

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I stand in this Assembly to present a petition with 1,387 signatures from families all across the province of Saskatchewan, with a large number of communities represented. Mr. Speaker, the petition calls on the Government of Saskatchewan to right the wrongs that the legislation and regulations regarding cans as the container for carbonated beverages have done, the results, partially, of which are: (1) massive lay-offs; (2) threatened plant closure; and (3) undue hardship and stress for employees.

On behalf of these 1,387 signatures here and many others in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition to the Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Pringle: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and to members of this Assembly, constituents and good friends of mine, Ken and Eileen Stone, who are seated in your gallery; their daughter Cheryl from Saskatoon Fairview constituency . . . or granddaughter; and Mrs. Stone's sister, Betty Walbaum from Regina Victoria constituency. Ken Stone is the son of Mr. Arthur Stone, who was an MLA in this Assembly for many years, and a man whom we paid tribute to a couple of weeks ago — a man that we honoured. These are very active followers of politics. They watch the proceedings every day on TV, and I would like to ask members to join with me to extend a warm welcome to them.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Tusa: — It's with pleasure that I introduce two members, two special guests to the legislature this afternoon, in the Speaker's gallery. I introduce Mr. Denis Rocan, the MLA for Turtle Mountain and the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

At the Table, I introduce Mr. Binx Remnant, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These two gentlemen are with us for two days to study our procedural and administrative support to the Legislative Assembly. I might also mention that Speaker Rocan has just visited us recently. He was here for the opening of our legislature, and we certainly welcome him again. Perhaps he's looking for a seat to run in.

Anyway, I would like to ask all hon. members to please welcome the Speaker of Manitoba and the Legislative Clerk.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Installation of Canning Lines by Breweries

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the minister for privatization, also the minister responsible for the liquor control board in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Minister, I ask if you will confirm for this House that last week you told the Saskatchewan hoteliers convention that Saskatchewan breweries should be installing canning lines if they want to survive in this province. And I ask you as well, Mr. Minister, how that squares with the response given by your Minister of the Environment in this House last June, an answer he gave in response to a question I asked about the protection of jobs with the introduction of cans in the province of Saskatchewan. He said, and I quote, "There may be some jobs lost, but we will make it as minimal as possible."

Mr. Minister, there have been 100 jobs lost already; 1,387 said through petition today that that's not minimal. And I ask you, Mr. Minister: what steps are you taking, concrete steps — what concrete steps are you taking to make this job loss as minimal as possible for the workers and the people of Saskatchewan?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the member opposite is reacting to a press comment that was made at the hotel convention. It wasn't in speaking to the hoteliers, it was in the press scrum after, that was played this morning on the CBC regarding the canning of beer. I take it from your statements and from your petition you rose early in the House, about that you're opposed to canned beer, and it's interesting to see that.

Secondly, you take a figure of a hundred jobs, which I've long since learned, coming from that side of the House, you take those questionable assertions . . . you choose to ignore, you choose to ignore that there was about 120 jobs created in SARCAN for handicapped individuals in the collection of cans . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — . . . which, I assume, you want to do away with, and you choose to ignore that the environmental impact of cans has been well handled in this province, and in the people I talk to, that certainly they support cans.

And yes, if I can convince the brewing industry, which is rationalizing, not only in Saskatchewan but across Canada, to bring a canning line to Saskatchewan to create further jobs in the canning of beer, I will continue to do so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — New question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I am opposed to job loss in Saskatchewan, and the people in this province would be well served if you and your

government took the same attitude as well.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — While we're talking about canning lines, Mr. Minister, you will be aware that in 1987 Carling O'Keefe had a canning line in the province of Saskatchewan but, because they could not get approval from your government, in early 1988 they shipped it off to Winnipeg, and that's where the jobs are now.

Mr. Minister, are you and your government so short-sighted that less than six months before introducing canned beer in the province of Saskatchewan you made a brewery send a canning line out of this province? And I ask you, do you and your government do absolutely no forward planning to protect Saskatchewan jobs? Will you answer that for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well I believe, again, your assertion is not correct, and we have seen that right from the by-election down in Assiniboia, that you can't always take what is said on faith. I mean, there's a whole concern developing across Saskatchewan as to the facts that you people come forward with. I remember the closure of hospitals. They didn't take place; it was just an exaggeration, and that continues to be the case. So if we talk about a hundred jobs, I'd like him to prove his facts first of all.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say the same as I did a minute ago, that I believe Saskatchewan people are supportive of canned drinks, both in the soft drink and in the beer industry. I believe that Saskatchewan people would like to see a canning line here in Saskatchewan, and I believe that we can create more jobs.

As I said in that same interview, and he chooses to ignore that, that perhaps we should come with Saskatchewan first. Look at what the Atlantic provinces have done with Moosehead beer, in demand right across North America. I believe that we can come forward with initiatives in Saskatchewan. As I said in my speech the other day, a pride in Saskatchewan to build things first in Saskatchewan, that will not take away from jobs, that will create jobs. And I hope you will support that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — New question again, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I asked you about the canned line in Saskatchewan. I note with great interest that you carefully avoided answering the question. Scrutiny will point out that I represent the facts very accurately in this Legislative Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Let's ask as well about another pricing policy of your government and your plans, Mr. Minister. You know that Saskatchewan will soon be inundated with American beer in the province, again to the detriment of beer bottled in Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan workers.

And I ask you, Mr. Minister: have you taken any steps to control the price of the American beer such that the product bottled here in Saskatchewan will remain competitive, or do your free trade instincts not allow you to protect Canadian jobs and Saskatchewan jobs for Saskatchewan people?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well obviously, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite is opposed to canned beer. I get that from his statements and that's fine if that's what he is. I think most people in Saskatchewan are not opposed to canned beer or opposed to soft drinks in cans either.

I also take it from your statements that you're opposed to SARCAN and jobs for the handicapped. You don't give any credit for that, and I believe that Saskatchewan people again support that kind of initiative.

In regard to American beer, certainly by the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), American beer will be coming into this province. As to a pricing arrangement, that has not been decided at this point in time because the only American beer that's in Saskatchewan today is that that's smuggled in. So as we develop a system, as I've said in the press, a system to distribute American beer, we will certainly look at a pricing policy for American beer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, a new question again to the same minister. Mr. Minister, my positions are documented and they're on record in this House. I wish that you, sir, would have the respect for this Legislative Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that you would give direct answers to direct questions. The members of the media can note very clearly that you are avoiding the questions that I ask you here today.

Another point, Mr. Minister. The reason that cans are selling so well in Saskatchewan, you and I both know, is because of your government's discriminatory pricing system, done intentionally by your government, a pricing policy, Mr. Minister, that could change very easily at the stroke of a pen by you, sir.

You say that you won't give the same preferred pricing to bottled beer which is bottled here by Saskatchewan workers because of loss of revenue to the treasury. Mr. Minister, you've got lots of money for Dome Advertising and lots of money for your patronage appointments of your buddies, but you don't have money to protect jobs of Saskatchewan workers.

Now I ask you, Mr. Minister, this: will you give — I ask you very clearly — will you give the same preferred pricing to bottled beer as cans to protect Saskatchewan jobs for Saskatchewan people?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the price of canned beer was brought in after a very exhaustive study

of the rural hotel situation. If you will remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, that there are many rural hotels in Saskatchewan, because of population changes, because of a downturn in the farm economy, that were undergoing severe stress. This government priced the canned beer in such a way . . .

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

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Mr. Speaker, we priced the canned beer in such a way that we took into effect the plight of the rural hotelier and also the consumer of Saskatchewan. And from all reports I've heard, I believe that it was well thought out, that the pricing structure was right on the money.

Now the member opposite says: will you look at the price of bottled beer? I can tell you that many of the prices are under constant discussion, and certainly I'm looking at the price of bottled beer. I'm not in a position to make an announcement at this time, but we're looking at this; we're also looking at the price of American beer when it should enter our borders.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Speaker, the minister will know, as well as I, that the consumption of canned beer in Saskatchewan is almost exactly twice the national average for the rest of the country, canned as compared to bottles. I will ask you again, Mr. Minister, a very clear question, and I would ask you to give a clear answer.

Will you protect the interest of Saskatchewan hoteliers and at the same time protect the jobs for Saskatchewan workers by providing the same — the same — preferred pricing for beer bottled in Saskatchewan as the same preferred pricing that you allow on cans in this province? Will you do it for the hoteliers in Saskatchewan, and will you do it for the workers in this province, Mr. Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — I'm amazed. I'm amazed to see a member of this legislature stand and ignore, and choose to ignore in his questions, the 120-odd jobs and more that are being created by SARCAN for handicapped people. I'm in support of those jobs; this government is in support of those jobs, and he chooses to ignore it time after time. He's against SARCAN; he's against canned beer; he's against the hotels.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that certainly as we look at the price of alcoholic beverages in total, I will be looking at the price for bottled beer, as I will for American beer, as I will for hard spirits, and whatever may be. And that's what I have to report to the House today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Loss of Jobs in Brewing Industry

Ms. Smart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the minister responsible for Liquor Board.

Mr. Minister, the Carling O'Keefe brewery plant is in the constituency of Saskatoon Centre, and I can assure you that there are many workers who are my constituents who

are losing their jobs because of your crazy economic policy. You talk about economic diversification. The brewery was processing what we grow here in Saskatchewan. You have said you're going to bring in a canning line after Carling O'Keefe has shipped their canning line to Winnipeg. What do you say to those workers, a hundred workers, who have lost their jobs in Saskatoon? And what do you say to the city of Saskatoon that's lost its tax base by losing those good paying jobs?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — So again, Mr. Speaker, I see another member of the opposition get up and choose to ignore SARCAN, and I guess I say, what do you say about SARCAN? I'd like to hear your position. It seems they're obviously against that.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, at the same interview, if they would have been looking at it all, I indicated that I would be interested in perhaps bringing some of those workers involved in the distribution of American beer. There may be other alternate uses for new products for that brewery. I'm willing to discuss these and look at new options.

So I think that should . . . take that back and tell it to the people who you've been talking to, that we're quite willing to allow these people to be part of the distribution system and get in tune with where we are today in this province and not be crying about things of the past.

Cost of Government Advertising

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Mr. Premier, looking through your government's returns, which were tabled somewhat belatedly, we see some very interesting figures. For instance, are you aware that during the period March 1984 to May 1988 your government paid out to your advertising firms, Dome Advertising and Dome Media Buying and Roberts & Poole, a total of \$45.8 million of taxpayers' money? The Minister of Finance will tell you that works out to \$33,000 a day.

Now I want to know, and the people of Saskatchewan want to know, is this your idea of fiscal responsibility, and is this how you spend taxpayers' money while necessary services such as health and education have to go begging in this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, any economic analysis of the NDP's expenditures on advertising will show, at constant dollars in 1980-81 they spent about 7 million alone on the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations.

You bring that up to constant dollars a day and you run it over any five-year period, Mr. Speaker, and you're looking at more money than the current administration is spending on advertising, and it goes to one firm or another, Mr. Speaker. So it's just a little bit out of context when they stand up and say that only one administration will advertise and they didn't — \$7 million at constant dollars today, Mr. Speaker, and they'd outspend any

administration in Canada.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Speaker, that's boloney.

A new question to the Premier. Mr. Premier, I was asking you to account for your actions in this Assembly. The NDP long accounted for its actions in 1982 when it lost the election, in part, in part because you promised, and I quote you, sir, you promised to cease all advertising by Crown corporations except advertising which promotes specific productions and programs offered by corporations where a monopoly does not exist.

Now in light of that promise, in light of your words, can you explain \$2.5 million in advertising for SaskTel, \$2.2 million in advertising for SaskPower, and more than \$5 million for SGI? Explain that if you would.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that the NDP lost in 1982 because they spent so much money advertising the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations. Now I will agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I'll also say that the people of Saskatchewan have not forgotten what you did in '82. They haven't forgotten the fact that you would give \$7 million or more to firms like Dunsky and Struthers.

Mr. Speaker, we said that we would promote Crown corporations when they were providing service to the Saskatchewan public. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation provides natural gas to people all across Saskatchewan. It didn't used to do that, Mr. Speaker — individual line service to consumers, home owners, and farmers all across the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It didn't use to do that. Burying power lines for people all across the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. The power corporation didn't use to do that.

