

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and to introduce to all members of this Assembly, two groups of students from the city of Prince Albert. Both groups of students have come to visit the legislature to have a tour of the legislature. I will be meeting them for photos after this question period and for drinks. These students are taking part in the Regina Optimist Band (and Vocal Jazz) Festival. The festival started yesterday and will continue through today and into Saturday. Along with the students from Vikar School who are seated in the east gallery, Mr. Speaker, are their teachers, Dave Monette and Kathy Spilchuk.

On behalf of the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, I would also like to welcome students from Vincent Massey School and from King George School, who are part of the band. These are both schools in Prince Albert. They are seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. There are 34 of them, and along with them are their teachers, Richard Smith and Florence Secele, as well as chaperons Don Thorsen, Gerry Straf and June Kudel. I wish you all a good day today, a good performance in the festival, and a safe trip home. And I ask the members to greet them.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Attracting Enterprises to Saskatchewan

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Premier of the province of Saskatchewan, and it pertains to a newspaper clipping in the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald* last Saturday, the headline of which reads as follows: "Devine yens for Asian funds." And the first paragraph states . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I'd like to remind the hon. member that we don't use members' names in the House. And I know sometimes these names are in quotes and headlines and that sort of thing, but we have been trying to follow the practice of not using names at all.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I abide by your ruling. I guess I will start the question fresh by saying, the headline would read, "(Blank) yens for Asian funds." And the first paragraph says:

Asian entrepreneurs hoping to cash in on the Canada-U.S. free trade pact . . .

Mr. Speaker, you should note this very carefully.

Asian entrepreneurs hoping to cash in on the Canada-U.S. free trade pact could be lured to Saskatchewan with promises of cheap land and

cheap labour, Premier Grant (Blank) said Friday.

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order, order. I believe that we should not only abide by the rule, but the spirit of the rule, the spirit of the rule. I think hon. members will agree with that.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I fully intend to comply with your rule, sir. Perhaps on orders of the day you might give me a clarification on this. I understood the rules of the House to be clearly not to use the names of members in the course of debate or speeches. I've always honoured that. But if there's a newspaper clipping or some other quotation in which the names are referred, how else does it relate? Nevertheless, I'll abide by that, and if you'll give me some time to speak at 10:30 I'll do so.

May I start then, with your permission, just to put the quotation into context and give the Premier some time to think of his answer?

The quotation says, quote:

Asian entrepreneurs hoping to cash in on the Canada-U.S. free trade pact could be lured to Saskatchewan with promises of cheap land and cheap labour, the Premier said Friday.

End quote, it's not a direct quote.

My question therefore to the Premier is as follows: isn't it correct that in this one statement to the Moose Jaw Progressive Conservatives which you made a few days ago is embodied the very heart of this government's, your government's economic policy which is a policy to try to build prosperity on the backs of cheap labour, cheap working people, and cheap farm land, cheap land in the province of Saskatchewan, that that is the ultimate goal of free trade and privatization? Is that so?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. I will say at the outset, happy St. Patrick's Day to the members opposite. It is the 17th of Ireland, and being of Irish descent I want to wish everybody happy St. Pat's.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of a North American free trade agreement between Canada and the United States, more and more people are looking at investing, manufacturing, and processing in Saskatchewan. Let me give you a couple of examples so the hon. member would know. Both of them would be, for example, and more, in Saskatoon.

If I could say, Mr. Speaker, the manufacture of turbines in Saskatoon by Marubeni-Hitachi, offshore Pacific Rim people, is going very well. They told me, Mr. Speaker, that they have never had better productivity in any of their production any place in the world; productivity, Mr. Speaker, labour productivity in those turbine manufacturing places in Saskatoon. That's number one productivity that they've found any place, including Japan.

Secondly, I note this morning that Canada's leading garment manufacturer, Peter Nygard, said that he is going to manufacture, now, clothing in the city of Saskatoon for the complete North American market with up to 300 new people employed in Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Now he said that, Mr. Speaker, because of the productivity of labour. He knows we have a very high wage rate, one of the highest levels of minimum wage any place in North America, and at the same time he knows that there's access to that North American market.

Now with respect to prices, Mr. Speaker, the price of real estate is lower here than it is in New York or it is in Chicago or it is in Los Angeles. This is a good place to invest because of productivity, because of the price of real estate, because, Mr. Speaker, we have access to raw material.

We just saw Weyerhaeuser just announce another \$23 million expansion as a result of free trade with North America. Everybody in the world is excited about manufacturing and processing in Saskatchewan because of productivity and access to the United States market, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, in the light of such legislative enactments as The Employment Benefits Act, your proposed equity financing proposal schemes which, as I understand it, will move farmers from owners to tenants, in the light of other initiatives which this government has enacted, namely such things with respect to the minimum wage, these are the actual embodiments of a cheap labour, cheap land policy.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that the reality is that this government has embarked upon a cheap labour, cheap land policy in the hopes of attracting industry and trade to the province of Saskatchewan, and in doing so is determined to drive down the standard of living of our workers and our business people. And that's wrong. Would you admit that?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, a couple more examples of increased trade and productivity and prosperity as a result of free trade. Intercontinental Packers is expanding, Mr. Speaker, because of the Pacific Rim. Intercontinental Packers in Saskatoon is the first Canadian packing plant to have a long-run contract to supply beef to Korea, Mr. Speaker. As a result of that, they're expanding. Flexi-Coil packers, Mr. Speaker, are now manufacturing air seeders for the North American market — they have a contract with John Deere — manufacture in Saskatoon air seeders and cultivators for all of North America. Why, Mr. Speaker? As a result of the free trade agreement.

Let me just point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member knows that as we develop, diversify, process, and manufacture the products we have here, Canadians and Saskatchewan people prosper. I just say to the hon. member, the more we can manufacture and process here, the better we will be.

And finally with respect to the land, Mr. Speaker: even Mikhail Gorbachev in the Soviet Union is getting rid of land bank in the Soviet Union — even Mikhail Gorbachev is doing that. Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time we allow Saskatchewan and Canadian people to prosper as a result of investment and not cut them off as the previous administration did with land bank.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Premier who is so well versed on Premier Mikhail Gorbachev. I wish he was as well versed on the needs and the problems of the people of Saskatchewan as he is on Russia.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Premier, my question to you is very simple. This article gives a quotation which you have not denied. And the quotation is that you're going to lure Asian capital and outside capital on "promises of cheap land and cheap labour." Those are your promises of cheap land and cheap labour.

Specifically, tell us how you're going to deliver on those promises of cheap land and cheap labour, other than what you've all ready done with respect to the question of farm foreclosures, equity financing, and everything else that this government has introduced. What additionally do you offer by way of cheap land and cheap labour? Tell us the details of that.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset that that is not true. I said we are encouraging people to invest here because of our productivity. People know that we can process, manufacture, and we have complete access to the North American market. And you're going to see more and more people come in to the province of Saskatchewan and invest.

And one day, Mr. Speaker, he's complaining because people are leaving rural areas. The next day he stands up and says, well you don't want to encourage people to build and invest and prosper in Saskatchewan. Well he can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. I encourage people to process, manufacture, invest in the province of Saskatchewan so in fact we can prosper. At the same time, I encourage people to invest in Power bonds, in telephone bonds, in energy corporations and in the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Well he's against that too, Mr. Speaker.

Just let me say this. He comes part way, then he slips back. He comes part way and says, well it's a pretty good idea, and then he slips back because the radicals on the other side say, no, we can't let people invest in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we are from all over the world, that immigrated here. The Irish, the Ukrainians, the Germans, the Japanese people world-wide came to Saskatchewan to build. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go back on that tradition. We are an open society. We are a democratic society. We are a free society. This country of Canada and the province of Saskatchewan will encourage immigrants . . .

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

**Mr. Romanow:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a new question to the Premier, and I don't think I need too much of a lecture from the Premier. I don't think he was lecturing me today about how new Canadians come to build this country. My father came from the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, to build a home for himself and his family and for us here. And we know all about that. No one objects to that.

I'm for attracting investment. I'm for attracting private entrepreneurial activity in Saskatchewan. No one is against that on this side. But what we are against is doing it at the expense of our farmers and our working people who are here, because we're not going to promise them cheap labour and cheap land as he promises.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Romanow:** — And when my father came over here he didn't come over here to displace some other Canadian to get lower prices for his labour.

Now my question is this, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Premier is, with respect to this article — and this will be the last question that I have on this matter — still under this same headline, there's another quotation which needs one question, and one answer from the Premier.

The quotation says this:

The people of this province want economic development, and they don't care whose money is behind it, said the Premier in Moose Jaw to attend a PC fund raising meeting.

"They don't care whose money is behind it," is the quotation. I want to ask the Premier, is that an accurate quotation? And if it's an accurate quotation, is the Premier of this province telling the people of this province that he doesn't care where the money comes from, including if the money comes from foreign countries, to take over vital public resources such as potash or vital public utilities as SaskEnergy, or farm land? Is that the position of his government, that he doesn't care where the money comes from as long as cheap land and cheap labour is achieved? Is that your approach?

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Devine:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is on pretty thin ice when he says that he doesn't want to see the French investing here, the Germans investing here, Americans investing here, Japanese, Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, let me just put a couple of points to the hon. member. We are encouraging people to invest and build in Canada and invest and build in the province of Saskatchewan.

And, Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration I believe it's fair to say that the Koreans invested here. They invested in uranium. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the French invested in Saskatchewan under the NDP, in uranium. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Americans invested here, right here in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

As a result, we saw economic development, we saw processing and manufacturing. Now when he's in the opposition, he said, well we can't have Hong Kong people invest here. He didn't say, oh, you don't want Chinese now; we don't want more Koreans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is he saying? He's just saying, as he does with respect to the land bank, as he does with respect to public participation, as he does with all kinds of programs with respect to trade, he's on one side when he's in on government, and he's on the other side when he isn't.

He says he's an immigrant and his parents immigrated here, but he's against people coming from China or other places to immigrate to the province of Saskatchewan. This province and this country was settled by immigrants, Mr. Speaker — Irish, Ukrainian, Chinese, German, Americans and others.

Mr. Speaker, we are an open society, and I say to the hon. member, this province will stay open to people from all over the world as long as I'm Premier of the province in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — I believe it's . . . Order, order! Order, order. I believe it's an appropriate time to just remind the House that question period shouldn't be a time for debate, and we should remember that and try to abide by that rule for the good of question period.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I don't think it's the hon. members in their seat who decides who speaks next. The Minister of Health was on his feet; I saw him on his feet . . . he may have been on his feet first, but I didn't see him on his feet first. Those are the rules of this House, and I don't think hon. members from their seats holler and decide who speaks next.

### Wait For Surgery

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, I attempted to bring this answer back to the House yesterday at my first opportunity. Mr. Speaker, I'm answering a question that the Premier took notice of on my behalf a week ago — I believe it was last Friday — and I just want to quote very briefly from *Hansard* of March 10; page 30 of *Hansard*,

Mr. Speaker, where the hon. member from Regina Lakeview, the health critic, said in part:

(A gentleman) . . . died of a heart failure while he was waiting for a bed in Saskatoon — for a hospital bed, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Premier how he explains this case?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is to set out the facts of the case, just very briefly the facts of the case, and then make a point that we all should be carrying our own responsibilities in here in whatever way.

Mr. Speaker, the facts of the case are as follows. The facts of the case are as follows. While the hon. member suggested that the person was waiting for a bed in Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, the facts are these. This information was received from the late gentleman's physician in Prince Albert.

Mr. Batten had undergone by-pass surgery in Alberta in October of 1982; he was an Alberta resident at that time. In October of 1988 Mr. Batten was diagnosed as requiring further surgery. Mr. Batten asked to be referred to his former heart surgeon in Edmonton and received preparatory testing in October, there in Edmonton. He was placed on the waiting list for surgery in Alberta as an elective patient.

I would like to point out that this type of surgery is done at the University Hospital in Saskatoon and at the Plains Health Centre in Regina. It has been confirmed by officials of the Department of Health that Mr. Batten was not on the waiting list at either of these facilities. University Hospital in Edmonton has confirmed that Mr. Batten was on the waiting list at their facility.

