger to the truth, if the Minister of Finance is a stranger to the truth, then I suppose what we said here this afternoon on — or this evening — on debating points of order has some validity. And I believe the Minister of Finance to be a stranger to the truth.

In conclusion of my speech, because I don't want to take any more of the valuable time of this House — I respect this House too much to waste the time of the House — but I want to say with unequivocal voice that I support completely the amendment which has been put forward. The amendment which is to be attached to the motion which is before the House in support of the throne speech says as follows:

but regrets that the provincial government has failed to provide business and job opportunities and security for Saskatchewan people, has failed to protect and improve critical public services like health care and education, has mismanaged the province's finances, has betrayed Saskatchewan's farm families, has failed in its responsibility to protect our environment, and has misplaced its priorities by putting privatization for the few ahead of the public interest for all resulting in the out-migration of thousands of Saskatchewan families.

That is the truth. I support that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and will not vote for this throne speech.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I was originally looking forward to entering this throne debate, but to my constituents of Regina South I stand here ashamed of the absolutely outstanding situation that occurred tonight. I find it hard to believe that the new Leader of the Opposition would allow anything as disgraceful to start in this House as we saw it tonight. And he has the gall to sit there and laugh and thinks that it's humorous.

The member from Saskatoon Westmount proved to me tonight that the biggest joke in this Assembly is him. And what a sad situation for the people of Saskatoon, to have a member of the Legislative Assembly with the background that that man came from, serving in the very chair that he had absolutely no respect for with his colleagues tonight. It was a total disgrace, and to my people in Regina South, I apologize.

You know, in public recently, the new Leader of the Opposition indicated that he had some trouble with unity in his caucus. It was on full display tonight. And not only does he lack unity in his caucus, in my opinion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he lacks total respect from his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege for me to join with my colleagues and the members on the other side of this House to participate in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. And I would like to begin by offering my congratulations on behalf of my constituents of Regina South to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor — if the opposition would show enough respect to listen to that — on the occasion of her, of course, first presentation of the throne speech to this Assembly. It was a presentation in the finest traditions of this Chamber. And I'm sure as she witnesses this debate, and particularly tonight, I'm sure that she must wonder at the activities and the absolutely disgraceful attitude that the NDP had for this Assembly and for her speech tonight.

But I, on behalf of my constituents in Regina South, would want to personally convey my congratulations to Her Honour for a job very well done. I know that my constituents in Regina South are proud to have such a gracious and talented representative of Her Majesty the Queen in our Lieutenant Governor.

Also making his maiden speech to this Legislative Assembly, and doing it with great distinction, was the new member for the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

An Hon. Member: — Oh yes, there was a high-minded speech if I ever heard one.

(2100)

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Yes, I might say that it was the finest address ever given in this Assembly by any member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. And certainly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was the only speech that we heard in this Assembly from a member of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that made any sense. It was, of course, the first time in the history of this province that a PC MLA for the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has spoken to this Assembly.

I want to extend a very warm welcome to the new member of this Assembly, and want to commend the constituents of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg for having the foresight, courage to elect him to this Assembly in the face of all the fear mongering and under threat, as the member from Regina Elphinstone points out, and I'm glad that he pointed it out.

The member from Saskatoon Westmount, a little bit

earlier, talked about a ballot. Would we talk about the ballots — the fake, dud ballots put into the senior homes in that very by-election by the NDP; the same one that the investigation is going on right now by the chief electoral officer in being dealt with? Let's find out how you . . . You mentioned the word, not me, about the threat of trying to suppress and fool the seniors of that seat.

Tonight is no surprise to me, but I'm sure that it's a surprise to the people. But imagine . . . that and fear mongering being distributed by the opposition party in that by-election last year — all sorts of distortions. Imagine the Leader of the Opposition of the party in the province of Saskatchewan putting his name on a letter stating the government was going to close down all hospitals in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg constituency. Shame on you.

And know he ridicules this Assembly again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when from his chair he says, with a smug grin on his face, shame, he made me do it. No wonder you have no respect from your caucus. You don't deserve any. Not only is the government not closing any hospitals in the constituency, but it is already planning a new, integrated health-care facility in the town of Lafleche.

And the opposition leader still hasn't had the decency to apologize to the people of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg for that distasteful act. And it has to reflect on the manner in which he conducts himself as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Have you ever thought about that title, sir, the one that we discussed earlier in the day about what you have a profit for?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Regina South were pleased to note that the top priority was given to health care in the throne speech. Health care will continue to receive the prime attention of our government, and I'm sure that this will be further evident for all to see, including the NDP opposition, when my colleague, the Minister of Finance, presents his provincial budget later this month.