Mr. Speaker, never did the power corporation or SaskTel offer bonds for people to invest in in the province of Saskatchewan — 500 million, \$600 million in investment, because we tell them about a real corporation that can help them lower the rates and invest here in Saskatchewan, not just to advertise NDP monopolies, but to help people live in communities and help their families and help keep the rates lower. That's the difference, Mr. Speaker, a considerable difference.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — A new question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, and would he please give a prescription for those rose-coloured glasses to everybody in Saskatchewan so they might understand what he's talking about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I tell you, because, Mr. Premier, families weren't going begging to food banks in 1982. Now my question, Mr. Premier, is last year in this House it was revealed that one Bruce Cameron, an official of your party, the PC Party, was writing letters to the president of your party, the PC Party, suggesting that

Dome, for all the work that it does for your government, be required to kickback a percentage to the party.

Now, Mr. Premier, what is the percentage kickback on this \$45 million? Is it 10 per cent? Is it 15 per cent? Or is it something more? Can you tell us that, Mr. Premier?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be the opposition's time to ask questions on pressing, urgent, compelling issues, and they've asked that question last year in public accounts. They went through it, Mr. Speaker; I went through it here when I went . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order. Order, order. I'm sure everybody in the House is having difficulty hearing the Premier respond, and I think you all do want to hear it, so we'll give him that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, they've already asked that question, and we've been through it in my estimates; we've been through it here in the legislature. I can say to the hon. member, as a result of us allowing Saskatchewan people to invest in Crown corporations, as a result of us providing them with that information, not only do we have wider public service, but 76,000 Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, have had the opportunity to invest in public utilities here, and in Crown corporations, and that they've done on their own free will, Mr. Speaker.

I remind the hon. member again, companies like Dunsky, companies like Struthers that the NDP paid \$7 million a year to, not for people to share in, Mr. Speaker, not at all — no bonds, no shares, nothing — just to pay for the Saskatchewan family of Crown corporations to advertise a monopoly, Mr. Speaker, that's the reason that they were turfed out. Seventy-six thousand Saskatchewan people and their families, Mr. Speaker, now can invest in Crown corporations and there's a significant difference and they like it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Privatization and Unemployment

Mr. Lingenfelter: — My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Deputy Premier and it deals with the problem that we have in this province of privatization and unemployment and the connection between the two.

Last week in the House, Mr. Minister, you unsuccessfully tried to mislead the public and, I say, to try to diffuse the issue of government broken promises as it relates to privatization by confusing facts. And I refer to your answer when you talked about no one losing their job with the merger of SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation) and the federal Crown corporation.

I want to say to you, is it not true that today — and can you confirm that Cameco (Canadian Mining Energy Corporation) is looking at laying off 100 workers and bringing in 16 people from Ontario to take the place of some of those workers, and can you confirm that that is taking place today at the Rabbit Lake mine?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, that is not true. What is true, Mr. Speaker . . . What is true, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be 30 employees out of 165 employees at Blind River, and 40 employees out of the 350 positions at Port Hope, Mr. Speaker, that will be eliminated. These positions are eliminated, Mr. Speaker, not as a result of any merger, not as a result of any merger . . .

Mr. Speaker, how can they say, oh! when in fact the conversion facility is all, as it exists, all part of what was once Eldorado. The merger did nothing to affect the conversion facilities in Ontario, absolutely zero.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is we have an over-supply of uranium in the world. We have an over-supply of uranium in the world, and we have declining prices for uranium in the world, Mr. Speaker.

Now as it relates to Rabbit Lake, Mr. Speaker, yes, there will be, there will be lay-offs at Rabbit Lake, Mr. Speaker. The lay-offs at Rabbit Lake, Mr. Speaker, will be for a duration of about six months. They will commence July 1, Mr. Speaker. The reason for the lay-offs, Mr. Speaker, is quite simply that . . . quite simply, Mr. Speaker, that the . . . two reasons. An over-supply, declining prices, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, an ore body that is approaching depletion and ore grades that are declining. Now, now the mill, the mill, Mr. Speaker, at Rabbit Lake has to be upgraded, and you can't run ore through a mill that's shut down. The mill has to be upgraded, Mr. Speaker, so that they can go into the underground ore body at Eagle Point.

Now to go into the underground ore . . .

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

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister the question again. Can you confirm that Cameco is looking at laying off 100 workers at the Rabbit Lake mine? That was the question. Is it about 100 workers that they're laying off?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I'd be very happy to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. Now we are moving from an open pit mode to an underground mode, Mr. Speaker. You can't go underground without digging a shaft. You can't get ore out of the ground without getting underground. So there is a transition period.

The Speaker: — Order. Order, order. The Deputy Premier is attempting to answer the question; however, he's being interrupted and we can't hear the answer. I want to give him that opportunity.

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — And during this transition, Mr. Speaker, during this transition while they are upgrading the mill so that they can take the higher grade ore from the underground ore body, Mr. Speaker, they will maximize the use of the people who would otherwise be laid off at the mine.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that there will be, I think,

20 people transferred from Ottawa to Saskatchewan. These are the research and development people of what was Eldorado, transferred to Saskatoon to work, most of them with the Saskatchewan Research Council, Mr. Speaker, and nothing to do with Rabbit Lake. And the other four will be in the department of environment and safety of the new company, Cameco, Mr. Speaker.

Having said that, anybody . . .

The Speaker: — Order, order, order.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — New question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. It's obvious now that it's the friends of the Tory party who are ending up with the mine, and the workers who are getting the shaft from this government, because there's no jobs by privatization.

I want to say to you, Mr. Minister, that it's your credibility that is at stake here, and I want to quote from you, June 23 of last year:

You can rest assured that the people who work at SMDC today will be working there in the new merged uranium company as well. That was a commitment that was given by this government and SMDC, and that will be a commitment that is delivered.

Given that quote, how do you explain today the lay-offs and the fact that you gave your word in commitment? Is your word and the word of the Premier of this province worth nothing? Or is the simple fact that you're serving your friends before you serve the workers of this province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, the lay-offs that Cameco's talking about today have nothing to do with the merger or privatization. The lay-offs would have to have occurred, they would have to have occurred, Mr. Speaker, had these companies been independent, because of market conditions, because of prices, because of over-supplies, because of ore body depletions, Mr. Speaker.

Let me make one small comparison. Today, Mr. Speaker, we have about 1,600 employees in the uranium industry in Saskatchewan. Over the next 10 years it's estimated that we'll get about \$0.5 billion in royalties from the uranium industry. In addition to that, there will be income tax and sales tax and further development, Mr. Speaker. Compare that to those people, Mr. Speaker, who have said they will close down the uranium industry in this province. Tell me who was protecting the jobs of that industry in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 9 — Activities of Future Corporation

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to participate in the discussion in this House, in particular on the motion that I will be moving at the end of my speech. But, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the content of the motion, I want to indicate to you and to the House that today in question period it clearly indicates why a motion like this has been put on the order paper.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, the government not addressing the issues that are facing the people of this province. They are so concerned, they are so concerned, Mr. Speaker, about serving themselves and their friends that they refuse to look at the reality and see what is happening in this province.

Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at what the situation is today. We have in this province, Mr. Speaker, over 25 per cent, over 25 per cent of our people living in poverty — 64,000 children living in poverty. We have, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Saskatoon alone approximately 10,000 people waiting to get into a hospital for surgery and other procedures. We had, Mr. Speaker, last week the announcement here in Regina, six schools being closed.

Mr. Speaker, I bring these things to your attention because this government refuses, simply refuses to address the problems that we are faced with in this province. Last month alone 6,200 people left this province. More people left this province than came in — a net loss of 6,200. It is estimated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that of those 6,200, at least 4,000, at least 4,000 of those were young people. That is why, Mr. Speaker, at the end of my remarks I will move the following motion:

That this Assembly condemn the Government of Saskatchewan's irresponsible decision to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars on an election year birthday party when financial constraints in departments such as Health, Social Services, and Education are causing severe hardship for Saskatchewan families.

That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the crux of my words today. Those are the things that I want to talk about.

We have in this province today a health care system that simply does not serve the needs of the people of Saskatchewan. We have an education system wherein last year alone — and the Minister of Education knows this — over 1,100 qualified students, over 1,100 qualified students were unable, were unable to receive post-secondary education in this province. A minimum of 500 could not get into the University of Saskatchewan, and an additional 600 students who were qualified, who were qualified in years past to attend education, were unable to do so because this Minister of Education, this government, will not provide the funding that is necessary so that our students can receive a good education.

In the area of welfare and social services we have literally thousands — and that is no exaggeration — literally thousands of our children who go to bed hungry every night, who have no other alternative but to go to the food banks to beg for food so that they can get at least one

square meal a day.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government has the audacity to bring forward a \$9 million birthday party in the year 1990. For what purpose? For the purpose, Mr. Speaker, so that they can politicize the year 1990 for their own political purposes. Because that is the year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you are fully aware, is the year when this government is expected to go to the people for another mandate.

What priorities! Where is the heart of this government? Where is its caring? Where, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this government's concern for those needy people of this province? We have farmers literally by the thousands who have been driven off their farms by the lawyers of the Minister of Agriculture, literally driven off the farms by actions taken by the Minister of Agriculture through his lawyers.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government, this heartless government doesn't deserve to receive another mandate, and they'll just assume . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — I believe very sincerely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as soon as this government calls the election, the people will speak. They will speak, and they will tell you people that you had your priorities wrong.

We paid our penalty, and in some instances yes, we had our priorities wrong in 1980-81-82, but I'll tell you people, our mistakes were miniscule to what you are doing today.

When I hear my colleagues in this House ask about what your government is doing with a \$45 million advertising campaign, I hear the Premier of this province laugh it off, laugh it off as though, what's \$45 million? What's \$45 million? You can't turn a paper today without looking at some government ad. You can't turn on radio without hearing somebody promoting a government program of some kind. You can't watch TV without having constantly brought to your attention that this government is privatizing everything that they possibly can.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this government has its priorities all mixed up. They are wrong in what they are pursuing, and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they're certainly very, very wrong in putting an additional \$9 million — \$9 million — purely for partisan political politics. That's what it is. Let's call it what it is.

Oh, there are going to be some changes made to that program now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of all the outcry that there has been, not only from members on this side of the House, but from SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), and from SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities), and from the STF (Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation), and the SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association), and from ordinary people in this province.

All of them, all of them have cried out to this government, have asked this government to cut out that program, put

that program to better use, put that program into the Department of Education or Department of Health or the Department of Social Services or the Department of Agriculture which you cut last year. Every one of them is saying there are more important needs in this province than purely your own partisan politics to get yourself re-elected again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the time will come and the people will speak not only on this program or the \$9 million birthday party, but they will speak on all the other priorities. And is it surprising, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is it surprising that this government should have come to this. I can't recall either in Canada or here in Saskatchewan, someone putting out millions of dollars to celebrate an 85th birthday. I can't recall that being done.

Oh there was a homecoming in 1971, planned by the Ross Thatcher government at that time. His idea was, we will ask each family to bring back in 1971 . . . in 1971 we'll ask them each to bring somebody home so we can have a big birthday celebration. We'll call it homecoming. Well the people spoke, the people spoke, and in June of 1971 they tossed Ross Thatcher and his government right out of office. And I tell you people, that's exactly what's going to happen to you - _ exactly what's going to happen to you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — You can only do so much to the people and then they will rebel. There are a lot of people out there very cynical. They are saying, why should I and my children go to bed hungry every night? Because the government says we don't have any money; everybody has got to tighten their belt. And yet, they have \$9 million to spend on a birthday party.

Educators are saying, why can't our children get into the school program that they need in order to become future leaders in this province? Because the government says there is no money; we're on hard times and we have to cut programs. But at the same time the government has \$9 million to spend on themselves for their re-election for a birthday party.

The people in our hospitals, the people in our hospitals are saying, why can't we have more nurses to serve us? Nine million dollars would put a lot of nurses into our hospitals. Nine million dollars would provide a lot of extra surgery spaces and surgery time so that the Minister of Health could cut down the waiting lists in Saskatoon which right now are still at about 9,000.

(1445)

The people are becoming very frustrated and very cynical because politicians say we've got to tighten our belts, but at the same time have millions of dollars to serve themselves to make sure that they are re-elected.