Over the past five months waiting times for this type of surgery at University Hospital in Saskatoon averages about 55 days for elective . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order. Order, order. The member has already received quite a bit of time to give the answer and I will give him a few more seconds, but he can't take three or four minutes to answer a question he's taken notice of.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, respectfully, the question deserves attention. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, let me just finish by saying this. There's a very key point to be made here, and it is that when we come to this House — all of us, whether we are in opposition or in government, Mr. Speaker, whether we are in opposition in government — we have a responsibility to seek out the facts before we deal with individuals, with individual families' concerns and so on, in the lights of this building and through the public forum. There is a responsibility for us to do that, Mr. Speaker.

This is not the first time that that NDP opposition has done this. And I want to make it very clear that there is a responsibility here.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — Mr. Speaker, Leslie Tomporowski, the

daughter, reported the facts to us, and that's the way we reported them to this legislature. And what is so appalling in this case is the insensitive manner in which the Minister of Health has handled this matter. The daughter raised some concerns about long hospital waiting lists, and instead of addressing those concerns, Mr. Speaker, the minister chose to belittle the daughter.

Now my question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister has to do with the real issue here. The real issue is long hospital waiting lists that are unprecedented in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — And if we look at the figures, Mr. Speaker, from winter of '89 and winter of '88, there's virtually no change — a very minimal change. Now my question to the minister is: what is he going to do about all these people who are suffering untold anguish waiting to get into hospitals for needed surgery? What is he going to do about that, Mr. Speaker? I've had three to four people phone me in the last two days about that matter.

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

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, I make the point. I have not denied, nor will I ever, nor should the hon. member or anyone else, that there are people on waiting lists in Saskatoon, as there are in all places across this country. That's not the question here. I have not denied that, nor will I deny that there are people who will wait longer than any of us would want. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, I will say this clearly: the number of days, the length of time that individuals wait has been tracking down in Saskatoon — and that's where our most serious problem is, is in Saskatoon — I'll say that clearly.

So I don't deny that people in Saskatchewan wait for surgery, nor have I ever. Okay, that's a serious problem in Canada. The point that I make here, Mr. Speaker, is not about the waiting lists that we have and the serious problem and the serious way that we all should be working to address it. What I question is the grandstanding tactics of that member and her colleagues over there who deal with serious matters for one day's political headline, regardless of which family they want to drag through the mud of this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### Error in 1988 Income Tax Forms

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — My question is to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, we have a rather sad situation. While the Premier is out trying to attract Asian investors with cheap land and cheap labour, we find that you are gouging the taxpayers unfairly in the province of Saskatchewan. For instance, Mr. Minister, will you confirm that the 1988 provincial tax form has a typing error, which was uncorrected, which states that the child tax reduction is available for children born in 1971 or later, when in fact it should read "1970 or later" in accordance with your own Income Tax Act.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — Well I can neither confirm nor deny, Mr. Speaker, that there may be an error. I can confirm that the Minister of Finance does not print the forms, and the Minister of Finance does not do the detail of the tax reform. But I'll take a look at the matter raised, Mr. Speaker. We do have the history, Mr. Speaker, of false material being tabled in the House by the opposition. I'll take a look at it, and if it's accurate we'll correct it . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. Kowalsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I have here an interoffice memo from H & R Block, which I will table after this question period, Mr. Speaker, and it states this, that:

Saskatchewan Finance have confirmed in writing that the 1988 Saskatchewan Child Tax Reduction will only be available for children born in 1971 or later, even though this is inconsistent with the federal deduction for dependent children.

In a letter dated February 17, 1989, the taxation and economic policy of Saskatchewan Finance continued by indicating that:

. . . it is not administratively feasible to correct this inconsistency for the taxation year.

Doesn't that mean, Mr. Minister, that an 18-year-old dependant can be a tax deduction for the federal government, but cannot be a tax deduction for the provincial government. And why are you unwilling to correct this mistake?

**Hon. Mr. Lane:** — I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that I would be prepared to take a look at that and see, first of all, if it's accurate because, understand, Mr. Speaker, that the government has a great deal of difficulty on allegations being made by the opposition that time after time after time have found to be deliberately false, Mr. Speaker. So I said I would take a look at it.

Secondly, I do find a bit of a humorous inconsistency with the hon. member's question and the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order, order, order. I think this is a good opportunity to point out to the House what's happening on the issue of members taking notice and then a supplementary after, because what really happens is you ask the original question, the member indicates he'll take notice, then you ask another question on the same topic, and of course, you know, he's expected to say, well I'll take notice.

So I believe that the proper way is to ask your question and then certainly ask him to come up with more information. There's nothing wrong with that.

I believe that the answer to the question is now complete.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Report on Health Symposium

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — Mr. Speaker, in August of 1988 in Saskatoon the premiers and territorial leaders of Canada directed that four national symposia be held in 1989 to address areas of national importance in health and social policy. I want to report to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all members on the first of the symposia which was held in Victoria, British Columbia, earlier this week.

Mr. Speaker, our Saskatchewan delegation to the Victoria conference on health promotion and disease prevention included representatives of the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses Association, the Saskatchewan cancer society, the heart foundation, the health departments of Regina and Saskatoon, and the Saskatchewan Institute on Prevention of Handicaps. These organizations all have a significant interest in health promotion, and their presence reflected the importance we place on working together for the health of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, the conference was impressive for two reasons. First, the quality of discussion was excellent; it was attended by 300 people from every province and territory, coming from a broad background of health interests and experience. Guest speakers included both national and international experts who stimulated challenging discussion about strategies and action plans for the future. Second, it confirmed for all of our delegation that we in Saskatchewan are on the right track with our health promotion programming.

Saskatchewan's Everyone Wins program was presented at the conference and proved to be one of the most broadly based of all provincial programs. Considerable interest was expressed in its progress to date and in its future directions. The activities of our own Saskatchewan Institute on Prevention of Handicaps were also included in the program presentation.

The symposium discussions led to the drafting of action plans in the following areas, Mr. Speaker: increasing the status of health promotion on the public and political agenda; secondly, developing opportunities for broad community participation in health promotion; thirdly, examining the current allocation of health spending and seeking the proper balance between health care and health promotion; fourthly, increasing our collaboration with health care institutions in the voluntary sector in promoting healthy life-styles; and fifth, pursuing other kinds of healthy public policy, particularly for the disadvantaged.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note the degree of unanimity from physicians, hospital representatives, and other health care providers, that such directions could attract broad support and need not come at the expense of treatment priorities.

Saskatchewan is already well positioned on many of these issues. We have launched a broadly based program with a strong emphasis on community and on co-operation. We've established a health promotion advisory committee involving key stakeholder groups, and as one of its first objectives I've asked the committee to develop . . .

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I've

talked to you in the past, and I know with previous Speakers, about the need for ministerial statements being brief and to the point, and also dealing with an issue that is new and relevant.

We had one yesterday that I think was questionable. I believe we're in the middle of another one today, where we see political grandstanding being done by members of the cabinet in order to announce programs that have been in place for a long time, or use it for political purposes, and I would ask you, having listened to half of what has gone on here, to rule against this as being a ministerial statement.

**The Speaker:** — I've listened to the point of order and of course, you know, from time to time we seem to have this problem with ministerial statements and people thinking they are.

The general rule for ministerial statements is that it should convey new information that the legislature has not had before, and it should be short, of course. And I ask the Minister of Health that if the information he has lives up to those guide-lines, he may continue. Otherwise, it's not a ministerial statement.

**Hon. Mr. McLeod:** — I'll be very brief in saying, and I'll leave it. I recognize what the members are saying about the length, but I want to just say this point.

Mr. Speaker, the symposium that I am speaking of is one that was attended by representatives of World Health Organization, representatives of international organizations, and across this country. It's important to this country, and it's important to Saskatchewan and the health programming of Saskatchewan.

So just having said that, and that's what I was trying to portray here, Mr. Speaker, let me just finish by saying this. I invite all members of this House — all members, all sides — to join with the programming that's in place here, not just the Department of Health programming, the prevention of handicaps and all those groups, to build a healthier future, a greater sense of well-being for all Saskatchewan . . .

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

**Mr. Lingenfelter:** — I want to have a ruling from you, sir, on whether or not this was a ministerial statement or political grandstanding, because if this is allowed, we could have ministers coming in and taking up the whole day talking about programs that have been in place over the past seven years. And I would like a ruling on that.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to get into this because I have a very selfish motive here. I want to support the opposition House Leader in questioning whether or not this is a proper ministerial statement. I happen to, in my heart of hearts, believe that it is, but I believe that if you rule that it is not, that will deny them the opportunity to respond.

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

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the ministerial

statement section of the parliamentary day depends on the honour system. It's up to the ministers to only bring forward statements that conform with the ministerial statement criteria.

Mr. Speaker, when you're checking the statement of the Minister of Health to see whether it is in fact conforming with the criteria for ministerial statements, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you could examine the statement made by the Minister of Finance the other day, which was also put forward as a ministerial statement, and bring back a ruling to this Assembly on ministerial statements on those two, because I for one, and, I know, all members of this Assembly, would not want the ministerial section of this parliamentary day to run aground because ministers have been abusing the criteria. And I hope you would do that, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — Well I'll certainly check the point of order raised by the member for Regina Elphinstone today, and I will read the record carefully before I make this ruling because I don't want to make any errors on it. And I will read the record, and I will bring back a ruling definitely to the House.

Were you speaking to the point of order?

**An Hon. Member:** — On a new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** — The member was on her feet, and if she gives her way to you, I will certainly allow it. I had recognized . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well a point of order is always in order, so I recognize the House Leader.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — The point of order is simply this, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the point of order is simply this: until you have ruled whether or not the ministerial statement is . . . I believe that it's a good one, but until you have made that ruling as to whether it is an appropriate and valid ministerial statement or not, how can the opposition respond to it if it's ruled out of order and not appropriate?

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order. Order. I would just like to make this point that . . . Order, order, order, order. I haven't ruled it out. I said that I would review it carefully and then bring in a ruling before . . . So if he wishes to respond, if they wish to respond . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do wish to respond to the minister's statements, and what I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that this minister and this government is all talk and no action.

The government and the Minister of Health knows that they're in trouble with respect to health care. They know that their health care policies, Mr. Speaker, have caused great deal of hardship to the people of Saskatchewan. The minister talks about the Everyone Wins program being such a fantastic program. Well let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that many health care professionals feel that the Everyone Wins program is simply an advertising gimmick of the Government of Saskatchewan.

While they put forward this advertising gimmick spending taxpayers' dollars, they're cutting back in public health workers in the province of Saskatchewan, the front line workers in the area of preventative health care. They're cutting back on the best preventative health care, dental health care program, in the entire continent — the school-based children's dental plan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — They've cut back on community workers in Northern Saskatchewan who are front line workers in the area of preventative health care, Mr. Speaker, and then they say they believe in preventative health care. What hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, what hypocrisy!

This government has had a total lack . . . There's been a total lack of commitment on the part of this government with respect to health care. Operating costs per patient day are well below the average in this province, Mr. Speaker. In every single category of hospital, except for long-term psychiatric, nursing staff paid hours per patient day are lower than the Canadian average, Mr. Speaker.

That's just a small example of this government's lack of commitment and the fact that health care is not a priority with this government. The minister can go to all the fancy conferences he wants to on the taxpayers' dollars, Mr. Speaker, but what the people of Saskatchewan want to see the minister doing is putting that money into long, unprecedented hospital waiting lists in this province; into a school-based, school-based children's dental plan; into public health nurses out in rural Saskatchewan.

Even a minister, one of their own ministers, in commenting on cut-backs in public health nurses, said to the health care commission that the travelling distances for these nurses was ridiculous. Even their own government realizes that these cuts have caused hardship for people working in the health care area and for people receiving the services.

