

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to the Assembly today, a group of six patients from the Cancer Patient Lodge here in Regina. These people are taking treatment, I believe, at the cancer clinic here in Regina. I know all members would want to wish them a speedy recovery and an enjoyable stay here in the Assembly for question period. We look forward to seeing you after question period.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Saxinger: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some guests, 20 students from Fulda. They're accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Eileen Germaine, chaperons, Laura Eckl, Donald Schlitz, Ralph and Karen Fleishhacker, Harold Wempe, and Gwen Kalthoff. Mr. Speaker, I look forward meeting with them at 2:30 at the steps. I hope they have an enjoyable stay. I also look forward to the visit on April 15 to the little town of Fulda for the official opening of the new school. I very much . . . I'm sure they appreciate that day. I would like to ask you to help me welcome these visitors.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Reservoir at Rafferty Dam

Mr. Lyons: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question today, Mr. Speaker, is . . . I guess, first of all, I'll direct it to the Deputy Premier, the minister in charge of the Souris Basin Development Authority. Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Deputy Premier, I have in my possession here a letter written to one Dr. J.D. Mollard, dated January 27, 1987, and it's from the engineering firm of Cochrane Lavalin, the engineering firm that carried out studies on behalf of the Souris Basin Development Authority in regards to the Rafferty-Alameda project.

In that letter, Mr. Deputy Premier, it states:

Based on data available starting in 1912, it will take about 40 years for the reservoir (that is the Rafferty reservoir) to reach its full supply level.

My question today, Mr. Deputy Premier, is this: given that your engineering firm says it's going to take 40 years to reach the full operational supply level of the dam, what kind of a deal did you and the Minister of the Environment cook up to suppress the status so it doesn't appear in the environmental impact statement that was presented to the people of the province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, number one, I don't

take what he says at face value. Number two, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I hope you do. Number two, Mr. Speaker, I can remember a couple of years when I was a young lad living in that valley, that one year — one year, Mr. Speaker, would have filled that dam. Based on the experience of the last five or six years, Mr. Speaker, and the run-off that we've had in the last five or six years, my guess is it would take about 6,000 years to fill the dam. So, Mr. Speaker, I don't take at all what he says at face value.

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, my new question to the same minister. The minister may not believe me, but he'll believe this when I put it on the Table — it's from his own engineering firm. The new question regards another letter. This time it's one dated February 26, 1987. It's to Mr. George Hood, director of planning and operations, Souris Basin Development Authority, and it's from the Saskatchewan Water Corporation.

I want to read the first sentence of this letter, and listen very carefully, Mr. Deputy Premier.

Dear Mr. Hood: As you requested February 23, we have examined the potential to reduce the full supply level of Rafferty reservoir in consideration of the proposal to eventually pump ground water into Rafferty reservoir.

Mr. Deputy Premier, my question is this. Despite the fact that you have repeatedly, in this House and in Crown Corporations Committee, denied that this was your proposal, and despite the fact that you have said to the people of Saskatchewan that there was no plans to pump ground water that would affect farmers throughout the area into Rafferty dam, I ask you again: what kind of deal did you cook up with that minister, the Minister of the Environment, to suppress this data from the Rafferty environmental impact statement?

Mr. Deputy Premier, don't you think that it's time . . .

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure it's only coincidence that the Leader of the Opposition finds it convenient to be out of the House when that member has a question.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Hon. members are reminded, as I have before, that we do not refer to members who are absent.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I apologize. Of all people, Mr. Speaker, I should know better. I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know of many projects any place in the world that are used for the purposes of cooling an essential service like the generation of electricity, a utility, where there isn't some consideration given to a fall-back position in the event of a sustained drought.

Now they laugh, they laugh, Mr. Speaker. I did not build Boundary dam — I did not build Boundary dam. This very

day, Mr. Speaker, we are pumping from four wells into Boundary dam to cool Boundary generating station so that we have electricity in the province. In the event that Rafferty, because of a sustained drought, did not reach its peak level, so that we ran into cooling problems, we better be prepared to cool that generating capacity or we won't . . . well the lights will go out.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lyons: — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the Deputy Premier. Mr. Speaker, wonders will never cease. For two years members on this side of the House have been questioning that minister about the environmental impact statement and the fact, the way in which this government has cooked the books on that environmental impact statement. My question to you, Mr. Deputy Premier, is this: based on the fact that you have just admitted to the people of Saskatchewan that you are going to pump the aquifer into Rafferty dam, will you please enlighten this House as to how many farmers will be affected by that pumping, and how many wells in that area will go dry as a result of this plan which you suppressed from the environmental statement?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I'm going from memory now, but I think . . .

An Hon. Member: — Well that's scary as heck.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And I agree. It ought not to be relied on with any degree of precision.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think we have drilled two wells, two farmer's wells deeper into the aquifer in the Estevan area. There, by the way, are two aquifers down there. One is the table-top aquifer and the other one is the Estevan aquifer. And we have drilled two wells deeper to accommodate farmers who may have been negatively impacted by pumping from the aquifers into Boundary dam so that we could cool the Boundary generating station so that we could keep the lights on, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is we had to derate this last year, derate the capacity of Boundary because there wasn't enough water, because of a sustained drought, Mr. Speaker, to cool it to the extent that it could operate at capacity.

Now these people, these people would deny us a body of water five times larger than Boundary to give us the kind of cushion we need to assure that that capacity will work in the long haul, Mr. Speaker. And any impact, to answer his question directly, any impact that may come as the result of pumping water from the aquifer into Boundary dam is because it's necessary — as a matter of fact, because of a sustained drought, will be mitigated by SaskPower, and has been done to date.

Mr. Lyons: — Supplementary. Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me, a new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Minister, you knew the plans of the Souris Basin Development Authority, that it would take 40 years for Rafferty to fill, that they planned

to pump ground water. These documents that I have produced today were done before the environmental impact statement on Rafferty were produced. You knew it; you suppressed it.

Don't you think it's time you did the honourable thing, instead of standing in this House trying to defend your unconscionable actions, that you did the honourable thing — referred it to the International Joint Commission and then packed in your portfolio and resigned as the minister who is irresponsible for the environment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what documentation the hon. member has today. He brings all sorts of documents to the House, and many of them without much credibility.

In the very detailed studies that have been done on the Rafferty and the capability of filling that dam, Sask Water Corporation advised me that it will fill, and it will fill on average once every 10th year, not once in 40 years. So the hon. member's documentation is not correct.

And, Mr. Speaker, I did nothing to write the environmental impact assessment or was I the one to review it. My department do the complete review, and at the time that they reviewed it and the federal government reviewed it, both governments felt that the environmental impact assessment was adequate, that it covered all the detail. It went out then for public input. The public went through that whole document as well, and at no time was this issue raised.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm very satisfied that my department and I have looked after the situation in the best interests of this government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Plans of Future Corporation

Mr. Koskie: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to direct a question to the Premier, and I ask you, Mr. Premier: are you aware — at least you should be aware — of the fact that the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities recently at their convention passed a resolution overwhelmingly requesting that you cancel the extravagant \$9 million package or celebration and to better spend that money in rural development?

I ask you, Mr. Premier: will you in fact take this advice, or will you go on in your blind arrogance and political expediency to plough ahead with this wasteful, ill-conceived celebration that the people of Saskatchewan have rejected?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to admit that for those who don't understand what the Future Corporation is all about, it may well . . .

An Hon. Member: — Answer the question. SARM wants it cancelled.

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — It's not hard to understand how people could come up with the idea, not knowing what it is, that it may well have been ill-conceived, Mr. Speaker. That could be the perception.

But I want to say this: the president of the Future Corporation spoke to a group of people in Bruno the other day; I think you were there — wasn't it Bruno? — and the member from Humboldt was there. And the people at this Future gathering, Mr. Speaker, supported with a great deal of enthusiasm the kinds of things that the former mayor of Saskatoon was talking about relative to the Future Corporation.

Now I might add, Mr. Speaker, that when the MLA for that area was given an opportunity to speak on this very thing, he got up and he endorsed it with a great deal of enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker,

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish the member for Quill Lakes would invite the member for Humboldt to brief his caucus on all of the positive merits of this particular undertaking, Mr. Speaker, because the more people know about it, the more they endorse it, the more pride they take in Saskatchewan, the better they understand how we fit in the world economy, the better they understand Saskatchewan . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order.

Mr. Koskie: — A supplement to the Deputy Premier, who is answering for the Premier. I want to say, Mr. Deputy Premier, what your answer indicated is that SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) delegates don't know what they're talking about. That's what you're saying.

I want to ask you, how can you possibly be so much out of touch with the economic crisis in this province? I ask you, how can you ask Saskatchewan families to celebrate when farmers are losing their farms, their farms are being auctioned off, small businesses are closing, and young people are leaving this province in droves? I ask you, where are your priorities? Don't you have any feeling for the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, what I did not say, I did not say that SARM didn't know what they were talking about. As minister responsible for the Future Corporation, Mr. Speaker, I take some — and I expect some — legitimate criticism for not having properly communicated what the Future Corporation is all about. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Humboldt understands now what it's all about, and I'm sure . . . I'm not sure that there's enough time in eternity, Mr. Speaker, to get the member for Quill Lakes up the learning curve on this particular issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's precisely because we have had difficult times in the agricultural community, it's precisely because we are a trading province. It is precisely because

our students should know how we fit in a world economy. It is precisely because technology is going to be what drives our economy in the long haul into the future — domestically, nationally, and internationally, Mr. Speaker. It's precisely because of those things that the Future Corporation will exist. Now . . .

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

Mr. Koskie: — A further supplement to the Deputy Premier answering for the Premier. This sounds like a farewell party for the Tory party come election time. Nobody knows about it except themselves.

I want to ask you, Mr. Deputy Premier, in light of the fact that the Minister of Rural Affairs indicated to the SARM delegates that there would be no further increase in revenue sharing; in light of the statement by the SARM delegates asking you to seek a better priority on behalf of the taxpayers, I ask you: will you change the priorities of this extravagant party for the Tory party and in fact spend the money on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan rather than for the benefit of the PC Party?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP's long view to the future has never gone beyond the next election, Mr. Speaker, never gone beyond the next election. And you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that this money will be well spent on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. It will be spent, Mr. Speaker, teaching our kids about how Saskatchewan fits into the world economy; teaching our students about how we get into that world economy; how we are in fact a very important trading province in this country; how our technologies will take us well into the 21st century, Mr. Speaker. This will be money very well spent, Mr. Speaker.

And if what that member says is true, if this is a party to celebrate our demise, why wouldn't he endorse it enthusiastically?

Mr. Koskie: — Final supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deputy Premier, why in fact don't you come clean with the people . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order. Order. Order, order. Order, order. I'm going to give the hon. member from Quill Lake an opportunity to restate his question because I had no opportunity to hear it.

Mr. Koskie: — Mr. Deputy Premier, I repeat my question: why don't you come clean with the people of Saskatchewan? Why don't you in fact indicate what you've set up? — a slush fund. Isn't it just a slush fund for the cabinet minister come the next election?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I missed being recognized, so I'll answer again. I said no.

Payment to Remain Investments

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and it concerns order for return which was tabled last week in the House, order for return no. 193. And we see in here, Mr. Premier, that your government paid to one Remail Investments Ltd. some \$22,572 to do an assessment for a hotel convention centre in Regina.

Could the Premier confirm this is the same Remail Investments which actually built a hotel convention centre, a great portion of it that is now being rented by your government through the property management corporation?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take notice of the question.

Mr. Anguish: — Well, new question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Premier, we know that in the order for return no. 193, \$22,572 was paid to Remail Investments Ltd., and they were to study the feasibility of a hotel convention centre. They build the hotel convention centre, and subsequently you lease it for millions of dollars. Did you really expect the assessment to be rejected, or the assessment to reject the idea of a hotel convention complex? How many sharp deals like this are you cutting for the people of Saskatchewan, or are these deals only available to people like John Remail and Remail Investments in the province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I notice that a Regina member didn't ask the question about the new hotel. I've taken notice, and I think there are 300 orders for return. I don't have all of them with me; I will be glad to respond when I get the information.

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

The Premier has taken notice, and I remind the hon. member that if he's asking related questions they should not be couched as a supplementary question but simply a request for further information.

Mr. Anguish: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that, but you read my mind inaccurately. My question is to the Minister for Trade and Economic Development, and I would ask the minister . . . it's the Department of Economic Development and Trade who gave the contract to Remail Investments, and we're seeing a lot of relationships between Conservatives and economic deals in the province of Saskatchewan. My question to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade is whether or not he would undertake to table leases that the government has signed with John Remail or Remail Investments Ltd. in Regina, so that the people in Saskatchewan can see just exactly how you're spending millions of taxpayers' dollars on empty office space in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Andrew: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been in the House now what, I think, two years. I think you appreciate the last two years, when you go into this, that each department contracts with SPMC

(Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) for their space. So in answer to the hon. member's question, the Department of Trade and Investment has entered into no contract with Remail.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Consultant Study for SaskTel

The Speaker: — I recognize the member for Regina North West . . . Regina North.