This province has become a world leader in health care, and time and time again our Premier has given his word that health care will always be our number one priority. And indeed we have backed up his word since coming into office by devoting more funding to health care than at any time in the history of this province.

And in the face of these record expenditures for health care, Mr. Deputy Speaker, far greater expenditures than ever made in history by the NDP, all the NDP can do is peddle their old refrain about cut-backs and old rhetoric with their heads buried in the sand. But they had better try to come up with a new refrain, and more importantly, if they are serious about serving the people of this province, they better come up with some new, meaningful ideas, and certainly some honest, responsible criticism, rather than accusations made by members of your bench, sir, that prove to be extremely inaccurate time after time after time. You should be ashamed of dragging through this Assembly names of innocent people, without doing the research and being sure if indeed those complaints are

legitimate. They will be dealt with in due course. But time after time . . .

An Hon. Member: — What complaints?

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Check *Hansard* and you can see. The people are not stupid. You think they are. I happen to have respect for them. They see time after time you bringing in accusations without substance, and again it will be dealt with.

Like the article I saw the other day in the *Leader-Post*, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking about the national NDP for a moment. The article said, sure they would have a new leader, but he would be stuck with the same old, outdated policies, just like the Saskatchewan NDP.

And, Mr. Speaker, this government is not resting on its laurels in health care, but rather we are moving forward to strengthen our health care system for the next decade and indeed into the 21st century. As you know, the Commission on Directions in Health Care, appointed less than a year ago by our Premier, is now winding up its public hearings in Regina. And you know what a tremendous amount of interest that commission has created among organizations and groups, health care professionals and citizens, generally, in the hearings of that commission; so much so that the commission has had to extend their hearings for several extra days in Regina. In fact, everybody has shown tremendous interest in the work of the commission except the NDP. You would think that perhaps the health critic of the NDP might be concerned, but obviously she, as well, has none. As usual, they're out of step again, as always, with the people of this province.

Our government expects to receive the report from the commission later this year, and I'm sure that that report will help set the foundation for the changes that are required to meet Saskatchewan's future health care needs.

Earlier tonight, now that I've had time to just give it a little pause and reflection, when the member from Saskatoon Westmount was speaking, he, as quite often the members of the NDP do in referring to the Future Corporation as a big birthday party, I can't help but recall the same old tired argument and how I tell my people of Regina South that it's the same old rhetoric, nothing new, that they brought up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we were involved with Expo. It was the same story, the same sad rhetoric. No pride by the NDP in this great, wonderful province of Saskatchewan. No pride in Saskatchewan, and the NDP government of the day in Manitoba as well, no pride in their province. They didn't attend at Expo.

The NDP in Saskatchewan ridiculed our attendance at Expo, and now when we have a similar situation in the Future Corporation directed at taking our province into the next century, directed at putting our province on the map of this new global village that has been created because of all the new technical jobs and all the new business specialties and high-tech industries that are forming, and when we want to participate in a big game with the big world, the NDP say no, we're having a party.

What . . . How you lose it, I don't have the foggiest idea.

The member from Saskatoon Westmount pulled out a magazine that he referred to, the *Business Review*, and he called it a chamber of commerce publication. Well I don't believe that it is a chamber of commerce publication.

But interestingly enough, and even if it were, that's not the basis of my argument, the new Leader of the Opposition, the new NDP leader is starting to try to become the champion of small business all of a sudden. And I don't have the foggiest idea either, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who would champion his cause in the small-business community.

Here the member from Saskatoon Westmount stood in his place and condemned — if indeed it were a chamber of commerce publication — condemned the use of government advertising in that publication. Does that indicate to you how the NDP are in favour of small business? Does that indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how the Leader of the Opposition can go out and make these claims that he is the new champion for small business? I doubt that very much.

And as this Assembly unfolds, and as this new session of the legislature opens, the real NDP attitude and philosophy, the real mark of the Leader of the Opposition will be left distastefully, not only in the mouths of the small-business community, but throughout the people of this province as they watch in near horror and see how they behave themselves in this magnificent place.

And I suppose that one other question that I ask and give them an opportunity year after year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is if the members, any members of the Opposition would claim to have a membership in the chamber of commerce. I doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that again we would find that there is not one single, solitary member of the new representatives of the small-business community that hold a membership in their local chamber of commerce.