Mr. Speaker, the minister standing up today and in glowing terms talking about his commitment to health care, is a farce, Mr. Speaker, and the province of Saskatchewan and the people in the province know it to be a farce, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

### POINT OF ORDER

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to belabour this, but I promised that I would, at question period. If you've made a ruling on this that I've missed, I will certainly defer and honour it. But I wish to make the point simply that in my time in the legislature the rule that I always operated under was that in the course of the debate we do not refer to members by name but by constituency while referring to matters specifically before the Chamber, but that if there is a reference, such as a newspaper article or some other outside document outside the Chamber to which there has to be a point of reference, namely a name, upon which to launch the question or make the point, that that is permissible.

Otherwise you get into the ridiculous circumstances of saying: I have a question to ask and I'm referring to this person but I'm not going to tell you who it is, it's got to be the Premier.

I think that this is really, if I may say so with respect, Mr. Speaker, an awkward rule. It leads to a variety of, perhaps even some irrational, results. And I'm not going to make a big issue of it. I'm prepared to live with the ruling that you gave me at question period if that's what you decide. But if you're of the mind to take another look at it, I would like to make my two cent pitch for you to reconsider it on the basis of the points that I've raised.

**Hon. Mr. Berntson:** — Mr. Speaker, as soon as I leave here, I'm going to have my temperature taken because this will be twice in a row that I've agreed with the opposition, and I must be . . . They may want to change their position, Mr. Speaker.

I think part of the problem with . . . it's not a problem . . . part of the way this place operates is that once a ruling is made it tends to become a precedent, and further rulings are based on the precedent that has been set. I think that there has been a very narrow view taken at some point in this House as it relates to the very point that's been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. And I think it's virtually impossible to deal with quotes without being given the kind of latitude that the Leader of the Opposition talks to.

So I would recommend that in the Speaker's review of this matter, that he does take a more liberal view of the interpretation of past rulings and allow the use of names of members of the legislature in direct quotes, Mr. Speaker.

(1045)

**The Speaker:** — I've listened to the point of order raised and the response from the Government House Leader. And before making my ruling, I would just like to give some background as to why we have attempted — and I say attempted, because I know many members have tried to circumvent it one way or another — we have attempted to have hon. members refrain from using members' names. And it goes back to approximately two years, approximately two years, when hon. members were in my opinion at that time, to be quite frank, abusing the privilege by bringing in long lists of members' names and simply quoting long, long lists of names. And I don't think that was ever meant by the rule, and therefore the rule was changed, and we have taken this rather narrow view. I thought I would just say that as some background for your information.

However, having said that, if the opposition side and the government side are in agreement, in unanimity, and wish that names be allowed in quotations, well I am certainly willing to go along with that, and we will follow the wishes of the House in that regard.

However, I just remind you that don't come and use long, long lists of names and abuse the rule, or we're going to have to tighten it up again.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps just one other

consideration, and that is maybe some set of draft rules might be prepared by your office or by yourself as to where, in these circumstances, it can be raised, how can it be raised.

I think the point that we want to avoid, I want to avoid, is in debate referring to that person by name. That, I think, is wrong. And I think even if it goes outside the House, that is wrong, because it's slipping in through the back door what I think we want to avoid through the front door. But there are, on occasions, some points of reference which might be of merit, and I don't know whether you can draw any guide-lines or not.

**The Speaker:** — I appreciate and thank the Leader of the Opposition for his views, and I'll certainly consider them. Quite frankly, I don't know whether we'll draw guide-lines for the very reason you just mentioned, but I'll certainly give it serious thought.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### SPECIAL ORDER

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I ended debate last night I indicated that I did have a few more words to say, and I would like to continue with that this morning. But I know that because of my Polish heritage I would like to, today, pay respect to those of Irish heritage. It is a big day for them. To all of the people of Irish descent, I wish them a happy St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, I, this morning, have a great deal of difficulty in putting together the words, the proper words to use as I ponder last night's events. As our government had forecasted, I think primarily because of lack of leadership in the opposition benches, we forecast that this session could be kind of stormy and difficult to control.

Last night, in my mind, the NDP displayed an ugly sense of arrogance with, in my mind, absolute total disregard to this House. And I guess that . . . and as again, they chide this about this from their chair, they fail to recognize . . . I recall, Mr. Speaker, very well my first day in this magnificent institution and what it meant to me and the respect that I had to show to this House, and I find myself in a awkward position, as a politician, of trying to gain respect, not only from my constituents but from the constituents around this province.

And as we watch the school children leave this Assembly with utter dismay after some of the difficult times that occur in this legislature, and in my mind when I saw how Her Honour, last night, had to be ashamed of some of the goings-on, again, you know, I can only apologize to my constituents, and I suppose to the people of this province as they witnessed the spectacle.

You know, it's a difficult thing for politicians to deal with our salaries in this House; it's public wash. And as we do that and go about the other business and then do what we do at other times, you can understand why people have a great deal of difficulty accepting politicians at all levels.

Particularly disappointing to me is the leadership of the NDP, where the leader publicly admitted that he had a problem with unity in his caucus. And his behaviour . . . I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if you watch our Premier, or I suppose any Premier in the past in this Assembly, they always managed to contain themselves to some degree. And any person that believes that they will one day, or hope that one day they will be premier of this province, will certainly have to have a much better outlook and much better control than is presently being displayed if he ever hopes to assume that chair.

I ended up, Mr. Speaker, touching on public participation, and I would like to continue for a moment in that regard. You know, entering the current session of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, the NDP said that they were preparing to launch a major offensive against the government's plan to allow Saskatchewan people to participate in the ownership of Crown corporations. However, it's a complete turn-about from the former NDP government's plan to do exactly the same thing. And it begs the question, why.

A quote from an editorial of the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, dated March 6, 1989:

The hidden New Democratic agenda tactically admitting Crown ownership wasn't working, together with plans to list Crowns on the stock market under the Saskatchewan Holdings and Reinvestments incorporated banner, was laudable. So were proposals to move potash mines, uranium mines, and oil and gas exploration into the private sector.

The editorial goes on:

The only criticism due the NDP is in allowing MLAs like (the member from Saskatoon Nutana, the member from Regina Rosemont; they use the names, which I am not prepared to do right now, but those are the members) to make fools both of themselves and of opposition leader Roy . . . (I'm sorry) and of opposition leader . . . by attacking privatization and uranium development, both once admirable if unpublicized initiatives.

Well again, last night I read into the records some items contained in minutes of a Crown, or CIC (Crown investments corporation of Saskatchewan) meeting at the time, in January of 1982 regarding the NDP's philosophy. I won't repeat those, but there are some other interesting observations that can be made from the same meeting.

The present member for Regina North East was a member of that committee, and the board reviewed a management paper which outlined a proposal for providing Saskatchewan residents with an opportunity to invest in provincial industrial development projects, and at the same time generate a new pool of capital which



would allow the province to take advantage of large industrial projects in an era when capital rationing for Crown investments has become a reality. This is the NDP.

These include the need to do an adequate selling job; for instance, making it clear to investors that share appreciation rather than large dividends is the main argument for the investment. The need to transfer some current investments with good prospects, and they used as an examples, Ipsco and PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company). And yet when our government involved ourselves with Weyerhaeuser, the big hue and cry. What hypocrisy this appears to be. And although that such a step would reduce the control of CIC — has in these two companies — the difficulty of meeting the two objectives at the same time, and so on.

Following the discussion, which as I mentioned earlier the member for Regina North East was present, the board agreed to approve in principle a program to provide Saskatchewan residents an opportunity to make equity investments in Saskatchewan enterprises through Saskatchewan Holdings and Reinvestment incorporated, a company they called SHAR.

What's happened to that philosophy since then? I wonder why they so strongly argue something that they once themselves were prepared to promote. Their guiding principles at the time were to provide a mechanism for all residents of Saskatchewan to invest in their own province. The NDP guide-lines: to provide an alternate source of capital for major new investments and resource enterprises and industrial projects. The NDP guiding principles: to reinforce the identification of a partnership between the government and the people of the province in the development of our economy.

It's almost astounding for me to see, if that was their guiding principle, why they so strenuously will oppose our plans. They go on, "Our Saskatchewan political parties will undoubtedly take similar proposals in the future." So was that, was that their underlying motive — fear that knowing that one day the Tories would be in power and they would do this, and they better get on the bandwagon and get in step with the people of our province? I think so. I think that they fully understood, way back in 1982, how much out of line they were with the people of this province. And in April of that same year, in no uncertain terms, the NDP was indeed shown how badly out of step they were with the people.

It goes on that the government would be able to take advantage of large industrial project opportunities without requiring a reduction in investment by the utility or commercial Crown corporations, or if the private equity infusion is substantial, the province could be in a better position to avoid long-term debt for the Consolidated Fund with consequent reductions in interest funds.

Why now, why change? What's different? Why argue? You agreed with it. The SHAR proposal, investment projects that have current dramatic interest, a heavy oil upgrader. Imagine that. They had interest in that, maybe not with the co-op, interested in selling shares in the potash mine. Isn't that interesting? Right here, the potash

mine, uranium mine, natural gas exploration.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what happened. I wonder why they changed their mind. Is it simply because we're in tune with the public and they're trying to get on the bandwagon. What is it?

There should be no surprises, and the member from Regina Centre again chides from his chair; he was part of it. He was part of that proposal. There should be no surprises in that approach, none at all, because socialist government world-wide have been treating and taking that trend; includes countries like New Zealand, Sweden, France, and now even Communist countries such as the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China are working hard on loosening government control. And yet our Saskatchewan NDP still firmly indicate that they will not go along with a trend that is presently world-wide. They're not only out of step with the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, perhaps with people of the entire universe.

Their leader, the member from Saskatoon Riversdale, and the NDP, now find themselves trapped. Their stand against greater participation is reactionary, out of step with modern living; out of step with modern thinking. They're back in the old days with their head in the sand, as the member from Saskatoon Westmount in his speech debate last night offered nothing for the future, offered no criticism of what was in the speech, but indeed chose to take an attack on a piece of legislation a year old, history.

Public participation is a means by which we can build and diversify our province, and that all Saskatchewan people can benefit in, directly and indirectly. I think that we could move along with the job much easier in this session if they simply agreed with us.

Mr. Speaker, I'll turn to a moment on the issue of store hours, which involves the people of this province. There seem to be two groups only that seem to have any real concern with the so-called issue of store hours. Those two groups are elected municipal officials and a few retailers. Now we have some union intervention coming along.

(1100)

But what about the people, what about the people? In our government we hear from the Leader of the Opposition that we should do this or we should do that or whatever. They don't seem to have a policy. They don't seem to take a stand on it. They try to make a few ripples here and there, but their position, as in agriculture; their policy, as in agriculture, there is none. Clearly, they don't have one.

I'll share a little story with you, Mr. Speaker, that as I explain the issue of store hours kind of makes a lot of sense, because we hear a lot of requests for a common day of pause. Is there such a thing really?

I describe a typical family that has a day off that decide that they would perhaps like to go and visit one of our provincial parks. So they jump in their car, they turn their radio on. Of course the radio stations are working Sunday; they're supposed to; it's that family's day off. They drive down to the service station and get fuel.

They're open; well they're supposed to be because it's the family's day off. They stop at a restaurant. They're open; it's the family's day off, but those people can work. They see the police department as they're rushing some place. They're working. But it's this family's day off. And eventually they get to the provincial park. Lo and behold!, the people are working. Well they should be because it's this family's day off. Following what they do, they tune in the television set — well that works because it's this family's day off — to watch a football game. Well that's fine, those players are getting paid because it's my day off. One of the players gets injured. The ambulance comes along. Well, they're working too because it's my day off. They take them to the hospital. They're working because . . . I mean, how far can you carry that?

We fail to recognize that nowadays in modern society there are two very significant and important classes of people — the single working parent and double-income families who have a great deal of difficulty in moving about doing their tasks with those in other occupations or with similar circumstances. So they're there.