Mr. Trew: — Apology accepted, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for SaskTel, if he would pay any attention to what's going on in the House.

Mr. Minister, return no. 148 tabled in this House March 10 regarding consultant studies done for SaskTel in fiscal 1985-86, shows \$77,000 paid to Pemberton, Houston, Willoughby for what is listed as a special study. What's so special about this study? Is that in fact the study on the privatization of SaskTel done in that year, and if it's not, will you table the study so that we know just what that special study is.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I direct the public's attention to the hon. member that . . . about the particular hon. member who said that the TeleBonds were a bust and a dud, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that the TeleBonds, Mr. Speaker, sold over 100 millions of dollars to the people of this province. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the TeleBonds sold to nearly 35,000 Saskatchewan people and yet . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Order. Order.

Mr. Trew: — New question, Mr. Speaker. My question, in case you hadn't heard, had absolutely nothing to do with your TeleBonds fiasco.

Mr. Minister, it has everything to do with your credibility, sir. In the 1986 election campaign, we released a copy of that study that said the government planned to privatize SaskTel. At the time, to quote you in the *Leader-Post* of October 17, 1986, you said:

Lane added he was never aware of a report prepared by Pemberton, Houston, Willoughby detailing issues relating to the divestiture by the province of Saskatchewan of all or part of its equity interest in SaskTel.

If we're to believe that you knew nothing of this report, then who in SaskTel has the authority to spend \$77,000 on a special study keeping you, the minister, in the dark all the time.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I recall the last provincial election, there was a rather extensive debate led by the . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order. Order, order. Order. I'm once more hearing unparliamentary language from the seats. I once more ask hon. members to refrain from that.

Hon. Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, we went through a rather lengthy debate on the alleged privatization of SaskTel, and it was denied at that time, Mr. Speaker. It's denied again. And the hon. member does not like to hear that. He was dead wrong on the TeleBonds, so far wrong, Mr. Speaker. He's been wrong on the privatization. That was the study that was debated, that was chosen selectively by the opposition, that various people had copies of at that time, Mr. Speaker.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate an important occasion for our province and our country. You will know that today has been declared the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting in Saskatchewan that this event be marked by the Legislative Assembly because we are a province of many peoples and many races. This province was built by immigrants from every continent and most countries of the world, and to this day we welcome new citizens from everywhere to help us build our province here in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we as a province need to grasp the opportunity afforded us by our multicultural identity — opportunities for personal growth, economic and social development, and frankly, the richest culture possible among nations.

From our first days as a territory, Mr. Speaker, multiculturalism has been and is an inseparable part of the individual citizenship of Saskatchewan people. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the people in the Department of Culture tell me that Saskatchewan continues to be the most ethnically diverse political jurisdiction any place on the globe.

With diversity there is a potential for conflict, and we in Saskatchewan are not immune from this threat to our social fabric. The crucial weapon, however, that we wield against the tyranny of racial discrimination is education. And it is for this reason that we are proud of the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College and its efforts to bring greater harmony between our aboriginal peoples and the diversity of Saskatchewan. It is this weapon of education that is wielded in The (new) Languages Act and the new languages institute, Mr. Speaker, which will teach our children not only the languages of other nations but an appreciation for the cultural values of those who share this soil.

It is this weapon of education, Mr. Speaker, that the multicultural task force appointed by the government in July of last year will wield when it makes its report this spring.

Through education we will all gain an appreciation for the cultures of our neighbours and indeed an appreciation of our own cultures that will translate into

greater harmony and indeed understanding in Saskatchewan. We are pleased with the implementation of the entrepreneurial immigration programs in Canada and Saskatchewan that are serving to bring people of many races to our province to join with us in providing opportunities for the children and all the children of Saskatchewan.

One example of this, Mr. Speaker, of the closeness of the world community, is the growing relationship between this province and the Pacific Rim, a relationship that encompasses many races and many cultures, a relationship that all of us hope expand to our mutual benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I join with all members of the Assembly and with all the people of Saskatchewan in our shared commitment to eliminate racial discrimination for ever from the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make some brief comment on the comments that the Premier has made with respect to the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

I want to begin by saying that I agree, and we on this side of the House agree that it's important to note such a day. But I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that that alone is not enough. A day certainly is a way to highlight certain things and certain issues and certain needs, but if all that we in our society do is sit and we recognize those issues on a specific day and do not provide some follow-up in dealing with those problems, then I think we will not have failed only those people at whom racial discrimination is directed, but I think we will have failed ourselves as a society.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly would have to agree with the Premier that in this province and in this country, but more in this province than anywhere else in Canada, because of the composition of the people who live here — people who have come here from every land in the world, people who can hear almost any language spoken on a given day on a street corner in some town in Saskatchewan — because of that kind of a composition there's probably a greater understanding of each other than in many other parts of the world. And that is certainly a credit to this province, a credit to our heritage, and a credit to our history.

But while I say that, Mr. Speaker, I want to also emphasize that although all of that is here, we too are not without some guilt because in this province, as there is in this country, there too is racial discrimination. It's happening and I think that it is incumbent upon all of us here in this legislature to recognize that and to make a commitment, not only in the day of recognition, but to make a commitment for every day of our lives to deal with that situation, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I say that and I say that we also have an obligation to recognize the difficulties around the

world with racial discrimination in South Africa, and apartheid comes to mind. And I hope that the government opposite will join us and that we, certainly together, can do all that we can to do the necessary things to try to bring an end in those kinds of situations throughout the world as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Soil, Water, and Wetlands Task Force

Hon. Mr. Swan: — Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the establishment of a five-person soil, water, and wetlands task force. We are working to protect and maintain soil, water, and wetland resources for the present time and for the benefit of future generations. The work of the task force will help us reach that objective. The task force will provide opportunities for public involvement by holding a series of public meetings throughout the province. It will then report its findings and make any recommendations to the minister responsible for the Saskatchewan Water Corporation.

The members of the task force will include Ed Kennett of Wawota, a farmer and past president of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation — Mr. Kennett will serve as chairman of the task force — Dr. Elaine Wheaton of Saskatoon, a research scientist in climatology with the Saskatchewan Research Council; Jack Piercy of Rosetown, a farmer and a member of the Sask Water's board of directors; Roberta Blackwell of Assiniboia, a farmer and public health nurse; and Joe Zagrodny of Fosston, a farmer and a director of the Saskatchewan Conservation and Development Association.

Drought conditions of the past several years have resulted in many groups and individuals having renewed interest in the topics of wetlands, marginal farm land, and erosion control. To help promote discussion on these issues, Sask Water will be distributing a report titled, **A Discussion Paper — Soil, Water, Wetlands**, prepared by Don Young of Environmental Management Associates of Regina. Dates and meeting locations for the soil, water, and wetland task force will be announced soon.

The announcement of this task force is further evidence of how our government is working to protect water resources, wetlands, Saskatchewan soil, and the environment. I encourage the people of Saskatchewan to make their views on this topic known to the members of the task force, and I look forward to their report and recommendations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a response to the minister's statement here today. I am looking at the statement before me, and I must say, and I say this having watched the operations of this government and this minister in the past, that I am not very encouraged. I am not very encouraged simply by the announcement by the minister of yet another task force. And the reason I'm not encouraged, Mr. Speaker, is because the record of this minister and this government with regard to these kinds of issues is not a very good one.

Here we have in Saskatchewan a massive project which is going to cost Saskatchewan taxpayers something in the area of a billion dollars at Rafferty-Alameda. The minister stands in the House and talks about a wetlands task force, but in this project, Mr. Speaker, the wetlands, both upstream and downstream, are being drained along with the project. Now that, Mr. Speaker, speaks a lot louder and says a lot more about the seriousness of this government than the minister's announcement today of yet another task force.

The credibility of this government on these kinds of issues concerning the important aspects of the environment, Mr. Speaker, is really questionable.

I'll show you another example. It's **A Discussion Paper — Soil, Water, Wetlands**. This paper, Mr. Speaker, was written and prepared by the Souris Basin Development Authority. It was done so, Mr. Speaker, without the knowledge of the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, without any knowledge by the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, because the Souris Basin Development Authority did not want the water corporation to know, nor want the federal government to know, what was happening over there in that development by the Souris Basin Development Authority.

And all that has been documented in letters which have been tabled, which have been discovered at the Saskatchewan Water Corporation, which shows that all along this government has been hiding what it's been doing and secretly trying to put in this project in spite of environmental concerns . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — I wasn't setting the member down; I was just kind of wondering if he wasn't straying from the topic. If he wants a few more seconds, well he certainly has the right to do it.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Speaker, I was not straying from the topic because the record of the government, I think, is important to note when one looks at any announcement which the government makes, which is what the minister has been doing here today.

And this record, Mr. Speaker, has been a saga of secrecy, keeping information from the public, keeping information from other authorities in order to cover up things that the government has been doing dealing with the environment, but knew that there would be some public protest if the public were made aware of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, this yet another announcement of a task force called the wetlands task force is going to be met with a great deal of cynicism. It's going to be met with a great deal of cynicism because the record of the government is such that there is no reason that the public can believe that they will do what they say.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTIONS

Change in Hours of Sitting

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, by leave of the Assembly:

That notwithstanding rule 3 of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan*, this Assembly shall on Thursday, March 23, 1989, meet at 10 o'clock a.m. until 1 o'clock p.m., and that when this Assembly adjourns on Thursday, March 23, 1989, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, March 28, 1989.

Leave granted.

Motion agreed to.

(1445)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Decrease in Population of Saskatchewan

Mr. Hagel: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Last week, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were made aware of some statistics, some facts that, to state it mildly, are alarming and for some reason yet to be explained, some facts that got very little public attention in the province of Saskatchewan. And even to those of us who serve in Her Royal Majesty's Loyal Opposition, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, these statistics, these facts were shocking.

Who would believe that in the month of February, last month, a month of 28 days, from the province of Saskatchewan 6,261 people left this province — 6,261 more than those who came in! The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in the month of February, a number of people equivalent to the entire population of Melfort up and left the province of Saskatchewan.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, those of us in the opposition consider this matter to be serious enough to bring forth in this first opportunity under rule 16 of this sitting of the Legislative Assembly, a motion which I will move at the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker. And I will be moving a motion to the effect:

That this Assembly regrets the continued alarming out-migration of Saskatchewan people, including many young Saskatchewan people, to other provinces — more than 6,000 in the past month alone, and (I will also move that this Legislative Assembly) urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take immediate steps to provide job opportunities for Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, when we review the statistics, the facts that are produced by the Government of Saskatchewan in their own documents, in their own publications for the month of February — last month, Mr. Speaker — we find, produced from the Bureau of Statistics, the figure referring to in-migration — those who moved into Saskatchewan

— 910 people which we welcomed into our province. But sad to say, Mr. Speaker, in that same month of February, according to the Saskatchewan Bureau of Statistics as published in the Saskatchewan hospital services plan covered population, in the month of February, last month, Mr. Speaker, 7,171 people moved out of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, that is an alarming figure; it is a shocking figure; it is nothing other than a condemnation — a condemnation pure and simple — bold-faced condemnation of the track record of the Government of Saskatchewan today. If there's any positive news at all that we could draw from those figures, Mr. Speaker, if there's any positive news at all, I say simply that thank God there were only 28 days in February or the figures would have been even worse.

So what has been, what has been the record of the Government of Saskatchewan when it comes to jobs? and what an abysmal record it's been. And let me take a look at some of the numbers, some of the figures, some of the facts, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be denied, and let me focus on February — last month — the most recent numbers available to the people of Saskatchewan. What do we find? As of February, last month, February was the fourth month in a row, the fourth month in a row, in which the unemployment rate in the province of Saskatchewan was higher than that for all of the nation.

And what's the significance of that, Mr. Speaker? The significance is this: is that for the past four months, for the first time, for the first time since statistics have been kept back to 1966, the rate of unemployment in our province, in our Saskatchewan, has been more negative than that for the people of this nation — 9.1 per cent unemployment in the province of Saskatchewan today; literally one out of every 11 people in Saskatchewan looking for work. And that's not the total picture. That's not the total picture.

The labour force in Saskatchewan today, 10,000 less than a year ago. The number of people with jobs in Saskatchewan today, 12,000 less than a year ago; 43,000 people — 43,000 people in Saskatchewan today unemployed and looking for work. And the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the real picture is even worse, because that's 43,000 who are unemployed and registered as looking for work. That doesn't include the thousands who have given up.

One out of every 11 people in the province of Saskatchewan looking for work. What a tragedy! What a tragedy for this province of ours in which we have known, in which we have had a history of full employment and putting our people to work.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it would be even worse if it wasn't for this mass exodus, if people were not fleeing our province. People of Saskatchewan are voting with their feet, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker; they're voting with their feet.