I say to you members opposite, you've gone a step too far. You've crossed the Rubicon, and the people are saying to you, we've had enough. And I believe very clearly that your polls indicate that to you, and too much is too much. You've gone too far.

And I ask the members opposite, put some pressure on your Executive Council. Say to them, it's not too late; let's cancel that program. Let's cancel it, and we're going to show to the people that we do listen. And in the next budget we're going to take another . . . we're going to take 3 million of that and we're going to give it to our universities so that the students are able to attend and get the programs that they require. We'll take another 3 million and we'll put it in agriculture to help some of those farmers. And we'll take another 3 million and we'll put it into health care and social services so that the starving poor in our province, the starving poor in our province are able to get a higher welfare benefit so that they don't have to go to bed hungry every night.

When I hear the minister of welfare say that he doesn't know of anybody that goes to bed hungry, or he feels that there is sufficient money on the welfare stipend that the welfare people receive, I say to the minister that he should be out there. He should live with those people on welfare, and he'd quickly find out just how far that stipend, that welfare stipend, will go.

I couldn't help, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by reading the **Star-Phoenix** this morning, when the member from Cut Knife-Lloydminster was asked about the food banks in Lashburn and he said, "No one has come to me; no one has come to me and said they were hungry." And he said, I don't see anybody going hungry in the town of Lashburn. Where has the member been? Where has he been hiding if those people aren't telling him that?

We see it every day. We get letters every day in our offices of people telling us that the programs of this government simply aren't sufficient and they should take that \$9 million and they should re . . . What's the word I want?

An Hon. Member: — Rechannel.

Mr. Rolfes: — Rechannel that money — thank you. My colleague from Saskatoon University is helping me out . . . rechannel that money so that the poor of this province don't have to go begging. And I just for the life of me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can't figure out how politicians can so far astray, how they can get their priorities so mixed up when we hear time and time again from the executive branch over there saying: but we are in tough economic times; tighten your belt; we can't give any more because the treasury doesn't have any more. And in the very next decision that they made, they come up with \$9 million — \$9 million, Mr. Speaker — which I have not heard any organization in Saskatchewan support.

SARM has condemned it, said it should be done away with; SUMA doesn't like it. The STF is saying that hey, look it, if you've got money for a birthday party, how about some money for our children?

And we hear individuals, we hear churches, we hear people from our churches saying, surely the politicians of this province must get their priorities straightened out. We can't continue in the way that we are going.

And I say to the members opposite: it is not too late, it is not too late. You can still cancel that \$9 million and you

don't have to listen to the opposition and all the people that have talked to us. Listen to your own constituents. Listen to your own constituents. And I know, for example, the Minister of Health has been requested many, many times to do away with that \$9 million program, to ask the treasury to take that \$9 million and put it to Health so that we can, Mr. Deputy Speaker, put more nurses in our hospitals, so that we can, Mr. Speaker, decrease those waiting lists.

And I know, I know the Minister of Education, because I, when I was a critic of Education and now the critic for advanced education, have had a number of requests of people saying, look, I can't continue. I can't continue with my education because I can't get a loan. If the government were to take this money and put it into that program, they would help an individual who would in the future would become the leader, another leader in this province. But without an education, without any opportunity to receive an education, what are these young people doing?

I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what they are doing. They're packing their bags, along with their parents, and they're leaving this province. A net out-migration, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of over 6,200 people last month alone. If that continues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you know what that means? That means that by the end of this year Moose Jaw will be gone and Prince Albert will be gone, plus another 12,000 people will have left this province.

Can you imagine what impact that will have on this province if you took Moose Jaw out of this province, the total population of Prince Albert, and another 12,000 people? That is going to have a tremendous drain on our economy, and it means that for the rest of us who remain, there will be a much heavier burden in order to pay for the programs that we have become accustomed to.

That \$9 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that \$9 million could be put to so many different uses, so many good uses in this province instead of a birthday party. And I say to the chairman, the member, the Deputy Premier, and I say to a good friend of mine, Cliff Wright, I say Cliff Wright should do the honourable thing. He should resign from the futuristic corporation and say, look, I will not compromise my principles to that extent when all those other needs are left untouched in this province.

When we have 64,000 children who live in poverty, when we have 1,100 students last year who couldn't receive a post-secondary education, when we have 9,000 people on the waiting lists in Saskatoon, I think Cliff Wright would do the honourable thing. He should resign from that and say to the government, no, I won't have anything to do with that partisan, political corporation that you set up just so that you people can get yourselves re-elected.

That's the honourable thing that Cliff Wright should do. And I think he might be considering that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unless this government dramatically changes the priorities of that corporation and puts that money to much better use that what they had originally intended to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've talked about cynicism and frustration of the people in this province, and there's lots of it. There's lots of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because there are so few opportunities available. There's lots of it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the people are finding day in and day out that this government opposite is selling their birthright.

And when they see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they see this government telling everybody that we are in an economic restraint, that you must all tighten your belts, and then come up with a purely partisan \$9 million political party, that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even enshrines that cynicism more in the people than ever before.

And I think it's about time that the government opposite recognizes this, that the people are asking you — through their organizations, yes, but also individually — to cancel that program. And maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they will do this in the upcoming budget on Thursday. Maybe the Minister of Finance will finally have listened to the people and he will say, all right, we have had thousands and thousands of requests to cancel that birthday party, and I am announcing today that it will be cancelled. I think he could restore some of that faith that the people in Saskatchewan have had in their government and in their politicians. He could restore some of that again.

But, Mr. Speaker, I won't hold my breath that the Minister of Finance will do this. I will only ask him to reconsider of all the needs that there are in this province, when farmers don't have enough money to put in their crops. I was, just on the weekend, Mr. Deputy Speaker, talking to some farmers who can't put in their crop because they haven't got sufficient money to buy the seed and buy the fertilizer and buy the fuel. And they don't know what they're going to do. Nine million dollars would go a long way, would go a long way, in helping thousands of farmers put in that crop.

And they don't want you people to spend that money on a birthday party. They want you to be more cognizant of their problems. They want you to say, hey look, have some empathy for the situation that we are in, and quit wasting the taxpayers' money. You could cut in other ways too. The \$9 million, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is just one incident of the waste that has taken place by this government, and it is a waste.

We had today in question period \$45 million of taxpayers' money going for advertising, much of it to Dome. And we found out, not only today but in the past, that there's a good possibility that some of that will be required as kickback to the Progressive Conservative Party. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is shameful, and it's simply not acceptable by the people of this province — \$45 million, add on the 9 million, you've got \$54 million — a lot of money. Mr. Speaker, that's a lot of money.

If you took 10 million of that, 10 million, and gave that to the University of Saskatchewan, the University of Regina, they could upgrade their programs and there wouldn't be any student who would not be able to enter university next year. All of them would be able to. The university would be able to pay their staff decent salaries.

And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, school boards, the Regina separate school boards, if they could just receive a little bit of that \$9 million they wouldn't have to close those six schools that were announced last week. And it was very clear, very clear, I think, in the chairman's remarks, that it was because of the cut-backs by this government to the separate school boards here in Regina that those six schools have to be closed.

We're having the same problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker, throughout all the school systems in Saskatchewan. I was talking recently to another large school division who were saying that they need millions of dollars to upgrade their buildings. They haven't been upgraded for a number of years, and if they don't upgrade those, those buildings are going to deteriorate to the extent that the costs are simply going to be exorbitant in the future.

I say to the members opposite, there are so many useful needs in this province, so many urgent needs. And I ask the Deputy Premier who is the chairman, you have a lot of power in this government. You have a lot . . .

An Hon. Member: — Chairman of what?

Mr. Rolfes: — The futuristic corporation. If you didn't know, you are the chairman. Okay?

An Hon. Member: — Thank you.

Mr. Rolfes: — I ask you, will you listen to SARM? Will you listen to educators? Will you listen to the health experts and use that \$9 million and redeploy it to those areas.

They've asked you to reconsider. And I ask the Deputy Premier if it's possible to think of that today. And I see him shaking his head that it's not possible. And I ask the Deputy Premier, when we vote on this motion, to vote in favour of it so that the people know, yes, you are listening to them and that you will change your priorities so that the urgent needs of the people of this province are met.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are so many other areas that I could mention. But I have mentioned three of the larger ones, or four of the larger ones, and that is education, social services, health and agriculture. There are tremendous needs in those areas. That \$9 million could be put to much better use, much better use in this province to serve the needs of those people.

(1500)

Not only that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I believe that if this government changed its mind that they could restore some of that faith that the people in this province have always had in their governments. The people would say, yes, they do listen and they have cancelled that program; we thank them for it and we won't forget it.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they don't do that, if they don't do that . . . and I say to the Deputy Premier, this is not a laughing matter, those people, those 43,000 people who are unemployed, those 6,000 people who left the province, those 9,000 who are on the waiting lists don't think it's a laughing matter at all. And they . . . the member opposite says yes, we're a laughing stock over here, but

the people . . . the Minister of Health says that too. And I say to the Minister of Health that those 9,000 people on the waiting lists in Saskatoon and those people who have to go out of the province to get their health care don't think that this is a laughing matter, and they think that you should take that \$9 million and put it back into health where it belongs, where it belongs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — And I say to the Minister of Health that when I was the Minister of Health the waiting lists in Saskatoon weren't one-fifth of what they are today, not one-fifth of what they are. And it's . . . that's true, and you know that. You know that, and that's true. And I say to the members opposite, you still have a chance. You still have a chance to change your minds and to take that \$9 million, redeploy it in the next budget so that the needs of the people of Saskatchewan can be met and so that you will give some hope to those young farmers who haven't got the money to seed their crop this year. Take some of that money and say to the farmers, we know what your needs are, we will redeploy that money and we will help you put in your crop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those words I will move the motion that I indicated earlier, seconded by the member from Regina Lakeview:

That this Assembly condemn the Government of Saskatchewan's irresponsible decision to spend millions of taxpayers' dollars on an election year birthday party when financial constraints in departments such as health, social services, and education are causing severe hardship for Saskatchewan families.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I so move.

Ms. Simard: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We've had considerable time now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, between the adjournment of the session last June and the opening of this new session, to travel throughout the province and talk to many people. And my colleagues and I on this side of the House have taken that opportunity to be in touch with the people in our constituencies and in touch with the people of Saskatchewan.

We have spoken to thousands of people over the last few months, and I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the people, the men and women of this province, are very upset with PC government policies. They're upset with cut-backs to health care. They're upset with the high student-teacher ratio that exists in our schools today and with an ever deteriorating education system.

The government's policies in education have caused stress on our teachers that are unprecedented in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It has caused stress on our children who are working in a system that is not designed to meet their needs because of government underfunding. It also has caused considerable stress on parents, a lot of stress on parents.

The high teacher-student ratio has resulted, as I said, Mr. Speaker — because members from the other side of the

House don't believe this; they obviously think the student-teacher ratio is adequate — the high student-teacher ratio has caused stress for teachers, stress for students, and stress on parents, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Stress on parents because parents are being asked to do more and more and more every day because the teachers are unable to meet the demands of the education system, the demands of the 21st century to educate our children, and therefore they're relying on parents.

So you're having stress in families, stress on children, stress on teachers, all because this government has seen fit to underfund education and fund birthday parties instead, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and line their pockets with government money that should be used in education and health care and other social programs.

What we see is growing tuition fees in the province for university students. University students are finding it increasingly difficult to attend university because this government has not properly funded our universities and instead has chosen to fund its Tory friends and pay itself fancy birthday parties, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We see unprecedented poverty in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker, unprecedented poverty. And people have complained about that over the last few months — well, longer than that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But particularly we've been hearing about it more and more as time goes on. Something like 64,000 children in this province are living in poverty. And in Saskatchewan, in the bread basket of the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have the second highest rate of child poverty in the country — in the bread basket of this country, in Saskatchewan, the second highest poverty rate in this country.

An Hon. Member: — Shameful. It's shameful.

Ms. Simard: — My colleagues say shame, and I agree. The members opposite should be ashamed of their government and their heartless policies.

We see ever increasing taxes on people, on the average person, while corporate taxes are not increased at nearly the same rate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that says again where their priorities lie. We see a total lack of agricultural policy, of any long-term agricultural policy to deal with the problems and the farm crisis being faced by farmers.