When our government took the leadership role that we did, out of respect to the municipalities, out of respect to the municipalities, we — and their autonomy — we gave them control of store hours, if they so choose to control people's lives. Clearly a leadership role, without any doubt. Then they said, or I in my position as Minister of Urban Affairs, that I was abdicating my responsibility. No, by resolution from SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) in 1981, they wanted to control their business hours. By resolution from city council in Regina, they wanted to control their business hours. Now we've given them this control and they seem to be encountering some difficulties because they're using that control. I wonder if they would have difficulties if they didn't use that control, as we see now in Prince Albert.

So the wonderful world of business comes along, and they're used to competition and . . .

**The Speaker:** — Why is the member on his feet?

**Mr. Goulet:** — I would ask leave of the House to introduce some visitors from northern Saskatchewan.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Goulet:** — Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, I would like to introduce some visitors from La Ronge in northern Saskatchewan, Grant and Shauna Rowland, along with their children, Samantha and Vanessa. Let's give them a warm welcome.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too welcome them to the Assembly. I have the opportunity of working quite regularly, not with missus but certainly with mister. Welcome to the Assembly.

## SPECIAL ORDER

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — There has been some stories that were promoted by the Coalition Against Sunday Shopping that this would destroy rural Saskatchewan. Our legislation, Mr. Speaker, is similar to that of Alberta and British Columbia, and certainly it hasn't destroyed their rural businesses.

People fail to understand that in the harsh reality of the business world where competition freely exists, the larger problem is Monday through Saturday. And I'm talking now about retailing, Mr. Speaker, because retailing is about the only regulated thing we have left, about the only thing that's held separate and apart. And you have to ask yourself why, why is that last section, you know, a little bit special?

But getting back to the rural Saskatchewan scenario. Retailers in the larger centres prey on each other Monday through Saturday. The big chains against the little independents in your large cities Monday through Saturday; the large cities, Regina against Moose Jaw, Monday through Saturday; Moose Jaw versus Assiniboia, Monday through Saturday; Assiniboia versus Gravelbourg; Gravelbourg versus Lafleche, and on and on — Monday through Saturday. Sunday has nothing to do with it.

The coalition that originally seemed to be quite vocal against our move, interestingly enough, the chairman, the very chairman of that coalition was the president of SUMA in 1981 when the resolution asking for control to municipalities was passed. It asks me if he was sincere. The vice-chairman of the coalition who also because of his position is able to control by-laws relating to that in his own city, presently facing eight charges of breaking his own by-law. Is that sincerity?

And it really, it really, you know, makes me stop and wonder. A big national chain saying that this will damage rural Saskatchewan, and yet that very chain finds itself in the catalogue mail order business in rural Saskatchewan, operating out of very small outlets, paying very little in business tax to support that community, while right next door the local merchant, the local merchant contributing a significant amount of tax dollars to his community.

If that major chain is sincere in their concern for rural Saskatchewan, then don't advertise to those rural folks; don't promote those catalogue order centres. Give that merchant the opportunity to open when he wants, if he chooses to open. Merchants don't have to open if they don't want to. You don't have to shop if you don't want to. Is it fair if a merchant wants to open, to say you can't?

My own personal experience, Mr. Speaker, where I was in a mall paying the same rent, the same expenses, against what was considered to be a so-called drug store, selling my products in the evenings and on Sundays when I couldn't by law. I would have created employment. I would have welcomed the opportunity to at least have

the equal footing to open if I wanted to open, and if my customers wanted to come and shop at a time that would be convenient to them.

So always, what about consumers? They appear to be the lost people in this argument of the last two interest groups, municipal legislators and a few retailers.

I'll turn to a moment, Mr. Speaker, on an item that deals with the future of housing in our province and why some of our ideas in housing is being so widely accepted. As minister responsible, I would just comment briefly on one or two programs and activities of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation.

In a few short years we here in Saskatchewan have become the leader, clearly, in North America in providing quality social housing for those who need it most — for our senior citizens, Mr. Speaker, and for our low-income families. We also now have implemented and included help for disabled people.

This has been achieved through the efforts of our local housing authorities spread out right across the province, along with other non-profit private and public housing organizations working in close co-operation with our Saskatchewan Housing agency, and with our strong federal partner, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, all of us serving in the finest Saskatchewan tradition, sharing our time, knowledge, energy — all of us together, to help serve others.

Last year the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation marked the 15th anniversary of service to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. Quietly, little fanfare, the corporation has been working for 15 years at its task of developing social housing in Saskatchewan. And what successes we have accomplished in the last six or seven.

It's owed mainly to the partnerships that have been made between all levels of government in our province — federal, provincial, municipal, with the local housing authorities, with the non-profit and private developers in Saskatchewan. We now have the amazing total of over 280 — 280 local housing authorities that provide services in public housing right at the community level where they can deal with it at their own local community with the people that they know.

Last year during the anniversary year a record total of over 1,000 delegates from all areas of our province attended the biennial conference of local housing authorities sponsored by Saskatchewan Housing. Imagine that — 1,000 at a housing conference in Saskatchewan.

(1115)

That gives you a good idea, Mr. Speaker, of the healthy interest in the housing programs of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. Our successes in social housing have been very, very significant, including the accommodation we have developed for senior citizens in enriched housing facilities right across our province — in special care homes; in our housing programs for low-income families and for the disabled.

But while our achievements in public housing in Saskatchewan have been outstanding, the challenges facing us in the future will be almost overwhelming. Consider the situation that we will be facing with respect to housing accommodation for our senior citizens. Our elderly population is growing at such rate that by the year 2000, 25 per cent of our total population will be considered seniors.

Right now in Saskatchewan about 13 per cent of our adult population — or 132,000 people — are over 65 years of age . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member from Saskatoon South seems to have some trouble with seniors. He's saying something from his chair. I assume it's disrespect for the seniors; I'm not sure.

In these circumstances we must face the problem of supplying even more housing accommodation to meet the growing increase in the number of seniors. As minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, I want to assure you that we are presently tackling this problem head-on. That we are working now in partnership with the local housing authorities and other housing organizations developing new ideas and new projects to provide not only more high-standard housing for seniors, but also for low-income families and the disabled for now and for in the future.

Perhaps one of our major success, Mr. Speaker, two years ago I had the pleasure of introducing a new housing program . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll stop for water until the member of Saskatoon South I guess, finishes that speech. He obviously has no concern for seniors at all and in senior housing. I'm really not impressed with the NDP member from Saskatoon South.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of introducing a new housing program, and that will help resolve some of the major challenges ahead of us. It's known as the innovative housing program. The program was set up to encourage communities, non-profit groups, and private developers to organize and develop housing projects in their local communities together with public sector assistance.

The innovative housing program gives communities across the province the opportunity to advise their provincial housing corporation what they need. We don't go out and tell them what the communities need, but rather it's a reverse. They tell us what they need, what they require in terms of public housing, and then they put together proposals to develop those facilities with some financial assistance from Saskatchewan Housing.

As minister, I have long felt that the most appropriate method for solving the housing needs of a particular community should indeed come from that community. Where else can it come from? Because it's at the community level that local needs, local resources, and local options that are available can best be brought together.

We are now calling for the submission of proposals for the 1989 innovative housing program. Recently the staff at Sask Housing conducted a series of regional meetings across the province. They outlined the program, and they

wanted to review for potential sponsors how to go about putting a proposal together. Meetings were held in Assiniboia, in Whitewood, in Humboldt, Kindersley, and here in Regina. We are particularly anxious this year to receive more projects from the smaller communities of our province.

The deadline for submissions is the end of this month. And I would ask all members of this House, including the member from Saskatoon South, to bring the program to the attention of communities in their constituencies, and to talk to various members in your constituency. Now that you're paying attention to what I am saying, perhaps you can generate some interest for your constituents. Perhaps you can help your constituents with senior housing, if you really care, and encourage them to get proposals which can qualify under the program.

It's interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as I read from *Hansard* what the member from Saskatoon Centre had to say about housing — and I'll read from *Hansard*.

Now the government says in its throne speech that it's committed to building more enriched housing units for seniors. . . . but the reality is that the PC government is emphasizing what it calls innovative housing for seniors. And this is the program where the PC government is allowing public money to be spent on housing schemes that charge seniors anywhere from 60,000 to close to \$100,000 for what's called a life-lease apartment. And on top of that they have to pay monthly maintenance fees. Only a few of these units are subsidized. Those on low income who can't get into them, have to go elsewhere or they're out of luck.

She goes on to say, my critic does, that:

Innovative, enriched housing is really housing for a few enriched seniors. It is not housing for the majority of seniors. So I ask you, what kind of protection is that, Mr. Speaker?

If the NDP would pay attention to that program. Unfortunately, my critic doesn't have the foggiest idea of what she's talking about, and it's right here in *Hansard*.

You would think that the Leader of the NDP Opposition would get a critic to be responsible enough to understand a program prior to criticizing it. And yet right here in the records of the Assembly, dated March 13, 1989, four days ago, my critic, absolutely totally unaware of how that program works. She didn't have enough interest in the senior citizens of this province to go and inform herself of a new program that is vital to our senior accommodation.

You know, every now and then the NDP call for the resignation of one of us ministers. I think that sometimes, in fairness, the critics should be properly looked at as well because if they don't have interest in seniors, if they don't have interest in housing, if they can't take the time to learn a program, why make them a critic?

And then to add insult to injury, this same MLA from Saskatoon Centre takes out a great big advertisement,

with her picture, and puts it into the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix* congratulating Luther Heights, a very seniors' project. The height of hypocrisy. I can't believe that that same member would have the gall to insult the seniors of Saskatoon in that fashion.

I think that the innovative housing program is the great way of the future for social housing in Saskatchewan. I'd even be willing to sit down with my critic and explain details of the program to her, because obviously she can't take the time to go and attend the informational meetings.

But through this program many new projects will be generated to help us meet the challenges of fulfilling our housing requirements in the years ahead. Our accomplishments in social housing over the years have been truly outstanding. But the challenges ahead, to continue to maintain the high standard of public housing that we have developed, will take our utmost dedicated efforts. It is desirable that as many services as possible for those who need assistance be delivered at the community level. Local people are most in touch with the housing needs in their communities and the opportunities to meet those needs.

Our very, very successful local housing authority system which provides the key community input into the management of public housing has met all the challenges of the past. And working with our Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, I know that all of those volunteers, thousands, in the housing authorities will continue to do just that.

And I have a lot of time and admiration and respect for all of those volunteers in the housing authorities that serve their people so well. They serve, as always, in the finest Saskatchewan tradition and in so doing are building their communities and indeed building a better province and a stronger Saskatchewan.

Just prior to closing, Mr. Speaker, and I take the opportunity to speak rather lengthy because it appears that the opposition very seldom, although they have the opportunity to so, don't ask questions of me, and I take this opportunity to explain some programs to them. And I'll speak just for a moment on business tax because this is probably another issue that they will not understand. They claim to have such a big working knowledge of the business community and the understanding of the business community and the like, and it's utter nonsense.

So I think that I will just, for their information and benefit, touch briefly on one thing that our provincial government, in partnership with local government, is doing to improve the business environment, and that's to reduce the burden of business tax.

Reaction to the announcement of the three-year, \$30 million program has been very, very positive across the entire province, from the business community obviously, but also from the local government sector.

So it doesn't surprise me, Mr. Speaker, because in the last year or so, an important issue that the media was filled with almost daily was indeed the business tax. And it was indeed a dominant issue for months and months, and as

this announcement came, all of a sudden the issue left the headlines.

I am pleased that our Progressive Conservative government is going to be, as we said, a part of the solution of the business tax problem. In consultation with SUMA, we decided to make the provincial rebate program to small business unconditional and to not have it tied to similar cuts on the municipal side. This program will have the effect of reducing business tax, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about 25 per cent across our province. The rebate formula provides relatively greater benefits to the smallest businesses, so that for them, for the small, small businesses in Saskatchewan, their business tax will be totally eliminated.

This PC initiative, however, is only a part of the solution. It's not a permanent program; it's a bridge. And it should not be seen as an encouragement for urban municipalities to raise business taxes in the hope that no one will notice. Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage all municipalities who have not yet done so, in the next few weeks and months during their budget deliberations, to look seriously at the level of the business tax in their community with the aim of reducing or eliminating the business tax.