In 1988, last year, 13,300 more people left this province than came in. We had a loss, an out-migration of 13,300 more than the people who came into our province —

13,300 shattered dreams in the province of Saskatchewan.

And 1989 gets worse. In January, 1,550 people more left than came in. And as I said, in February, 6,261 more left than came in. Thirteen thousand three hundred in 1988 alone, and in the first two months of 1989, Mr. Speaker, 7,800 people more have left this province than came in.

Mr. Speaker, that means in the past 14 months, 21,000 shattered dreams for Saskatchewan people, people who have upped and left — 21,000. Sometimes it's hard to comprehend. What does that mean. That's equivalent, Mr. Speaker, to every man, woman, and child in Lloydminster and Melfort and Melville and Indian Head, in 14 months, having shattered dreams and picking up their hopes and their futures and going out of Saskatchewan to try and realize their hopes. What a tragedy. What a tragedy in the province of Saskatchewan.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, the only reason, the only reason that we've only got one out of 11 looking for work in the province of Saskatchewan is because people have left. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, if those 21,000 people had stayed home, had stayed here where they call home and stayed unemployed, our unemployment numbers in Saskatchewan would not be 43,000 but 64,000 people — 14 per cent unemployment, and one out of seven people in Saskatchewan looking for work, if 21,000 had not left in the last 14 months. What a condemnation of the record, the failed employment record of the government opposite.

And I listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully what the government had to say in the Speech from the Throne, and I know that that debate is over and the motion has been passed, but what did the Speech from the Throne that we have just heard, the government's grand plan for the people of Saskatchewan, have to say about jobs? Nothing.

And I listened very carefully as every member opposite got up and spoke. And what did they talk about? Did they talk about vision? Did they talk about employment? Did they talk about hope for people of Saskatchewan? No, they didn't. What they talked about was the track record of the New Democratic Party government in the 1970s; one or two even wandered back into the '40s, and nary a word, nary a word about jobs, employment and future and hope for the people of Saskatchewan — stone cold silent on the topic of jobs. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that that is a betrayal of the hopes and the dreams of Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, that's not only devastating to individuals and families in this province, it's devastating to family business. You know, family-business people around this province say, more than anything else, what they need is people working; people with disposable income in their pockets so that they can afford to shop on Main Street, Saskatchewan and small-business, family-business people can afford to make a living. This is not only a betrayal of individuals and families in Saskatchewan, it's a betrayal of small business and family business in Saskatchewan.

I've said in this House before, and I say it again now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when we come to this Assembly and we ask ourselves what our priorities are and our objectives are, employment is number one. Clearly employment, a full employment economy, is the number one responsibility of those of us who come into this Assembly. Fact of the matter is, so many of those other social problems that we find ourselves looking at programs and legislation to deal with, simply go away when people are working.

Employment, Mr. Speaker, and the record of employment has to be the number one reflection of political will. You know, Tommy Douglas once said, when referring to the level of employment that occurred during the war, that maybe it's time we declared war on unemployment, and maybe it's time we declared war on unemployment in the province of Saskatchewan.

What are the facts? Political will says, 43,000 unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan. It would be 64,000 if 21,000 hadn't fled in the past 14 months. And political will and the Government of Saskatchewan says, Mr. Speaker, that there are jobs for defeated, jobs for defeated PC members. Political will. You can't get rid of them, the people of Saskatchewan say. They're worse than wild oats, wild oats gone wild.

Let me just give you a very short list, Mr. Speaker, and these are defeated PC members; these reflect the political will of the government opposite. Let me just give you some examples from across the province of Saskatchewan because they're all over the province, Mr. Speaker. All over the province there are defeated PC members who are working and making a good living.

Up in Saskatchewan we get Paul Schoenhals, former PC MLA, defeated. Where's Paul now? Paul's got himself a job as chairman of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Down goes a Tory and up pops a job, Mr. Speaker. They got a job in Regina for Gordon Dirks. Gordon Dirks, Regina PC MLA defeated. He was rejuvenated as an educational consultant — down goes a Tory, up pops a job. Political will.

Sid Dutchak, PC MLA from Prince Albert, he was defeated. He was revived, Mr. Speaker, as the president of Sask Housing — down goes a Tory, up pops a job. Keith Parker, from Moose Jaw, defeated PC MLA. Where's Keith these days? Keith's at the Liquor Board these days, Mr. Speaker — down goes a Tory and up pops another job. Ralph Katzman from Rosthern, PC MLA, defeated. You find Ralph these days at the Department of Highways — down goes a Tory and up pops a job. John Gormley from the Battlefords, member of parliament, PC, defeated. Where's John these days? He's in the department of privatization, and down goes another Tory and up pops another job. And Louis Domotor, Louis Domotor from Humboldt, PC MLA, defeated, and where's Louis? He's in the property management corporation these days — down goes a Tory and up pops another job.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when we look at the track record of the Government of Saskatchewan today, we have to say, and we have to wonder, whether

this massive exodus and unemployment are consequences of mismanagement. Can anybody be that incompetent, or are they consequences of privatization? Or are they a deliberate government plan in support of the message that the Premier took to the Conservatives of Moose Jaw a week ago when he said that in order to be more attractive to Asian investors what we need in Saskatchewan is cheap land and cheap labour?

Well, Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I would move for the consideration of this Assembly, seconded by my colleague from Saskatoon Eastview, this motion:

That this Assembly regrets the continued alarming out-migration of Saskatchewan people, including many young Saskatchewan people, to other provinces — more than 6,000 in the past month alone, and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to take immediate steps to provide job opportunities for all Saskatchewan people.

(1500)

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to second this motion made by my colleague from Moose Jaw North, and I commend him for, at his earliest convenience, bringing forth this motion to the House to this very, very serious situation of out-migration of people from Saskatchewan.

It is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that this government take immediate steps and positive and concrete action to address an issue that has never been more critical in the province in the last 45 years. As my colleague has outlined, the number of people who out-migrated last year, the trend in January and February for this year is absolutely staggering and scary. It's increasing so rapidly that it's hard to imagine that that's the case.

But the concern I want to specifically address myself to today are the number of young people leaving. Of that 6,200 in February, literally one-quarter, or 1,500 of those people were young people. Now we all know, Mr. Speaker, young people leaving the province of Saskatchewan. Every family knows someone who's leaving. There's no question about that.

As youth critic for the opposition, I have on a month-to-month basis called on this government to bring forth some concrete action to deal with this situation. Not a month has gone by that I've not done that, because the statistics of young people leaving have continued to increase and increase month by month, and I don't know what it will be next month. There's certainly no summer works program and no reason for optimism that the situation is going to change.

If this Premier who likes to talk about families and youth, if this government is serious about rural Saskatchewan, about communities and about the people of the province, why don't they do something to prove it? There's no question that there's a lot of rhetoric, but very hollow promises. And we just simply hear the Premier say the same thing day after day in this House: by golly, what are we going to do for you in the future; just hold on and you wait and see. The point is, he said that in 1982 — we'll

bring the kids home — and he's been doing nothing but driving them away by his failed economic policies, Mr. Speaker. The people of this province, the youth of this province, are still waiting for the Premier's policies that are going to bring the children home. And I have to say that there really is no choice; he's not leaving the young people any choice.

The Premier's failed leadership, his failed economic policies, his failed blind, ideological, privatization mould has resulted in the loss of 20,000 young people — net loss of 20,000 young people in the last seven years. So that's not bringing the kids home; they're leaving in record numbers.

In February of 1989, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate for young people is 17.5 per cent, almost twice as high as the provincial average, which is also high for unemployment provincially.

This PC government is in charge; it is in power. The Premier of Saskatchewan is at the helm. What is he going to do about young people leaving the province? Is he not concerned about that? These are his stats, Mr. Speaker.

This PC government has left young people with few options but to leave. This government has cut back on university and technical education programs. They've created a crisis in our universities by underfunding. They have not provided job opportunities through summer employment programs. They cut back over \$4 million last year in summer job creation. They've got no winter works program. They've got no long-term strategy for employing young people. Again, there's no . . . and more seriously, as my colleague from Moose Jaw North has said, there's no plan for the future.

The throne speech was full of rhetoric. And I wish the Minister of Education would listen; it's his department that's in a shambles. The throne speech had a lot of rhetoric but no substance, and that simply isn't good enough. We've got the greatest depopulation since the Dirty Thirties in this province. The blind privatization has resulted in losing jobs, exporting our future, exporting our young people. The financial waste and the mismanagement by this Devine government is unprecedented, Mr. Speaker.

Patronage? Well there's no jobs, as my colleague from Moose Jaw North said, no jobs for ordinary Saskatchewan people, but lots of jobs for PC hacks and parasites who are getting high salaries and big benefits at public expense. No relief to small businesses. Money for Pocklington, money for Weyerhaeuser, money for Remai, \$1 billion to ensure that the Premier gets re-elected in Estevan. But where are this government's priorities? Where are the priorities for families, for young people? Where are the Premier's priorities? Who is leading this ship? Who's the conductor of this train that's going the wrong way?

In my view, the Premier of the province is responsible for the fiscal and the economic mess this province is in. Just like his buddy in Alberta, he'll be turfed out at the next election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: — In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beg this government to come to its senses, to seriously come to grips with the fact that young people, young families, are leaving the province; to acknowledge the problem that is faced by the small-business people, the backbone of the economy; to change its view about blatant privatization and destroying one of the major engines of our economic growth and our mixed economy.

I plead with this government to come to its senses, to recognize the problem of out-migration as being very real. As my colleague from Moose Jaw North said, the unemployment rate would be much higher, tremendously a great deal higher, if the people who were leaving were counted in the stats — and they're not, of course. So this government has got to create employment. They need a long-term plan. They need some immediate plans. They need to beef up a summer employment program for students. They need to prioritize education. They need to have faith in the people of Saskatchewan.

People of Saskatchewan want security and they want opportunities. They want to stay here. And people in Saskatchewan want to work. They want hope and they want a future in this province. They don't want to leave their families and go elsewhere, but this government is forcing them to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the government, I would ask the Premier of this province, to quit talking about his support for young people and support for families, but to invest, to start doing something to invest in our young people, to invest in our farm families, to be serious about an economic strategy about an informed and a relevant farm and agricultural policy, and turn this serious out-migration trend around.

It's time for this Devine government to put people first, Mr. Speaker, not . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. I think the hon. member knows what I am referring to, the use of a member's name. And I know we've talked about allowing some of this, but basically where we're allowing it is in quotations, headlines, that sort of thing.

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to close by saying that it is time for this PC Tory government in Saskatchewan to get its act together to develop a long- and a short-term economic strategy that encompasses the mixed economy, not the blind, ideological, privatization, megaproject mentality that is driving people away from this province.

And in closing, again I take great pleasure in, I take great pleasure in seconding the motion put forward by my colleague from Moose Jaw North. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding the motion presented by the member from Moose Jaw South and the out-migration of youth from the province of

Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we've just been discussing for the past number of days the throne speech, and the throne speech has brought out many initiatives that will deal with some of the problems that are being faced in the unemployment sector.

And also, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that over the years there's always been a movement of young people in our country, a movement from one area to another. Even within the province of Saskatchewan we get the movement of our teenagers from the rural area into the cities because of the economic growth within the cities.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little unfair that the member would attack the economic development initiatives of this government, and I find those attacks unjustified.

Mr. Speaker, we're also aware of the fact that the agricultural community in Saskatchewan has faced multiple challenges in the past few years. Just two or three years ago we faced the challenge of grasshopper infestation and the problems associated with the grasshoppers. We've been facing the challenge of global subsidy wars, and the fact that our agricultural producers have been taking lesser prices for their product because of the initiatives other governments have placed to protect their producers.

We've also seen the problem that monumental drought has created. And all the members opposite are as well, Mr. Speaker, are aware of the initiatives, not only by this government but as well by the federal government, in helping our agricultural sector.

And while helping our agricultural community deal with these setbacks, our government has been busy initiating economic development programs to help diversify the economy and lessen the problems facing agriculture on the rest of the province.

Mr. Speaker, had this government not been so active in creating these initiatives, the impact on our province would have been even more horrific; in fact, our entire province would have been decimated by the drought we've been just experiencing. And it's certainly gratifying to see the greater amount of snow and the higher prices in the agricultural field, as I'm sure the farming community themselves are looking forward to even a better year than they've had, experienced the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite know as well as any Saskatchewan resident that the problems related to the drought are what is causing the migration of residents outward, not any policy of this present government. In fact, the Premier just reminded us a few days ago in question period of the fact that we have 10,000 fewer jobs in the agricultural field. And one of the largest institutions in this province of jobs, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, has even had to face some serious questions themselves as they've cut back on their employment, because there just is not the product in the rural economy in order for the wheat pool themselves to maintain their job level.