We see broken promise after broken promise. We see a dishonest and corrupt government, and we see the lack of any real commitment to child care on the part of this government.

Something . . . the subsidy rates with respect to child care have not been increased since 1982, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Current subsidies only pay something like \$240 a month, while costs are on the average of \$340 a month for families. This government spends about 12.96 — \$12.96 — per capita on child care in total, and Saskatchewan has the second lowest number of child care spaces per capita in the country. The second lowest number of child care spaces per capita, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The cost of one birthday party could buy some

3,200 new day-care spaces in this province.

We see high unemployment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We're seeing an exodus of young people from this province because of the lack of the PC government to create good job opportunity for our young people.

We see a lack of commitment to women's shelters, for example. The government is critical of the Regina Native Women's Association for spending \$76,000 to provide a needed service. On the other hand, they're prepared to waste \$9 million on an unneeded birthday party, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Apparently each shelter currently being funded only receives an average of \$245,000 from the government — that's women's shelters in the province — and the government spends only 1.3 million for five shelters across this province. The cost of one birthday party, the cost of one of their birthday parties, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could buy seven years of funding for provincial women's shelters. One birthday party could buy seven years of funding for the women's shelters in this province.

What the people of this province want, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is some hope. They want a government that is sincere, and they want a government that takes genuine actions in the area of health, education, and social services. They want to work together with their government to build a better society for Saskatchewan, and the people of Saskatchewan are ready and willing to work to build a better Saskatchewan society for their children and their grandchildren and for all people living in this province.

But what we see instead is a government throwing a \$9 million birthday party, a \$9 million birthday party when it's had seven budget deficits in a row — seven budget deficits in a row. And it's throwing a \$9 million birthday party to propagate their right-wing agenda.

What we will see with this 9 million birthday party, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I'm sure of it, is a massive amount of government advertising. And we're seeing that today. Every time I turn on the TV there's another government advertisement propagating the right-wing agenda, and I find that nauseating when we have so many children and families who are going hungry in this province. And I know what their response is on the other side of the House. They said it last time. When I talked about children going hungry, what they said was, la-di-da. And that's how much they care, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's how much they care.

There's a cumulative deficit of some 3.6 billion in this province today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, yet we see less money for health, education, and social services — less money. This deficit of \$3.6 billion has meant that one child in four live in poverty in Saskatchewan — one child in four. And something like 18,000 children went to food banks last year alone, and I think that's appalling, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And the men and women of this province want that trend reversed. They don't want the money spent on birthday parties.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Simard: — The \$3.6 billion deficit has meant that one in 11 people is looking for work, and in February our labour force fell by 6,000 people and the number of people with jobs decreased by 7,000.

It's meant farm families cannot count on this government for assistance that they need and deserve. It's meant that farmers can't put their crops in this spring. And yet this government is going to spend \$9 million on a birthday party in an election year, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It's meant deteriorating education for the children of Saskatchewan, and high tax increases. In 1988 there was only a 2 per cent increase allocated to local school boards, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and only \$3 million was added to the university operating grants in 1988 when inflation was at 6 per cent.

So what we see is a system in Saskatchewan where students are having difficulty attending university because tuition fees are being raised. We see a situation where our children in school are working in a stressful situation where there are too many students per teacher. We see children who are going hungry, we see families who are going hungry, we see long line-ups at food banks — 18,000 children going to food banks in last year alone; one in four children living on poverty. What does this government do? It throws itself a \$9 million celebration in 1990. A celebration.

(1515)

What is it celebrating, Mr. Speaker? Is it celebrating the one children in every four that are living in poverty? Is it celebrating the 18,000 children that are going to food banks every year? Is it celebrating the students who can't get access to a university because of high student tuition? Is it celebrating the children who are labouring in schools where there aren't enough teachers per student? Is it celebrating the teachers who are working under stress because of high student-teacher ratios? Is it celebrating the parents who are under stress because of the lack of funding for education? Is it celebrating families who are under stress because lack of child-care spaces and lack of commitment to child care? Is it celebrating the women and children who are fleeing violent situations, who can't get access to transition homes and shelters? Is that what it's celebrating, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

This government's priorities, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are not the priorities of Saskatchewan people. It cuts funding and services in health care, education, and programs, but it spends its \$9 million on a birthday party. It spends its billion dollars on the political boondoggle in the Premier's riding, the Rafferty-Alameda project. It spends millions on self-serving political advertising and millions on patronage, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Our unemployment rate has exceeded the national average on a consistent basis, since November 1988 to be exact. And today in Saskatchewan one in 11 — one in 11 — people is actively looking for a job. And on top of this we are seeing an exodus from this province of our

children. We are seeing people leaving at an unprecedented rate — 6,000 people leaving the province last month alone, and I believe 1,600 the month before that. And most of these people are between the ages of 20 and 29. They are our future, Mr. Speaker, and they're being driven out of this province by PC government policies, driven out of their own home, driven away from their families because of this government's lack of policy or this government's heartless, inhumane, ill-thought-out policies.

At the same time we see high-priced salaries for their friends, high-priced salaries for Paul Schoenhals and John Gormley and George Hill, high-priced salaries for their Tory friends and give-aways to multinational or out-of-province corporations, but no jobs for our young men and women. No jobs for our young men and women. No food for some 18,000 children who have to go to food banks. I say that this is just appalling.

And the Premier, as you recall, promised to bring our children home. Well I say that's hypocrisy, total hypocrisy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And in spite of all the indicators, in spite of all the evidence that's out there, this government accepts no responsibility for its own policies. It blames the weather, it blames world conditions, it even blames former governments, but it never looks to itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it never accepts any responsibility for the heartache and the suffering that people in Saskatchewan are feeling today. It accepts no responsibility for that.

It accepts no responsibility for high unemployment, no responsibility for the exodus of our children from this province, no responsibility for the crisis that so many families are facing in rural Saskatchewan and in urban Saskatchewan. It blames everything else but itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And it justifies its privatization mania on the grounds that this is solving the problems, and yet the evidence is clear that privatization has resulted in lost jobs to this province and high unemployment.

The government says that it has no money, it has no money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to pay for health care services or other services, and therefore it has to sell off the province's assets to the lowest bidder, providing that lowest bidder has a Tory membership.

And I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's this government's gross incompetence which has given rise to the present crisis we face in Saskatchewan. And it's true that there's been no money for our most vital services like health, education; no money to create jobs for our young people. There's been no money for hungry children, no money to keep our children in this province, but there's been money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's been money for Peter Pocklington; there's been \$9 million to lavish a fancy birthday party; there's been money for out-of-province travel for high-priced executives and government ministers; there's been money for the political boondoggle in the Premier's riding; there's been money for PC political advertising — lots of money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but not — as far as this government is concerned — there's been no money where it really counts.

Since this government was elected in 1982, revenue from personal income taxes jumped by 103 per cent while revenue from corporate income taxes only increased by 10 per cent. And this clearly indicates the priorities of this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker; burdens for families and benefits for corporations, that's their priorities.

And I say that it's time that this government assumed responsibility for its fiscal mismanagement, and it's time this government stopped making the people of Saskatchewan carry the burden of its heartless and cruel policies. It's time for this government to reassess its priorities. And the first thing it should do immediately, today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is cancel its fancy birthday party, its fancy celebration in the election year of 1990.

And when we take a look at health care, in particular, we see that in 1987-88 there was what amounted to approximately an \$18 million cut to the health care budget. We saw a very small increase last year that didn't even meet the rate of inflation. And now we see, in Saskatchewan, a health care crisis that is of extraordinary proportions that was created by this government because of its underfunding and cut-backs to the health care system. Cut-backs for health care, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but a \$9 million birthday party for its Tory friends.

The government's record on health care in this province is a national disgrace. They have developed no long term strategy in health care. Instead, they've chosen to hack and slash in a piecemeal fashion that has caused untold hardship in this province to the sick and the elderly. They chose to do this to try to pay off their huge deficit — \$3.6 billion, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They chose to do this to pay off their huge deficit which was created by them to begin with because of their mismanagement, misplaced priorities and misguided policies.

They slashed away at the children's school-based dental plan. They cut, I believe, \$7 million from the dental plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And the cost of one birthday party could buy back that dental program, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Meanwhile we have some 400 dental workers who were put out of work, 400 dental workers out of work as a result of their policies. And one birthday party could have put that dental plan back, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Not to mention the parents who are having to travel long distances in many cases to get their children to a dentist, who are having to take time off work and bear the expense of that — not to mention the travelling expenses — parents who are having to take time off in urban Saskatchewan to take their children to a dentist and lose a day's pay or half-a-day's pay, whatever it might take for their family.

So there are hidden costs here with respect to the destruction of the school-based children's dental plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker — hidden costs, not simply the costs of the 400 dental workers, as bad as that may be. There are further costs to the parents who are attempting to maintain the spirit of the plan and continue to take their children to a dentist. Yet this government has \$9 million for a Tory birthday party in 1990.

And the cuts to the prescription drug plan are another

example of this government's priorities. In 1988 the government cut 7 million from the drug plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker — 7 million from the drug plan. And their cut-backs to the prescription drug plan caused considerable hardship to many seniors and elderly people in this province — considerable hardship, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We see long hospital waiting lists. They are almost 9,000, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this province, almost 9,000 people waiting to get into the hospital for needed surgery. And this is causing a lot of hardship to many people, and I hear from them on a regular basis.

But what do they do? They choose, they choose a \$9 million birthday party, a \$9 million birthday party to celebrate. To celebrate what? — the long hospital waiting lists? Is it to celebrate the long hospital waiting lists and the people who are suffering, waiting to get their needed surgery?

And we look at staff levels in hospitals. Many hospitals are grossly understaffed and so are nursing homes in this province, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And I hear from people who are in hospitals, and I hear from staff who are working in hospitals — patients in hospitals and staff — about the hardship that's being created as a result of understaffing in hospitals. But what does this government choose to do? It chooses to spend \$9 million on a birthday party instead of dealing with hospital waiting lists and staffing the hospitals.

We see cut-backs to public health nurses. We see cut-backs to public health nurses in this province through a twinning arrangement. We hear from people around Saskatchewan about the hardship that the cut-backs are creating for them. This government says it's interested in preventative health care, but it cuts back on the front line workers of preventative health care — the public health nurses. And the area that many of these nurses are serving now is far too large, and they have less time to spend with their clients and their patients than what they should have, and more time is spent travelling around the province and dealing with bureaucratic matters as a result of government cut-backs.

But this government has \$9 million to spend on a birthday party instead of staffing our public health offices across the province. Instead of putting more front line preventative health workers out in the province, they choose to have a \$9 million birthday celebration in an election year.

And when we look at what's happening in northern Saskatchewan, you see understaffing of community health workers. You see cut-backs to the northern food transportation subsidy. You see cut-backs in northern Saskatchewan to health care workers and to food subsidies, but they've got \$9 million for a birthday party — \$9 million for a birthday party. Well that shows where this government's priorities are, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

And what we hear the Minister of Health saying and other members of the PC government, the Premier and other members, is that health care costs are spiralling out of control. That's a common theme that we hear out there —

health care costs are spiralling out of control. Well we know that's not true. The evidence shows that that's not true. In fact the SHA (Saskatchewan Hospital Association) said that there was no cause for hysteria; that yes, health care costs are increasing, but there's no cause for hysteria. They're not out of control, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The government says there's no money for health, but \$9 million for a birthday party in its 85th — not its 75th or 100th birthday, Mr. Deputy Speaker — its 85th birthday, its 85th birthday.

They have \$12 million a year for empty office space, and I wonder how much of that is rented from friends. In fact, with respect to this \$9 million birthday party, we saw rural municipality officials call on the government to cancel the birthday celebrations. Now I hope that this government has listened to that message. If it refuses to listen to us, I hope it will at least listen to the R.M. officials.

With respect to the birthday party, I'm just . . . I read an article in the paper that said that there would be presentations of, I believe, \$50,000 made for this project or that project during the course of this birthday party in 1990, in an election year. Well one of the things that we heard about, when we were campaigning down in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, is that some people were saying, you vote for us if you want your hospital. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that how they intend to use this \$9 million for its birthday party? Is that how they intend to use it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to try and buy votes? Is that what they intend to do? Well with the arrogance that we've seen on the part of the PC government and the Premier, I wouldn't doubt it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

(1530)

Yes, I'd say it's time for this government to start behaving responsibly on a fiscal basis. It's time for this government to stop its cut-backs to health care and education and social programs. It's time for this government to start funding health care properly, to start funding education properly, and to get its priorities straight in the manner that the people and the men and women of this province would like them to do.