And I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that on behalf of many, many of my constituents in Regina South who operate their own small businesses, I only hope that the city of Regina in their wisdom, on behalf of my constituents, will certainly do their share in reducing a very high tax load to my constituents.

It is only by municipalities reviewing their spending priorities and by working together with their business community, that a lasting solution to the business tax problem can be found. And some communities have already discovered that. They've already decided to provide their own rebates to businesses, and one case in point is the city of Weyburn which will provide rebates of 12 per cent this year.

Now unlike the NDP who have admitted that they don't understand what economic development is all about, this government, Mr. Speaker, is indeed moving forward and making progress in building a diversified provincial economy that will be viable in today's world.

**An Hon. Member:** — Any thoughts on the Speech from the Throne, Jack?

**Hon. Mr. Klein:** — The member from Regina North West will have his opportunity. I only hope that his comments will make as much sense as hopefully mine are.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are planning for the future, unlike the NDP who are still living in the distant past. And that next speaker will be interesting to listen to his history as he promotes his best seller, the new economic development forecast for the '70s.

(1130)

As one of their leaders puts it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's

something going on out there in the new economic world that the NDP wouldn't know about. Welcome to the new world. But unlike the NDP, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in this government are moving forward with new economic policies as we face the challenges of the '90s. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I will support the original motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Although I'm pleased to have this opportunity to reply to the throne speech today, I do so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with some sadness. What we have witnessed over the initial days of this session is a constant but sure deterioration of democracy in this Assembly. We have the rights to speak our minds in this Assembly, and with that comes the responsibility to say what we believe the truth to be. The rules of this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do not tolerate fabrications in the legislature, and I would think that you would be upset with any member who deliberately stated a fact he or she knew to be untrue.

But what we are seeing today is a government that is running scared; we are seeing a government that is desperate. This government has obviously decided that anything goes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They've decided to engage in a smear campaign and personal attacks on the Leader of the Opposition in order to cling to fading power. If they can't win honestly, Mr. Speaker, they'll win whatever way they can.

Now everyone makes honest mistakes, but this government, Mr. Speaker, makes deliberate mistakes, and what is worse, it makes them with a smile on its face. The position of Premier, cabinet minister, and members of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, used to be respected positions, but they've deteriorated in the eyes of the public.

And this is because Tory governments across this country are prepared to stoop to gutter politics, unfounded personal attacks, and mindless and vicious tactics, and they are making a mockery of our democratic system.

I have a great deal of respect for the democratic process, but if governments are going to continuously try to undermine the process for their own personal and political gains, then the system will not work, Mr. Speaker. We've been entrusted with a very serious responsibility and I feel that this government has breeched that trust. And I'm very disappointed by the lack of respect that has been shown by the government for this parliamentary institution.

Mr. Speaker, I spent the last eight months meeting with my constituents and travelling throughout the province and meeting with many different groups on health care issues and many other issues. So I have heard a lot, a lot about what is on the minds of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and I've heard a lot about the policies they would like their government to implement. And everywhere I travelled, Mr. Speaker, I heard the same thing. I heard that people were fed up with misplaced, misguided government priorities. They told me that the

PC government has forgotten the people and prefers to shower favours on big business and its Tory friends. And they told me that they're doing this because the government knows it's in its last term.

They told me that this government has forgotten what's important and what a government should be doing for the people. They've forgotten health care, education, highways and social programs, and other essential services in this province.

They have told me that government policies have created hardship, unemployment, inequity and injustice in Saskatchewan. And they've told me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they're waiting for the day when the New Democrats will take office and supplant mismanaged, patronage ridden, unfair government with competent, reasonable, fair government.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — And that is what the people want for the future of this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And the PC Government fails miserably in this regard.

I travelled throughout this province for the last eight months. I venture to say that I was on the road more than I was at home. And everywhere I went, people were upset with cut-backs in health care. They were upset with high teacher-student ratios and a deteriorating education system. They were upset with the PC government selling off the Saskatchewan heritage at rock bottom prices to out-of-province corporations.

They were upset with high taxes and the total lack of any long-term strategic agricultural policy in this province. They were upset with broken PC promises and they were upset with dishonest and corrupt government. They were upset with high unemployment, and very, very disappointed that so many children were leaving the province today.

The people want some hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they want hope, and they want sincerity and genuine action. The people of Saskatchewan are ready to work and give of themselves to build a better, more decent society. They love their province, and they want to build a province that is prosperous, compassionate, caring and fair. That's what the people want, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They want this for their children and they want this for their grandchildren.

But what we see instead is a government that engages in gutter politics and political expediency to try to assure itself of another political win. What we see instead is a government that has had seven budget deficits in a row. It has a cumulative deficit of 3.6 billion, and this deficit has meant less money for health, education, and social programs.

It has meant that one child in four live in poverty in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker — one child in four. Well the people never thought it would come to this. The bread basket of the world, but one child in four living in poverty. And something like 18,000 children — 18,000 children went to food banks in the last year, in last year alone,

Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I think that's appalling. And the people of Saskatchewan want this trend reversed.

This \$3.6 billion deficit has meant that in this province, one in 11 people is looking for work. In February our labour force fell by 6,000 and the number of people with jobs decreased by seven. It has meant farm families cannot count on this government for the assistance they need and deserve, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It has meant deteriorating education for our children, and high taxes for the average person in Saskatchewan. It has meant long hospital waiting lists in the vicinity of nearly 9,000 in the winter of 1989. It has meant the destruction of first-rate preventative health care programs in the province. It has meant pressure and stress on families, and particularly on farm families, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This government's priorities are not the priorities of Saskatchewan people.

It cuts funding and services and health care, education, and social programs, yet it'll spend \$9 million on a birthday celebration in 1990, which incidentally happens to be an election year.

It will spend over 1 billion on the political boondoggle in the Premier's riding, the Rafferty-Alameda project. It spends millions every year on out-of-province travel for cabinet ministers and high placed executives in Crown corporations like SaskTel. It spends millions on self-serving advertising, millions on patronage, and yet there are no jobs for ordinary people. No jobs for ordinary people, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And on top of this, people are leaving this province at an unprecedented rate, and most of these people who are leaving are young people between the ages of 20 and 29. This is our future, Mr. Deputy Speaker, our future — these young people who are leaving this province by the thousands.

While these young people are leaving the province, we see high priced salaries for the George Hills, the Paul Schoenhals, the John Gormleys of the PC party. High priced salaries for the . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. I wonder if the member for Weyburn and the member for Saskatoon South could continue their debate outside and allow the member for Regina Lakeview to continue her speech.

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. While we have thousands of young people leaving the province, we see high-priced salaries, high-priced salaries for the Tory friends, and huge give-aways to out-of-province corporations. The government's economic policies have brought massive unemployment to this province and they've caused untold stress on families who are trying to survive.

The Premier promised to bring our children home. You remember that promise, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Instead he's driving them away; he's driving them away in droves, Mr. Speaker. And does the throne speech, the speech of the government, address the issue of unemployment and

young people leaving this province by the thousands? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not a word in the throne speech.

This government obviously accepts no responsibility for this alarming and unprecedented decline in employment and for this alarming and unprecedented number of people leaving Saskatchewan. The government's policies have failed. This government is old, it's tired, and it's worn out. It shows no creativity and no initiative. The throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was a speech of an old, tired, worn-out government devoid of ideas.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — Today in Saskatchewan, family farms are in serious trouble, and the stress that rural people are suffering is unprecedented, except maybe in the Dirty Thirties. Wives and mothers are having to leave the farm and go to work in order to keep the wolves away from the farm gate. Many of these wives and mothers are working for minimum wage, a poverty wage, Mr. Speaker. Minimum wage is a poverty wage, and this government has no compassion for those women and no compassion for their families.

This government has no compassion for the children of these families who are under stress, growing up in families that are distraught and burnt out from the heavy financial burden that they face. Yet this government has no long-term strategy in agriculture — none whatsoever — no strategy to deal with the farm crisis. Instead we have a Premier who instructs foreclosures on these farm families. Never before in the history of this province have we had a premier instructing foreclosures on farm families.

Farm families simply cannot count on this government, except maybe at election time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's the extent of this government's agricultural policy. Farm families in rural communities are in crisis and their problems must be addressed. An agricultural policy that is consistent, well planned, and which addresses the real needs of the farmers must be put in place if we are to stop the unmitigated loss of our family farms and a slow death of our rural communities.

Instead of dealing with this farm crisis, what we see is a Premier bent on privatization mania, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He's going to sell as much of our province as he can possibly do before he's kicked out of office. And that's his agenda. That's the Premier's agenda, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He's adhering to an ideological viewpoint without any reason or rationality. His ideology has gone wild.

(1145)

PC privatization amounts to a sell-off of Saskatchewan assets at rock-bottom prices, and it's meant fewer jobs and lost income to this province. Privatization of highways maintenance and children's school-based dental plan meant the loss of 800 jobs. Privatization of Sask Oil meant 25 per cent of its work-force was laid off after only six months. Privatization of SED Systems meant the lay-off of 70 workers within one year of the sale.

PC privatization does not mean more jobs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it means fewer jobs. PC privatization has meant that over the past 12 months alone, Saskatchewan has lost 12,000 jobs. PC privatization means that if present trends continue, Saskatchewan will lose 20,000 people this year alone — 20,000 young men and women who must leave this province to search for jobs and economic opportunity elsewhere.

The PC government says that privatization creates economic and investment opportunity. Well it does, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but only for an elite few. The great majority of Saskatchewan people are in no position to take advantage of this government's share offering, notwithstanding their tax dollars went to building up those corporations.

For example, privatization of Sask Minerals meant ownership by two out-of-province companies. Privatization of PAPCO meant ownership by a foreign corporation. Privatization of SaskPower assets meant ownership by big business from out of province. Now the Premier is proposing to sell off the potash corporation to big business in Hong Kong and to the Governments of India and China. Privatization does not mean increased investment opportunities for Saskatchewan people; it means increased investment opportunities for big business and a few wealthy investors from out of province. Privatization, Mr. Deputy Speaker, means lost economic control for the people of Saskatchewan when our resources are owned and managed by big business from out of province.

The government also says that privatization means more effective and efficient public services at good value for money. Well, Mr. Speaker, the privatization of Saskatchewan parks has meant higher costs. Park entry fees are up approximately 30 per cent, and cabin fees are up. Privatization of highways maintenance has meant rapidly deteriorating highways, and I should know; I've been all over them in the last eight months. Privatization of SaskPower assets has meant sharp utility rate increases. Privatization of the children's school-based dental plan meant the elimination of the best preventative dental health care plan in North America.

Privatization does not mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, increased services at a better value for the dollar. It means decreased services and higher costs for Saskatchewan men and women. In a nutshell, it means fewer jobs, fewer services, lost revenue, lost economic control for the Saskatchewan people.

And at the same time we see that taxes have increased at record levels, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the financial mismanagement of this government and its misguided policies. Crown corporations, which brought revenue to the people of this province and which helped to fund health care and education and social programs, have been sold at discount prices.

We've the fastest-growing deficit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in all of North America, right here in this province. We have an operating deficit of \$4 billion and a Crown corporation debt of 8 billion. That is a 600 per cent increase, Mr. Deputy Speaker — a 600 per cent increase since 1982.

Interest charges alone on the PC deficit are costing Saskatchewan people \$3 million a day.

In seven short years this government's financial mismanagement has brought economic ruin to this province. The government blames the weather, and it blames world conditions, and it blames previous governments, but it never looks to itself. It never looks to itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or its own economic mismanagement as a cause of the problem. Well I say it's this government's gross incompetence which has given rise to the present crisis that we face in Saskatchewan.

Since this government was elected in 1982, revenue from personal income tax jumped 103 per cent, while revenue from corporate tax increased by only 10 per cent. This clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, indicates the priorities of this government: burdens for families, benefits for big business. It's time that this government assumed responsibility for its fiscal mismanagement. It's time that it stood up and assumed responsibility. It's time that this government stopped making the people of Saskatchewan carry the burden for its irresponsible fiscal policies.