In reality, Mr. Speaker, it is the policies of this government in economic development and diversification that has kept this province from feeling the even more potentially disastrous effect of the drought, had our economy not been expanded by an economic base created by this government.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of jobs in the agricultural sector points out more than ever the need to diversify the economy of this province. And I believe members opposite know full well that the more economic development stimulated in this province, the less dependent our province will be on the agricultural economy. That in itself will help keep a viable future for the young people of our province.

Talking about youth unemployment, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note statistics that I noted recently. In the years '72 to '82, youth unemployment in this province was 1.9 times the national average; '82 to '89, it was 1.8 times the national average. I would suggest that the fact that it was lower was due to the initiatives of this government in diversifying our economy.

I think an excellent example of the diversification of the economy are the public participation initiatives that this government has embarked on. The member opposite just accused this government of selling out to Weyerhaeuser. In fact, Weyerhaeuser in Prince Albert, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was once the money-losing Crown corporation PAPCO (Prince Albert Pulp Company). And I remember right now with great delight the speech you shared in the throne speech debate just telling each one in this Assembly and the people in this province of the economic development in the Prince Albert area because of Weyerhaeuser.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Weyerhaeuser employs approximately 1,000 people in Saskatchewan, including about 100 in the saw mill in Big River, another 100 at a chemical plant in Saskatoon, and the rest working out of its pulp and paper mills in Prince Albert.

Mr. Speaker, when Weyerhaeuser constructed the world-class paper mill, there were over 700 jobs created in the construction field and 169 more permanent jobs in that area of our province.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but Weyerhaeuser has just announced a \$21 million expansion for their pulp mill, an expansion which will create more jobs for the young people of this province. Weyerhaeuser has tied this expansion directly to the signing of the free trade agreement, an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that it is expected the mill will create 34 permanent jobs and about 100 man-years of construction in the construction of this new expansion to the mill.

(1515)

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the initiatives that will keep young people in Saskatchewan, an initiative which provides a future for our young people, an initiative which appears many times to be opposed by members opposite, rather than proposing new initiatives of how we can create employment to keep our young people here;

in fact, to lure young people from other parts of Canada into this province because we do have a great province to live in.

We do live in a great province. We live in a province with a lot of abundance. We have abundance in mineral wealth, Mr. Speaker, abundance that we need to learn more of how to explore, develop, so that we can create the jobs that are needed to slow down and in fact create an inflow of population versus the outflow.

Mr. Speaker, when we think of Weyerhaeuser and we think of the fact that PAPCO was costing the taxpayers of this province \$90,000 a day, it seems to me that in light of question period, the question period we just faced, that the \$9 million that is going into the Future Corporation — \$9 million which is going to be put into the Future Corporation, which is an incentive to create employment, to promote our province, so that the youth of this province have something to look forward to and indeed more jobs created so that they will continue to stay and work within our province — not just in the cities and the large urban sectors, but I'm sure the members opposite will agree that they would like to see the youth in the small urban communities and on the farm as well. Mr. Speaker, that \$90 million a day that we were losing, or \$90,000, pardon me, could have been used to diversify our economy.

And then we have developments such as the Meadow Lake Sawmill. Since this government sold it to the employees and the local Indian bands, many millions of dollars are being invested in that area, and there are more than 400 new jobs projected to develop. New jobs, not only for all youth of Saskatchewan but even for the natives of our province, for the Indian community who want to create initiative and employment for their own.

When WESTBRIDGE Computer Corporation with the employees and Indian bands are providing a future for their young people, what do the opposition do, Mr. Speaker? They oppose it, Mr. Speaker. When WESTBRIDGE Computer Corporation was initiated with a \$13.9 million share issue to its employees, expansion was almost immediate. Six million dollars in out-of-province contracts has already created 50 new jobs, and continued growth promises another 200 employment opportunities — 200 more jobs, Mr. Speaker, for the youth of this province.

Public participation, creating employment, keeping our youth here, and the NDP propose to fight it. It appears the opposition shows nothing but opposition. I would like to hear some of the initiatives the opposition has as to how we can work together to create employment and create incentives for the youth of our province.

Mr. Speaker, the purchase of the unutilized natural gas reserves has resulted in planned gas development activities that will create new economic activity with 100 new gas wells and the potential, Mr. Speaker, for 600. There was a projected total of 1,000 jobs to be created through this initiative — 1,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker, through one public . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The time is expired.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate over the tragic failure on the part of the provincial government to stop the out-migration of people from our province, and to encourage young people through positive initiatives and programs to stay in Saskatchewan to obtain their education and to seek employment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I recall as a young person growing up in the late 1960s under a right-wing Liberal government, in this case a government that provided very little hope for Saskatchewan youth, a government that was not interested in providing educational opportunities and employment opportunities of Saskatchewan young people.

And I recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it was the young people in this province that decided that it was time for Ross Thatcher to get out of politics, and we went out in droves and worked against Ross Thatcher. And we went out in droves while the election was being conducted and we defeated Ross Thatcher, and I suggest to you that that will again happen in 1989 or 1990.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — I also recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, being a candidate for government in the 1982 election, and the theme that I heard over and over again, on behalf of the members opposite, was bring the children home; that somehow children, young people were leaving Saskatchewan in droves because under an NDP government there were no job opportunities and no educational opportunities.

And I kind of smile about that now; I kind of smile about that now because, as a young person growing up in the 1970s and receiving my post-secondary education and obtaining employment in this province, we had hope. We had job opportunities, we had access to the University of Saskatchewan or technical institutions, and that certainly is not the case now. We had hope; we had a future. We planned to raise our children here in Saskatchewan, but that is not the case now.

An Hon. Member: — We had socialism. That's what we had; it was socialism.

Ms. Atkinson: — And the member opposite says that we had socialism. I call it democracy, Mr. Minister of Education. We had opportunity, we had fairness, we had democracy, and we no longer have that in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Now the member from Moosomin just spoke about the agricultural crisis in Saskatchewan and how his government is moving towards diversification in order to keep people in Saskatchewan. And I want to recall the diversification that we see.

He says we want to have a diversification program because agriculture is gloomy; that we have the European

Economic Community and the Americans to contend with. These people have no hope for agriculture; they've already given up, and I'll explain to you why.

What do we have? We have a rural transition program for farmers who can no longer stay on the land because of the economic agricultural policies of the people opposite. And what do what they want to do? They want to move those people into the city. That's what the rural transition program's all about.

We have a situation where we will soon see farmers paying an additional \$2 a tonne to transport their grain to market. That's under a Tory government.

We have a Tory government that has just removed oats from the Canadian Wheat Board. We have a Tory government that has just talked about equity financing — let's turn the farmers' land over to the big wealthy investors. That is not my idea of what should happen in rural Saskatchewan. Farms should continue to be operated by family operators, family farmers, not some bigwig from Ontario or Toronto or Washington or whatever. It should be owned by the people of Saskatchewan, not people in Hong Kong.

And then we have a Tory government that has just hitched its wagon to the free trade agreement with the United States. And what we have here is a government that is dependent upon . . . is going to hitch its wagon to the free market system of the Americans, and that simply has not worked for the United States, and it won't work for us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recall the Premier, the Premier of Saskatchewan had a major celebration when we welcomed the one-millionth person to the province. And there was a huge celebration, and the press were called and everybody was there. And he was singing the Hallelujah Chorus because we now had 1 million people in our province. But it's interesting. When the population of our province dropped below 1 million people in the month of February, did this government have a farewell party? Did they say goodbye? No. They tried to bury it, and they're denying it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 7,171 people left our province last last month, and in total we had a loss of 6,261 people. That is the most phenomenal number of people leaving our province that I can remember since I in fact was born in 1952. That is phenomenal. And 25 per cent of those people were young people. Now why are they leaving?

This government, in 1986 . . . 1987, I should say, moved to cut post-secondary educational opportunities in this province, and in fact over 1,000 spaces were lost. We saw the nursing program cut at the Wascana and Kelsey institute. We saw a number of hairdressing spaces cut, beauty parlour spaces cut. The numbers were phenomenal. And as a result we've seen a tremendous increase in private education in this province. People who can no longer get into post-secondary institutions in our province are going over to private education institutions.

And while some of those private education institutions

offer good quality educational opportunities, many of them do not. Many of them do not. They set up courses for a travel position, for instance, and when you look at the number of spaces that they're offering, we don't have those number of jobs in Saskatchewan. And when those young people go to get a job at a travel agency, their certificate isn't worth the paper it's written on because it's not recognized anywhere.

And has this government moved to do anything about private education? Not that we can see, Mr. Minister, and I'll be darn interested to know how many of students who are going into those programs are defaulting on student loans because they can't get work. They can't get work because, if you look at what's happening in the United States with private education, over 50 per cent of those students in those programs are defaulting because they're not worth . . . those programs aren't worth the paper they're written on, and those young people can't get job opportunities because of the poor quality of education.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to review for the record, because that's what my colleague, the member from Moosomin did; I just want to review for the record some job creation statistics that have occurred in our province. In the last six years the number of jobs created by the Tory government has been a tremendous disappointment.

From 1981 to 1988 the number of jobs created yearly was about 3,714 jobs. But under a New Democrat government, from 1971 to 1981 the average number of jobs created was 9,100 new jobs each year. Compare the record — compare the record.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — In 1981, there were 334,000 jobs in this province. In 1981, there were 425,000 jobs in this province, for an average of 9,100 jobs each year. And in 1988 the number of jobs in this province was 4,500, or, pardon me, 451,000, for an average of 3,714 new jobs per year.

Now let's look at unemployment under this Tory government opposite. In 1981 there were 21,000 people unemployed. And as far as I'm concerned, when you're unemployed any unemployment is unacceptable. We have to have a full employment policy in our province. But in 1987 under a Tory government there were 36,000 unemployed.

The unemployment rate in our province soared from 4.1 per cent in '81 to something like 7.5 per cent in 1987, and in February last month it was 9.1 per cent, and that's totally unacceptable, totally unacceptable. In NDP years we never had an unemployment rate over 5, and in PC years we've never had an unemployment rate under 6.

Now let's look at youth unemployment. In 1981 there were 100 . . . pardon me, youth employment. In 1981 there are 110,000 jobs for young people in this province, and in 1988 under the Tories there were 90,000 jobs, for a loss of jobs for young people in the neighbourhood of 20,000 jobs. And that, my friends, is why Saskatchewan young people and Saskatchewan people are leaving this

place in droves because they can't find work. And that in fact is the truth. Now we can continue to discuss . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

Why is the member on his feet?

Mr. McLaren: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd ask leave to introduce some students please.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. McLaren: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's a real pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce some exchange students from the state of Kentucky in the United States who are attending the Yorkton Regional High School in my home town. And there are four students, grades 10, 11, and 12, and they are accompanied today by their teachers, Barry Sharpe and Bill Dosch. I hope I've pronounced your last name correctly, Bill.

But it's a real pleasure for me to introduce these students from the United States. I have a soft spot in my heart because two of my children went down to North Dakota for their university, a son in Dickinson State College and my daughter at Mary College in Bismarck, so we certainly enjoy having you come to Saskatchewan.

(1530)

We hope you're enjoying your studies at our high school in Yorkton, and I'll be meeting with you shortly after 4 o'clock for pictures and some drinks, and we can have a session of question and answer about our parliamentary system here in Saskatchewan.

So I would ask all members to please welcome these students to the Assembly today.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — I'd also like to welcome the students, as the opposition's education critic. On behalf of the opposition, I'd like to welcome the students from Kentucky to the legislature.

We in Saskatchewan take our politics very, very seriously. Our system is much different than the American system. We have a parliamentary tradition, and I hope that you have the opportunity to learn about our democratic traditions in this country as we have had the opportunity to learn about yours. And I hope you have a wonderful time at the legislature and have a wonderful time in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTION UNDER RULE 16

Decrease in Population of Saskatchewan (continued)

Mr. Martin: — Mr. Speaker, we've heard for the last . . .

the last three speakers on the opposite side have reeled off a whole bunch of statistics. People come and go in this province. People follow the economy of Canada, wherever it may be. Yes, we've lost a number of people this last year, and I think the Premier pointed out quite clearly that some in the neighbourhood of 10,000 jobs were lost in the agricultural industry last year.

Mr. Speaker, it really doesn't do anybody on either side of the House a lot of good, as far as I'm concerned, to sit here and talk about statistics — people coming and going. Most of the people out there don't understand them anyway.

The point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is: what are we going to do about it? That's the question. These people opposite, the NDP, have not come up with one suggestion to solve any problem in the last four or five years, and I don't suppose they will because they don't have an agricultural policy.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about, just briefly, about the agricultural industry. I'm by no means an expert on agricultural industry, but let me point out some of the things that I am aware of that have done to help the people of this province.