We again see in very vivid terms how they continued to live in the past with the rhetoric displayed by the member from Saskatoon Westmount. When he brings up an old debate, all he could talk about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in regard to the throne speech, was something that was not even in it, an old piece of history — the ward system. If that is the best talent that that member has, is to go back into the annals of history and pull something out, it's really unfortunate that that would be the best that they could put up to stand and speak.

The ward system is in the past. The NDP lives in the past and yet, if he would even complete all of his accusations — they take, Mr. Deputy Speaker, text from context and switch figures around, and the member referred to the various votes that were taken in Regina and Saskatoon, but not once did you have the honesty, the courage, the decency to point out the votes where Saskatoon indeed voted twice to retain the at-large system before the NDP government of the day imposed it.

Do you believe that the people of this province are

stupid? You obviously do. The people of this province are aware of that fact, and don't think for a moment that even constituents of yours know that you didn't have the courage, the resolve, to tell the full story in this Assembly, and they're probably ashamed of you after they saw how you behaved tonight.

And not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm only going to dwell on it for a minute or two, not the 30 minutes that the member chose to speak on it because that is all in the past. And I should point out just for one little piece of information — and I won't call it your stupidity because that's not nice — but I think in your lack of research, did you know that it's your city council, the city of Saskatoon, that has the right to determine the size of the ballot.

They chose to use that particular ballot and go in that fashion. And this government had nothing to do with it. And if you would have checked it out, sir, you would have been able to determine that that's how it went. And again you display that; again you display that, and you know you're not supposed to do that in the House, but you're welcome to break the rules. You're welcome to again show that you have no respect for the Chair, the very Chair that you once sat in. Shame on you. And you don't know that it was the city of Saskatoon that controls the size of the ballot and how it's to be printed and how it's to be made up. Well, before you come on with your big, glorious speeches, why don't you check it out.

The member from Saskatoon during his remarks was interrupted several times by members of the legislature.

An Hon. Member: — How tall was that ballot?

An Hon. Member: — Two and a half inches taller than the fellow over there.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — And they made some unkind comments to our Minister of Finance. I should point out that again . . . Well I can take all the jokes that they want to make about my size, and I guess they think that it's funny. I suppose that if I were a handicapped person you would probably make jokes as well. Would you think that that's funny?

An Hon. Member: — Never said a thing about your . . . (inaudible) . . .

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Oh no. Oh you referred to the size of the ballot, don't tell me that, and my physical stature. So you know, I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of anything that they did.

But in regard to the budget projection, they failed to recognize also that a budget projection is simply a projection.

(2115)

The member from Saskatoon Westmount indicated that I had the opportunity to speak to our local home building industry last night, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I did, and as always I enjoyed it. I want to tell everybody how pleased we are with the very effective working relationship that our government has, not only with all members and all

sectors of the business community in our province, but certainly with all of the home builders, not only in Regina but in Saskatchewan.

We have a good open line of communication with business, between the business community and this government. And not only with them as associations in their respective business communities, but also with most of them as far as it relates to them individually, as well.

So as a result, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it makes it possible for us to always have frank and honest, sincere discussions with any sector of the business community.

Our government clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is solidly behind business — we always have been; we always will be. We are not promoted or driven or hidden by any fears such as the *Regina Manifesto*, created by, well, I guess the CCF of the day, but now adhered to by the NDP, and perhaps one day I will read that into the records when the opportunity arrives and let the small-business community determine for themselves. But we work hard to ensure that we give good, solid representation to the business community of our province because we know that it's business and industry that really creates the wealth in our society, that really creates the jobs.

And it's the private sector that create the opportunities, and that will provide the opportunities for this province to grow and prosper and thrive, so that my kids and my grand-kids will have a better place in which to live. And that's why we have, and value so much, every opportunity that we can dialogue with the business community.

And for instance, out of dialogue with the people such as home builders, have come programs which have helped to encourage and stimulate, in this case, their particular industry. And they have been great, popular, solid programs now with the general public of Saskatchewan. I refer, of course, to programs such as the mortgage protection plan, which protects home owners and everyone involved in the housing industry from the effects of rising interest rates.

That program, still in effect by this government, when in 1982 the NDP saw the interest rates go to 21, 22 per cent — said there wasn't anything they could do about it. There was no way that they could protect the people of this province. There was no way that they could protect the families of this province. There was a way, but they didn't care. They didn't care to exploit the ways that they could have protected the people from that kind of an interest rate — 21, 22 per cent — with people beginning to lose their homes, or giving up everything that they had in the form of extra dollars so that they could afford to make their ever-increasing payments.