And I would like to talk about health care, Mr. Deputy Speaker. These days we see the Premier running around the province trying to tell the people of this province that he cares and that his government is an innovator in health care simply because it spent millions on plastic health cards, which it was forced to do as a result of its incompetent policies, and simply because it has set up health care commissions costing enormous sums of money, because it was forced to do so because of its ridiculous, incompetent health care policies. And now this government tries to claim that it's an innovator in health care, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This government's record on health care is a national disgrace. They dismantled the school-based children's dental plan and imposed deterrent fees in the prescription drug plan that make it difficult for the sick and elderly to afford their prescription medication, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Through underfunding, they've created a situation where thousands of people are on a hospital waiting list throughout the province. In fact, I believe the figure is close to 9,000 people on hospital waiting lists, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I hear from these people on a regular basis. In the last two or three days I've heard from three or four people again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we'll be looking at their situation and asking the Minister of Health what he's going to be doing about their particular situation.

There are unacceptable waiting lists at cancer clinics, and chronic underfunding. I'm sure that the member from Regina Wascana gets calls from his constituents as well on long hospital waiting lists, and if he doesn't, it's only because they know that the people who are going to stand up for them are the New Democratic Party opposition.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — There are unacceptable waiting lists at cancer clinics and chronic underfunding and

understaffing of hospitals. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the member from Regina Wascana wishes to enter this debate, he'll have an opportunity to do it at another time. There has been underfunding and understaffing of nursing homes and public health care programs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is this government's record in health care. It's pretty dismal, isn't it?

In the throne speech, this government talked about community involvement in health care policies, in health care services. Well let's examine its record about community involvement. The government always talks about community involvement, but it's another example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of how the government pays lip-service to an idea and a belief that's popular to the people of Saskatchewan and then does nothing about it. The government's all talk, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It doesn't put its money where its mouth is.

They established a health care commission that's been travelling through this province getting information and listening to the people of the province. And in the midst of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they came down with major health care policies in Saskatoon, a major policy to integrate all the hospitals in Saskatoon, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And did they do this in consultation with their health care commission? No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not a word to their health care commission. In fact, I had the opportunity to personally ask the health care commission whether they had been consulted, and the answer I received was no, they did not know about it until they got the press release in their hands the day the government put it out.

And this government talks about community involvement. Here is a commission that has been listening to people across this province, and this government doesn't even consult before it makes a decision on a major initiative in this province. And that's an example of this government paying lip-service to an idea that's popular to people and something that they know the people want to hear, but when the crunch is down, they don't follow through, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a sham. It has made a mockery of the health care commission inasmuch as it talks about community involvement when it has totally ignored the community involvement and input given to the health care commission. And we aren't suggesting that the government shouldn't be taking action; we are saying that if they believe in community input and community involvement, they should listen to it before they make their decisions.

This government talks about nurse staffing levels, and they promise to increase them, but the truth of the matter, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that staffing standards have been recommended by an advisory committee some time ago, and I understand that these have not been implemented.

And in that regard, I want to just quote from a brief that was presented to the Saskatchewan health care commission. And the quote goes as follows:



In the early 1980s a lot of work was done through an advisory committee to the Minister of Health to establish staffing standards for hospital departments and base hospitals, regional hospitals, and community hospitals. To the best of our knowledge, these staffing standards have not been implemented.

And that's a hospital brief. To be precise, it's the Yorkton hospital brief, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

But the government comes here with its throne speech and says it's going to increase staffing levels. They've been saying this for the last two or three years — saying one thing and doing another. Not following through on their promises.

The throne speech talks about preventative programs and the need for preventative health care in the province. But let's look at the record of this government on preventative health care so that we know where they're really coming from and what they really think about health care, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about preventative health care.

There has been a decrease in the number of public health nurses in this province. Public health nurses are the front-line workers in the area of preventative health care, so this government says; therefore, preventative health care. They establish a fancy advertising campaign — fancy advertising campaign, Mr. Deputy Speaker — but they cut back on the front-line workers in the area of preventative health.

That's how important preventative health is to them. Preventative health to this government is a means by which they can engage in more self-serving advertising in this province, not a means by which they can help the people of Saskatchewan with respect to their health care.

And let's look at community health workers in the North. There were cut-backs to community health workers in the North. Once again, front-line workers in the area of preventative health care. And what are we seeing in northern Saskatchewan today? We're seeing substantial increases in the number of tuberculosis cases, Mr. Deputy Speaker — substantial increases in that — unacceptable, intolerable increases in the number of tuberculosis cases in northern Saskatchewan. And this is because this government's cut back on community health workers, and this government's cut back on the northern food transportation subsidy which was helping people buy food for their families. That's this government's commitment to preventative health care in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It has no commitment at all.

So what do we . . . And let me just show that we're not simply coming to this legislature and talking about things off the top of our heads, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We've heard from the people of the province of Saskatchewan on this, and we're bringing these concerns to the government.

(1200)

But here is what a number of people said to the health

care commission with respect to prevention of disease and health promotion. There is a growing fear that the quality of care, preventative treatment and educational wellness programs are not the government's main concern. Numerous reports have identified the need for prevention, yet we see these services diminishing in our area.

The reduction in service is a false economy. The cut-backs in funding to preventative health care measures, such as the school-based children's dental plan, the prescription drug plan, home care, and VON (Victorian Order of Nurses), has placed additional pressure on the hospital system. Those are the words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of the people of this province. That's this government's commitment to preventative health care. The throne speech is a sham and a mockery, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What we have instead is a phony Everyone Wins program. That's what health care professionals are telling me, Mr. Minister. This program is inadequate. What they want to see, what the people of this province want to see, are real preventative health care programs that put workers out in the field to help people with proper living standards and measures that they can take to improve their health care situation. They want front-line workers. They want the public health nurses and the community health workers, who have been cut and slashed by this government, back in the front lines working with the people to improve the health care in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — And this government talks about improving conditions for seniors and northern residents. They talked about it in the throne speech.

But what have they done to seniors in the last two years? They've levied deterrent fees on prescription medication that are very, very unreasonable for seniors, who are on fixed income, to meet and pay. They have increased nursing home rates, and yet they say that they're concerned about seniors. And they've increased property taxes, which is an extra burden for seniors who are on fixed incomes, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And with respect to northern residents, I've already dealt with it here earlier, but simply they cut the food transportation subsidy, they cut back on community health workers. And what we are seeing in northern Saskatchewan is increased incidences of tuberculosis and high unemployment. If people don't have jobs to buy food, how are they going to pay for that high-priced food that's available in northern Saskatchewan, now that they don't even have the northern food transportation subsidy.

This government says that health care is its priority, but two years ago — we mustn't forget that two years ago this government cut back the health care budget by \$18 million. And the increase last year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the increase didn't even meet the rate of inflation.

And it goes about the province propagating the myth that health care costs are spiralling out of control so it can justify its long hospital waiting lists because . . . so it can

justify its long hospital waiting lists that are causing people, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a lot of anguish and distress as they're waiting to get into the hospital. Hospital waiting lists, as I've mentioned before, of almost 9,000 people, almost 9,000 people. And I hear from people on a regular basis, as I indicated before, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we'll continue to bring these matters to the attention of the minister and the government who are responsible for the suffering of these people.

So why is the government disseminating the myth of spiralling health care costs? Well I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's to cover up their incompetence and their cruel and heartless policies. It's to set the stage for further reorganization of the health care system, which is really another word for cut-backs as far as this government is concerned. It's to set the stage for deterrent fees. This government says it's not for deterrent fees. That's what we've heard them say, but we all know that they say one thing and do another, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In fact, we had a bit of a debate about that last night in this Assembly, and I'm referring to the fact that the Minister of Finance said one thing before the election with respect to the budget, and lo and behold!, he was saying another thing after the election. In short, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't trust the PC government when it comes to deterrent fees in health care, and nor do the people of Saskatchewan.

This government says it protects rural Saskatchewan and rural Saskatchewan families. But let's look at what rural Saskatchewan — let's just listen to what rural Saskatchewan has to say about health care. The members opposite, who claim that they stand up for the rural Saskatchewan family, let's just hear what rural Saskatchewan people say. And this is a quote from a brief that was presented to the health care commission:

When you live in rural Saskatchewan, don't get sick. Many of my friends and I feel like we're living in a third-world country in terms of availability of emergency health care in rural areas. When you believe that emergencies won't be handled, it's like living without health care.

That's what rural Saskatchewan people say, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's like living without health care.

People all across Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have expressed concerns, as I've indicated before, about long hospital waiting lists, understaffing in hospitals, ageing equipment, and a chronic shortage of health care specialists. And once again, let's listen to what the people of Saskatchewan have to say on this:

In the early 1980s a lot of work was done through the advisory committee to the Minister of Health to establish staffing standards for hospital departments in base hospitals, regional hospitals, and community hospitals. To the best of our knowledge, none of these staffing standards have been implemented.

Another quote:

The overall funding for hospitals per patient-day in Saskatchewan is well below the national average and, indeed, lower than most progressive provinces.

Yorkton Union Hospital, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The overall funding for hospitals per patient-day in Saskatchewan is well below the national average and, indeed, lower than most progressive provinces.

That's what the people of Saskatchewan say, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And when we look at the response to preventative health care cut-backs which have taken place in this province in the last two years, let me just once again quote from the people of the province of Saskatchewan:

Saskatchewan has had a long, proud history of ensuring that health care services are available to all. We feel that this tradition is being eroded and that our system is becoming deficient in the area of universality and accessibility.

That was from the Saskatchewan Association of Certified Nursing Assistants. Another quote from a hospital board, Mr. Deputy Speaker:

We feel that many services that could and should be provided are not available to our residents and that many are so inaccessible as to be non-existent.

I could go on here for hours, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — I could go on for hours about the hypocrisy of the PC government. It makes all sorts of glowing statements in its throne speech; it trots about the province telling people that it's an innovator in health care and they care, and that health care is a priority. And it's all hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, complete hypocrisy.

And I've simply illustrated that in the last few minutes by showing what this government really thinks about preventative health care, hospital waiting lists, staffing standards, community involvement, and other issues in the health care areas.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is a health care system that is viewed within a framework of a broad concept of health. Basic necessities such as food, shelter, income and social equality are essential; they are essential to good health, Mr. Speaker. How can our children and our families, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who are starving, be expected to have good health? If we let children starve in Saskatchewan, which is what's happening . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. And one of the members opposite says la-di-da! The member from Wilkie says la-di-da. Well that's precisely my point, Mr. Speaker. I'm sad to stand here today to talk about children who are starving . . . and is it the member from Mayfair? It's one of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who says la-di-da.

Well I tell you, I'm just absolutely astounded at the callousness and the brashness of the members opposite, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We have children starving in this province today, and the opposition . . . the government says — I should call them the opposition because they're acting like one.

The fact of the matter is, is we have children starving and all they can say is la-di-da. We can't guarantee people's health, Mr. Speaker, if we don't provide them with food and basic necessities. We have to look at the health care system within a framework of a broad concept of health, and that means looking after people's basic necessities.

We had 18,000 children who went to food banks, but the government accepts no responsibility for their suffering. The government accepts no responsibility for the suffering of people who are suffering from mental illness. They need support services, too, to regain their health. And yet what we see are inadequate social service assistance levels for these individuals that make it virtually impossible for them to regain their health and get back on their feet. But perhaps this is a concept, perhaps this is a concept that's too difficult for the government, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just read to you two quotes that illustrate what I am attempting to say, Mr. Speaker, and these are quotes from briefs that were submitted to the health care commission. The first quote is from St. Joseph's Hospital at Ile-a-la-Crosse. And St. Joseph's Hospital says:

In our region many people lack the basic needs which have the biggest impact on health. Among these needs are water and sewer (water and sewer, Mr. Speaker), adequate shelter, education and employment.