The member from Nutana spoke about keeping people on the farms, and absolutely, I totally agree with that. It may be the only things they said all afternoon that I would agree with, and this government has tried very hard introducing initiatives to keep people on the farms.

For instance, agricultural credit initiatives, Mr. Speaker, agricultural development fund, livestock facilities tax credit, the livestock investment tax credit, livestock cash advance, \$25 for each of the hogs for the hog farmers, \$125 for beef for each of the beef farmers. These things all help. They're interest free, Mr. Speaker, and they work to keep the farmers on the land.

But the big question is, from my point of view as a father of four daughters attending university in this province, my concern is: are there going to be jobs available for them? Now the NDP will say, no, there aren't going to be jobs for them. Well fortunately my children are far more enthusiastic and encouraged than these people are.

We have to, as the member from Saskatoon Eastview said, prioritize education. And I absolutely agree with him — prioritize education. And this government has tried very hard to prioritize education during the last eight years. We must, of course, seek new ways to provide adequate learning opportunities for all the people who want them, regardless of age, economic circumstances, and geographic location. I think the term geographic location points out . . . is what I'd like to speak about for a moment or two.

For instance, we've introduced a wide range of first and second year arts and science classes all over Saskatchewan through the regional college network. We are looking for ways to make credits more portable, easier to transfer from one institution to another in the province.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, living as you do, away from a

major city, that many, many young people going to first year university find it very difficult moving into a city, into Saskatoon or Regina, where heretofore they have had to attend universities. It's very difficult to go to first year university if you live in a smaller community because, I mean, not only is the expense prohibitive in many cases, because of the cost of having to rent an apartment, or whatever, getting back and forth to the communities.

So we felt, our government felt, and the Minister of Education drove this initiative the last couple of years to introduce classes, first and second year university classes, to outlying areas as it were — outlying areas in a sense that are away from the major cities, like Yorkton, or Melfort, or North Battleford, or Swift Current, or Weyburn, or those kinds of communities where young people ready for university could stay in the home community and attend universities.

But not only young people, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about people, perhaps housewives who completed part of a university course and then went on and got married. Or maybe we're talking about nurses who worked as nurses for a few years and then had to . . . and then got married and moved out to the country, wherever they were living, and would like to continue to educate themselves, look for new courses.

So those kinds of things will be available not only through the regional college network but through all distance education programs, like the distance education that now exists at the University of Saskatchewan and the very fine distance education program that exists at the University of Regina — one that I'm particularly interested in. So those kinds of initiatives, I think, Mr. Speaker, are very important to the youth and to the mature students of this province.

But now let's move on to another area. Let's talk for a moment, let me talk for a moment about our four daughters, as I mentioned earlier, four daughters the age of these people up in the Speaker's gallery. What are they going to do when they get out of university? Well, they have to have jobs, and one of the ways that we've done that is to try to build Saskatchewan's economy.

And why do you want to build Saskatchewan's economy? Well, you want to have investment at home; you want to create jobs. And of course by building the economy, it increases investment, diversifies the economy. Now what does it do for the people of Saskatchewan? Well it provides opportunities, increases incomes, creates employment, lower taxes, increases participation, etc., etc., etc. As the Premier said just the other day, Saskatchewan people want to be independent. We do not want to have to rely on the people in eastern Canada for our job opportunities.

Now let me talk about some of the initiatives that have occurred in just the last couple of years where jobs have been created. The Meadow Lake Sawmill, I think, is an excellent example. This is a sale . . . the saw mill was sold to the employees and to 10 local Indian bands and has attracted substantial new investment in the area. For instance, Miller Western Pulp Ltd. is going to invest \$236 million. King, Murphy, Lavelin, that's a chopstick factory,

is going to invest \$11 million. And the saw mill modernization plans will realize \$3.2 million in the Meadow Lake area. There are over 400 jobs projected in that one initiative alone.

WESTBRIDGE Computer Corporation — this company's quick rate of growth has already created new employment opportunities, continued expansion, promises additional jobs. Fifty jobs created, 200 jobs projected, and since forming, WESTBRIDGE has earned new revenue in out-of-province contracts worth \$6 million.

And now the big one for Prince Albert in the Torch River area, Mr. Speaker — where you're from — Weyerhaeuser: \$236 million, \$250 million going into construction. We're talking about 700 construction jobs, 169 permanent jobs. Monthly incomes of paper mill employees are being injected directly into the city of Prince Albert. The city of Prince Albert realizes, every month, \$500,000 into their community.

Now the offshoot from all of that, the small industries who will contribute to the Weyerhaeuser operation, leads into a considerable amount of money.

Saskatchewan Minerals Corporation, Mr. Speaker. Its sale of two companies brought new marketing and technology expertise into the province — \$3.4 million; modernization plans at \$2.5 million. And on and on and on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one more thing too. Parks, Culture and Recreation. Parks leasing arrangements continue to bring new investment and interest into the future development of the province's recreation facilities of \$15.1 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about new opportunities. And one of the things that really has excited me, and I think excited many people in this province, because the response has been simply overwhelming . . . For many, many years in this province, because we are so isolated, because we're a small province relying on agriculture, if we wanted to do any power projects or telephone projects or whatever major projects . . . For instance, if we wanted to get power out to the people in rural Saskatchewan, we had to borrow the money from New York or from Toronto or from Japan or some other place. This year, this last year, Mr. Speaker, this government introduced an initiative called SaskPower bonds. These bonds were sold only to the people of Saskatchewan. We raised \$340 million in this province from the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martin: — Now that's independence. We no longer have to rely . . . But the good part is, not only did we raise the \$340 million, but \$34 million in interest goes back to the people of Saskatchewan; not to New York, not to Japan or to Toronto or some other place, but right back to the people of Saskatchewan. Now that's participation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martin: — It's very difficult, Mr. Speaker . . . Well it's

not. I was going to say it's difficult to remain optimistic with the flood of pessimism that we hear from the people across the way. But not even, not even their pessimism on a day-to-day basis, not only the denigrating expressions that we hear from that side of the House can do anything to stop my enthusiasm or the enthusiasm of members on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, it just gets better and better and better.

Then of course we have the SaskTel bonds that the member from Regina . . . one of the members from Regina has denigrated on many, many occasions — in at \$103 million; 28,900 Saskatchewan people bought bonds — 28,900 Saskatchewan people bought bonds, SaskTel bonds. There's two kinds of bonds. There's the credit bond which will be credited to the telephone.

Mr. Speaker, the public participation and privatization initiative is a world-wide program, and goes on and on.

But, Mr. Speaker, the motion brought by the member from Moose Jaw urges the Government of . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this debate, and I can understand why the member from Wascana didn't want to talk about the unemployment situation in Saskatchewan, and talked about selling SaskTel bonds, and SaskPower bonds. I wonder what those people who are unemployed, and those people who have left the province would say to him if that's your only answer is to say to those who have the money, we'll give you a greater opportunity to make the money — but we're not concerned about you people who don't have any jobs. If you want to leave, that's tough luck. Talk about the programs that could have affected those young people; that's what we want to do today.

And I say to the member from Wascana, when you were amalgamating the technical institutes, when you and I went to the U of R the other day, they didn't welcome you with open arms. If they were so grateful about the programs that you are providing for them, why were they so critical of you and your government?

I say to the Minister of Education, when we met at Kelsey the other day, they didn't welcome him with open arms there; they didn't applaud him for all the things that he did or supposedly good things that he did. Why should the staff, and why should the students of this province welcome you people and applaud you when you cut their positions, when you cut programs, when you cut opportunities for our young people. Why should they applaud you? And they don't.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we need here is some realistic viewpoints from the members opposite. If you were realistic you would appreciate the fact that if all those people who had left, you would now have 64,000 people unemployed in this province. That's a tragedy. That doesn't speak very well of this government.

And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they say, where are our programs? I say to them, we are not the government;

you are the government, and it's your responsibility to provide those programs and to provide those opportunities. And when the Premier says, when the Premier says that we, that Saskatchewan has so much going for it that you can waste a little and still come out ahead, I'll say to the Premier in this province, when you take a province from a net deficit of \$3.4 billion to over \$12 billion, you are not breaking even and you're not coming out ahead.

But I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is money available. The members opposite say, well we've had tough times, but every time one of their people needs a job, as my member from Moose Jaw North says, or Moose Jaw South, is it North? North . . . Moose Jaw North says, every time a Tory gets defeated, up pops a job.

There is money available but only for those people who are associated with the Tories opposite. And that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is unacceptable. That's simply unacceptable. Let's get our priorities in order. Let's give some priority to education. Let's give some funding to the U of R and the U of S and our technical institutes so our students, the ones that are qualified, the ones that have met the standards in the past, are able to attend our universities. It is our bright and future leaders, Mr. Deputy Speaker, sad to say, that have to leave this province, that have to leave this province for opportunities somewhere else. And it's about time that members opposite recognize that.

(1545)

I remember full well 1982 when the Premier, over and over and over again, said, let's bring our children home. Why is he now, why is he now chasing those people outside the province? If he and his ministers spent less time on privatizing and spent more time on devising programs of employment for our young people and opportunities for our young people, I think the people of this province would be more appreciative of your efforts.

But all we hear, day in and day out, if a particular agency is profitable it's a good candidate for privatization. SaskPower, natural gas, very profitable — it's a candidate for privatization. Let's sell it off and let's give all that money to the private sector and have none for our own programs. And, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't make sense. But it makes sense over there if you are a friend of the government.

We heard today again, heard today again, advertising by this government. We heard the other day the member from Westmount — \$32.5 million went to Dome Advertising in less than two years. But no money, no money for programs for our young people, no money for programs. We heard today a member bringing forth an incident where we have a company doing a consultative study for \$77,000, and the minister refuses to tell the people of Saskatchewan what that study was all about.

We heard a question directed to the Premier today, a study done by Remai — twenty-two-point-some thousand dollars — and again no intelligent answer given to the people of this province as to why that money is spent in that fashion.

We have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a wastage of \$34,000 a day of leased property that is not needed by the government — empty spaces not needed by this government. And I say to the members opposite, if you took all those millions of dollars and applied only a portion of that to create jobs for our young people, we wouldn't have had the exodus of over 7,000 people in the month of February, just a few months ago.

But you people don't seem to care. You don't seem to care that our young people have to leave and can't find any opportunities here. But I say to the members opposite that these are our young people who should be the future leaders, not in other provinces, but they should be the future leaders here in this province. They should be the ones that we should be relying upon.

And I say to the members opposite and particularly the Premier, unless you have a vibrant economy, unless you take a hold of all the sectors of this economy — and that is the private and the public and the co-operative sector — you cannot, you cannot provide those opportunities. And if you rely only on the free market principle, this province will not endure and it will not provide the opportunities that we need for our young people so that they can stay in this province.

When you privatize, we saw in the past privatization of our highway workers, hundreds of people put out of work. We saw the children's dental program privatized — 3 to 400 people out of work. We saw Saskoil sold off — another 25 per cent of the employees in Saskatchewan out of work. Oh, lots of jobs created in Alberta where Saskoil went to invest, but no jobs for our people here.

I say to the members opposite, you have your priorities all mixed up. When the member from Wascana says that, oh well, PAPCO was losing money, it only lost money when the members opposite took over. They sold Saskoil. They sold PAPCO for \$100 million less than it was worth. They sold Sask Minerals. They had it assessed themselves. They sold it for \$7 million less. I say to the members opposite, just those two alone of \$107 million, if you had taken only a portion of that and put it into programs for our young people they wouldn't have to leave this province. They could stay here and work here and earn their livelihood in this province.

And Minister of Education, it's about time that you start recognizing that it's your responsibility to make certain that our young people can attend technical schools and the universities. So don't cut programs; don't cut the spaces. And see to it that there is adequate funding, adequate funding for our students in this province so that they can get their post-secondary education.

Mr. Minister, that is your job. That's why you were assigned that job and I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the minister will take those things seriously and see to it that he gets through to the Minister of Finance so that adequate funding, adequate funding will be available for education.

Our libraries rated about eighth or ninth on a scale of 10 last year in the whole country of Canada. The U of S

library was so badly outdated and didn't have the updated books that they needed for the programs available. And the Minister of Education says, but we're short of money; times are tough. And I say to the minister, I've given you several examples today where you could have had adequate funding for those programs.

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. The member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's somewhat sad that I have to be speaking on part of a resolution that was brought forward from members of the opposition in regards to the exodus and migration of young people from the province of Saskatchewan and other areas of the country.

I'd like to touch on some basics, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not like that of the member from Saskatoon South that's been kind of talking and sounding his horn. But I'd like to indicate to the member from Saskatoon South and to all members of the opposition that this government has reacted in many different ways as far as job creation and enhancing the security of Saskatchewan young people and seniors, and in fact including everyone in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government has taken many initiatives, and those initiatives are definitely cited and very much a part of us as far as the public participation is going in this province.