But in 1982, we said no, there is a better way; we can do something about it. We can protect families, we can protect home owners, we can protect home builders. And the mortgage protection plan did just that. No new ideas at all from the NDP — zero, blank, dud.

And in 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of this province dealt with the NDP in the harshest fashion of

any display, I believe, in the history of this province when they threw all but eight out of office and said, enough! We need a government with fresh, new ideas; a government that does care about people; a government that is prepared to protect people, to do things for families, and our government since 1982 has been doing that.

The home improvement program, those in the subtrades last night and in the suppliers' businesses, they're well aware of the powerful impact that that program has had on their business operations — the home improvement program and the strong impact of that program to those involved in building subtrades, to suppliers, operators.

The members opposite don't really recognize, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the impact in rural Saskatchewan that that home program has had, and they don't care. They don't care about rural Saskatchewan. They don't care much about urban Saskatchewan, but they care less about rural. The impact in rural Saskatchewan that has kept small contractor after small contractor after small contractor alive and well and employing people in rural Saskatchewan where, particularly since last year's drought, there has been a severe impact on employment in the rural area.

And yes, unfortunately, for the first time our employment levels have increased a little bit, the effects of the drought, Mr. Speaker, nobody hauling grain, no trucking, nothing like that. But the home program for three years, almost three years, has kept employment levels in Saskatchewan number two in the country almost continually.

No single program ever introduced in Saskatchewan has had the impact and the public appeal, and at the same time generated as much economic wealth and activity as the home improvement program. And I'm pleased to tell you tonight that more than one billion dollars in home improvement activity has been generated since the introduction of that popular program in September of 1986 — one billion dollars.

An Hon. Member: — Tell us about the fictitious figure of the number of jobs . . .

Hon. Mr. Klein: — And the member from Regina North West again chastises from his seat across the room, and he's asked about the jobs that it's created, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'll get there. To the end of January, let him respond to the 282,000 individual applications for matching grants that have been processed — part of that 282,000 by the members opposite.

And we're finding that the matching grant of \$1,500 has stimulated home owners to the extent that many have exceeded, by far, the \$3,000 required in total costs on their individual projects. As a result, over \$600 million in home improvements have been generated by the matching grants, and another \$400 million in home improvements have resulted from the 59,000 individual loans at 6 per cent — another 6 per cent. I hope the members of the NDP are paying attention to that — 6 per cent on the \$10,000 loan made by lending institutions under that program.

Our research surveys show that these tremendous

expenditures on home improvements have resulted in 22,000 jobs for the people of our province, and the home program has been a tremendous stimulant for the home improvement industry. My people in Regina South would be interested in knowing that here in Regina alone the home program has generated \$192 million in home improvements, and our figures show that a total of 73,000 people in our city have taken advantage of the program.

So I hope that the members opposite, particularly the members from Regina, if and when they ever contact their constituents, talk to them about that successful program, because with the 73,000 people in Regina taking advantage of that program, obviously that is the majority of adults living in our city, and certainly they would be well advised to talk to them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight briefly, in these remarks in my debate to the Speech to the Throne, some of my responsibilities and programs from my cabinet portfolio, but rather than deal with items of the past, I look to the future, and I will contain my remarks in that regard and direct them into the future.

Mr. Speaker, this past October, as was pointed out recently, municipal elections were held in cities, towns and villages throughout the province, and I'm pleased to note that it was also one of the heaviest voter turn-outs in recent years, particularly in the cities. And I would suspect that the at-large system, to a large degree, was responsible for the big voter turn-out. These elections also were notable for the record number of candidates running for council, and we saw a display earlier in this Assembly as to the number that ran in Saskatoon. And I suppose that the NDP doesn't like to see that many run. I suppose they think that in a democracy, that if there are 10 seats there should be 10 candidates. Well I was pleased to see the high number of candidates that ran in Saskatoon. It tells me that the people of Saskatoon are indeed interested in their city and how to operate it.

But I did note that there was indeed a wide variation of the costs of the campaigns mounted by many of the candidates, or at least what appeared to be a wide variation of the costs. In fact, at its recent annual convention, the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association — which I have a lot of time and respect and energy for and meet with regularly, not unlike the members — they passed a resolution requesting that the government bring in legislation establishing election expenditure guide-lines at municipal elections, limitations on campaign contributions and the disclosure of sources of funding by all candidates for municipal elected office.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that limitations on campaign contributions and expenditures enhance the democratic election process by making municipal office more accessible to representatives from all areas of the community and by limiting the influence of individual campaign contributors. A requirement for the disclosure of the source of candidate's funding will increase, in my mind, the accountability of candidates for municipal office to the public.