The \$9 million birthday party is just another excuse for patronage and waste, Mr. Deputy Speaker, another excuse for patronage and waste. Well, the government talks and advocates belt-tightening during these rough economic times, yet the Premier insists on spending 46,000 a year to rent an office in Prince Albert while a government building stands empty right across the street.

Pocklington received, as I understand, \$480,000 in grants plus 5.9 million mortgage loan from this government to open a Gainers plant. In 1987 alone SaskTel paid 691,000 to travel agencies, yet we don't have jobs for young people. We still have children starving in this province. We have long hospital waiting lists. We have a decimated school-based children's dental plan. And the list goes on and on, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

It's time for this government to get its priorities straight, to cancel its birthday celebration, and to start spending its money where it counts, and where the people of this

province want the money spent. And that's in our major services such as health, education and social services. It's time for this government to get its priorities straight and to get its fiscal house in order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to start spending its money, or our money — the taxpayers' money — responsibly, because that's what the people want it to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to second the motion. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to rise in the Assembly today to address this debate. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's with some source of amusement that I find when I take a look at the wording of the motion itself — this is motion no. 9, Mr. Speaker — and in that motion the member from Saskatoon South refers to a birthday party. Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it quite a waste of time to talk about a birthday party that in fact does not exist.

And I don't want to waste the time of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, in debating something that is fabricated by the members of the opposition. But I am assuming, Mr. Speaker, that from the wording of this motion, from the words expressed by the members opposite that the members must be referring to the Future Corporation. And, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, if that is the case, and I do trust that it is, I will confine my remarks to the Future Corporation — not a birthday party but to the Future Corporation, and the other implications that stem from the motion that we have before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make the case today that the Future Corporation was established to co-ordinate very special programs and special events throughout the year 1990. These special programs, Mr. Speaker, will highlight Saskatchewan people, will promote new ideas and technology that is going to take us into the future, Mr. Speaker.

The member from Saskatoon South motion specifically reads, “. . . election year birthday party.” The member from Saskatoon South refers to 1990 as an election year, and that that is why the Future Corporation was formed. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest to you, and I suggest to all people in the province of Saskatchewan that 1990 may not be an election year. Perhaps 1989, perhaps this very year we will have an election. Perhaps the election may be called tomorrow; it may be called in 1991. So I say, Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat presumptuous of the opposition to say that 1990 is going to be an election year.

When I stop and think about that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps we should have an election soon. When I stop and look back in recent history, just a few months ago, 1988 was not a bad year to have an election. And the member who currently sits in Assiniboia-Gravelbourg is good testimony to the fact that 1988 was not a bad year for an election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — And I'd say, Mr. Speaker, if that is

the thinking of the opposition, if the opposition does think there's going to be an election soon, I would say that it would be fair ball . . . fair advice for the opposition to get ready, to get for an election, Mr. Speaker. And I say that with some good reason, and the reason is as follows: the NDP have no policy today. The NDP, and I look at them across the legislature, Mr. Speaker, have sat in opposition for seven years. For seven years, Mr. Speaker, they have had an opportunity to discuss with the people of Saskatchewan, to discuss with the members in their own caucus, to discuss at their party conventions, what their policies and their programs and their suggestions and their alternatives might be. But I ask the members of the NDP Party, have you brought forward any reasonable solutions or alternatives? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is a flat, outright no.

I take a look at this specific motion here today, Mr. Speaker, along with the first 10 or 12 or 15 motions on the blues on the order paper, all put forward by members of the NDP Party, all put forward by members in the NDP Party. And Mr. Speaker, is there one, is there one positive solution, alternative, or suggestion by the members of the NDP Party among those 17 motions? Mr. Speaker, there is not one. There is not one.

Here today is another example of something that is straight negative, straight critical, straight condemnation.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP got up this morning and they said, well what negative things can we think of today? What negative things can we bring forward in the Saskatchewan legislature? Well, Mr. Speaker, is that the tone, is that the mood, is that the way of Saskatchewan people? Is that at the heart of Saskatchewan people? The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

And I respect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that members in opposition have a right and a responsibility to criticize. And I think the people of Saskatchewan recognize that as well. But, Mr. Speaker, when it is day after day, straight condemnation, criticizing, and not a positive alternative or solution put forward, Mr. Speaker, the people across Saskatchewan are saying, hey, what is wrong with the NDP? Their own people in the NDP Party are scratching their heads and saying, did we make a mistake electing our new leader? Have we done the right thing?

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is there any wonder that there is disunity and a lack of harmony and disorganization in the NDP caucus today. There's no question that that is there, Mr. Speaker, and it's not easy . . . pardon me, not hard to see why.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, the NDP thus far, all they have done in seven years is criticize. Mr. Speaker, the NDP are a negative bunch of people in this Saskatchewan legislature. I don't believe that they're even serving their own members properly or correctly when all they do is create all this negativity.

And, Mr. Speaker, I apply that directly to the motion that we're talking about here today, and let's talk directly and specifically about the future. And, Mr. Speaker, is it right, is it right that we stick our heads in the sand and we say no; well, we're not going to worry about the future; we're

just going to let it take care of itself. Well, Mr. Speaker, the very nature of the Future Corporation is looking into the future, looking at change.

Mr. Speaker, we are living today in one of the most exciting and interesting times that this country and this world has ever seen. Technology is advancing on us so very, very quickly. Computerization is run amass in the public. Young people have the right, young people have the right, Mr. Speaker, and leaders in Saskatchewan and elsewhere have a responsibility to guide the young people in Saskatchewan, guide the entire population, in fact, into the future with some positive suggestions, some positive alternatives.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is what the Future Corporation is all about. The mandate of the Future Corporation is to create a better awareness of our province's accomplishments in things like research and development, computerization, technology, change. And how is that accomplished, Mr. Speaker? Well, frankly, by education — through the education system, Mr. Speaker. The Future Corporation will play a very, very major role with and alongside the educational system in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon South — and I recall his remarks in condemning our government for forming the corporation because of financial constraints in certain departments — and he talks about health, for instance, and I'd like to talk about that just a little bit. And I'd like to perhaps, Mr. Speaker, set the record straight, set the record clear on health care and health care expenditures under this administration.

Mr. Speaker, last fiscal year, if my memory serves me correctly, approximately one and one-quarter billion dollars was spent on health care in this province. Mr. Speaker, if you take that and divide it by the population that we have, that's about \$1,250 per man, woman and child.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you compare the expenditures on health care with those expenditures made in the year 1982 by the former administration, that is about a 68 per cent increase. Mr. Speaker, when you woke up this morning, in this province of Saskatchewan approximately \$3 million today was spent on health care. Mr. Speaker, that is not a cut-back. And, Mr. Speaker, the public of Saskatchewan have every right to know the real figures and the real truth about health care expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, our government has a very good record when it comes to the expenditures on health care, and I compare that with the record of the NDP. And the NDP member from Saskatoon South today admittedly was the minister of Health for some time in this province, and I'd like to talk just a little bit about that, Mr. Speaker.

That member talked today about waiting lists in the province of Saskatchewan, and indeed there are waiting lists, Mr. Speaker. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, those waiting lists have been reduced under this administration. I will tell you further, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons for the waiting lists are such things as CAT scans. There's a big demand, a big waiting list for

CAT scans, CAT scans here in the province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, under the NDP there were not any waiting lists for CAT scans, a zero waiting list. And do you know why, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Because under the NDP administration they refused to buy a single CAT scanner for the people in this province. Mr. Speaker, we have spent many millions of dollars buying CAT scanners for the people of this province. So the NDP say, well, there wasn't any waiting lists. You bet. Under the NDP, there weren't any CAT scans either.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give you a quotation from that very member from Saskatoon South who was the minister of Health at one time, and I don't remember exactly the year, but it was under the NDP administration. And that member from Saskatoon South talked about waiting lists. Well, I'll give you his quotation, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon South, the NDP member from Saskatoon South, referred in a speech at one point in his career:

To run an efficient hospital system, you must have a waiting list. I have said this on a number of occasions. A waiting list is an efficient way of running a hospital system. Those who run efficient hospital systems do have waiting lists.

(1545)

That is the current NDP member for Saskatoon South. So I debate the member on the point, Mr. Speaker. I say that it is somewhat hypocritical for him to be talking that way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on to some other areas that the member referred to, or perhaps some that he didn't refer to. And a shining example in the health care field of what technology is giving the people today, and the shining example, Mr. Speaker, is the new computerized health card. Here is a card, Mr. Speaker, that a few years ago was not possible to have because of lack of technology. Now today, Mr. Speaker, things have changed. Computerization is a very, very big part of society today, and this administration, with the help of the people in Saskatchewan, has developed a new computerized health card system.

This is technology, Mr. Speaker. This is change, Mr. Speaker. This is the future, Mr. Speaker, and an example of how the Future Corporation can adapt to such things as health cards is, I will just bet you, Mr. Speaker, that some of the programs and some of the policies and some of the efforts that that corporation will have with our young people will be coming up with other ideas similar, similar to the health card system.

And, Mr. Speaker, the NDP are opposed to the new health card. The NDP has said that it wouldn't work and they wouldn't have done it that way. Well, Mr. Speaker, testimony, testimony to the fact that that health card is a good idea is the fact that different jurisdictions from all over North America, and indeed in other foreign countries, have contacted this government and are today, as we speak, investigating the possibility of implementing a health card system similar to that of Saskatchewan's.

Mr. Speaker, is that something that we can be proud of in Saskatchewan? I submit to you that the answer is yes. Yes, we can be proud of the new health card in Saskatchewan. Yes, we can be proud of the people in Saskatchewan. And indeed the Future Corporation and its mandate, its very mandate of its existence, is to look at different changes in technologies and research and development, and involve the people of Saskatchewan, whether it's in the educational system or whether it's right within local communities.

Mr. Speaker, what this is, is representative of a government's attitude, representative, Mr. Speaker, of this government's attitude that we do have a strong belief in the public of Saskatchewan. We, Mr. Speaker, tend to try, try and be as positive as we can, and have that positive belief and trust in the people of Saskatchewan that we together can come up with good, new ideas; that we as a people in Saskatchewan can adapt to the technologies and the changes that are taking us in right now to the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, and there's a big, big difference. There's a big difference in the fundamental belief and a fundamental attitude that people on this side of the House have, as opposed to the NDP who are a bunch of career critics, and all they can do, Mr. Speaker, is criticize and condemn and be negative, Mr. Speaker, and there's a big, big difference.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP have gone on and berated this whole corporation across this province. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing that I will admit to here today is the fact that perhaps, perhaps we as a government have not done as good a job as we could have in telling the people of Saskatchewan exactly what this corporation will be doing. But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that the story will be told.

And one of the best examples of that was the other day in the constituency of Humboldt — and I believe it was right in the city of Humboldt, but correct me if I'm wrong; but I do know it was in the constituency of Humboldt — the Future Corporation held an informational meeting. And it was very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to witness at that event some of the participants. One of the participants in particular, Mr. Speaker, was the member for Humboldt, the member for Humboldt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that member sat in the front row, as I am led to believe, listened to the presentation made by the Future Corporation, and immediately thereafter stood openly, publicly, amongst his constituents and had words of praise for the corporation, for the mandate of the corporation, and for what is likely to transpire in 1990.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the member from Humboldt has some explaining to do to his caucus. I would invite the member for Humboldt today to perhaps speak on this issue . . .

An Hon. Member: — Come clean.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — And as one member said, come clean with your real true feelings. Because I know that that member was standing, just a few days ago, amongst

his constituents after hearing an address by the president of the Future Corporation, and that NDP member publicly and openly supported it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn for a few moments to the president or the head or the CEO, or whatever the title is, of the Future Corporation. That man is a man by the name of Cliff Wright. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a very wise choice has been made by this government in appointing Mr. Wright as the head of the Future Corporation.