But I want to take you back a little further. I want to take you back to the point in time where the NDP opposition were the then government, and I want to relate this to my particular constituency. I want to relate this to my particular constituency where there is an oil economy as well as an agricultural sector out in my particular area. I want to indicate to the NDP opposition that they were the individuals that . . . and their federal NDP caucus members were the individuals that tossed out . . .

The Deputy Speaker: — Order. I'd ask the member from Moose Jaw North to allow the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster to make his comments.

Mr. Hopfner: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I thank you for your ruling. I know I touch nerves when we touch into the realm of the way they used to operate as a government in this province.

But I want to indicate to you that along with their federal counterparts, their NDP federal members here in Saskatchewan, I want to indicate to you that those were the members that sided with the Liberal government of that time to oust a Tory administration that was definitely aware of the western Canadian . . . and in fact in the economy, and that takes into consideration Saskatchewan's economy and jobs for young people.

And I want to say to you, I want to say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we inherited, for instance, the energy program here, the national energy program here through Pierre Elliott Trudeau's day and the NDP opposition were

those that sided with him.

And I want to talk to you about exodus. I'll tell you, it had brought us down to our knees in my riding. It had brought it to the point where people were leaving in hordes into the U.S. for jobs in drilling and exploring for new oil reserves. And they disrupted families. They just uprooted these families that thought they had long-term secure jobs in my constituency.

And that's not only my riding, but you can look at the Estevan riding. You can look at Weyburn and all throughout the province in regards to the oil and gas program. In fact, under their administration, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the members opposite, as they were in government for I believe 10, 11 years under the NDP logo, they did not I believe even hit the 100 in numbers for the number of gas wells drilled in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I want to indicate to the members opposite that if you look back at a change in our policies here in the province of Saskatchewan, that we had had close to 800 natural gas wells drilled and put into production here in our province. It had created many jobs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for man, woman and the young people of this province.

And I want to indicate the spin-off factors, the spin-off factors for small business and allowing our high school students and our university students an opportunity for those jobs.

And I understand and I listen to the members talk about cuts, cuts, cuts. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I challenge any one of those members to show to anybody where there has actually been any cuts in any one of the various different departments that they so point out. I asked them to show me in Health; I asked them to show me in Education; I asked them to show me in any department that they wish. I will guarantee to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there have been increased expenditures in every year in every department for every particular main social and government service department.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if these guys would come out and tell the truth about the fact of the expenditures, instead of trying to sing the old story that they're so used to singing, I want to indicate to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there has to be, and it's true, a great change in attitude from those members.

I ask the people of Saskatchewan, whenever you hear one of those NDP opposition members run down our policies and what we're trying to do to enhance the job and the secured living of people in our province, and they run it down, what's the alternative? What are they giving to the people in this province as an alternative?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have not, to this day, since this session, this here latest session started, they have not offered one idea, one new little idea that would have enhanced anything.

And I want to indicate to you that they talk about the migration of people. Saskatchewan, under their administration, has never been in a population of a

million-plus people. And I'll tell you today, to this day Saskatchewan is still a million-plus people. So where are they coming from? I ask you, where are the NDP opposition coming from?

We've had a poor economic situation in agriculture. We've had poor economic situation in oil, in revenues, in resource revenues. And I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there has been not once that this administration, this PC government under our leader, our great Premier, that has ever turned his back or the government's back on any of the people in this province.

When the member from Saskatoon South talks about cuts in health care, he was the one that put the moratorium on nursing homes and hospitals. That didn't create jobs in the building industry as well as the service sector — jobs for nurses and doctors and everyone else that had to do with it.

(1600)

I want to indicate to you, the member from Saskatoon South was then the Minister of Health, and all he could think of was moratoriums. His greatest expenditure into the health system here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was about \$700 million and that was still in 1982.

When this administration took over, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have doubled that expenditure. And that member over there has the gall to stand up, the member from Saskatoon South has the gall to stand up and criticize this administration because we're doing nothing for health care enhancement.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that on the point of health care I'll give you an example. In my riding, Mr. Speaker, my riding has received three brand-new hospitals; it's received a couple of brand-new nursing homes. And I want to tell you that those were . . . the NDP had gone through three elections promising those facilities and it took a Tory government to deliver.

And I want to say that the people in my riding will not forget; they will not forget. In fact, I want to indicate to you that jobs were under way, the carpenters were building these facilities. And this was in the 1986 election when we were having a nursing home being built . . .

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, I want to take part in the debate. There were some introductions during the debate, and I don't know how much time is left. Could you . . .

The Speaker: — All I have here, according to our records, we're at 73:14. So you have almost two minutes, not quite.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to use the time, Mr. Speaker, that's available to me to put forward some of the facts with regard to the resolution that's before us.

The motion before us laments the fact that over 6,000 people left the province of Saskatchewan in February 1989. And the answer to the problem, which is contained in the motion, is that jobs should be provided in Saskatchewan for those people that are leaving Saskatchewan for jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I speak of this from a personal point of view as well. I have a son who has graduated at the University of Saskatchewan. He has a master's degree. He left the province in January, 1989, and he obtained a very good job outside of Saskatchewan. So I have some personal experience with this particular problem.

The facts of the matter are, Mr. Speaker, the labour force of Saskatchewan — 1988 February, compared to February 1989 — has dropped 6,000 people. The persons employed has dropped by 12,000 people from February '88 to February '89. The population, of course, has dropped 6,260 people. The aggregate drop in population in this year, January and February of this year, is over 8,000.

The problem with this government is that they won't admit there's a problem. That's the problem. Mr. Speaker, what are the human consequential effects of this? The consequential effects of the policies followed by this government are that people are unemployed in greater numbers in Saskatchewan and people are leaving in greater numbers . . .

The Speaker: — Time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 4 — Financial Situation in Saskatchewan

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I shall at the conclusion of my remarks move a motion:

That this Assembly condemns the waste and financial mismanagement of the provincial government, which have caused an alarming provincial deficit and an unfair tax increase on Saskatchewan people.

The hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden wants to know if I want to talk about the clock. That makes about as much sense as some of the budgets he's brought in, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the 1982 campaign where I think all of this began. The hon. members opposite ran that campaign on the basis of what at the time must have been known to them to have been irresponsible, and certainly it has proved to have been since.

They promised money in your pocket. I wonder how many Saskatchewan people remember those campaign slogans, "Money in your pocket." They abolished thereafter the gas tax, reduced oil royalties, and lo and behold!, produced a deficit — a deficit that began at \$312 million.

I recall asking the member from Kindersley, who was the first Finance minister, when he thought they might balance the budget. After prodding him in his estimates for a few moments, he finally ventured a guess that he thought he would probably succeed in balancing the budget by the time the 1986 election rolled around. Oops, he missed. Not only did he not eliminate the deficit; by the time the 1986 election rolled around, the deficit had increased by almost an arithmetic progression to 1.2 billion.

If viewed with hindsight, those four years were the height of folly, Mr. Speaker. Simply put, we took off the gas tax, ran up a deficit that's \$3.8 billion, and now we've reinserted the gas tax and we've still got the deficit. I wonder if it isn't obvious even to members opposite that that was folly, that was mismanagement of the highest order.

Not only do we have, Mr. Speaker, the gas tax back on at an increased level, we see, we learn in the last few days, we've a sales tax which is higher at 7 per cent, a flat tax of 2 per cent which produces a high level of taxes for Saskatchewan people, and any number of small nuisance taxes. They're just endless. Everything from increased park fees to fees for incorporating companies that have increased by . . . that have trebled since these people took office — just endless. Increased hunting fees. Every time one pays a fee to this government, it seems to have gone up.

We're carrying a much, much higher tax load; at the same time we have a much poorer level of services. One would not have thought it possible, but it has happened. We have a higher tax load, not because we have better hospitals — the public of Saskatchewan are acutely aware of how seriously our health system is underfunded; not because we give our young people a higher quality education in our schools and universities. Anyone who has visited a university, as I have, is embarrassed that our young people would be getting an education in an institution which is so seriously underfunded. I find it embarrassing the way we treat young people.

We're not paying a higher level of taxes because we have better roads. No one can walk down the streets without realizing that isn't the case. We suffer, as bizarre as it seems, we suffer from a higher level of taxes and a poorer level of services.

How could that have come about? Well it comes about in part, Mr. Speaker, because we've still got the \$3.8 million deficit. We have the gas tax back, we have other taxes on a higher level, and we've still got the deficit. Even members opposite must realize how foolish those four years were.

It's a fact, Mr. Speaker, that in the last budget only three departments enjoyed a higher allocation of money than we spent on interest. And I will predict that in the next budget, only in Health and Education will we spend more than we will on interest. We will this year go to spending more on interest than we do on social services. It's a fact, Mr. Speaker, that we spend more money feeding the bankers in New York and Tokyo and Hong Kong and

Zurich than we do in feeding the poor in Saskatchewan. And that ought to embarrass members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we have money for an advertising program which must be totalled in the tens of millions of dollars, and we don't have a few hundred thousand dollars for a fresh food program for northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we enjoy . . . we are afflicted with, I should say, a higher level of taxes and a poorer level of services, not just because of the deficit but because there is an enormous amount of waste and mismanagement in this government. The public of Saskatchewan are coming to understand how expensive it is to run a government which is based on patronage. Patronage is a very, very expensive way to waste money and to run a government. Not only do you have people in office who don't know what they're doing, but you've people in office who simply aren't needed.

There's an endless amount of patronage. Perhaps the most brazen illustration of that is one of the oldest, Dome Advertising. This government had not found out where the washrooms were in this building when they announced that all advertising would be handled through Dome Advertising. That's also the same company, not by chance, which does all the advertising for the Conservative Party.

An Hon. Member: — Imagine that.

Mr. Shillington: — Imagine that, the member from Weyburn says. It appears not to bother his conscience that those two accounts can get mixed up and undoubtedly do — undoubtedly do. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers pay for the lavish advertising programs that the Conservative Party treats the public in Saskatchewan to. Undoubtedly that's true. And if it isn't true, I invite members opposite to give us the answers to the orders for returns which would establish that.

If the members opposite say it's not true, then I say to the members opposite, we will be moving some motions for return which would prove your innocence. All you have to do is pass them rather than amend them. I know full well, because this is seven years I have sat opposite watching this scam; I know full well that those orders for return will never be passed. They will be amended into some harmless form. Once again we will know that you are funding Conservative Party advertising with tax dollars, and so will the public in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, if one compares the '81-82 year to the '88-89 year, the year which will be completed in a few days, the mismanagement in this government comes into stark contrast. Since February 1, 1982, the cost of living in Canada has increased by 38 per cent. The expenditures of this government have increased by 55 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The level of expenditures has gone up much more rapidly than the cost of living. While hospital waiting lists sit at a level which is simply not acceptable, while schools and universities embarrass responsible people who care about young people, while the highways and streets are almost impassable, and while food banks are unable to meet the demand — all of the time that the public of Saskatchewan suffer through these

indignities and this degradation of public services, expenditures in this province have increased by roughly half again as fast as the level of inflation.

(1615)

How can that happen? How could we have a runaway level of expenditures and a collapsing level of services? Well it happens, as I said, because patronage and waste . . . patronage is a very expensive way to run a government. There's any number of examples of it. If one had to kill time, if that were my ambition, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't think of a better subject to do it on than the patronage in this government. There's just an endless number of illustrations.

An Hon. Member: — We can't even match you guys.

Mr. Shillington: — I say to the member from Weyburn, who is making his usual sparkling contribution from his seat, that you will have an opportunity, you'll have an opportunity to defend your record, and I'll venture to say the member from Weyburn won't take it. I'll venture to say the member from Weyburn will be a great deal quieter when he gets an opportunity to stand than he is from his seat. The member from Weyburn will have his chance, and I know his contribution will be every bit as sparkling from his feet as it is from his seat.

There's any number of examples of this. We saw yet another one today. And some of these examples just go on endlessly.

Last year the public of Saskatchewan were outraged by the fact that we had rented a hotel as an office building for public servants. An ex-cabinet minister, Mr. Embury's response was: oh, good heavens! they didn't do it, did they? Well they did. They rented a hotel at an exorbitant cost per square foot, then they left it empty for a period of time, paid rent on an empty building.

Now we find out, Mr. Speaker, that they commissioned a study by the people who were going to rent them the space to determine whether or not the government ought to lease the space from them. I have, in my years that I've been in office, Mr. Speaker, seen some incredibly useless studies, but I cannot imagine a more useless expenditure than commissioning someone who you're going to lease from to do a study to tell you whether or not you ought to lease it. That strikes me as something that you might want an outside opinion on.

As I say, the list is just endless, and these examples just go on endlessly. But while the Renaissance Hotel may be an outrageous example, the sums are trifling when you compare them with some of the waste that goes on elsewhere — absolutely trifling, infinitesimally small.