My Department of Urban Affairs is currently reviewing

similar legislation in other jurisdictions. That way we can ensure that any legislation that we will bring in will be fair, it will be equitable, and it will be up to date.

We will, as always of course, continue to consult with SUMA on the details that will affect their elections. We will get their feedback on any of the proposed legislation. And I hope that we can introduce these amendments to The Local Government Election Act in time for the next municipal elections to take place in the fall of 1991.

And again tonight, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we witnessed for another time the uncontrollable antics of the opposition and the lack of disrespect, not only for this Assembly but for the people of the province, when again they contradict the legislation, the very important legislation, on control of dangerous dogs.

And they're laughing again now from their seat. They're laughing again, Mr. Deputy Speaker. For some reason or other they believe that the issue of dangerous dogs, they believe that the issue of dangerous dogs is a joke.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the issue of controlling dangerous dogs is one of increasing concern in our society, and the members of the NDP should heed that because that concern is widespread, not only across this nation but across this continent, throughout North America. And the NDP in Saskatchewan sit and laugh about it. And I guess because a great part of North America is indeed made up by Americans, they laugh at it because of their total disrespect for the people of the United States of America. And there they go again, jiding and joking about this.

Last year we heard from many groups and individuals who asked that we take action to control the public. Many members will recall that in the last session we responded to their pleas for action. And at that time, a year ago, the Leader of the Opposition thought that this piece of legislation was a big joke.

(2130)

And he referred to mad dogs, and people as mad dogs, us as mad dogs. What an unfortunate position for a man that is supposed to have a highly respected position in this democracy of ours, to not be able to control his passion; to not be able to separate sincere, good, honest humour from sincere attempts for quality of life for people, not only of urban centres but of rural centres.

And now the member from Saskatoon Westmount, he laughs at the legislation. Mr. Speaker, I just find it hard to believe that if members of their families, any member, or their relatives or friends were attacked by a dangerous dog running loose in their constituency — indeed, never mind if it was their relatives or if it was their friends but indeed one of their constituents, and he or she was attacked by a dangerous dog, I would challenge you, I would challenge you to go up and laugh and giggle at that family as they suffer with their child or their mother or their sister or whoever, after a vicious, dangerous dog attack. And you have the nerve to laugh at that piece of legislation.

To this day the NDP still haven't had the decency to

apologize to the people of this province who have . . . and they're laughing again. They won't even listen — that the apology should go to the people of this province who have been attacked by dogs who do appreciate this legislation, who indeed when you laugh at that legislation, you indeed laugh as the member from Regina North West is doing right now, at some poor, innocent child in this province that was maliciously attacked by a dog, that suffers some big scar to this day.

Mr. Solomon: — Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. The member from Albert south, Regina South, is accusing me of laughing at the legislation that his department has put forward. I am not laughing at that; I am laughing at the member. He's such a humorous person.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I find your point of order not well taken, a dispute between two members. The debate continues.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's all of a sudden, it's all of a sudden strange that for the very first time, for the very first time we see a member of the NDP stand up and try to squirm his way out of this one.

Now we've talked . . . And there they go laughing again . . . There they go laughing again. We know what you think of that legislation. We know that you think it's funny.

One day I will bring to you a child that suffers the scar of a vicious dog attack, and let me see you laugh in their face. To this day, you don't have the decency to apologize to the poor, unfortunate people that have had to suffer and endure that.

Well at any rate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we responded to requests for action. We didn't laugh at it when the people came up and said, we want this dangerous dog legislation. We didn't laugh when the municipality said, we need more help. We didn't laugh when the city of Saskatoon said, please help us strengthen our by-laws.

No, we were concerned. It was a legitimate piece of legislation, and it wasn't a laughing matter. And it also puts proper responsibility for those types of animals to their owners. We have provided expanded powers to urban municipalities to indeed deal with animal control problems. In fact, our legislation is considered by many to be the strongest, to be the most responsible dog control legislation in North America, and they're just having a good time with this one, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They're still laughing about it; they still think it's funny. We have the leading legislation in North America. Perhaps all of those jurisdictions that are interested in seeing this legislation should come and sit in this Assembly and see what the loyal opposition think about the legislation and then, and then let them explain to the general public.