Mr. Wright has had a long history in municipal politics, being a very successful mayor in the city of Saskatoon, and I believe he is a man who has a very, very good understanding and idea of the very nature of Saskatchewan people. I do know, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Wright has an open invitation to go to various communities, give his presentation, and talk to the people about what the Future Corporation really means to them and really means to all people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that in time, in a very short time, people will be very, very supportive of the mandate of the Future Corporation. I believe that the brochures are now out to all communities across Saskatchewan. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that interest is growing in the Future Corporation, in the programs that it will deploy in the year 1990.

So, Mr. Speaker, I once again say that the members of the NDP have made not a wise choice in condemning this initiative, that they should have — as in many things — studied the facts, studied the facts before they jumped to their feet and assumed that 1990 was going to be an election year, because it may well not. The members should not have jumped to their feet and said, it is just a birthday party, because it is not just a birthday party, Mr. Speaker.

What it is is something that will touch the very fabric of people all across this province. What it will do, for instance, Mr. Speaker, is encourage tourism to various communities. This government has a firm and a solid belief in local people, in local communities banding together and deciding for themselves how they may best attract tourists, and perhaps it will be a theme within the Future Corporation in the year 1990 that does that.

And, Mr. Speaker, here again the members opposite do not have the understanding of how important the tourist trade is to the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it is predicted that by the year 2000 or sooner that tourism will be the biggest industry in North America, and, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon leaders in the Government of Saskatchewan to encourage that type of an industry. Mr. Speaker, the Future Corporation is a prime example of a vehicle that can do just what I say and attract tourists to this province.

Mr. Speaker, members of the opposition, if it was left to them, would they have established a program or a policy or a corporation like this? No, Mr. Speaker, they would not have. Mr. Speaker, do the members in opposition, do the NDP have that trust and belief and faith in local people, taking on local programs and local initiatives and deciding what is best in their communities? No, Mr.

Speaker, they do not have that belief.

Mr. Speaker, I submit once again to you that the Future Corporation will take us well into the 1990s. We are moving in a rapid fashion. Change is about us all over, Mr. Speaker, and we have to accept the change and grow towards the changes that are taking place about us.

Mr. Speaker, I definitely do not support the motion that has been made by the members opposite, but I do have an amendment that I would like to propose and this is moved by myself, seconded by the member for Redberry:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" be deleted and that the following be substituted therefor:

That this Assembly commend the Government of Saskatchewan for the creation of the Future Corporation which will serve our citizens in preparing for the future of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gerich: — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to address this motion. I agree with my colleague that this motion was . . . by the opposition, was worded inappropriately. The member from Saskatoon South speaks of an imaginary birthday party. And seeing that the Future Corporation is within the realm of this motion, I too will focus my attention on discussing the merits of the corporation.

I will not speak at great lengths on this subject. It is such a small part of the Future Corporation, but a subject that is grossly exaggerated by the opposition members.

I cannot understand why the members opposite chose to ignore the positive effects and aspects of this corporation. In order to get to any kind of detail on the Future Corporation, I too find it necessary to outline for the member from Saskatoon South the corporation's mandate. The mandate is to build a better awareness of our province's accomplishments in the areas of research and technology and to encourage the development of new and novel projects, projects that will be developed by the people of this province. The corporation endeavours to reach the broadest spectrum of the people in all parts of the province and of all age levels.

Let's be realistic. Advanced technology is impacting Saskatchewan's culture and our economy. The way in which we handle the technical change will determine Saskatchewan's success in the world of the future. The Future Corporation is offering to our public the opportunity to participate in the consideration of how we will react to future change.

We in Saskatchewan have a long list of major contributions in the area of technical advancements. We have a list of over 100 firsts, and I could not possibly discuss them all at this time, so I'll be selective. Because the member from Saskatoon South took time to hit on health, I feel obliged to do the same, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Without notes, I could reel off a number of our accomplishments in this area, a very notable

accomplishment like the new Wascana Rehabilitation Centre and a cancer clinic.

The Wascana Rehabilitation Centre, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a facility that will be unsurpassed in all of Canada once it's complete. The new cancer clinic is a facility with world-class equipment. Some of that equipment was developed right here in Saskatchewan, and one piece of equipment was developed by our very own Lieutenant Governor. We in Saskatchewan are achievers. We're in the front line of the technological advancements in Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government cares about the people of Saskatchewan. Look at our Everyone Wins program. It was a program established to motivate individuals and communities to engage in a healthy life-style, a program geared towards educating our people, towards improved and healthier life-styles. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is preventative health care.

Another major accomplishment introduced recently was our innovative health card. That little innovative card is quite an accomplishment. That card is capable of recording our entire medical history. It will, in the near future, have recorded our allergies, our regular medications, our individual ailments, and even our blood type. I can tell you that once the card's full capabilities are carried out, you and I will not be without it, and neither will the members of the opposition, because they realize what kind of advancements our government made in regard to health. They know what the little card is capable of.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, look at the Saskatchewan Commission on Directions in Health Care. They're right now examining a wide range of health issues, and they are doing so in direct consultation with the public and with the health care providers. They're looking towards the future management of the health care system.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Saskatoon South mentioned social services. I think my colleague who spoke before me made a good point in regard to welfare reform, and I'd like to elaborate on it.

(1600)

Mr. Speaker, our government is committed to welfare reform. We are not initiating welfare reform to save money. The direct opposite is the case. We are providing employable people with jobs. If this government wanted to save money we would keep these people on welfare. This government chooses to address what the opposition members chose to ignore. We realize that self-respect and dignity is worth paying for. We are providing these people, previously on welfare, with their dignity.

The members opposite surely don't think that these people want to remain on welfare. They want to get their feet back on the ground. We're giving them a chance. Surely the members opposite don't want these people on welfare. Just because it's cheaper for a government doesn't mean it's right.

I think the people opposite are out of touch with the

people. They criticize welfare reform. They say that we're forcing people to take low paying jobs. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those jobs are an incentive. They pay more than welfare does, and we want to see that more are offered to our employable welfare recipients.

And seeing that I'm on the topic of social services, I feel once again compelled to brag about another first, the development of a fully automated computer system for social assistance programs in Saskatchewan. This computer system was implemented province-wide to improve client service and to strengthen program control. Mr. Speaker, this system is the most advanced of its kind in North America — again, Mr. Speaker, in North America.

Yet another area that the member from Saskatoon South discussed was education. Well I say that education is what the Future Corporation is all about. You can say that \$9 million that the member from Saskatoon South refers to is actually going towards education. Education is where the future lies, and education is the base for future growth.

I say our PC government has made education accessible to more students today than it has ever been in Saskatchewan. Distance education and a new SCAN (Saskatchewan Communications Advanced Network) program, just introduced on March 8, have ensured that education is accessible to our students wherever they may be in the province. Through distance education, rural students have the opportunity to take university and technical institute courses in the regional college in their area.

Credit courses, Mr. Speaker: this government is working with those educational institutions to ensure that these credits are transferable in the smoothest way possible. Rural students can keep on working on their family farms or keep their part-time job in their communities while attending a post-secondary institution. They can live at home and attend university. We are giving them an option. They don't have to move to go to school.

Through SCAN, students in remote areas in Saskatchewan will have access to educational programming via cablevision and satellite broadcast. Students of all ages will benefit from SCAN. Professionals can upgrade from their home. Single parents who find it hard and difficult to leave the home now have access through SCAN to education that they may not otherwise have had the time before.

Mr. Speaker, the Future Corporation projects and programming will also reach these people. Any group, organization or individual can apply for a grant available through the Future Corporation. They can hold seminars and they can organize science fairs. They can even hold a celebration of sorts in appreciation of Saskatchewan's past and future contributions to research and technology.

Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to the people of this province. The Future Corporation mandate is to build a better awareness of our province's accomplishments; its mandate, to encourage the development of new projects. The grants available to our

people through the Future Corporation will foster new development. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the proposed motion, and I will definitely second the amendment.

Mr. Speaker I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Resolution No. 14 — Opportunities for Northern Saskatchewan

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll be moving the resolution which will be also seconded by the member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake.

The essence of the resolution, resolution no. 14, is the overall aspect of the PC government neglect of northern Saskatchewan. And this is not a new story because this has been happening since 1982, and every year we have introduced a resolution of this regard basically because the situation gets a lot harder for a lot of children, seniors, and families and workers of northern Saskatchewan.

It also, as time goes on, shows that the traditional resource users such as trappers, and fishermen and women, and also the small-business sector and the wild rice growers, and so on, are seeing a lot more and more positive benefits for big business in northern Saskatchewan and a lot less for them.

In regards to the central aspect of the resolution, the thing that really concerns a lot of people time and again throughout all these years is the whole question of unemployment. I must say that the people have been very positive and they've always been providing a lot of suggestions for action all these years, but these suggestions have fallen on deaf ears. The fact of the matter is this: when a lot of people are looking at an over 9 per cent unemployment rate for the rest of the province, we have a 50 to 80 per cent unemployment in northern Saskatchewan, and that is absolutely devastating.

Most of the records and experiences of people throughout the world and also here in Saskatchewan, whether we look back in the early 1900s or during the Dirty Thirties, or at times when the unemployment rate has risen, the fact remains is that the pressure on families becomes unbearable and many things start happening.

One of the most important things that have happened in the past six years, over six years, and has happened quite continuously, is that there is a rising level of suicide rates in northern Saskatchewan. When you look at the research base, it states very clearly that for every 1 per cent rise in unemployment there's a 4 per cent rise in suicide rates. And as I looked at the records, in particular as I looked at the story of my own community back in the about '82, '83, '84 period at a time when the housing pretty well stopped because of PC federal policy and because of PC provincial policy, the lack of jobs for the summer so that they can continue their benefits through the winter, created a crisis condition. And for a community who was very, very proud of their history of working in the mines and working in the forests and working in the farms, they became to be involved in a situation where it was

becoming difficult for their youth to look forward into the future.

As a result, a lot of the people started seeing a lot of breakdown in their communications with their youth. And many of the youth took on to drugs and alcohol and started rebelling against some of the advice that more elderly people and their parents were saying at the community level. During that period in time, there was a tremendous amount of community upheaval; a lot of the students were crying out for help but nobody was listening. The government was not listening. In that particular three-year period, about 13 people committed suicide — all relatively young, or young families.

And as I look back in history, I recognize the fact of that it is such a tremendous, terrible impact for people, and this has continued. And although people try to get groups to work together to try and resolve this problem, it can never recover the loss of losing a loved one in regards to the suicide rates. And many people recognize, as there is pressure taking place right now in Saskatchewan, that it causes not only the tendency for greater suicide rates to increase but it causes a lot of family problems.

There's a lot of family breakdowns. Not only do the youth try and argue for a job, but because there isn't one, they develop conflicts within the family. But also the spouse who finds a job comes back and is laid off and tries to look for another job and is laid off again. Then he tries to look for another job, they can't find it, and after doing it about three, four times, they quit going to look for a job. And it's very disappointing during that period because a lot of the family fights take place during that time. People start blaming themselves because they cannot get a job, and as a result, a lot of fights take place between the man and the wife.

And in that regard, a lot of the family breakdowns occur because there is really a lack of economic support, basic support, you know, for the family as a whole because at the same time you are getting a lot more children who are hungry. And I'm glad that we are starting to recognize that problem that one out of every four children is now going hungry because that's the impact of unemployment. It really, really, really destroys the future that all of the children are really looking for when they are growing up with their parents at the community level.

So I see it from a direct basis that a lot of people don't experience, as I come to the South. A lot of them are experiencing it at a 9 per cent level. I see it and experience it at an 80 per cent level. And I can tell you that it's a highly destructive force.

Many times when the need for jobs was there and it was requested and the social aid programs came, the welfare programs came, many people said, we do not want the welfare programs; what we want are jobs. We want those pay cheques in the same way as anybody else, not the welfare cheques. We want to be able to make sure that we provide and are responsible for our own families. And that is the essence of the message that I was raised with and I was born with as I lived up in Cumberland and having travelled around at the community level.

So the impact of unemployment is very destructive, not only to the individual children and the individual youth who are trying to look forward to the future, but also the families. It destroys families.

Many people fight. I've seen people who never used to fight before when I was growing up, now fighting at the community level at a greater rate than I've ever seen before. And the same thing with child neglect. It was really unheard of before; now we see it today. And those are the hard core facts of unemployment as we look at the question when we raise it time and time again.

(1615)

When I looked at the ... So overall I may say that unemployment is a destructive aspect on the individual, it's a destructive aspect on the family, and it's also a destructive factor in breaking down a lot of our communities.