I'll mention just one of them: the Rafferty dam. I think it's apparent, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of alternatives to the Rafferty dam. The best one is the cheapest, and that's conservation; that is relatively cheap. And I think it's becoming apparent, Mr. Speaker, that we need to conserve energy rather than try and promote its use, which is what the Saskatchewan Power Corporation does under your auspices. Under the

auspices of members opposite, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation encourages the use of energy and promotes it and does nothing to promote conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is true . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well now, I must say I've done something I didn't think was possible. I've offended the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden. I am most surprised. Nothing I said was . . . I assure the member, nothing I said was in any way designed, Mr. Member, to ruffle your feathers, and I'm dreadfully sorry that I've done so.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1970s we went through the energy crisis. Ten years later we're going through an ecological crisis — 1988 may well be the year that the earth said, ouch! We had, at one and the same time, a discussion of a greenhouse effect, the depletion of the ozone layer. It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that in the long run, and perhaps even in the short run, we don't have any option but to be a lot more conservative in our use of the earth's resources. That is what members opposite ought to be doing, but they're not.

Let's supposing just for the moment, Mr. Speaker, that the power is needed. We have at Coronach a partially utilized power plant. It's designed for four generating units; it does not happen — it has two. It is apparent even to people who aren't of an engineering bent, Mr. Speaker, that for approximately \$300 million those units could be brought on stream, with few additional ecological problems. Are they doing that? No, of course they're not. Instead, they're building at Estevan, in the Premier's riding, the Rafferty dam at a cost of two to three times that.

Mr. Speaker, the Rafferty dam illustrates something else, and that is that the mismanagement in this government is not due to incompetence. That would be a very generous statement, and I wished I could believe it. I wished I could believe of members opposite that their waste and mismanagement was due to incompetence. Some of it is clearly intentional; it is patronage.

Mr. Speaker, we see another illustration of that as a result of the Rafferty fiasco. Not only has . . . There is a group which all members will be familiar with, SCRAP (Stop Construction of the Rafferty and Alameda Project). It has sued members opposite, and may well succeed, because they bypassed the process by which these things are evaluated.

Just last month, Mr. Speaker, it introduced yet another novel idea and one that I dearly hope bears some fruition. They asked the RCMP to press criminal charges against this government; did so on the following basis: if I am a trustee of private property and I utilize that property not for the benefit of those for whom the property is held but for my own personal gain, I'm guilty of a criminal breach of trust. What they have said is, there's a similar concept with respect to public property. If you take public property and knowingly use it for your own purposes rather than in the best interests of the public, you're guilty of a public breach of trust.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting concept, and I sincerely wish they proceed. I don't have a whole lot of optimism they're going to, because for that to happen

would require the consent of the Justice department. I dearly wish I could believe that the Justice department in this government is honestly and fairly run, but I don't, and neither do most other observers who have watched this government.

What we have seen in the last brief while, with respect to Rafferty, is this government hiding information, this government attempting to manipulate the processes by which public decisions are made, so that the federal government won't catch up to them, so that the Manitoba government won't catch up to them, and so that the public of Saskatchewan won't catch up to them.

Well I've got news for them, Mr. Speaker. The public of Saskatchewan are going to catch up to them. It may come this year. If it doesn't, it will come next year in the form of an election. And when the Saskatchewan public catches up to them, they will finally get that which is their just deserts.

Mr. Speaker, they have hidden information in other ways. I mentioned the property management corporation. The expenditures of this government increased very rapidly when the property management corporation came into being. Expenditures within a year increased by 25 per cent. The property management corporation, as members opposite and as the public will know, basically provides the lease space for the government in buildings and provides the property — the pens, the pencils, the waste-baskets, the desks, etc., that this government uses. We no longer have really any means of finding out how that money is spent.

One of the acts which endeared this government to the public early in its reign was in the summer of 1982 in the midst of a very serious water problem in Regina. Their response was not to do anything about it, but to look after themselves. They installed Nimbus water treaters in each of their offices. It outraged the public, as well it should.

I say, Mr. Speaker, today we'd never know that happened. With the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation in place, we'd have no means of ever knowing such a thing had happened. Basically, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that since the property management corporation has been brought into being, we have no means of finding out how a large portion of the public funds are spent.

The auditor, Willard Lutz, referred to this fact, referred to the fact that the Crown corporations are being used to keep information from members of this legislature, and what happened? He was pilloried by members opposite who sat on that committee. For several days the Public Accounts Committee was stalemated by the issue. And finally, I believe more to get public accounts working than because he felt any sense of remorse for what he said, he partially at least, withdrew the remark.

I would mention this while the tabling of the **Public Accounts** . . . Until this government took office, the **Public Accounts** were available and tabled in the fall, usually in November or December. They have not, Mr. Speaker, been tabled by this government, with one exception, before the spring.

Mr. Speaker, there was one occasion when the former Paul Rousseau, the member from Regina South, did table the **Public Accounts** in February. And when some people used the **Public Accounts** to do what this legislature is here for, that is to hold the government to account, he said he was never going to introduce them again, and hasn't.

Mr. Speaker, I could mention the activities of the Public Accounts Committee in attempting to gag members of this opposition who ask questions, legitimate questions about the Minister of Finance and how much he knew previous to 1968. Perfectly legitimate questions, questions the public accounts should be asking about the minister's activities in 1986, and members opposite attempted to gag our members. I don't think, frankly, they succeeded.

I could mention the orders for returns, some of which were over two years old, that have not been answered. This is information which we are supposed to be given so that we can do our job, we can do what this legislature is here for, and that is to call this government to account.

Mr. Speaker, for all of those reasons I know members opposite will suffer some very severe pangs of conscience if they don't vote for the following resolution which I now move, seconded by the member from Saskatoon Fairview:

That this Assembly condemns the waste and financial mismanagement of the provincial government, which have caused an alarming provincial deficit and unfair tax increases on Saskatchewan people.

An Hon. Member: — Let's . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Shillington: — We'll be very certain we leave sufficient time for the member from Weyburn to come to his defence.

Mr. Mitchell: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very important motion to bring before this House, and a very important subject to speak about and remind the people of Saskatchewan just what's been happening over the last seven years and what it means to them.

The waste and financial mismanagement of this government are subjects that have been spoken about and brought to the attention of the people of this province by members of the opposition and by others, again and again and again. And as my friend from Regina Centre says, the government will be brought to account for those matters at the appropriate time in the future.

I want to focus on the question of the deficit, the deficit that is a result of the financial mismanagement and the waste of this government over the past seven years. And I want to discuss it, Mr. Speaker, in the context of what that deficit means to this province this year and next year and all of the succeeding years, and what the result will be, what the consequences will be for the people of this province.

The deficit, as we all know, has risen to a level of 3.7 to \$3.8 billion. Now that's a very, very large amount of money. Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for a person making say \$30,000 a year to even comprehend how much three billion eight hundred million dollars actually is. It's just one of those numbers that are so fantastically large that you can't envision how much it is.

Well to give it some perspective, Mr. Speaker, let's just look at the cost of that deficit year after year so far as the people of this province are concerned. And the cost is the interest payments that we have to make just in order to pay for that money which we've borrowed over the last seven years.

And it's important to keep reminding ourself that we have borrowed that money over the last seven years. Because as we have said over and over again, until the year 1982 there was no deficit in this province; there was a surplus. And all of this outrage, all of this \$3.8 billion has been run up since my friends opposite have been elected. And the blame for that lies upon them and they must bear the consequences of it.

(1630)

Now the interest rate, Mr. Speaker, is the figure provided by the government in its estimates, and it is \$330 million; \$330 million is the amount that I think we'll see when the Minister of Finance tables his budget at the end of this month.

Now \$330 million, Mr. Speaker, can be understood if you think about it in terms of how much that is each day, and it is almost a million dollars each day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. You wake up tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, and it's with the certain knowledge that today our province is going to have to pay a million dollars to finance that deficit of 3.8 billion — \$1 million dollars.

An Hon. Member: — Is there another way you can put that?

Mr. Mitchell: — Now I think that I'll respond to the question just asked by the member from Weyburn, and that is, can I put it in another context, give it another perspective. Let me just do this. Imagine that . . . let me do it in this way. Imagine that a child care program was to be introduced in this province next month, a really comprehensive, meaningful child care program. Let's say that that child care program is to cost us, say, \$12 million — and you could mount quite a meaningful child care program for \$12 million. That would be the equivalent of 12 days interest — 12 days interest. Now how's that for a perspective?

If we think, for example, that the . . . let's look at the drug plan for a moment — look at the drug plan, the changes to the drug plan with the introduction of the deductible, the annual deductible, and the introduction of a 20 per cent charge for the drugs covered by the plan. And think about how much the government thinks it's saving, how much the people are having to pay for drugs that used to be obtained for free. Is that figure, what, \$30 million? Say the figure is \$30 million, Mr. Speaker. That's only one month's interest — one month's interest on this debt. And

that's all attributable to the mismanagement of this government over the past seven years.

Now consider it in this perspective, if the House needs still another perspective in order to understand the point. We have in this province an annual expenditure of \$330 million which we just simply didn't have before. It wasn't here. In order to achieve a balanced budget in Saskatchewan, we're going to have to come up with 330 million more dollars than we would have had to in 1982, because that expenditure just wasn't there.

In other words, the Blakeney government could balance the budget, but if the Blakeney government had to pay the kind of interest that this government has to pay today, it starts off with a deficit of \$330 million, makes it almost impossible for my friends opposite to ever achieve a balanced budget, and I don't think they ever will. I don't see how they can do it.

In order to do it, they're going to have to cut services to the people of this province to an unacceptable level. A new government is required, Mr. Speaker, a new government which can get Saskatchewan going again, generate the kind of revenues that have to be generated in order to put this province back on a sound financial footing again.

Now how did it happen? You know, the fact is that nobody knows how it happened, at least nobody outside of a few people in this House. Something serious went wrong, Mr. Speaker, back about 1982, 1983, when this government, when this party took over the government of this province.

And yet, and yet, what was it? Whenever they speak to the subject, which is very seldom, they're inclined to say, well we've just had a lot of bad luck; we've had a lot of bad luck. Oil prices are bad; potash prices are bad; farming situation's been bad. In other words, none of it is their fault, Mr. Speaker, none of it is their fault at all. They're just sitting there sort of the unlucky victims of a lot of international circumstances that combined, or conspired, to put them into this dreadful position.

And that's nonsense, Mr. Speaker, that just doesn't bear up to examination. If you look at oil prices over the past seven years, oil prices go up, oil prices go down, but on the whole the oil prices haven't been bad. Today as we speak, they're not bad. They weren't bad at this time last year. So that that can't be an excuse.

You look at the potash prices, and the potash prices over the last seven years haven't been bad either. It was a cyclical market again. It took a dip in the last two years, but it was strong before that and it's strong now. And you can't blame any part of this deficit, or any but a small part of this deficit, on the potash prices.

And so it goes, Mr. Speaker. There's no obvious answer. There's nothing that these people can point to to blame and say, that's why we have a deficit. The answer, rather, lies in the way in which they've conducted themselves in government, in the way in which they've squandered and foolishly wasted the money, the resources of this province; and the way in which, at the same time, they have not behaved properly as far as collecting revenue is

concerned.

And let me give you what I think is the outstanding example. It is the way in which this government has treated the oil industry. Now in 1982, which is the year of course in which they attained office — so part of this is their numbers as well as the former government — in 1982, the value of production was about 1.3 million. That's \$1.3 million. That's the value of production. And the provincial revenue taken from that production was 700 million.

The production in 1987 was higher than that. It was about \$1.5 billion worth of production — about the same as it was in 1982. But the provincial revenue taken from it was less than half, Mr. Speaker. The provincial revenue taken from that production was 347 million.

The oil industry, producing more oil in 1987 than it produced in 1982, was having to pay to the provincial government less than half of the taxes and royalties that it paid in 1982. Now that's a lot of money. And if you look at the figures between 1982 and 1987, you get some very significant figures.

In 1983, production rose to 1.7 billion; and in 1984, to 2.1 billion; in 1985, to 2.4 billion, and so on, Mr. Speaker. And during that time, the revenue figures gradually declined until, as I say, in 1987 it is only half of what it was in 1982.

That's the kind of financial mismanagement that we're talking about. That's the kind of financial mismanagement that just makes a mockery out of the notion that the financial fix of this government, the financial difficulties therein, are as a result of forces over which they have no control. The fact of the matter is they have a lot of control over these forces, and they have allowed themselves to get into this ridiculous, ridiculous financial situation.

So I repeat again — and I fear we have to keep repeating these numbers so that the people of the province will clearly understand them. That deficit is so high today that this province pays \$1 million per day in interest — \$330 million a year. And that money has to be paid before anything else is paid in this province. To achieve a balanced budget, we have to be in the same position as we would have in 1982 to achieve a surplus of \$330 million, and that kind of surplus, Mr. Speaker, is just never, ever achieved by government. That's the kind of financial situation that we're in.