And I think that quote illustrates my comments far better than I could do, Mr. Speaker. Another quote from another brief to the health care commission:

Mentally ill persons have great difficulty in accepting their illness, but they have a harder time accepting being poor, unemployed, rejected, and dependent on social services.

Mentally ill people have a harder time accepting being poor, unemployed, rejected and dependent on social services. And that's why these areas, Mr. Speaker, have to be improved upon substantially, and they have to be improved upon immediately.

Simply put, health care is not a priority for this government. It never has been, and I don't believe it ever will be. They fought it when the CCF-NDP brought medicare to Saskatchewan, and they're no different today.

They have no credibility in health care. They have hurt the health care system in Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatchewan do not trust them with our health care.

But the people of Saskatchewan can count on the NDP, Mr. Speaker, to revitalize and maintain ambulance services, home care services, hospital and other health

care services in rural and urban Saskatchewan. And together with the people we will build a better health care system and we'll build a better society.

(1215)

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask leave of the Assembly to introduce some guests that have just arrived.

Leave granted.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Hon. Mr. Hodgins:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I notice in your gallery that we have some guests that have just arrived, and I am pleased to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, from Tisdale, Saskatchewan and area we have the Tisdale Lions Junior Band. There are 45 band members, ages 9 to 14. We also have a number of adults along with them today. They're going to be observing the legislature for a short while. They've had a tour of the Legislative Assembly. I do understand we're going to have some pictures and drinks.

And it's just my pleasure, as some of the students in the band are from my constituency, it's my pleasure to give them a warm welcome to the Saskatchewan legislature.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**The Speaker:** — The Minister of Rural Development, does he wish to also . . . Is leave granted for the Minister of Rural Development?

Leave granted.

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to join with my colleague, the Minister of Highways, to introduce . . . he's introduced, to welcome the students from Tisdale and Star City area. Tisdale, as you know, is the north-east part of our province, and I think all our students would agree that the area there is the greatest area in Saskatchewan, and we welcome . . .

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Hardy:** — It's the home of many fine athletes, as you well know, in the summer games. It's also the home of many fine people.

And I'd like to extend, along with the Minister of Highways, a welcome to the students. Have a . . . sure an enjoyable few minutes here in the legislature. We'll join you for drinks and pictures later, and a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to join the two members of the government in welcoming the students from Tisdale and Kelsey area and Melfort area to the Legislative Assembly. My family has a long association with that area of the province. I, in fact, was born and raised in the Tisdale-Bjorkdale area, and have fond memories of that area, and I certainly want to join

the members in welcoming these young people to the Legislative Assembly.

## SPECIAL ORDER

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY (continued)

**Ms. Simard:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to return to the fact that the government, as I said earlier, has been going throughout the province trying to propagate the myth that health care costs are spiralling out of control, Mr. Speaker. And in that regard, I just want to quote from a brief that was presented to the health care commission from the Saskatchewan Health-Care Association, who I believe have a certain amount of authority in this area:

For the past two or three years we have heard quite regularly that our health care costs are running out of control. Costs have escalated, to be sure, but hysteria is unwarranted.

And the point that the health care commission was making is the fact that yes, costs have gone up, but they are not out of control, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Simard:** — But this government would have the people of Saskatchewan believe that health care costs are out of control, and they want the people to believe that so that they can justify further cut-backs. Oh, they will put it under different words, Mr. Speaker. They won't call them cut-backs — rationalization or reorganization or some fancy title like this. But we know what it is, Mr. Speaker. It's cut-backs; in many instances this amounts to cut-backs.

The PC government also wants to spread the myth that health care costs are out of control so that they can justify the imposition of deterrent fees at some future date, regardless of what they say about it now. The fact of the matter is, their party is on record as proposing deterrent fees. The fact of the matter is, is that this government, some time in the future — well, it's already done it on prescription drugs, Mr. Speaker. It has levied a deterrent fee that is unreasonable for people on low income and for seniors on fixed income.

But the Saskatchewan Health-Care Association goes on to say:

To serve the people of this province, any examination of the health care system must not be conducted with the intention of reducing costs or expenditures or to match another province's allocation of available resources. It must be done with a view to improving the effectiveness of health care programs for Saskatchewan residents and, it is hoped, concomitantly increasing efficiencies at an operational level.

A very, very reasonable and rational statement, Mr. Speaker. It must not be conducted with the intention of

reducing costs or expenditures. That's what the Saskatchewan Health-Care Association states. But what did this government do? It cut back the best preventative dental health care program in North America for the purpose of cutting costs. It levied harsh and cruel prescription drug deterrent fees on the people of Saskatchewan for the purposes of cutting cost. And at the same time, it approved drug patent legislation in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, drug patent legislation that has increased the cost of drugs in the country, which is an example of why this government wants ... it's supporting the multinational pharmaceutical corporations when this government approves Brian Mulroney putting in the drug patent legislation.

They're in the pockets of the multinational corporations and big business, Mr. Speaker. They're in their pockets. They say prescription medication is running out of hand and the costs are soaring, but at the same time they are ... while in the back pockets of the multinational pharmaceutical associations they go along with Brian Mulroney's drug patent legislation which has increased the cost of drugs across this country. And I say that's hypocritical, but it's exactly where this government is at, Mr. Speaker. That's what they stand for.

Saskatchewan people believe, Mr. Speaker, that they have a right to health care. And in that regard I wish to quote from one particular brief, which states:

As Saskatchewan citizens we historically believe that optimum health care for all peoples, regardless of race, creed, age, or financial status, is a right and not a privilege.

The people of Saskatchewan believe, Mr. Speaker, that health care is their right — and so they should believe that. They pay for it; they pay for it through their taxes, Mr. Speaker, and they should be entitled to receive good health care. To have government members running around the province saying that people are abusing the system and they're using it too much and the people of the province are abusing the health care system and therefore we need to cut back on services, is total hypocrisy.

The people of Saskatchewan have paid for their health care services. They've paid for it through their taxes, and this is the sort of health care system that they want, a tax-funded, tax-based health care system that's publicly administered, not a health care system like the American system where 37 million Americans go without health care, Mr. Speaker — 37 million Americans without health care, and a per capita cost that is substantially higher than what we face in Canada. The Americans have something to learn from us, Mr. Speaker, with respect to health care.

And the government's move towards privatization of health care by privatizing the school-based children's dental plan, and by moving prescription drugs to a very high deterrent fee, which is a form of privatization, this isn't acceptable to the people, Mr. Speaker. It's simply not acceptable. The people of this province want a publicly administered, publicly funded health care plan, that's what they want. And that means that the government is going to have to reassess its priorities and do what is necessary to raise the funds for health care programs in

this province — and that doesn't include selling off Saskatchewan assets at fire sale prices, Mr. Speaker — it doesn't include that.

That's not the way; you don't sell the pump at the well if you run short of money because there's a drought in the area, Mr. Speaker. But that's what the Minister of Finance would do, that's what the Minister of Health would do — sell off Saskatchewan assets at rock-bottom prices, at fire-sale prices in order to pay off its deficit that was caused as a result of its mismanagement and incompetence and misplaced priorities, Mr. Speaker, instead of using Crown corporations that are profitable to earn money for the people of Saskatchewan so that they can pay for school-based dental programs; so that they can pay for a first-class prescription drug program; so that they can straighten out the hospital waiting lists that are causing the people of this province untold misery, Mr. Speaker.

They should be using money from these sources, reassessing their priorities, so that we can afford our health care programs instead of running away from them and burying their head in the sand and saying that costs are spiralling out of control and people are abusing the system. That's the myth that they would like people to believe, Mr. Speaker. But I have a lot more confidence in the people of Saskatchewan, and so do my other colleagues on this side of the House, the members of the opposition. We have confidence in the people of Saskatchewan. We believe that the people of Saskatchewan use their health care system in a responsible fashion. We believe that by far the vast majority use the system responsibly.

And the people want the system to be funded through public funds and to be administered publicly, and I hope this government gets that message, because I sure got that message clearly as I travelled throughout the province and spoke to health care groups and health care professionals. They don't want deterrent fees, they don't want any more cut-backs. They don't want this government engaging in any more misplaced priorities. They want this government working for them, not for multinational corporations. They want this government doing what a government should be doing and not playing into the hands of their Tory friends. They want this government working for them, and together with the people of Saskatchewan we can build a better health care system, and we can build a better and more decent society in Saskatchewan.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to participate in this debate this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I'd like to, first of all, take this opportunity to extend a hearty congratulations to all the Irish people in this province on St. Patrick's day. It's a terrific day for the Irish. It's a day that Irish people get together and talk about old times and about their history and about their culture. And I think it's an important opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for Irish

people to get together and tell stories that stretch the truth from time to time.

As a matter of fact, it's commonly referred to, Mr. Speaker, as . . . the Prime Minister, for example, who has gone on public record quite often, Mr. Speaker, and told stories that have stretched the truth, as has the Premier of this province, and it's referred to as a little bit of blarney, and it's all in fun and it's always encouraged and welcomed by people.

But, Mr. Speaker, what we've seen over the years in this particular legislature, is a government that uses blarney in every opportunity they possibly can. Mr. Speaker . . .

(1230)

**The Speaker:** — According to rule 13(1), when the fifth day of the said days of any amendment be under consideration of 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, the Speaker shall forthwith put the question on any amendment or amendments then before the Assembly.

We do have an amendment before the Assembly. The amendment was moved by the member for Regina North, seconded by the member for Prince Albert.

The division bells rang from 12:31 p.m. until 12:37 p.m.

Amendment negated on the following recorded division.

#### Yeas — 18

Romanow	Upshall
Prebble	Simard
Rolfes	Kowalsky
Shillington	Solomon
Lingenfelter	Atkinson
Tchorzewski	Goulet
Thompson	Lyons
Brockelbank	Trew
Mitchell	Van Mulligen

#### Nays — 32

Muller	Pickering
Duncan	Toth
McLeod	Sauder
Andrew	Johnson
Berntson	McLaren
Lane	Hopfner
Taylor	Petersen
Smith	Swenson
Swan	Martens
Schmidt	Baker
Hodgins	Wolfe
Gerich	Gleim
Hepworth	Neudorf
Hardy	Gardner
Klein	Saxinger
Meiklejohn	Britton

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

amendment is lost. Debate continues on the main motion.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Her Honour Sylvia Fedoruk for the fine job of reading a very weak-content throne speech. She's actually a very nice person. I've had the honour to represent our caucus last Christmas at her place over a sandwich, with my wife, and we had the occasion to visit with her for about a half an hour. And my wife and I both found her to be a very gracious person, and we wish her well in her new job.

I'd like to as well offer my congratulations to the mover in the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. It's always nice to win a by-election — although very, very narrowly, and only because of the government pumping in more promises than they can keep — to come to this House and be part of the Speech from the Throne.

I might caution the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg that it's a bad omen to move this speech after winning a by-election, because from personal experience I can tell you that it happened to me and I lost the next election, so I know he's going to have a very tough row to hoe.

And of course I want to take a few moments as well, Mr. Speaker, before I talk about what the member from Regina South, the minister of housing, spoke about last night. I represent the constituency of Regina North West, which many of you know. It's a terrific riding and I've had the honour to represent that riding since the election of 1986. When the election was undertaken there were about 15,751 voters. That has now expanded to about 18,000 voters, a little over 10,000 households.

The constituency of Regina North West, Mr. Speaker, is composed of a number of neighbourhoods. There's Sherwood Estates and McCarthy Park and Walsh Acres and Rochdale Park and Lakewood and Lakeridge, Regent Park, Normanview, and part of Normanview West as it exists now. And the families in Regina North West that have lived there in the last few years have been undergoing a very severe problem. And the problem that they're faced with is a little bit of a malignant cancer of government in this province.

We've had in our constituency, Mr. Speaker, a number of families suffering as a result of government programs that the Conservative government have implemented over the last couple of years. They feel that they're under attack by this government, that they're under attack by the Premier in almost every corner.