And when I looked at the record of the Progressive Conservative government in the past six years, I looked at the one characteristic about PCs and Conservatives in general, and that was the whole issue of the upholding of law. There's a great ideology within the Conservative ranks about making sure that we follow the law, that we don't break the law, that indeed the regulations that are provided by our legislatures, by our system, are important and we should not break them.

But when I look at the record, what people are telling me in the North is this: that the law is bent for the big corporations, but the law becomes very strict on the people. And I'll provide an example. For many years, people have been saying that the unemployment rate is unacceptable and that we should have definite goals of improving the number of people employed at the mines.

And that came to be a big issue in the '70s, so an affirmative action lease agreement strategy was brought in by the NDP government. And that, when I looked about it in the past, was the most successful thing in the history of employment in the North. Although there was a need for improvement of the particular record, even within the NDP years, there was a greater level of employment than ever existed before. Not only were people employed during the construction phase but in the operational phases as well.

Because what tended to happen in the past was this. When people went into the construction jobs in the North and they built, let's say, Sandy Bay or Island Falls hydroelectric power development and they built the dam there, or when they built the mine in Flin Flon, a lot of Indian and Metis labour was used. And during that period in time a lot of people went on their own and got the jobs there because they wanted to partake in economic development, and a lot of them ... and their record is not known.

I talked to and did research for the community of Sandy Bay and I interviewed people who had worked 40 years for the company, but they never received anything, or they received very little. And it's very important therefore to recognize that a lot of people had wanted to be part of

development. They always will be part of development. They wanted to be part and have a fair share of the jobs that exist in the North. That's exactly the precise message.

And when I look at the whole aspect of the ideology of law by the Conservatives, it's to make the people pay that are poor, is what I see. Be very harsh with the law when it comes down to the poor. When it comes down to the trapper or the fishermen and women who are out there on their species limit, hire helicopters to look after them, because that's what's happening. We see sometimes people going with video cameras, chasing people out on the lake, acting like they're tourists and looking at that, and spending a lot of money in trying to track down people trying to make a living.

And when I look at the record that you have a 50 per cent hiring clause for northern Saskatchewan, which is the law and the regulation in this province, this government turned that from a good record, which was about 50, 55 per cent, and now it's down. It went all the way down to about 15 per cent, 19 per cent. And now I look at the records, it's 28 per cent. But the 28 per cent is on Northerners, on native people, which is the intent on the human rights code. It's only about 12 per cent. And so we're looking at a fact that the law is not being followed.

And at the same time ... I just got a call, even yesterday, by one of the tourist outfitters who is trying hard to make a living up in the North. He said that he was being harassed basically because the officers had made a mistake in regards to one of the charges that they were trying to give him, but they didn't find sufficient enough proof. So that they were harassing him and he was finally told, I think, yesterday that he had to watch himself. And it's a very sad situation, you know, for people to have to put up with that. When they want to try hard to make a living, they are pressed and pushed hard for regulating you.

And it's not that people don't want regulations. They want these regulations because it saves their livelihood in the long run, because it's for their own protection. But they are saying, why are you regulating us at such a tight level when you will not follow the regulations of the big corporations? You're deregulating the big corporations. And that is what the message of the people is in regards to the aspect of law.

They say very straightforward, there is one law for the rich and the big corporations and the friends of the Tories, and another law for the people who are trying hard to make a living in northern Saskatchewan, whether it's small business, tourist operators, trappers, fishermen and women, or many other people who are trying to find employment in the North. So that's the central message that I see that's happening.

The other aspect that's very important to recognize, you know, for the record, is this. People are always saying, why doesn't the government consult with us? And I must say for the record that, you know, for the first time now we had a minister that does a lot more travel in the North than ever before. Now what I'm seeing is the lack of action, though.

The fact is this, that when I looked at the ads and I looked

at the fact that there was supposed to be a model of co-operation in regards to northern development, and I mentioned it in the throne speech before, that the model of co-operation was such where the people took a strong stand in Cumberland, and they did it in such a way that the government wasn't listening, and they tried to get back at the government that they weren't listening. So they finally brought in the media. And they brought in that . . . and built in the weir at Cumberland, and brought in public attention so that there was action taking place after that.

But I think what the people are saying is that they're very open and they want to co-operate. They don't only want to co-operate in settling, you know, 60-year agreement on compensation in Sandy Bay or a 35-year lack of compensation efforts in regards to Southend, but they want also to co-operate in regards to the construction that takes place on the roads that lead to the mine. They want those roads upgraded because a lot of them are fairly dangerous when those great big trucks come rolling down there with a lot of the dangerous chemicals that are sitting in the back of those trucks, and a lot of people are forced off the roads.

What our people are saying is that, let's improve those roads. Not only should they be big enough to carry the big trucks so that they could travel around and take the ore out from northern Saskatchewan, but those roads should be built safe for the people to travel in. That indeed it would create a lot of jobs, not only the highways from P.A. to La Ronge, but also the highly unfinished one from P.A. to Creighton, and also into communities like Sandy Bay, into communities like Grandmother's Bay, the roads from Cumberland to the mine, the roads up to Southend, the road up to Wollaston Lake, building the road not only to the mine in Wollaston Lake — there's a road right up to the mine, but there isn't one to the community. There isn't one to the community. Right there in Wollaston the people want those roads. It means a lot of jobs for the people. And I think that is what the people are saying. They are not opposed to the development. They would like to see the development continue in the North. They want to partake in the development.

The other point that is mentioned quite often is this. Not only is there a lack of jobs or a lack of real consultation, but there is a lack of economic support for the people at the community level. They say about a billion dollars is taken out from the North, and I mean a billion dollars. That's a tremendous amount of money.

Last year one of the uranium mining companies made \$385 million. They sold \$385 million worth of uranium — \$385 million worth of uranium. There was \$60 million clear profit. That same company makes 52 million this past year, clear _cut profit.

What the people are saying is this. They don't want the whole 60 million. All they're saying is, why don't you take \$10 million for community development so that our children can drink fresh water. Many of the places do not have running water. They would like to have the jobs to build the sewer and water systems in the North. Many of the people still have the basic necessities and in having to deal with ordinary, common everyday living.

And I think what the people are saying is that the economic subsidies for the big corporations is there. We see 32 miles of road being built for Weyerhaeuser every year and, of course, the government says oh, we're doing all kinds of positive . . . of course, it's positive. It's positive for Weyerhaeuser. But there used to be subsidies for trappers to build roads for themselves as they went into the new areas to trap. Because when they depleted, you know, one aspect of their trap line, they would move to another area and there would always be growth after a few years. And they would need a little bit of economic support to be able to build those roads because the costs of gas was so so expensive — about three, four times the rate in some of those communities than we do over here.

And it's very important to recognize that that's what the people are saying. They said, we don't want hand-outs, but we want support when we want to build our roads so that we can make a living for our children and our families so we can get to the trap line. That's what the trappers are saying.

When I talk to the fishermen and women, they say we want the transportation subsidy, you know, that was taken away from us. We made a little bit of money from pickerel, but it seems that every time we make a little bit of money off something, you take that subsidy away. But on the other hand, you will still subsidize liquor in northern Saskatchewan. You will not subsidize the food that the fishermen and women can get for their family, but you will subsidize liquor.

And that's the biggest contradiction that people see in the North. There used to be a full transportation subsidy plan before, but it's all gone. It was replaced by a \$25 grant to welfare people which can only buy you four quarts of milk in Stony Rapids. Four quarts of milk, a family can drink that up in a day.

And those are the types of things that the people of the North are saying in regards to development that the subsidies are always there. I recall, I put . . . in the newspaper a little while ago that the a . . . in November, that the uranium companies had gotten an extra tax holiday on that rate of 1 per cent, and that amounted to about \$7 million. And this is about the amount that people are requesting for in regards to just dealing with basic economic development. They want about \$10 million to be able to do a lot of development because what the people are saying is this: you are exploiting the resource right now. You are taking a lot of our forests. You are mining out our forests. The American giant is mining out our forests. The Cameco, the new privatized corporation, is mining out and exploiting the ore bodies at a high rate right now. And what are people going to do 5, 10 years down the road?

And I looked at the promises made — and this is the other aspect that the people of the North always mention — they said, in 1982 when the Tories were campaigning, they said they would live up to their promises on jobs. But as I look back on the past seven years, that just hasn't been the case. They won't even follow the law in regards to the Key Lake agreement.

(1630)

In regards to today, the news came out now. The privatized company, the privatized SMDC which is now called Cameco, today of course said, we are now going permanently . . . we're going to eliminate 100 jobs out of 350. And I listened to the minister, and he said it was only a lay-off, you know, temporary, for six months. It's going to be a six-month period is what he had said. But as I examined the news release, it says they're going to eliminate 100 jobs.

Last year, as the critic for SMDC, as I sat across the table from him, and I asked him very directly, I said: Mr. Minister, what about the jobs in the North, I asked. Oh, he says, not to worry, not to worry, they'll be there. And I said: but we can't live up to your promises. We have heard these promises for the past five years, I said, at that time. I said, you could not keep those promises. You've never kept them before. Why would I want believe you. No, no, he said, you just wait and see; there'll be more jobs for the people. Privatization provides jobs, and that's automatically the way it is, and that's what it'll do.

And then I asked him, I said, well why don't you, if you are so sure of helping the people in the North, why don't you back up your promise? And I said, why don't you legislate a clause in there for the protection of jobs for people in the North and protection of jobs for Indian and Metis people? Well, he says, we don't really need that. He said, we'll be able to provide those jobs.

And when I meet with the people in the North they always say, how come they never live up to their promises? How come what they say means absolutely nothing? Why is it that when they say something, they just cannot live up to their word?

The history and culture of people in the North is to live up to your word. And what we see now is a government that will simply — and a Premier and a Deputy Premier that will simply not live up to their own words.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — And I think I mentioned the aspect for a real need for consultation. The new minister, of course, as I mentioned, was travelling through the North last year. And what I found out was again more promises. And then what I'm looking at is this. If they're going to promise something, why doesn't the minister in charge of the North follow the law in regards to the Key Lake agreement? Why doesn't he have a strong training program to be able to get those jobs they're now planning? It doesn't take five, six years. We'll be into seven years and he will still have not lived up to that agreement.

Not only that, one of the things that I've noticed in this regard is in history a lot of the people said, we want to be involved in the process of decision making. We want to be involved in the process of monitoring, because we have been promised many times, but we are not involved in monitoring. So when the Key Lake agreement came to be the NDP government brought in, institutionalizing the agreement, a monitoring committee. This monitoring

committee was supposed to look after small business development in the North to make sure that the small businesses were getting the contracts from the mine. And many of them were getting contracts at that date. But what was happening was that this monitoring committee was not going to be even mentioned.

Now this monitoring committee was also to look after hiring rates. But nobody hardly ever knows about the hiring rates until we bring them out in the news through the legislature. That's the only time people . . . but it's not made public because the monitoring committee was supposed to look after . . . and people who were in the monitoring committee were directly people from the North. They would have known right away how many people were hired throughout, but this government wanted to keep it secret — they wanted to make it a big secret. They wouldn't want the people to know anything so they knocked off this monitoring committee.

The other aspect in regards to the monitoring committee is the fact that many of the people were supposed to consider — and again, this is part of the cultural heritage of the North — many of the people said: we not only want the jobs, we want to make sure that our people who work there work in an environment that is safe, that the workers' health and safety has got to be the best in the world. And they also said that we wanted to make sure that environmental controls were simply the best. And so the monitoring committee was supposed to look after that.

But again, what did the PC government do? They knocked off the Department of Environment workers who were supposed to work with the monitoring committee to be able to do effective monitoring. And also they . . . they say basically because they wanted to keep everything secret. They wanted to keep their records away from the people. And to this day, I never see those records publicly displayed.

As we look at the overall aspect, I guess, the only thing that we can get in the North nowadays is the . . . when we fight for jobs, when we fight for consultation, and we want to fight for real input into decision making, what we get in return is just plain, simple promises and ideological messages that the saving grace will be privatization of the North. And again we've heard from, you know, the minister in charge of privatization, we've heard the Premier, we've heard the Deputy Premier, and they said: never we're going to lose jobs. You will see that it is the basis of our diversification, and we're going to have jobs and jobs and more jobs.