And when you think about what you could do with that money, what you could do with that \$1 million a year, it's enough to bring tears to your eyes. Think of a lavish program that may cost \$60 million and these people would say we can't afford that kind of a program because we don't have the money. Mr. Speaker, it is two months interest, and if we hadn't been led down this awful garden path, we would be able to afford that kind of new programming that is so much required by the people of this province.

Now while the oil companies have been getting a good revenue break as I've just described, Mr. Speaker, some of the other people in this province haven't done as well. Some of

the other people in this province haven't done as well at all. Some of the other people in this province haven't done as well at all.

The reality is, as we pointed out before, that a Saskatchewan family of four with a total income of \$40,000 pays the highest provincial income tax in Canada. That didn't used to be the case. A flat tax was introduced in 1985 and has been bumped up since then to the point now where it is 2 per cent of net income, and for a lot of people in my constituency that amounts to \$600 a year which they didn't used to have to pay. So they're certainly paying their part. They're certainly making a contribution to this government to try and balance its books.

Between 1982 and 1987 farm operating costs in this province increased by 10 per cent, but over that same period the total property taxes paid on Saskatchewan farms jumped by 44 per cent. Now over this same period, 1982 to 1987, the annual revenue from individual income tax increased by 36 per cent. Now not all people have shared in this same kind of pay, Mr. Speaker, because Saskatchewan corporations, at the same time, paid an increase of only 25 per cent, and the revenue realized from corporate income tax only increased by 25 per cent. The amount realized from individual income tax increased by 36 per cent, and a good deal of that lies at the foot of the flat tax.

Property taxes increased at the same time. Property taxes increased because the municipalities had to increase them. They weren't able to look to this government to provide them with the funds that would normally have been provided to municipal governments. And as a result, Saskatoon property taxes increased by 65 per cent, Regina property taxes by 55 per cent, Yorkton property taxes by 55 per cent. This is a terrible load for the people in this province to be paying.

And while they're paying it, they still see a government which is not able to manage the financial affairs of this province, a government that continues to run a deficit, continues to get us deeper and deeper into the hole, and creates a situation, Mr. Speaker, where our children and our grandchildren are going to have to be suffering the consequences of this mismanagement for decades — for decades.

Now I am going to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, because we do want to hear from the member from Weyburn. But I want to go back once more to this very, very important idea, this very important reality that it is the members opposite that have created this deficit. There is no excuse for them having created it. They have never, ever been able to justify or to explain to the people of this province how they got us into this mess, what they did, or what they had to do that justified it.

The fact of the matter is that during those seven years, Mr. Speaker, resource prices have, on the whole, been strong. They've dipped up, they've dipped down, but on the whole they're strong. The fact of the matter is that Saskatchewan net income has been high. Sectors have suffered; other sectors have done well. But on the whole the income has remained high and the level of taxation

from that source has remained high.

But this government has foolishly squandered the money of the people of this province and have gotten us into a situation which is so deplorable and which will be a millstone around the neck of we in this House and we in this generation and our children and our grandchildren. And for that, these people are going to have to be brought to account by the electors of this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hepworth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to enter into this debate this afternoon on resolution no. 4, that this Assembly condemns the waste and financial mismanagement of the provincial government causing alarming provincial debt and unfair tax increases on Saskatchewan people, as proposed by the NDP.

I find it probably disappointing, Mr. Speaker, that in the first private members' day since the legislature got under way, that the big issue, that the main issue in the NDP's minds facing Saskatchewan people is not the reality of the small-business sector; it's not the reality of what our farm sector is facing; it's not the reality of what's happening in rural Saskatchewan; it's not that they're prepared to face the challenges of our health care industry; it's not that they want to talk about the education of our young people. No, Mr. Speaker, all of those things are important, but the NDP refuse to grapple with those realities, Mr. Speaker. They refuse to grapple with those realities.

(1645)

We hear this afternoon a resuscitation of the things, quite frankly, we've heard in this legislature in 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986 from that same NDP opposition, Mr. Speaker. They are that same group of doom mongers and naysayers and changer resisters that we've come to know as the NDP, Mr. Speaker.

The simple question is this, Mr. Speaker: where is the NDP's vision of the future? Where is their blueprint for the future in agriculture, Mr. Speaker? Where is their economic development strategy for the future, Mr. Speaker? Where is their health care plan for the future, Mr. Speaker?

The reality is they do not have one. They can stand and take their places, one after another, and talk about the changes that we've put in place and how they do not like them.

Mr. Speaker, I was reminded when I listened to this of a lecture I attended the other night at the University of Regina, because all we hear, Mr. Speaker, here, is the politics of despair. That's all we hear from the NDP — the politics of despair. Doom mongering, naysayering, they are the change resisters, they are the agents of despair, Mr. Speaker.

And why I say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think I've hit a nerve, Mr. Speaker, over there; I think I've hit a

nerve. What I was reminded . . . When I heard those speeches this afternoon, I was reminded of a lecture I attended at the University of Regina the other night. It was the Luther lecture on the occasion of their 75th birthday, Mr. Speaker — if you like, 75 years of Luther College in this province. And as their guest lecturers at the Luther lecture which is now their 13th, I think — they hold them annually — they had a couple of people there, a couple. He was 76 years old and I think she was probably about the same age, absolutely bright, absolutely cogent, absolutely delightful. Their names were Drs. Howard and Edna Hong, and their area of expertise particularly is the writings of Kierkegaard.

Now I openly admit, Mr. Speaker, that I do not know a lot about Kierkegaard, and that is why I thought it would be interesting to go to that lecture. And the topic of their lecture on Kierkegaard's works, Mr. Speaker, was this — and that's what I was reminded of when I listened to these speakers over here — the topic of the lecture was, "Kierkegaard: Hope and Despair." Because here we have despair, epitomized by the NDP; and on this side with our Premier, we have the hope for the future, Mr. Speaker.

And a word that Dr. Hong used, and as I understood it he got from his study of Kierkegaard's work, was this term — and I thought, now how apt this is when you think about the NDP and the despair that they spell out for this province regularly; I thought how apt this word was — and he used the word, as Kierkegaard has used it, called "radical pessimism." And I think over here in the NDP, we have the most radical pessimists ever known to Saskatchewan society, Mr. Speaker.

Now the only other word, the only other word that I can think of, what I heard here today, and it came to mind when I was reading this last edition of **The Economist**, dated 4-10, March, 1989, Mr. Speaker. And in this **Economist** there's an article entitled "Tomorrow's Companies: New products, new markets, new competition, new thinking". And this fellow writing in here goes on to talk about what he sees as the 10 new realities of the future in so far as companies and their employees and how the world of work in the future is going to unfold. And he talks about things like unprecedented uncertainty, Mr. Speaker.

He talks about things like that markets are being fractured and products will have to become increasingly customized. He talks about giant firms no longer being able to behave as they used to. As he said, "Wake up, Goliath." I could say, wake up, NDP.

He talks about the fact that we have to look at new organizational configurations, Mr. Speaker. And I want to come back to that one in a minute. And he talks about this, Mr. Speaker, he talks about this. He says, "Old ideas are being challenged"; we can't afford to have our blinkers on, like we used to have on the horses, that they just sort of keep on the straight and narrow. It's a big world out there and there's no idea any more that is sacred, Mr. Speaker. And he talks about the idea of internationalism for all taking root.

Now I've only picked out a few passages, Mr. Speaker. I want to come back to this one about organizational

configurations, because in a way it talks about a major difference between the NDP and the Progressive Conservatives, and that is privatization, Mr. Speaker. You see, their whole economic policies of the '70s, and the one they continue to cling to, Mr. Speaker, is to nationalize, nationalize, nationalize; Crown corporations for all; don't let the public participate in a mixed economy and in a partnership. Nationalization, nationalism, Mr. Speaker, is the order of the day for them.

Through the '70s, which were the heady days, really, if you think back on it, when the NDP were in power. The '70s were really the heady days in this province. Okay. Inflation, land prices were going up, driven by the NDP policy of the land bank competing with our young farmers. They were buying potash mines, uranium mines, farm land. They were building Crown corporation buildings one after the other, Mr. Speaker. Everything that moved, they nationalized.

Really what they were practising, Mr. Speaker, if you analyse it, was Keynesian economics, and that is where the government intervenes in sort of down times to provide a stabilizing force. That is to say, if the economy itself isn't going up, the government will pour some money in to stabilize it.

Now where that was wrong, Mr. Speaker, where that was wrong, Mr. Speaker, was that the '70s were buoyant times. We didn't need the government intervening with its family of Crown corporations. It was the real families that people were looking to see some help for, because their administration was the administration of high interest rates — 22 per cent interest rates. There was help for the family of Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, but was there any help for those families that had mortgages at 20 per cent? No. Money to buy potash mines, Mr. Speaker, but was there help for the young farmers who were faced at buying land at 22 per cent? No, Mr. Speaker, there was no help. Mr. Speaker, there was help; there was help to buy uranium mines. There was help to buy uranium mines, Mr. Speaker. Was there help for the small-business sector, Mr. Speaker? Once again, once again, no, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't the first one to notice this misguided economic philosophy that the NDP had. The people of this province noticed it. They were then known in '82 as the state capitalists. They were the state capitalists. They would trot off every six months or so with their suitcases, off to New York to get them loaded up with some money, to come back and buy somebody else's farm or potash mine that was already in existence, Mr. Speaker.

They had this notion of state capitalist: trot back with the money borrowed at some bank at who knows what rates, okay, as opposed to, as opposed to — as my colleague from Regina Wascana talked about this afternoon — a more sane and more sensible, logical economic policy where we offer bonds to the people to invest in this province; have the interest paid here; have the money borrowed here; have the people here have a chance to participate.

But I, even all of the people in Saskatchewan were not the first to notice, because they turfed the NDP out in 1982, and it's been Tories ever since, Mr. Speaker. There was a person in the NDP who noticed as well that their policies were misguided, and his name was James Laxer. And he wrote a rather stinging report about the NDP — in 1982-83, it was. And the reality is, Mr. Speaker, they are grappling with that same issue today. What Laxer said is that their Keynesian economics that they practised through the '70s was a policy out of tune with the times, a policy out of tune with the times.

And he said the NDP must come to, must grapple with and come up with an economic policy, an industrial policy, a post-industrial policy, Mr. Speaker. To this day they have not. They do not have an agricultural policy, Mr. Speaker; they do not have an industrial development policy. Mr. Speaker, they are bankrupt, or as some would say, and I read from a *Globe and Mail* column of January this year, Mr. Speaker, by Thomas Walkom, and it was headlined: Socialism spinning its wheels. And the lead sentence, I think, says it all about the New Democratic Party today in this country, Mr. Speaker, and it's true today just like Mr. Laxer said it was in 1983. The lead line in this is: "The New Democratic . . ." And I quote, Mr. Speaker:

The New Democratic Party is confused, uncertain, searching for the proper path.

They are confused, uncertain, and searching for the proper path. They have no vision; they have no blueprint; they have no economic policy; they have no health care policy; they have no agriculture policy; they now have no educational policy. They have no policy. They don't even know where the road is, Mr. Speaker. They have no map; they have no map; they have no map, Mr. Speaker.

And you contrast . . . You see, and why I raise this, Mr. Speaker, is because in the lack of any policy framework, in the face of the lack of any policy framework in economic policy, they cling to the old ways. They cling to the old ways. And what that means, Mr. Speaker, is they are deathly against of any government, this Progressive Conservative government, that would touch those jewels — the family of Crown corporations. They deathly fear the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are privatizing them.

Now, it's well-known, it's well-known, Mr. Speaker, in the U.S. election where we had Bush, the Republican, elected over Dukakis, the Democrat, who was defeated. One of the great lines that Bush used in that campaign, in my view, Mr. Speaker, was this. He described small "l" liberalism as being the l-word which sort of cast Dukakis as a wimp, Mr. Speaker, and they would always talk about the l-word.

Well I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in this House, in this House, what makes the NDP pale is the p-word: privatization. They can't handle that word, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine the member from Saskatoon Nutana, or Saskatoon Centre, or Regina Rosemont, can you imagine them trying to say that word? Privatization, Mr. Speaker. They can't get it out.

Nor can they get the double "p" out: public participation.

They can't get the p-word out. But it goes beyond that, Mr. Speaker. They can't get the e-word out either. Entrepreneurship. Say it. Can you say it over there? Entrepreneurship. Oh, that's another dirty word, Mr. Speaker, amongst the NDP. Or enterprise. Could you say that one, Mr. Speaker.

Well, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I'm just getting started. I will have much more to say on this silly resolution, Mr. Speaker, but right now I would move that we adjourn debate on this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:57 p.m.