The tradespeople in my constituency — the carpenters and the dry-wallers and the electricians, and others in the trades — have never had a more difficult time in earning an income in their profession since 1982. Mr. Speaker, up till 1982 the riding was a prosperous, thriving constituency. Families, both spouses in many cases, were working to earn an honest living so they could raise a family and purchase a house in the constituency or to participate in the economy like other families in the province do.

But since 1982, Mr. Speaker, they have been riddled with unemployment. The economy has basically died in this province as it pertains to the building trades, and they are very, very concerned about the economic policies of this government, Mr. Speaker. It's my view, as their representative, that this government has not been accountable to them or other people in this province. They have neglected their duties in tough economic times to be involved in the economy to assist in creating jobs with businesses and the co-operative sector. They have failed in that obligation, and in my view, Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable, and my constituency will be voicing their concern come the next election.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we have teachers in our constituency. I visited with many of them at Centennial School this week, and last week at Bud MacNeill school. And they're telling me, as well as the students, that they have a very major concern with regard to education. They're concerned about the fact that this Devine government has cut back education expenditures; they've modified the approach to education like no other government in the history of this province.

They're concerned about the fact that when students graduate, when young people graduate, they are subjected to quotas to enter university. They are subjected as well to quotas, even stiffer quotas to get into technical schools.

And the problem that we've got, Mr. Speaker, is that young people in our province are the most valuable resource in the province. And the problem we've got, that these have, is that we are not able to provide these people with continued education, and from continued education, jobs that come after that. This government of the member from Estevan — we all know his name — has not done their job when it applies to the young people of this province. They have given up on young people. They have not prioritized, in terms of education, their government's programs. And, Mr. Speaker, this is totally intolerable.

(1245)

I have, Mr. Speaker, written a letter to the Premier and to the Minister of Education on behalf of many of my families in Regina North West. And the letter, Mr. Speaker, pertains to, in this instance, a public high school in north-west Regina.

The people I've mentioned to you, the 10,000 households, the 10,000 families in my constituency, which is a very large constituency in terms of voters, do not feel adequately served in the public high schools. We have, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, no high schools for 10,000 families plus 2,000 that are joining my constituency on the west side of my riding and the south side of my riding, which is now called Westhill, and part of the Normanview West extension.

And these families, Mr. Speaker, have to bus their children, or the school system buses the children to high schools a great distance away. And it's my view that the public high school board have made specific requests for capital funding over the last number of years, and they've

been turned down. But it's my view, Mr. Speaker, that the government has been negligent in their duties to considering their request for a high school over the past number of years.

In my letter, Mr. Speaker . . . and I want to excerpt some of it for the public record, and it's to the Premier:

Dear Mr. Premier: The public school board has planned for some years now to build a public high school in the north-west area of Regina, subject to the provincial government's approval of the necessary capital funding. This year the board has again requested capital funding for this important project. In addition, many families have been telling me that a public high school in this area is urgently needed, and I write to request support on that project. There are over 12,000 families living in these districts, many of them who have children attending the 14 elementary schools.

Eight of the elementary schools that are feeder schools for the high schools in the central part of the city are public schools, Mr. Speaker.

And I go on in the letter to describe some other details about the requirements and the necessity. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Premier and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education to read the letter. I have not received a reply as yet, although it's only been a month. I know it takes a long time for some of these people in this government to read letters, but it's been a month. There's been no acknowledgement of the letter; there's been no response with regard to capital commitments for this coming budget.

But on behalf of the constituency of Regina North West, I urge the government to favourably consider this capital expenditure for a much needed high school.

I'm sure some of the members opposite, the member from Melfort, will attest to the fact that his constituency has at least one high school, and maybe they have more. And each one of those ridings over there that have far fewer families living in them have those public high schools. My constituency does not, Mr. Speaker, and I urge that that shortcoming be addressed as quickly as possible.

I've done a great deal of visiting with some of the businesses in my community as well, Mr. Speaker, and what I have found is that the business community is under extreme pressure of high interest rates. This government has neglected to address the problem of small-business people. They are telling me that they have great difficulty with the fact that the government has supported Sunday shopping.

They tell me that the government has knifed the business community in this city by saying that large national corporations can come in here and break the law and encourage Sunday shopping.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, they're telling me the interest rates are important, and the fact that the government has withdrawn from the economy and have been the architects of the worst economy that we've had in this

province. Bankruptcies last year in the business community in the province of Saskatchewan were at the highest level in the history of our province. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a direct net result of the economic policies of this Conservative government.

I had the occasion, Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago to attend the Regina Home Builders' Association dinner, and the member from Regina South was there. He had some words to say, but even the members of the Regina Home Builders' Association expressed to me their unbelievability, their astounding disappointments at the government opposite, Mr. Speaker, with their economic policies.

Saskatchewan housing starts have been the worst in 1988 than they were in recent modern history in this province. There were, in 1982, 6,822 housing starts in this province; last year there were 3,800 housing starts; and in 1989 the home builders of Saskatchewan are telling me and my colleagues that 1988 was probably a better year than 1989 will be. And that worries them a great deal, Mr. Speaker.

The membership in the Saskatchewan home building association has dropped significantly by about 25 to 30 per cent from 1988 to 1989. The government, the minister from Regina South, has gone on record at this dinner at the association on Wednesday night, said that the past year was not a good year. This is what the minister said, that the past year in home building in Regina and in Saskatchewan was not a good year.

Well it was the worst year in the modern home building history of this province. If that's not a good year, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what isn't a good year. But it's a terrible year, and they're quite worried because they're hung out there with the high interest rates, and they're being the victims of the high interest rate policy that this government and their cousins and their kissing cousins in Ottawa have supported and forced upon the people of Saskatchewan.

These high interest rates, Mr. Speaker, are not the engine for our economy. The engine of our economy, Mr. Speaker, are the small businesses, including the home builders in this province, and they are being attacked by this minister and by this government and by their cousins in Ottawa with high interest rates, with a lack of economic policies, and with a lack of any initiative when it comes to creating jobs.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the minister went on and confirmed what many of them were telling me. They were telling me that this minister has not been a very effective minister in the government. They were very disappointed with his performance. They feel that he's done about as much for them as the drought has done for farmers. They feel that he is the drought of the home builders' association. And he went to say, Mr. Speaker, that there were 22,000 jobs created by this home program.

I mentioned a few moments earlier that the tradespeople in my constituency are underemployed; jobs are scarce. They're doing as much as they possibly can in other areas where they have no training and skills just to keep alive.

Many of them have moved out of the province, seeking work in Ontario and Alberta and British Columbia. And this government refuses to come to grips with that. Their response, rather than coming forward with a program which would benefit working people, which would benefit the economy of this province, is to say, well we have a terrific home program. It's created 22,000 jobs in the province.

Maybe there's 22,000 Conservatives hired somewhere out there on the government payroll, but the people in Regina, Mr. Speaker, are not working in the numbers that he is stating. And I challenge the minister, as we challenged him in the February sitting of the Crown Corporations Committee of 1989, to table the information, the formula, the documents which supports his contention that there are 22,000 jobs created. It's a fantasy. It's a fantasy of this little Minister from Regina South.

And it's my view, Mr. Speaker, that it's indicative of the hypocrisy of this government. This government is full of hypocrites, in my view, Mr. Speaker. The member from Rosthern gave his speech earlier on the Speech from the Throne, and he talked about freedom of speech, that this is a place where we can get up and speak our mind, and he gets out and puts his neck on the line and commits political suicide by making accusations which were totally untrue.

But his tactics and the tactics of this government, Mr. Speaker, remind me of the tactics of the Nazi Party in the 1930s, prior to gaining power in Germany, Mr. Speaker. And we all know what happened in that circumstance. They gained power at all costs, and they hung on to power at all costs. And it cost money and it cost the destruction of lives. Now it's not quite that desperate in Saskatchewan where people are dying, although we've had some examples of waiting lists that have caused premature deaths because of this government's policy. What we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is a policy of this government which is hurting people's lives; they're under all kinds of stress; they're underemployed; they're unemployed; they're being forced to move out of this province.

The statistics from February alone, Mr. Speaker, says 6,200 people, net loss of people from this province alone; we've lost 6,200 people in four weeks. February has 28 days.

**An Hon. Member:** — Lucky it was a short month.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Lucky it is was a short month, my colleague, the member from Elphinstone says. If it was March, it probably would have been 7,000, and we may see those numbers materialize yet. And that's terrible, because what we do, what we're doing here, Mr. Speaker, is this government, along with the taxpayers of this province, are spending money on education — although not enough and in poor priority sense — we're training our young people; we're giving them, hopefully, some skills; we're giving them some education, and then when they graduate, there's no jobs available. So the taxpayers are financing the training of our future, our young people; we're training them; we're paying for their

education, and they're moving out of the province. It's a brain drain. I wish some of these members opposite, the Conservative members, would leave the province. It would save the taxpayers a fair amount of pain and a fair amount of tax dollars over the last . . . in our province. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it would not be a brain drain, as we're experiencing with the loss of our young people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Solomon:** — The member from Rosthern talked about freedom of speech. Well, the hypocrisy of that, Mr. Speaker, is that we have had orders for return in this House for about 18 months, two years — took that long to get a few written questions responded to, and he says that that's the freedom of speech, and that's co-operation.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, this government and this Premier attempt to change the face of our province, and I'll get into that in a few moments, or if not now, certainly on Monday.

But some of the changes they're undertaking — instead of freedom of speech, they're a government of secrecy. Rather than having a session in the fall, which has been the tradition in this province in the last 15 to 20 years where the government introduces some Bills, the House is adjourned. The opposition is given the opportunity to look at the Bills and discuss the impact of the Bills with the groups and people that they impact upon; they've cancelled that.

Now what they're trying to do is to shroud themselves in secrecy. They've got so much to hide, as we can see from the public accounts disasters. They're hiding the reasons for misleading the people of this province, and in effect the result is that the people feel that they've been lied to by this government. Mr. Speaker . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. Order, order, order, order, order, order, order. We've talked about this now many times, and I think the hon. member knows what I'm referring to, and I would like to ask him to withdraw his unparliamentary remark.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Mr. Speaker, I meant to say that the people of Saskatchewan were misled by this government, and if it was taken another way, I'll withdraw that.

But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, what we've got here is that the government is stymieing the opposition. They're promoting secrecy in government. They're not being very co-operative. The public accounts is an example. Question period is an example.

We ask the Premier questions and he gives the answers on everything except the question. He comes in this House, Mr. Speaker; he's got a speech to give. It doesn't matter what the question is, he's going to get up there and give his speech. And there seems to be a little bit of abuse on that from the Premier and from other members, including the Minister of Health.

We've seen Bob Andrew . . . I'm sorry, the member from Kindersley-Lloydminster — I withdraw that — the member from Kindersley-Lloydminster, Mr. Speaker . . .



**An Hon. Member:** — No, just Kindersley.

**Mr. Solomon:** — Or Kindersley. I'm sorry. The member from Kindersley has gone on record in 1980 and 1981 as saying that the government requires more access. We have to have a freedom of information act. He spoke in this House time after time on the reason and the need for freedom of information.

And what we have, Mr. Speaker, is this government, led by the member from Kindersley, rather than coming forward with his ideas that we require more information to the public, he has been the author, along with a colleague, the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden, and the member from Estevan and the member from Meadow Lake, in hiding information, keeping information secret.

You never hear the member from Kindersley getting up and waxing eloquently about the need for more information. He gets up there and responds in a fumbling, disjointed, incompetent way, hiding information and not providing any information. Mr. Speaker, I think that's the epitome of hypocrisy that I earlier on indicated this government is very guilty of.

Mr. Speaker, I've got a number of other things I'd like to talk about and perhaps we should get into them right now because I think it's important for the people of this province.

We have, Mr. Speaker, as indicated, many other comments by my colleagues, a government of opposites. This government has no credibility. It is literally riddled with hypocrisy, and it is a government of opposites. Everything it says, it means the opposite. When they get up in this House, Mr. Speaker, they talk about things that they are going to do. They then . . .

**The Speaker:** — Order. It being 1 p.m. this House now stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m.

The Assembly adjourned at 1 p.m.