I am pleased to report to this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that to date we have received a positive response from municipalities, particularly cities who have reported to us that enforcement is going well. I know that as a result of this legislation being in place, two law enforcement officers in the city of Saskatoon were allowed to protect themselves, and protect themselves without any fear or hesitation. And the member from

Saskatoon Westmount, why don't you go and talk to those law enforcement officers? Why don't you go and laugh in their face when they had protection to deal with the animals as they had to?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the area of economic development our government will be giving further encouragement to public participation initiatives. We feel these public participation initiatives are ushering in a new era for our province. The need to diversify is one of the main challenges facing our provincial economy. Simply to survive as a viable economy in today's world we must diversify.

I guess one of the biggest forms of diversification that I can think of, and how well it's worked, that the NDP again really missed the boat on — they talked about an upgrader for I don't know how long, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 10 years, 15 years? They kept talking about an upgrader, talking about an upgrader — well we acted. We acted on an upgrader, and I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people of Regina South are awful proud of the Regina upgrader, the single largest investment in the history of our province.

And you know, as we saw this diversification go on, it was made possible, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a result of a partnership between the government and the co-ops. Now that's not supposed to happen with a Tory government. But the NDP, in their narrow-minded little blinkers that profess now to be the champions of small business or business, and yet still chastise the Weyerhaeusers, still chastise the bacon plants, still don't believe that the upgrader is here, they couldn't see past the nose on their face that indeed they could have encouraged the co-op to do what they did with our government. But no, they just don't have the foresight for anything like that.

This winter, at the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, I had the privilege of discussing the merits and the opportunities created by the private sector delivery of activities currently carried out by governments — federal, provincial and municipal. And I must say that I received quite a favourable response, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of the record attendance of more than 1,000 delegates from all parts of the province.

And as I discussed with the SUMA delegates, we as government, provincial and municipal, we're here to provide services to the public, the people that elected us. The public expects us to maintain and also to improve the levels of service, but at the same time they obviously resist paying more in taxes for these services. So we, as government agencies, have a duty, have a responsibility of considering alternative ways of delivering services.

Municipal public participation, I believe, can help to achieve those ends, and that's what we discussed. And at the same time it would encourage local economic development. As I advised the SUMA delegates, if private sector delivery of services works well in many circumstances provincially, then why wouldn't it work as well in municipalities as well? And I suggested to them that they examine the many successful ventures in

contracting out various municipal services, right here in our province, as well as in other parts of Canada.

As the Speech from the Throne has outlined, Mr. Deputy Speaker, public participation will continue to chart a new course for economic growth, for diversification and job creation in Saskatchewan. During the coming year, our government will be giving further encouragement to public participation initiatives through employee ownership, new savings opportunity in Crown corporation bonds.

Indeed, public participation opportunities such as these are leading to the creation of a capital market here in Saskatchewan, which mobilizes local savings rather than borrowing only from inter-financial markets at high interest rates, and where we see the interest leave Saskatchewan, leave Canada, go to New York, go to foreign countries, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But by the people of Saskatchewan investing right here at home, the interest stays here at home. Our people get that interest to put back into our economy.

And if you think about it for a moment — and I just mentioned the upgrader, and I know that a lot of my constituents in Regina South belong to the co-op, and as they go along a highway and need gas and there's a string of service stations, undoubtedly those with a co-op membership, because they've got that teeny-weeny little membership, they'll stop there. And they will buy their gas because of that investment.

Indeed, if they have a share in any particular motel, let's say an Imperial 400, probably the same thing would happen there, Mr. Speaker, as they travel around the province, needed an overnight. If they had just a tiny little share, they would probably stop there.

I can assure you that the people that have invested in the VCC (venture capital corporation) in the Fuddrucker's operation here in Regina would certainly go there, would certainly go there to enjoy their meal because of the little interest that they have in the VCC, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And I noticed a little bit earlier, the member from Saskatoon Westmount engaging in a battle from his seat, where he seems to shine better, with my colleague, the Minister of Public Participation. But I would like to commend my colleague, the member from Indian Head-Wolseley, for the tremendous leadership that he is giving to the public participation movement in our province.

Since the formation of our Department of Public Participation just one year ago, and under his guidance, our province has moved to the forefront of public participation initiatives across Canada. This is an objective that most of us who live in this province share and accept, and if we didn't know it before, the urgent need to become involved in public participation — because that will help the diversification that we're looking for, the need to diversify — was certainly driven home to all of us by the events of the past few years.

Who could have predicted back in the mid '70s, when our economy was thriving, that the world prices for our

key resource products upon which we depend for our basic livelihood in this province, would suffer such a severe decline, and all at the same time? And it has been a major economic downturn, created not by us, but created for us by the poor market conditions around the world for our resource products. To offset this, we must learn to take our rich raw materials another step along the production line and do more processing and do more manufacturing of our resources before we ship the products to the market of the world.