And when I look at the record, I see the youth leaving the province. I see 43,000 people out of jobs. Of course that's only the official statistics; 80,000 are probably more like the figure. We have 60,000 people on welfare. A lot of people realize that there's been not only a realization at the Canadian level of a significant increase in welfare, the records show that there's been a 25 per cent increase in welfare since 1982. And so the only economic development strategy this government has brought in was welfare economics. And the other aspect of it is of course large scale welfare to the big corporations. And that's the record of this government.

So as I talk to this resolution, I thought I might bring into perspective this whole ideology of . . . this false ideology of privatization which is merely the same old open for business strategy of 1982, and all it means is that as we provide more money for the corporations in the past seven years, we all end up paying.

A lot of the middle class in Saskatchewan were initially very positive of what was going to be happening, because everybody likes to be positive, but then after a while they started seeing the reality. There was . . . pretty soon by this year we have \$4 billion. And all the taxpayers have now to pay over \$1 million a day on interest payments — \$1 million a day. Over 300 million a year — \$300 million a year goes down the drain to pay for the interest rates so that the big banks can prosper. And at the same time you have an 80 per cent unemployment rate in northern Saskatchewan. There is absolutely no justice in this form of governing.

I've mentioned the aspect of mine work. I've mentioned the aspect of the need for help for the trappers and the fishermen. There's also the need for more help for the wild rice growers, and there's also a need for help at the community infrastructure levels so that the community leaders can look forward to hiring some of the youth that are being puzzled and withdrawn by the alcoholism that has overtaken a lot of them.

And they want to be able to say yes, we want to make a positive stand with the other people of this province. But as they go around, all they get in return is the government will take them on a trip to the nuclear power plant in Ontario; or the Premier will say, hey, great things are going to happen from China; great things are going to happen from Japan; everything will save us in the American free trade agreement.

And the people in the North are still waiting. They're waiting for the Premier to come down to Sturgeon Landing in northern Saskatchewan to see the situation for himself, for the Deputy Premier to see the unemployment situation in Timber Bay, to see the fact that the people are living in many situations . . . I've looked at the senior living in a one-room shack in northern Saskatchewan. They want to stand up and be positive, but they say, the government doesn't hear us; they don't listen to us.

So as the resolution mentions, there is a real need for the Government of Saskatchewan to start going to the people in northern Saskatchewan. I certainly hope that the new minister can go and not take a confrontational approach — we don't need a confrontational approach — join with the people and the opposition in making sure that there are jobs for the people, that you follow the law in regard to the Key Lake agreement, that you indeed, when there are new mines opening up, that you make special plans to involve not only the small-business sector but the workers in the North; that when you go in to planning and to cut new pulp in new areas, that there is consideration for the foresters of northern Saskatchewan, not so that they take only the jobs that are the poorest, but they want some of the cream of the crop too, and not only Weyerhaeuser gets the cream of the crop.

They want you to quit making promises. They want action. They want to see you promoting not only job development strategy but tourism right in the North. They want to you promote the trapping industry. They want you to promote the fishing industry. They want you to promote all those things that are very important for the lives and the families of northern Saskatchewan.

And with that I will pass the following resolution, which is seconded by the member from P.A.-Duck Lake:

That this Assembly condemns the Government of Saskatchewan for its neglect of northern communities and northern people, and for having imposed increasing hardship on the families of northern Saskatchewan, and urges the Government of Saskatchewan to make a sound, positive and meaningful commitment to provide opportunities to northern people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(1645)

Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to this this afternoon. And my comments will be brief because I think the people of this province have got a clear understanding of why we have resolutions such as this before the legislature, why we have hardships in northern Saskatchewan and, indeed, throughout this province. And I think it's becoming clear to the people of this province that what we lack is leadership.

We lack the leadership of a Premier, someone who will speak out for Saskatchewan, someone who will speak up for hungry children, someone who will speak up for Northerners who demand to be employed in their province rather than having to sit at home on social assistance with no hope for the future, or leave this province as some 6,000 people have done in February.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what the people of this province are looking for is a Premier who will speak out on behalf of Saskatchewan people when the ever-growing problem of high interest rates starts to stifle the economic growth of this province. They're looking for a Premier who will speak out, who will speak out to make sure that a commitment to the farmers of this province, made during an election time, will be fulfilled. They're looking for a Premier who will speak to the Prime Minister of this country and explain to him concisely the problems of the people of this province and the problems that they're facing.

The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no longer believe in this Premier because he can't be trusted — promises made, promises broken, and a litany of a lack of understanding of what average Saskatchewan people are facing.

He hasn't been addressing the problem of high interest rates that business people of northern Saskatchewan are facing. And this weekend, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I was back in my riding and I was talking to some of the business people in Prince Albert, and I was talking to

some of the people who do their accounting, they're starting to understand what the minimum wage economy of this government means. They're starting to understand that it means bankruptcies, and that it means small businesses closing their doors, and that it means families breaking up because of lack of employment opportunities. They're starting to understand that this people is hell-bent on destroying the middle class people in Saskatchewan and really don't care about what the consequences of that are.

They're starting to understand that there's no basic economic support for northern people or for people in the urban communities, small-business people, working people. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if this government were to have the courage to go to the people, that they would be chastised severely.

They know full well that this government is willing to subsidize liquor sales in northern Saskatchewan, but not milk or bread or eggs. They know where this government's priorities lie. And they know when they read a column from the member from Rosthern who indicates that in a privatization meeting he found no evidence of public disdain at their desire to put more liquor outlets in this province, they understand clearly where these people are coming from, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And that may be one of the reasons that that particular member plays a lesser role in this government in the last few days.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of this province are looking for leadership, leadership that can be and will be delivered by the member from Riversdale. That's what they're looking for.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — They're not looking for a Premier that goes on a month-long junket at public expense. They're not looking for that kind of a Premier. They're looking for the kind of a Premier who is sincere in what he's doing, sincere in what he wants to accomplish on behalf of the people of this province.

When you look at an out-migration of some 6,000 people from this province in the month of February, and at the same you can see members of this government stand up and praise and applaud the Premier who's caused it all to happen, can you expect anything less than the people of the province are fed up and are leaving? There's no hope any more.

And why is there no hope? Because this government doesn't have a vision. Oh yes, they've got a vision for Pocklington; and they've got a vision for Weyerhaeuser; and they've got a vision for the people that run Manalta Coal now; and they've got a vision for Remai. Those are the people that they have a vision for. But I tell you it's a small group of people in this province that they have that vision for, and the rest of the people of Saskatchewan are simply not going to put up with it any longer than they have to. And as I suggested, were an election to be called, I would suggest this Premier would be dust.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lautermilch: — And they want more than a brochure, a glossy brochure from the minister responsible for northern economic development, with her picture in it some 17 times and they want to see more than her aircraft flying into their community to deliver another promise that they know full well is never going to be fulfilled. That's not what they're looking for. That's not what they're looking for and that's not what they expect from a minister of the Crown.

I want to say to you, Madam Minister, that they're as happy when you leave as they ever could be simply because they don't want to hear any more of your stories. What they want is jobs. They want some security for their families. They want some hope for the future, none of which, Madam Minister, your government can deliver because you're not governing for those people.

They want some basic economic support and some decency and some honesty from government. And, Madam Minister, it's a sad thing to say, but clearly your government can't deliver any of those, because either you don't have the knowledge or you don't have the desire, or maybe it's a combination of both. They know who your vision is for, and they know they're not included.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is much more that can be said on this particular issue. There's much more that needs to be said on this issue and on others, but as I said, I want to allow some other members of this legislature . . . And I would particularly be interested to see if the members opposite might be interested in addressing this issue of hunger and unemployment in the North, but I doubt that's going to happen.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm going to take my place, but before I do I want to challenge the minister to get up and defend her record in northern Saskatchewan. It would be a very short speech, because she would have little to say.

And with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that I'm very pleased to support this motion because I know that the member from Cumberland who introduced this motion to the floor of the legislature, understands clearly what the problems are. And I await the minister's response in terms of this motion. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to respond to the misinformation and unreliable statements not only made by the member from Cumberland, but his seconder — his seat I forget, but it's one of the Prince Albert seats.

At the onset, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to inform the House that at the conclusion of my remarks I will be moving an amendment to resolution no. 14, an amendment which will commend the Government of Saskatchewan for designing and promoting a vision of northern Saskatchewan, and promoting that vision by providing for what will be the most exciting, most prosperous, and I think, most productive period of time that the North has ever been witness to.

Mr. Speaker, the member from Cumberland has fallen into the old CCF-NDP trap, along with all his colleagues. Not one of them, not one of them since this House has opened, has talked about the promise, the potential, the pride of Saskatchewan people. Not one of them. To listen to them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would think that we were, as my colleague said, a fourth-world country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government has recognized the special needs of our northern people, and in understanding their issues, have opened doors of opportunity for northern people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to read into the record part of a letter I received from the northern village of Pinehouse which says — and I hope the member from Cumberland listens because he sure doesn't listen when he goes up North, if he ever does:

Dear Madam Minister: It seems apparent that the province of Saskatchewan has taken a bold step in recognizing the abilities and the responsibilities of Northerners. Over the last few months the province has continuously allowed us a voice in the social and economic direction affecting northern Saskatchewan. We have what you may call come of age, where we are fully capable to deal with the directions necessary to guarantee economic and social stability in each community.

And, Mr. Speaker, yes I have travelled extensively in northern Saskatchewan and I feel privileged to do so. And I feel privileged to do so because of the people, the leaders that I have met in the northern communities, leaders like Greg Ross. He is not a person who does not speak for northern Saskatchewan. The leaders that I have met in northern Saskatchewan, duly elected by their local villages and local towns, they speak the same way that the mayor of Pinehouse does.

They feel that they have the ability, they feel that they have the capability, and they feel that they have the desire to face the problems that are facing northern communities. But they are looking at working with government, with this Tory government under our Premier, the member from Estevan, to come to grips, to come to an understanding of some of the issues that are facing them.

But one thing that they recognize, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that there has been open for them a window of opportunity right across northern Saskatchewan. And it's through the innovative approach of this government to the North that this government is responding to the special needs and the special desires, as articulated by northern mayors and northern councils, the desires of northern Saskatchewan people. And we are developing an action plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which focuses on the issues that are crucial, that are crucial to the success of the northern part of our province.

Mr. Speaker, it was this PC government that ended the 26-year-long dispute with Cumberland House and SaskPower in 1988. And the member opposite says, oh well they had six years to do it; six years it took you, six years to settle this 26-year dispute. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, his party had 11 years to solve that dispute and

did not one thing. Not one thing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mrs. Duncan: — And it was this government, under this Premier, the member from Estevan, that said, let us resolve this long-standing irritant, and that's what we did in December of 1988 with a historic \$23 million settlement to the people of Cumberland House and the Indian band of Cumberland House. And you did nothing to promote that. Not a thing.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say on this particular subject because these people travel, not very far north, maybe not much farther than Prince Albert, but the misinformation, the deliberate misinformation that that member sends out and that member sends out and that leader sends out, Mr. Speaker, is unparalleled in our parliamentary tradition in this province.

And Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I have more to say on this, and I hope to have the opportunity next private members day, I move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn.

The division bells rang from 5 p.m. until 5:04 p.m.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 32

Muller	Klein
Duncan	Meiklejohn
McLeod	Martin
Andrew	Toth
Berntson	Sauder
Lane	Johnson
Taylor	McLaren
Smith	Petersen
Swan	Swenson
Muirhead	Martens
Maxwell	Baker
Schmidt	Wolfe
Hodgins	Gleim
Gerich	Gardner

The Speaker: — Order. I think the hon. members know that it's a well-practised tradition that we allow the vote to be taken with as little interruption as possible. I'd ask for your co-operation.

Hepworth	Saxinger
Hardy	Britton

The Speaker: — Order. I just want to inform the House that the vote will not proceed if there are constant interruptions.

Nays — 21

Prebble	Goulet
---------	--------

Rolfes	Hagel
Shillington	Pringle
Lingenfelter	Lyons
Koskie	Calvert
Mitchell	Lautermilch
Upshall	Trew
Simard	Smart
Kowalsky	Van Mulligen
Atkinson	Koenker
Anguish	

The Assembly adjourned at 5:07 p.m.