And, for instance, the privatization or the public participation of Weyerhaeuser at the pulp mill has had major benefits and major impact to that area of Northern Saskatchewan, as you well know, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And diversification at its best is now very apparent with the introduction of the new paper mill which would never have been there if it were a government operated proposition. And we would really look forward with anticipation to that.

(2145)

And that public participation, that improvement, that diversification, to help all the Northerners to obtain more employment — and the member from the North is now sitting there giggling. I guess he thinks employment in the North is funny, too. It's really unfortunate.

But to help us to diversify, our government strongly supported the new trading agreement with the United States. Now here's a major opportunity for us to obtain wider markets for products we can manufacture and process right here at home.

And I'll use the paper mill. Do you think that that paper mill is going to just supply paper to Saskatchewan? You're an idiot if you think that. It's going to go out throughout the world. Their sales will be going to the United States. So there's a major opportunity for us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to obtain wider markets for products that we can manufacture and process right here at home.

Obviously, exports to that huge American market is one of the most important things we can do to secure Saskatchewan's future. And that is totally lost by the members opposite.

Public participation is designed to increase economic growth and to diversify our economy, objectives that all of us must strongly desire for our province. Public participation also provides incentives for our citizens to increase their ownership and control of Saskatchewan corporations, now owned or previously owned directly by government.

To bring further support to the process of diversification and to facilitate economic development, our government is now giving prime attention to public participation initiatives. These initiatives are bringing a new era for economic development in our province.

Public participation involves a four-dimensional program. These are: number one, the privatization or sale of government-owned assets which will create greater efficiencies and improved services, and to develop more

business opportunities and jobs, something that this government cares very much about. And, the jobs that can only come from the private sector.

But number two, the four-dimensional program, the widespread sale of government and Crown corporation bonds and shares.

Third, the formation of employee-owned companies. And again it was referred to tonight. We see that in the new yellow pages telephone directory, for all of the employees participated in the public participation of forming another new company and going out on their own and getting it done.

Now the NDP seem to have a little trouble with employees going out and starting their own business. I don't know why they won't accept the business community. The member from Saskatoon Westmount freely admits that he has trouble with the business community and with the employees when he can't see the rationalization of employees striking out on their own, and rather than being civil servants, going out and entering into new, fresh, vibrant business enterprises so that they can create even more opportunities for themselves. And I really can't believe why he can't see that.

And finally the fourth dimension, the contracting out of services to the private sector and volunteer organizations.

Now these initiatives, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are helping to stimulate economic growth and diversification. They're attracting new investment. They are creating new jobs. And they are creating new ownership opportunities for our citizens.

Let me give you some examples. First, with respect to the sale of a government asset: Prince Albert pulp mill, which the government was indeed heavily involved, was losing \$91,000 a day.

An Hon. Member: — Ninety-two.

Hon. Mr. Klein: — I might be able to stand corrected on that figure, but it was in the area of \$91,000 a day.

And since the sale of the pulp mill to Weyerhaeuser, it has now become a profitable operation. It has given us that first paper mill that I mentioned with 170 permanent new jobs and many, many new opportunities for Saskatchewan businesses and industries.

With respect to the sale of bonds and shares, I look at the very successful sale of SaskPower bonds. The sale that raised over \$343 million, with a total of 42,000 Saskatchewan residents purchasing those bonds and keeping the interest money right here in Saskatchewan. You don't have to be any mental giant to figure out how good that is. And I know that you people are still working desperately to figure it out.

Bond sales such as this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, allow our people to invest right here at home, and rather than forcing those companies to have to borrow from banks in New York or Toronto to finance their major projects.

We know that Saskatchewan people are excellent savers and have big amounts of dollars saved away in various savings accounts, so that bond and share offerings rechannel these savings to keep our interest and earnings at home. It makes our money work at home. New investment, new markets, diversification, economic growth, new jobs — I guess everything the NDP does not stand for — these and other factors are all part of the public participation programs of our government.

All of us have a stake in the future of our province — even you people if you want to stay in opposition — you've got a stake in it; otherwise you'll be out in the streets, and through public participation we can secure a more prosperous future for our province.

And where does the NDP members opposite stand in the midst of all of these successful public participation initiatives? Out of step, of course, as usual. They put their heads in the sand. They stubbornly refuse to accept any progress. They're still trying to exist with their policies for the first half of the 20th century while the rest of the world is getting ready to move into the 21st. Even their leaders are starting to admit that they're not in step, and if the member from Regina North West is not in tune with his leader — he might be one of the ones that your leader indicated, you know, he was having some problems with unity in your caucus. You might be one of those, so I'll quote some other NDP leaders for you.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was wondering by leave of the House if I could introduce a special guest.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I want to thank the Minister of Urban Affairs to allow me to introduce a special guest that's in the Speaker's gallery.

I met this young fellow only tonight. He is the Rhodes Scholar-elect from the province of Alberta. He's here this evening to attend a convention, a journalists' convention at the U of R (University of Regina). And he's off to England next fall, might I say, with my son Brian, who also is a Rhodes Scholar-elect from Saskatchewan. And they're off to Oxford next fall for two years. David is going to be studying philosophy. He hopes to get a master's in philosophy. And I hope that my son will get a master's in law.

So I welcome David here to the proceedings, and hope that you have a good stay in England and learn well. And I want to thank the Minister of Urban Affairs for allowing me to introduce David Howarth from Edmonton to the House this evening. Thank you very much.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SPECIAL ORDER

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

Hon. Mr. Klein: — Welcome, David, and good luck.

But some other NDP leaders, Gerry Kaplan. Boy, the members opposite are full of all kinds of humour tonight, aren't they? Gerry Kaplan, one of the socialists' back room strategists, admitted the other day on national TV that their policies were not viable in the new economic world. "There's something going on in the new economic world that we in the NDP don't know about," he said. And that was his confession. Now that may be a startling confession for a die-hard NDP socialist to confess, but as a business man for many, many years in the city of Regina, I could have told him that 25 years ago.

Another NDP stalwart for many years, Stephen Lewis, who is reported to be one of the leading candidates for their vacant national leadership, also made quite a confession. He said the other day that the NDP were great at distributing wealth but very poor at productivity. How true. Many of us in this province have long, bitter memories at their efforts to try to distribute wealth and their weakness that they experienced in productivity. They were great at distributing wealth as they taxed companies and industry to death — companies and industries who had been providing jobs for the people of this province. And if they couldn't finish them off by heavy taxation and their bureaucratic regulations, there was always the threat of taking them over, of nationalizing them, which had been a key platform plank in the NDP philosophy. And the only way in which they could hope to develop any productivity was to take over an existing business or industry already developed by a private entrepreneur.

The only thing that the NDP know about creating jobs is to add people to the government payroll, either directly within government departments or within their vast family of Crown corporations that they created and which has added to the tremendous burden on Saskatchewan taxpayers and laid the foundation for the debt we're now carrying.

And while I'm speaking about this public participation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the minutes of the Saskatchewan crown investments corporation directors meeting for January of 1982 were brought to my attention — 1982 just prior to the provincial election. And the NDP cabinet ministers of the day stamped their seal on approval of privatization.

I understand that the then Premier Allan Blakeney — Finance minister at the time, who is presently in opposition, the member from Regina North East and others — I guess I'm striking a nerve because there they go yelling again.

But they argue public participation now. You know why? Because they think they're going to be in step with the

people of Saskatchewan because it's being promoted by the Tories. And that you have to argue that simply because . . . And because they are too afraid to admit that it's right, and too afraid to agree that it's right, and too afraid to agree to tell the people that it's right. And yet in 1982 members of that very bench today agreed that privatization was pretty good.

They actively considered a public participation program in 1982 and proposed creating a holding company called SHAR (Saskatchewan Holding and Reinvestment) or maybe share; I guess it depended on how you wanted to pronounce it, and approval in principle was given which would provide Saskatchewan residents an opportunity to make equity investments in Saskatchewan enterprises through SHAR. And the NDP's proposal had two stated objectives.

Understand this, number one, to encourage Saskatchewan residents to invest in provincial industrial developments. That's what we're doing now. What's your problem? You thought it was a good idea in 1982. You should have done it; you might have been re-elected.

And secondly, to generate a new pool of capital for strategic investments and large industrial projects. Now isn't that something, you agreeing with us! What's wrong with it now, nine years later? Have you changed your mind, or doesn't your leader have any policies? He doesn't have any agricultural policies. He'll day-dream one up, and if he can't figure one out, then he'll make up a story about something. Why can't you people ever get together? No wonder he hasn't got any unity in his caucus.

The SHAR proposal had three guiding principles to provide a mechanism for all residents of Saskatchewan to invest in the province. Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say, but I see it approaching 10 o'clock and I ask you to call it 10 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 p.m.